



Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research

A Data-Driven Analysis of Environmental Disaster Management: Comparing Nigeria and the USA

Lawani Raymond Isi ^{1*}, Michael Okereke ², Oludayo Sofoluwe ³, Gilbert Isaac Tokunbo Olugbemi ⁴, Nkese Amos Essien ⁵, Akoche Ochefu ⁶

¹ Schlumberger Oilfield Services Lagos, Nigeria

² Independent Researcher Dubai, UAE

³ Company and School: Total Energies Headquarters France, IFP School, France and BI Norwegian Business School, France

⁴ Chevron Nigeria limited, Nigeria

⁵ Totalenergies Ep Nigeria Limited, Nigeria

⁶ Benue State Civil Service Commission, Benue, Nigeria

* Corresponding Author: **Lawani Raymond Isi**

Article Info

E-ISSN: 3050-9726

P-ISSN: 3050-9718

Volume: 04

Issue: 01

January-June 2023

Received: 15-03-2023

Accepted: 18-04-2023

Published: 28-05-2023

Page No: 427-433

Abstract

Environmental disasters pose significant challenges to nations worldwide, necessitating effective disaster management strategies. This study conducts a comprehensive data-driven analysis to compare the environmental disaster management approaches of two diverse nations, Nigeria and the United States of America (USA). Despite differences in economic development, governance structures, and geographical characteristics, both countries face environmental threats requiring robust management frameworks. Utilizing a multidisciplinary approach, this research examines various factors influencing disaster management in Nigeria and the USA. Data sources include governmental reports, academic literature, and statistical databases, enabling a thorough comparative analysis. Key metrics evaluated encompass disaster preparedness, response mechanisms, mitigation strategies, and post-disaster recovery efforts. In Nigeria, a developing nation with a burgeoning population and fragile infrastructure, environmental disasters such as flooding, oil spills, and desertification present formidable challenges. Limited resources, institutional weaknesses, and political instability often impede effective disaster management. Conversely, the USA, as a highly industrialized nation, confronts a diverse range of environmental hazards including hurricanes, wildfires, and industrial accidents. However, its robust institutional framework, technological capabilities, and financial resources facilitate more coordinated disaster response and recovery.

The analysis highlights disparities in disaster management capacities between Nigeria and the USA, revealing areas for improvement in both countries. In Nigeria, enhancing institutional capacity, investing in early warning systems, and fostering international cooperation are imperative to mitigate the impacts of environmental disasters. In contrast, the USA must address issues such as climate change adaptation, socio-economic disparities in disaster resilience, and strengthening community-based approaches to enhance overall disaster preparedness and response. Through empirical evidence and comparative analysis, this study provides insights for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers to develop tailored strategies for effective environmental disaster management. By leveraging data-driven approaches, nations can better anticipate, mitigate, and respond to the complex challenges posed by environmental disasters, safeguarding lives, livelihoods, and ecosystems in an increasingly vulnerable world.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54660/JFMR.2023.4.1.427-433>

Keywords: Data-Driven, Environment, Disaster Management, Nigeria, USA, Review

1. Introduction

Environmental disasters pose significant threats to human lives, economies, and ecosystems worldwide, necessitating robust disaster management strategies (Srinivas, and Nakagawa, 2008; Paul, 2011).

From natural calamities like hurricanes and wildfires to human-induced crises such as oil spills and industrial accidents, these events have profound implications for societies and the environment. Effective disaster management is crucial not only for mitigating the impacts of these disasters but also for building resilience and facilitating sustainable development (Kreimer, and Arnold, 2000).

Throughout history, environmental disasters have occurred with alarming frequency and severity, leading to devastating consequences (Kousky, 2016). These disasters encompass a wide range of events, including floods, earthquakes, tsunamis, droughts, and pollution incidents. Rapid urbanization, industrialization, and climate change have exacerbated the frequency and intensity of these disasters, posing unprecedented challenges to governments, communities, and organizations worldwide (Van Aalst, 2006).

Effective disaster management is essential for minimizing the loss of life, infrastructure damage, and environmental degradation caused by environmental disasters (Smith, 2013; Olorunfemi, and Adebimpe, 2008.). It involves proactive planning, preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation efforts aimed at reducing vulnerabilities and enhancing resilience. Timely and coordinated responses can save lives, protect livelihoods, and preserve ecosystems, while inadequate or inefficient management can exacerbate the impacts of disasters, leading to prolonged suffering and economic losses. Nigeria and the United States of America (USA) represent contrasting contexts for environmental disaster management. Nigeria, a developing nation in West Africa, grapples with a multitude of environmental challenges, including flooding, oil spills, and desertification, amidst limited resources and governance constraints. In contrast, the USA, as a highly industrialized nation, faces a diverse array of environmental hazards, such as hurricanes, wildfires, and industrial accidents, but benefits from robust institutional frameworks and technological capabilities (Paul, 2011; Krausmann, *et al.*, 2019).

The purpose of this study is to conduct a data-driven analysis comparing the environmental disaster management approaches of Nigeria and the USA. By examining key factors such as disaster preparedness, response mechanisms, mitigation strategies, and post-disaster recovery efforts, the study aims to identify disparities, similarities, and lessons learned between the two countries. The scope of the study encompasses a comprehensive review of literature, analysis of relevant data sources, and the formulation of insights and recommendations for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers in both nations and beyond. Ultimately, the study seeks to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and practices in environmental disaster management, with implications for enhancing resilience and sustainability on a global scale.

2. Literature Review

Environmental disaster management involves a multi-faceted approach to anticipate, prevent, respond to, and recover from disasters caused by natural or human-induced hazards (Van Vuuren, 2015; Haque, 2005). Various frameworks exist to guide disaster management efforts, emphasizing preparedness, response, mitigation, and recovery phases (Gupta, and Nair, 2011; Dias, *et al.*, 2013). These frameworks often incorporate elements such as risk assessment, early warning systems, community engagement, and inter-agency

coordination to enhance effectiveness. Examples include the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Hyogo Framework for Action, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreements. Additionally, national governments and international organizations develop specific policies, strategies, and action plans tailored to address environmental disaster risks and vulnerabilities within their jurisdictions (Handmer, and Dovers, 2013; Twigg, 2004; Metcalfe, 1994).

Previous studies have explored the challenges and opportunities associated with disaster management in Nigeria and the USA (OffiaIbem, 2011). In Nigeria, research has highlighted issues such as inadequate infrastructure, poor governance, socio-economic disparities, and environmental degradation exacerbating vulnerability to disasters. Studies also emphasize the importance of community-based approaches, capacity-building, and international cooperation in enhancing disaster resilience. In the USA, research has focused on the impacts of climate change, urbanization, and socio-economic factors on disaster risk, as well as the effectiveness of emergency response systems, public policies, and regulations (Olorunfemi, and Adebimpe, 2008). Comparative studies between Nigeria and the USA have identified differences in institutional capacity, resource allocation, and cultural factors influencing disaster management practices (Agbaje, and Adio-Moses, 2020).

Several factors influence the effectiveness of disaster management efforts, including governance structures, institutional capacity, socio-economic conditions, technological advancements, and environmental policies. Effective leadership, stakeholder collaboration, and public participation are essential for fostering resilience and adaptive capacity in the face of evolving threats. Furthermore, access to timely and accurate information, risk communication, and community empowerment play critical roles in enhancing preparedness and response capabilities. Challenges such as inadequate funding, political instability, corruption, and lack of public awareness can hinder effective disaster management and exacerbate vulnerabilities (Burkle 2006; Lewis, 2012; Peters, 2021).

Despite extensive research on disaster management, several gaps persist in the literature, particularly regarding comparative analyses between Nigeria and the USA. Limited studies directly compare the environmental disaster management approaches of these two countries, highlighting the need for more comprehensive and empirical research in this area. Additionally, there is a lack of data-driven assessments that systematically evaluate the effectiveness of disaster management strategies, identify best practices, and offer practical recommendations for improvement (Li, *et al.*, 2017). Addressing these gaps will contribute to a better understanding of the complex dynamics shaping disaster resilience and inform evidence-based policy-making and practice.

2.1 Environmental Disaster Profiles

Nigeria faces a myriad of environmental hazards, including flooding, oil spills, desertification, land degradation, and pollution. Flooding is a recurrent problem, particularly in coastal and riverine areas, exacerbated by heavy rainfall, poor drainage systems, and deforestation (Douglas, 2017; Chang, and Franczyk, 2008; Hasnat, *et al.*, 2018). Oil spills from pipeline ruptures and illegal bunkering activities pose significant environmental and socio-economic consequences,

contaminating water sources, degrading ecosystems, and impacting livelihoods (Umar, *et al.*, 2021; Onabajo and Ayeni, 2015; Twum, 2019). Desertification and land degradation, driven by deforestation, overgrazing, and unsustainable land use practices, threaten agricultural productivity, food security, and rural livelihoods (Singh, and Chaudhary, 2023; Gupta, 2019). Additionally, pollution from industrial activities, waste disposal, and urbanization contributes to environmental degradation, public health risks, and ecosystem decline.

These environmental hazards have profound impacts on communities, the economy, and the environment in Nigeria. Disasters such as flooding and oil spills result in loss of lives, displacement of populations, damage to infrastructure, disruption of economic activities, and degradation of natural resources. Vulnerable populations, including marginalized communities, women, children, and the elderly, bear the brunt of these impacts, facing heightened risks of poverty, food insecurity, and social exclusion. Furthermore, environmental degradation exacerbates existing socio-economic inequalities, exacerbating poverty, unemployment, and social unrest (Paul, 2011; Olusola, 2018).

The USA is susceptible to a wide range of environmental hazards, including hurricanes, wildfires, earthquakes, floods, tornadoes, and industrial accidents. Hurricanes, particularly along the Gulf and Atlantic coasts, pose significant threats to coastal communities, infrastructure, and economies, resulting in storm surges, flooding, and wind damage. Wildfires are prevalent in western states, fueled by drought, heatwaves, and forest mismanagement, causing destruction of homes, forests, and wildlife habitats. Earthquakes, though less frequent, have the potential for catastrophic impacts, particularly in regions such as California along major fault lines. Flooding, both from coastal storms and inland precipitation events, is a pervasive risk across the USA, impacting urban and rural areas alike. Additionally, industrial accidents, such as chemical spills and nuclear incidents, pose environmental and public health risks, requiring swift emergency response and containment measures (Olusola, 2017; Summers, *et al.*, 2022).

These environmental hazards have diverse impacts on communities, the economy, and the environment in the USA. Disasters such as hurricanes, wildfires, and floods result in loss of lives, property damage, disruption of transportation and communication networks, and economic losses. Vulnerable populations, including low-income communities, racial and ethnic minorities, and indigenous peoples, are disproportionately affected by these disasters, facing barriers to evacuation, access to emergency services, and recovery assistance. Furthermore, environmental degradation exacerbates climate change impacts, leading to sea-level rise, extreme weather events, and habitat loss, threatening biodiversity, ecosystem services, and human well-being (Smith, 2013).

2.2 Comparative Analysis

In Nigeria, institutional capacity for disaster preparedness and planning is often constrained by limited resources, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and fragmented governance structures (Billing, 2019.). The National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) is responsible for coordinating disaster management efforts (Mashi, *et al.*, 2019; Kasten *et al.*, 2023), but faces challenges such as inadequate funding, outdated infrastructure, and insufficient

trained personnel. In contrast, the USA boasts a robust institutional framework comprising federal, state, and local agencies with defined roles and responsibilities in disaster management. Addressing socio-cultural barriers and leveraging technology for information dissemination are critical challenges that can be mitigated through inclusive digital platforms and community-based initiatives (Nazia & Gangadharan, 2023). Agencies like the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) play key roles in coordinating preparedness efforts, allocating resources, and providing technical assistance to states and communities (Meadow, *et al.*, 2016; Prizzia, 2008; Oti and Ayeni, 2013).

Nigeria's early warning systems for environmental disasters are underdeveloped, relying primarily on traditional methods such as community-based observations and informal networks. Limited investment in modern technologies, such as meteorological sensors and remote sensing, hampers the timely detection and dissemination of warnings to vulnerable populations. Conversely, the USA has made significant strides in developing advanced early warning systems for various hazards, including hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and wildfires. Utilizing sophisticated meteorological models, satellite imagery, and communication networks, agencies like NOAA and the National Weather Service (NWS) provide accurate and timely warnings to residents, businesses, and emergency responders, enhancing preparedness and evacuation efforts (Denning, 2022; National Research Council, 2007.).

Community engagement is essential for effective disaster preparedness and planning, facilitating local knowledge sharing, risk awareness, and resilience-building initiatives (Burnside-Lawry, and Carvalho, 2016; Olushola and Olabode, 2018; Pandey, 2019). In Nigeria, community engagement efforts often face challenges such as low literacy rates, cultural barriers, and distrust of government authorities. However, grassroots organizations, religious institutions, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play crucial roles in mobilizing communities, conducting risk assessments, and implementing resilience projects at the local level. In the USA, community engagement is a cornerstone of disaster preparedness efforts, with initiatives such as Community Emergency Response Teams (CERTs), Neighborhood Watch programs, and public outreach campaigns promoting disaster resilience. By empowering communities to take proactive measures, share resources, and support vulnerable members, these initiatives strengthen social cohesion and enhance disaster response capabilities (Wells, *et al.*, 2013).

In Nigeria, disaster response and coordination efforts are often hampered by bureaucratic red tape, overlapping mandates, and weak inter-agency coordination. While NEMA serves as the primary coordinating body, its effectiveness is hindered by limited resources, political interference, and a lack of clear protocols for multi-sectoral collaboration. Conversely, the USA benefits from a well-established system of governmental agencies and coordination mechanisms, with FEMA playing a central role in coordinating disaster response efforts at the federal level. Through the National Response Framework (NRF) and the Incident Command System (ICS), federal, state, and local agencies work together to mobilize resources, deploy emergency personnel, and support affected communities in a timely and coordinated manner.

Nigeria's emergency response infrastructure is often

inadequate to meet the demands of large-scale disasters, lacking essential resources such as emergency shelters, medical facilities, and search and rescue equipment. Limited investment in disaster preparedness and response infrastructure leaves communities vulnerable to delays and disruptions during emergency operations. In contrast, the USA maintains a comprehensive network of emergency response infrastructure, including evacuation routes, emergency shelters, hospitals, and communication systems. Pre-positioned supplies, such as food, water, and medical supplies, enable rapid deployment and distribution to affected areas, minimizing the impact of disasters on public health and safety (Sabbaghtorkan, *et al.*, 2020; Klibi, *et al.*, 2018; Rodríguez-Espíndola, 2016).

International cooperation plays a vital role in enhancing disaster response and coordination, enabling countries to leverage mutual assistance, technical expertise, and financial support during emergencies. In Nigeria, international cooperation in disaster management is limited by factors such as sovereignty concerns, diplomatic tensions, and bureaucratic barriers. While Nigeria participates in regional and international forums on disaster risk reduction, such as the African Union and the United Nations, actual collaboration and resource-sharing with foreign partners remain limited. Conversely, the USA actively engages in international cooperation efforts, both as a provider and recipient of assistance during disasters. Through mechanisms such as the International Search and Rescue Advisory Group (INSARAG) and the International Disaster Assistance (IDA) program, the USA collaborates with foreign governments, NGOs, and international organizations to respond to disasters worldwide, demonstrating solidarity and leadership in global disaster response efforts.

2.3. Disaster Mitigation Strategies

Both Nigeria and the USA face challenges in enhancing infrastructure resilience to withstand environmental disasters. In Nigeria, rapid urbanization, informal settlements, and inadequate infrastructure planning contribute to vulnerabilities such as flooding, landslides, and infrastructure damage. Limited investment in resilient infrastructure, such as flood barriers, drainage systems, and building codes, exacerbates the impacts of disasters on communities and economies. In the USA, aging infrastructure, urban sprawl, and coastal development increase exposure to hazards such as hurricanes, floods, and sea-level rise. However, efforts to enhance infrastructure resilience through measures such as green infrastructure, smart growth policies, and hazard mitigation planning have been implemented at the federal, state, and local levels, reducing risks and enhancing community resilience (Rozaki, *et al.*, 2021; Adeniyi *et al.*, 2020; Kumar, *et al.*, 2021).

Nigeria and the USA have regulatory frameworks to address environmental hazards and promote disaster risk reduction, but enforcement and compliance remain challenges. In Nigeria, weak enforcement of environmental regulations, corruption, and inadequate monitoring and enforcement mechanisms contribute to environmental degradation and disaster risks. The lack of accountability and transparency in resource management exacerbates vulnerabilities to disasters such as oil spills, pollution, and deforestation. In the USA, stringent environmental regulations, such as the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and National Environmental Policy Act, provide legal frameworks for pollution control, hazard

mitigation, and environmental planning. However, regulatory loopholes, industry lobbying, and budget constraints weaken enforcement and undermine environmental protection efforts, posing risks to public health and safety (Coburn, *et al.*, 1991; Abdulkadir *et al.*, 2022; Sahni, *et al.*, 2001).

Climate change exacerbates environmental risks and challenges existing disaster mitigation strategies in both Nigeria and the USA. In Nigeria, climate change impacts such as rising temperatures, erratic rainfall patterns, and sea-level rise exacerbate vulnerabilities to disasters such as flooding, drought, and food insecurity. Limited capacity for climate change adaptation, inadequate funding, and competing development priorities hinder efforts to build resilience and reduce risks. In the USA, climate change intensifies hazards such as hurricanes, wildfires, and heatwaves, posing significant challenges to disaster preparedness and response efforts. However, initiatives such as the Climate Resilience Toolkit, the National Climate Assessment, and regional adaptation plans provide guidance for integrating climate change considerations into disaster risk reduction and resilience-building efforts, fostering adaptive capacity and innovation.

In Nigeria, post-disaster recovery efforts often face challenges such as inadequate funding, bureaucratic delays, and limited capacity for reconstruction and rehabilitation. Displaced populations, damaged infrastructure, and disrupted livelihoods exacerbate socio-economic vulnerabilities, hindering recovery and resilience-building efforts. In the USA, post-disaster recovery efforts are characterized by swift mobilization of resources, coordination of assistance programs, and public-private partnerships. Federal programs such as the Disaster Recovery Assistance program and the Community Development Block Grant provide funding and technical support for rebuilding infrastructure, restoring services, and revitalizing communities affected by disasters. However, challenges such as inequitable distribution of resources, long-term planning deficits, and socio-economic disparities persist, undermining the effectiveness and equity of recovery efforts (Maskrey, 1989).

Environmental disasters exacerbate socio-economic disparities and vulnerabilities, disproportionately affecting marginalized communities, low-income households, and minority populations in both Nigeria and the USA. In Nigeria, disasters such as flooding, oil spills, and land degradation exacerbate poverty, displacement, and food insecurity, widening socio-economic inequalities and undermining development gains. Vulnerable populations, including women, children, and indigenous peoples, face heightened risks of exploitation, displacement, and loss of livelihoods, exacerbating social tensions and conflicts. In the USA, disasters such as hurricanes, wildfires, and floods disproportionately impact low-income communities, racial and ethnic minorities, and indigenous peoples, exacerbating existing disparities in access to resources, services, and opportunities. Vulnerable populations face barriers to recovery, including inadequate housing, healthcare, and social support, perpetuating cycles of poverty and marginalization.

Long-term resilience building is essential for reducing vulnerabilities and enhancing adaptive capacity in the face of environmental disasters. In Nigeria, efforts to build resilience focus on sustainable development, ecosystem restoration, and community-based adaptation initiatives. However, challenges such as limited funding, weak governance, and

competing development priorities hinder progress and exacerbate vulnerabilities. In the USA, resilience-building efforts emphasize holistic approaches that integrate disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, and sustainable development principles. Initiatives such as the National Disaster Recovery Framework, the National Flood Insurance Program, and the Resilience AmeriCorps program promote community engagement, capacity-building, and innovation to enhance resilience at the local, regional, and national levels. By investing in risk-informed decision-making, ecosystem-based approaches, and inclusive governance processes, countries can build resilient communities, safeguard livelihoods, and protect ecosystems for future generations.

In conclusion, a comparative analysis of disaster management approaches in Nigeria and the USA reveals disparities, challenges, and opportunities for enhancing resilience and sustainability in the face of environmental hazards. While both countries face complex and evolving risks, their responses are shaped by factors such as governance structures, institutional capacity, socio-economic conditions, and environmental policies. By learning from each other's experiences, sharing best practices, and fostering international cooperation, countries can strengthen disaster management systems, build resilient communities, and promote sustainable development in an increasingly uncertain and interconnected world (Gougelet, 2016; Ferreira, *et al.*, 201).

2.4. Future Research Directions

Despite significant progress in understanding and addressing environmental disaster management, several avenues for future research exist to further enhance resilience and sustainability. Future research should adopt interdisciplinary approaches that integrate insights from various disciplines such as environmental science, social science, engineering, economics, and public health (Mabry, *et al.*, 2008; Schoolman, *et al.*, 2012). By understanding the complex interactions between natural and human systems, researchers can develop more holistic and context-specific solutions to environmental disasters. Engaging local communities in research processes is essential for understanding their needs, priorities, and knowledge systems. Future research should prioritize community-based participatory research (CBPR) methodologies that empower communities to co-design, implement, and evaluate disaster management strategies. By incorporating local knowledge, values, and practices, researchers can enhance the effectiveness and relevance of interventions. Given the increasing frequency and intensity of climate-related disasters, future research should prioritize climate change adaptation strategies that enhance resilience to environmental hazards. This includes exploring innovative approaches such as nature-based solutions, ecosystem-based adaptation, and green infrastructure to mitigate risks and promote sustainable development in a changing climate. Improving the accuracy and timeliness of risk assessments and early warning systems is critical for enhancing preparedness and reducing disaster impacts. Future research should focus on developing advanced modeling techniques, integrating remote sensing and geospatial data, and enhancing communication networks to deliver actionable warnings to vulnerable populations.

