Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_130704**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Flood Risk and Resilience: Evidence from the 2024 Flood in Maiduguri, Nigeria.**
Type of the Article	**Research article**

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it provides critical insights into the intersection of climate variability, urban resilience, and disaster management in the context of rapidly urbanizing cities in the Global South. By focusing on the 2024 flood in Maiduguri, Nigeria, the study contributes original data on rainfall trends, infrastructure resilience, and the socio-economic disparities that exacerbate vulnerability to climate-induced disasters. It fills a crucial gap in understanding how localized governance challenges and inadequate infrastructure amplify the impacts of extreme weather events. Moreover, the manuscript's integration of qualitative and quantitative methods offers a robust framework for future studies and policy development aimed at enhancing urban climate adaptation and disaster preparedness.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title of the article, "Flood Risk and Resilience: Evidence from the 2024 Flood in Maiduguri, Nigeria," is suitable as it clearly conveys the focus of the study. It highlights the key themes of flood risk and resilience and situates the research in a specific time (2024) and place (Maiduguri, Nigeria), which ensures clarity and relevance for the target audience.**	

Review Form 3

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**The abstract is comprehensive, but it could be streamlined for clarity and impact. Here's a shorter suggestion:** **Flooding poses a critical threat to urbanizing areas in the Global South, as demonstrated by the 2024 Maiduguri flood. Using a mixed-methods approach, this study reveals a significant upward trend in rainfall and highlights systemic vulnerabilities, including inadequate infrastructure and socio-economic disparities. The flood disproportionately impacted marginalized populations, such as women and children, and exposed deficiencies in preparedness and response systems. The findings emphasize the need for climate-informed urban planning, resilient infrastructure, and community-based disaster management strategies to mitigate future risks.** **This version maintains the key points while reducing length and unnecessary detail.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It employs a robust mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative data from interviews with quantitative analysis of rainfall trends (e.g., Mann-Kendall test, Sen's Slope) and corroborates findings with secondary sources like official reports. The statistical methods used for trend analysis and rainfall anomalies are appropriate and commonly accepted in climate and hydrological research. Additionally, the manuscript contextualizes its findings within existing theoretical frameworks on climate resilience and urban vulnerability, citing relevant literature to support its claims. The conclusions drawn are consistent with the data presented, highlighting systemic issues like infrastructure deficiencies, governance challenges, and socio-economic inequalities. However, it is important to ensure that all calculations, datasets (e.g., rainfall data from 1992–2024), and cited reports are accurate and properly validated. A peer reviewer may want to confirm the statistical results, particularly those related to the rainfall trends and their interpretation, to ensure the robustness of the conclusions. In summary, the manuscript is scientifically sound, but a detailed review of its data and calculations is necessary to confirm accuracy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are largely sufficient and include a mix of foundational studies and recent works, such as those from 2022 and 2024, ensuring relevance to the research topic. Key authors and theories in climate resilience, disaster management, and urban vulnerabilities are cited, providing a solid academic foundation.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. It employs formal, academic language with clear structure and appropriate terminology, making it suitable for its target audience. However, there are a few areas where the language could be refined: Simplify overly complex sentences: Some sentences are lengthy and dense, which might hinder readability. Breaking these into shorter sentences could enhance clarity. Eliminate minor grammatical inconsistencies: For example, ensuring consistent use of tense throughout the manuscript would improve fluency. Clarify technical terms: While the use of terms like "Sen's Slope" and "Rainfall Anomaly Index" is appropriate, a brief explanation in simpler language in the methodology or results section would make the manuscript more accessible to a broader audience. Overall, the language is effective for scholarly communication, but minor edits to improve clarity and coherence are recommended.	
Optional/General comments	**Here are some optional/general comments for further improvement:** **Visual Aids: Adding more visuals like charts, maps, or diagrams to illustrate rainfall trends, flood impacts, or affected areas could enhance reader engagement and comprehension.** **Policy Recommendations: While the policy suggestions are strong a brief discussion of how these could be practically implemented in resource-constrained settings would add value.** **Community Engagement: Expanding on how local communities' knowledge and efforts could be integrated into formal disaster response frameworks would strengthen the focus on resilience.** **Future Research Directions: Including a dedicated subsection on potential future research areas, such as the use of technology in flood forecasting, could inspire additional studies.** **Abstract Refinement: Ensure the abstract is concise yet fully captures the study's significance, methodology, key findings, and recommendations.** **These adjustments would make the manuscript more impactful and accessible to a wider academic and policy-making audience.**	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Arion Iulia Diana**
Department, University & Country	**University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania**