

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Vulnerability, Resilience and Adaptation of Lagos Coastal Communities to Flooding

Review, Earth Sci. Syst. Soc.

Reviewer: Stacy Hope

Submitted on: 17 Oct 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/esss.2024.10087

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

This paper highlights the impacts of climate change, and in particular Flooding, as it pertains to Lagos State in Nigeria. It also outlines ways in which adaptation and resilience strategies are employed and ways in which the nationstate could address urban flooding.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The report is more informational than critical/analytical. There is little analysis and critique of papers cited making this more a collation of sources. I would implore the authors to be more critical of current resilience strategies, and how these are currently working, where they fail, why they fail, and where there is scope to strengthen current resilience and adaptation strategies.

There is also use of definitive language, where more scope for challenging other's work and exploring other hypotheses is needed. One example [lines 372-373] states that flooding impedes development in four ways, whether this still holds true from 2016, when this was stated, to now.

In general, this paper offers readers, particularly those new to climate change, resilience and adaptation, information that may otherwise have to be referenced from multiple sources.

Q 3 Does the review include a balanced, comprehensive and critical view of the research area?

This is not a critical review, but a collation of information on climate change and flooding in Nigeria. There is much more scrutiny needed on impacts of flooding on [the national economy (e.g.) and a lack of consideration for gendered impacts and more localised adaptation strategies that might be working.

Q 4 Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Is the quality of the figures and/or tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Does this manuscript refer predominantly to published research? (unpublished or original research is non-standard for a review article, and should be properly contextualised by the author)

Yes.

Does the manuscript cover the topic in an objective and analytical manner

No.

Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

Does the manuscript include recent developments?

Yes.

Does the review add new insights to the scholarly literature with respect to previously published reviews?

No.

Q 5 Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

The paper is a reference tool and does not apply the level of scrutiny academic scrutiny required to challenge current strategies forward.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 6 Quality of generalization and summary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 7 Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 8 Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 9 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>