Investigating the effectiveness of disaster governance structures, policies, and regulations is essential for enhancing

accountability, transparency, and resilience. Future research should examine governance mechanisms at various scales, analyze policy implementation processes, and evaluate the impacts of regulatory frameworks on disaster risk reduction and management outcomes (Siriwardana, *et al.*, 2018). Addressing socio-economic disparities and vulnerabilities is crucial for promoting inclusive and equitable disaster management practices. Future research should explore the root causes of social vulnerability, assess the differential impacts of disasters on marginalized populations, and identify strategies for reducing inequalities and promoting social justice in disaster response and recovery efforts. Leveraging emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, drones, and satellite imagery can revolutionize disaster management practices (Linardos, *et al.*, 2022; Aboualola, *et al.*, 2023; Abid, *et al.*, 2021). Future research should explore the potential applications of these technologies in disaster risk assessment, early warning, damage assessment, and response coordination, while also addressing ethical, privacy, and equity considerations.

3. Recommendations and Conclusion

The comparative analysis of environmental disaster management in Nigeria and the USA highlights disparities, challenges, and opportunities for enhancing resilience and sustainability. Key findings include differences in institutional capacity, early warning systems, community engagement, and post-disaster recovery efforts between the two countries. While Nigeria faces significant challenges such as limited resources, governance constraints, and socio-economic vulnerabilities, the USA benefits from robust institutional frameworks, technological capabilities, and international cooperation mechanisms.

This study contributes to the field of environmental disaster management by providing empirical insights, comparative analysis, and recommendations for policy and practice. By synthesizing existing literature, identifying gaps, and proposing future research directions, this study advances knowledge and understanding of the complex dynamics shaping disaster resilience and governance.

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations are proposed for enhancing disaster management in Nigeria and the USA; Strengthen institutional capacity and coordination mechanisms to improve disaster preparedness, response, and recovery efforts. Invest in modernizing early warning systems, enhancing community engagement, and promoting public awareness and education on disaster risks and preparedness measures. Implement evidence-based disaster mitigation strategies, including infrastructure resilience, environmental regulations, and climate change adaptation measures. Prioritize socio-economic equity, inclusion, and community empowerment in disaster management policies, programs, and interventions. Foster international cooperation and knowledge sharing to address transboundary environmental risks and build regional and global resilience to disasters.

Environmental disasters pose significant challenges to societies, economies, and ecosystems worldwide, necessitating coordinated and comprehensive disaster management strategies. By learning from the experiences of countries like Nigeria and the USA, sharing best practices, and fostering international cooperation, nations can enhance resilience, mitigate risks, and build sustainable futures in an

increasingly uncertain and interconnected world. Investing in disaster preparedness, response, and recovery efforts is not only a moral imperative but also a strategic imperative for safeguarding lives, livelihoods, and ecosystems for present and future generations. By prioritizing resilience-building measures and integrating disaster risk reduction into development planning, countries can build more resilient and sustainable societies, contributing to global efforts to address the growing threat of environmental disasters.

