

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 #2

Received and published: 28 August 2015

The paper presents a review of flood risk in the Lagos area aiming at identifying future challenges towards flood risk reduction. In the paper a list of flood events occurred since 1968 is included, previous works about social vulnerability, hazard mapping and risk perception have been specifically quoted. Recommendations towards the improvement of risk mitigation practices are finally described. Despite the contents and topic are very interesting the manuscript suffers of different major shortcomings that prevent its publication.

1) The data are not presented in a well-structured way. Flood risk is a combination of three main factors (hazard, vulnerability and exposure) so I would recommend to

C1570

clearly describe what has been addressed and what is still lacking in Lagos considering such a framework (or other more detailed frameworks). In general it seems that the definitions of the risk components are confused. In my opinion the evolution of Lagos flood risk could be clearer if the authors may comment on hazard (did it increase or is it expected to increase according to your references?) and similarly on vulnerability, what is for instance the main driver of flood risk in Lagos situation? What about the urban development (a map could be useful)? Tables or schemes could improve the understanding of the contents.

2) What I understood is that hydrologic and topographic data are available (NIHSA) and the main difficulty towards hazard mapping is that LiDAR data are not available. Why not to use world open data such as global DTM? A discussion is needed. Moreover the role of the involved public Authorities is not clear.

3) In my opinion a review considering so many years should at least include some synthetic description of the temporal evolution of flood awareness (i.e. in terms of development of the environmental legislation), maybe to sum up with a table.

4) The written style could be improved avoiding repetitions of works and ideas.

For these reasons I suggest major revisions before publication. A few comments can be found in the attached manuscript.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/C1570/2015/nhessd-3-C1570-2015-supplement.pdf>

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

C1571