



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Review Article: A review and critical analysis of the efforts towards urban flood reduction in the Lagos region of Nigeria” by U. C. Nkwunonwo et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 27 August 2015

I attach the manuscript with comments.

As a general comment, (and not knowing anything about flooding in Nigeria) it sounds like it is important research for Nigeria and an important critique of current flood management practices.

Having said this, both the structure and the written style of the paper could be vastly improved. It is currently hard to read and repetitive in places (I don't mean the individual word repetitions that I've highlighted, but ideas are repeated in some places). It is also somewhat non-specific and would benefit from some concrete examples here and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



there. I've suggested a couple of places but there are more.

Information needs to be added, like an explanation of concepts such as 'living with floods'. I'm not sure what measures the author is lumping into this approach. Ecosystem approaches? (ie, relocation of vulnerable development, changing land use so as to return flood prone land to the river? Wetland protection? Enhancing natural flood buffers?); flood accommodation type measures, such as building standards – raised buildings? floodproofing? From what I read I got the impression the authors were just referring to integration between agencies and addressing vulnerabilities in the community, but I may be wrong.

There could also be a better discussion about why flood modelling was so important and why it isn't done, who should be responsible, why LiDAR data isn't released to researchers. The discussion about flood management agencies and their responsibilities could be made clearer using a diagram. I was a bit concerned about one of the recommendations which (I think) is recommending a national flood insurance scheme like the USA. Other countries have explored and discarded this option for very good reason. Why was the basis for this recommendation not discussed in the text? There are plenty of other comments throughout the paper and I won't reiterate all of them.

Although I think this is potentially an important study, I feel it needs a lot more work. I therefore suggest it should be given the opportunity for major revision and re-submission.

I've filled in the 'form' lower down in the email. My letters are in red so you can see what's mine.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/C1565/2015/nhessd-3-C1565-2015-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 3897, 2015.

C1566

NHESSD

3, C1565–C1566, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