4. References

1. Abdulkadir M, Abdulahi A, Abdulkareem LA, Alor OE, Ngozichukwu B, Al-Sarkhi A, *et al.* The effect of gas injection geometry and an insight into the entrainment and coalescence processes concerned with a stationary Taylor bubble in a downward two-phase flow. *Exp Therm Fluid Sci.* 2022;130:110491.
2. Abid SK, Sulaiman N, Chan SW, Nazir U, Abid M, Han H, *et al.* Toward an integrated disaster management approach: how artificial intelligence can boost disaster management. *Sustainability.* 2021;13(22):12560.
3. Aboualola M, Abualsaud K, Khattab T, Zorba N, Hassanein HS. Edge technologies for disaster management: A survey of social media and artificial intelligence integration. *IEEE Access.* 2023.
4. Adeniyi OD, Ngozichukwu B, Adeniyi MI, Olutoye MA, Musa U, Ibrahim MA. Power generation from melon seed husk biochar using fuel cell. *Ghana J Sci.* 2020;61(2):38-44.
5. Agbaje FI, Adio-Moses RO. Technology and disaster management in Nigeria: prospects and challenges. 2020.
6. Billing T. Government fragmentation, administrative capacity, and public goods: The negative consequences of reform in Burkina Faso. *Polit Res Q.* 2019;72(3):669-85.
7. Burkle FM Jr. Globalization and disasters: Issues of public health, state capacity and political action. *J Int Aff.* 2006;241-65.
8. Burnside-Lawry J, Carvalho L. A stakeholder approach to building community resilience: awareness to implementation. *Int J Disaster Resil Built Environ.* 2016;7(1):4-25.
9. Chang H, Franczyk J. Climate change, land-use change, and floods: Toward an integrated assessment. *Geogr Compass.* 2008;2(5):1549-79.
10. Coburn AW, Spence RJ, Pomonis A. Disaster mitigation. In: *Disaster mitigation.* 1991. p. 59-59.
11. Denning LM. A historical analysis of the US Federal Emergency Management Agencies (FEMA) response and recovery to gulf coast hurricane and other weather-related disasters. 2022.
12. Dias C, Stokes J, Pido MF. Asian Experience In Disaster Management-Challenges Prospects and The Future. Bangkok: Asian Resource Foundation; 2013.
13. Douglas I. Flooding in African cities, scales of causes, teleconnections, risks, vulnerability and impacts. *Int J Disaster Risk Reduct.* 2017;26:34-42.
14. Ferreira MA, de Sá FM, Oliveira CS. The Disruption Index (DI) as a tool to measure disaster mitigation strategies. *Bull Earthq Eng.* 2016;14:1957-77.
15. Gougelet RM. Disaster mitigation. In: *Ciottone's Disaster Medicine.* 2016. p. 160.
16. Gupta AK, Nair SS. Environmental knowledge for disaster risk management. In: *Abstract Volume of International Conference.* 2011. p. 10-11.
17. Gupta GS. Land degradation and challenges of food security. *Rev Eur Stud.* 2019;11:63.
18. Handmer J, Dovers S. Handbook of disaster policies and institutions: improving emergency management and climate change adaptation. Routledge; 2013.
19. Haque CE, editor. Mitigation of natural hazards and disasters: international perspectives. Vol 371. Dordrecht: Springer; 2005.
20. Hasnat GT, Kabir MA, Hossain MA. Major environmental issues and problems of South Asia, particularly Bangladesh. In: *Handbook of environmental materials management.* 2018. p. 1-40.
21. Kasten J, Hsiao CC, Ngozichukwu B, Yoo R, Johnson D, Lee S, *et al.* High Performing pH-Universal Electrochemical Energy Storage Using 2D Titanium Nitride Mxene. In: *2023 AIChE Annual Meeting.* AIChE; 2023 Nov.
22. Klibi W, Ichoua S, Martel A. Prepositioning emergency supplies to support disaster relief: a case study using stochastic programming. *INFOR Inf Syst Oper Res.* 2018;56(1):50-81.
23. Kousky C. Impacts of natural disasters on children. *Future Child.* 2016;73-92.
24. Krausmann E, Girgin S, Necci A. Natural hazard impacts on industry and critical infrastructure: Natech risk drivers and risk management performance indicators. *Int J Disaster Risk Reduct.* 2019;40:101163.
25. Kreimer A, Arnold M, editors. Managing disaster risk in emerging economies. Vol 2. World Bank Publications; 2000.
26. Kumar PG, Tejaswini V, Rao PK, Shankar GJ. Disaster mitigation and its strategies in a global context-a state of the art. *Mater Today Proc.* 2021;45:6488-92.
27. Lewis J. The good, the bad and the ugly: disaster risk reduction (DRR) versus disaster risk creation (DRC). *PLoS Curr.* 2012;4.
28. Li T, Xie N, Zeng C, Zhou W, Zheng L, Jiang Y, *et al.* Data-driven techniques in disaster information management. *ACM Comput Surv.* 2017;50(1):1-45.
29. Linardos V, Drakaki M, Tzionas P, Karnavas YL. Machine learning in disaster management: recent developments in methods and applications. *Mach Learn Knowl Extr.* 2022;4(2).
30. Mabry PL, Olster DH, Morgan GD, Abrams DB. Interdisciplinarity and systems science to improve population health: a view from the NIH Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research. *Am J Prev Med.* 2008;35(2):S211-24.
31. Mashi SA, Oghenejabor OD, Inkani AI. Disaster risks and management policies and practices in Nigeria: A critical appraisal of the National Emergency Management Agency Act. *Int J Disaster Risk Reduct.* 2019;33:253-65.
32. Maskrey A. Disaster mitigation: a community based approach. Oxfam GB; 1989.
33. Meadow AM, Guido Z, Crimmins MA, McLeod J. From principles to action: Applying the National Research Council's principles for effective decision support to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's watch office. *Clim Serv.* 2016;1:12-23.
34. Metcalfe L. International policy co-ordination and public management reform. *Int Rev Adm Sci.* 1994;60(2):271-90.

35. National Research Council. Improving disaster management: the role of IT in mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. National Academies Press; 2007.
36. Offialbem E. Challenges of disaster vulnerability reduction in Lagos Megacity Area, Nigeria. *Disaster Prev Manag.* 2011;20(1):27-40.
37. Olorunfemi FB, Adebimpe RU. Sustainable disaster risk reduction in Nigeria: Lessons for developing countries. *Afr Res Rev.* 2008;2(2):187-217.
38. Olushola AO, Olabode KT. Prevalence of sexting among students in selected secondary schools in Southwestern Nigeria. *Gend Behav.* 2018;16(1):11011-25.
39. Olusola AO. Rural-Urban Migration In Nigeria. *Int J Manag Sci.* 2017;10(1):79-87.
40. Olusola AO. The Concept Of "Equality" And "Compensation" In Education. *J Technol Entrep Rural Dev.* 2018;7(1):15.
41. Onabajo F, Ayeni OO. Managing Industrial Conflict In NIGERIA. 2015:1-15.
42. Oti A, Ayeni O. Yoruba culture of Nigeria: creating space for an endangered specie. *Cross-Cult Commun.* 2013;9(4):23.
43. Pandey CL. Making communities disaster resilient: Challenges and prospects for community engagement in Nepal. *Disaster Prev Manag.* 2019;28(1):106-18.
44. Paul BK. Environmental hazards and disasters: contexts, perspectives and management. John Wiley & Sons; 2011.
45. Peters LE. Beyond disaster vulnerabilities: an empirical investigation of the causal pathways linking conflict to disaster risks. *Int J Disaster Risk Reduct.* 2021;55:102092.
46. Prizzia R. The role of coordination in disaster management. 2008.
47. Rodríguez-Espíndola O. A multi-organisational approach for disaster preparedness and response: the use of optimisation and GIS for facility location, stock pre-positioning, resource allocation and relief distribution [PhD thesis]. Aston University; 2016.
48. Rozaki Z, Wijaya O, Rahmawati N, Rahayu L. Farmers' disaster mitigation strategies in Indonesia. *Rev Agric Sci.* 2021;9:178-94.
49. Sabbaghtorkan M, Batta R, He Q. Prepositioning of assets and supplies in disaster operations management: Review and research gap identification. *Eur J Oper Res.* 2020;284(1):1-19.
50. Sahni P, Dhameja A, Medury U. Disaster mitigation: experiences and reflections. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.; 2001.
51. Schoolman ED, Guest JS, Bush KF, Bell AR. How interdisciplinary is sustainability research? Analyzing the structure of an emerging scientific field. *Sustain Sci.* 2012;7:67-80.
52. Singh V, Chaudhary N. Land Degradation, Desertification, and Food Security in North-East India: Present and Future Scenarios. In: Sustainable Development Goals in Northeast India: Challenges and Achievements. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore; 2023. p. 153-66.
53. Siriwardana CS, Jayasiri GP, Hettiarachchi SSL. Investigation of efficiency and effectiveness of the existing disaster management frameworks in Sri Lanka. *Procedia Eng.* 2018;212:1091-8.
54. Smith K. Environmental hazards: assessing risk and reducing disaster. Routledge; 2013.
55. Srinivas H, Nakagawa Y. Environmental implications for disaster preparedness: lessons learnt from the Indian Ocean Tsunami. *J Environ Manage.* 2008;89(1):4-13.
56. Summers JK, Lamper A, McMillion C, Harwell LC. Observed changes in the frequency, intensity, and spatial patterns of nine natural hazards in the United States from 2000 to 2019. *Sustainability.* 2022;14(7):4158.
57. Tasleem N, Gangadharan S. Navigating stakeholder dynamics in large-scale transformations. *J Adv Multidiscip Res.* 2022;1(2):48-56.
58. Twigg J. Disaster risk reduction: mitigation and preparedness in development and emergency programming. Overseas Development Institute (ODI); 2004.
59. Twum A. Environmental Impact of Oil and Gas Exploration and Production on the Socio-Economic Life of Niger Delta [PhD thesis]. 2019.
60. Umar HA, Khanan MA, Ogbonnaya C, Shiru MS, Ahmad A, Baba AI. Environmental and socioeconomic impacts of pipeline transport interdiction in Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Heliyon.* 2021;7(5).
61. Van Aalst MK. The impacts of climate change on the risk of natural disasters. *Disasters.* 2006;30(1):5-18.
62. Van Vuuren IDJ. Vulnerability as a multi-faceted phenomenon: A GIS-based data model for integrated development planning, environmental management and disaster risk reduction [PhD thesis]. 2015.
63. Wells KB, Tang J, Lizaola E, Jones F, Brown A, Stayton A, *et al.* Applying community engagement to disaster planning: developing the vision and design for the Los Angeles County Community Disaster Resilience initiative. *Am J Public Health.* 2013;103(7):1172-80.