



Reframing Sustainable Development and Disaster Management: Moving Beyond Technical Solutions toward Human-Centered Approaches

Mohamed Mohamud Hussein
Daystar University, Kenya
Email: mohamedAP123@gmail.com

Abstract: Sustainable development and disaster management require approaches that extend beyond technical solutions to prioritize human development, ethical responsibility, and social well-being. While engineering innovations, scientific modeling, and technological interventions remain essential, growing evidence indicates that purely technocratic responses are inadequate for addressing the complex social, cultural, and moral dimensions of contemporary development and disaster risks. This article employs a rapid review methodology to synthesize evidence from 42 peer-reviewed articles and authoritative reports published between 2010 and 2024. Literature was retrieved from databases including Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and United Nations agency repositories using predefined keywords related to human-centered development, disaster management, sustainability, ethics, and community resilience. The findings demonstrate that interventions integrating community participation, social capital, cultural values, and ethical leadership consistently produce stronger outcomes in resilience, recovery, and sustainability, particularly in low- and middle-income contexts. Evidence from disaster-prone regions further shows that community-led preparedness, inclusive governance, and value-driven leadership significantly enhance adaptive capacity and reduce long-term vulnerability. Additionally, human development factors, such as education, social protection, equity, and psychosocial support, are critical to sustainable recovery and development trajectories. The review concludes that development and disaster frameworks must shift toward human-centered models that integrate ethical considerations, social inclusion, and local knowledge systems.

Keywords: People-centered policy, Disaster risk reduction (DRR), Sustainable development policy, Inclusive governance and Resilience-based development.

How to cite this work (APA):

Mohamed, M. H. (2026). Reframing Sustainable Development and Disaster Management: Moving Beyond Technical Solutions toward Human-Centered Approaches. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 10(1), 672 – 679. <https://doi.org/10.59765/3th7>

1. Introduction

Sustainable development and disaster management have traditionally been framed through technical, scientific, and policy-oriented lenses, emphasizing infrastructure, technology, risk modeling, and institutional coordination. While these approaches have produced measurable gains, mounting global crises, including climate change, pandemics, forced displacement, and protracted

humanitarian emergencies, have exposed their limitations. Increasingly, scholars and practitioners argue that technical solutions alone are insufficient to address the deeply social, ethical, cultural, and moral dimensions of development and disaster risk. Without deliberate attention to human development, values, and lived experiences, well-designed interventions risk resistance, exclusion, and unsustainability among the very communities they are intended to serve.

Emerging scholarship highlights the necessity of integrating human-centered values, such as compassion, ethics, dignity, and spirituality, into sustainable development and disaster management frameworks. Abumoghli (2023) argues that religious values and belief systems play a critical role in complementing scientific approaches to environmental governance and sustainability, particularly in contexts where faith shapes social norms and collective action. Similarly, Luetz et al. (2023) contend that spirituality and sustainable development are intertwined concepts that cannot be meaningfully discussed in isolation, especially in climate-vulnerable regions where religious institutions exert strong social influence. These perspectives challenge the dominance of technocratic paradigms by emphasizing moral responsibility, shared meaning, and ethical stewardship of natural and social systems.

Human-centered development is also closely linked to stakeholder engagement and community ownership. Development institutions, including the World Bank, increasingly advocate participatory approaches that involve communities across all stages of the project cycle, from planning and design to implementation and evaluation. Stakeholder analysis is not merely a procedural requirement but a critical process for understanding community values, preferences, power relations, and belief systems. In pluralistic societies such as Kenya, where Christian, Muslim, Hindu, and indigenous belief systems coexist within a shared constitutional framework, development and disaster interventions must navigate religious diversity while fostering social cohesion and collective responsibility. Failure to recognize these dimensions can undermine trust, participation, and long-term sustainability.

Within disaster management, the limitations of top-down and command-and-control models are particularly evident. Imperiale and Vanclay (2021) identify poor conceptualization of community resilience, lack of appropriate methodologies, and persistence of paternalistic practices as major barriers to effective disaster risk reduction (DRR). Their work underscores the importance of socially sustainable risk governance that prioritizes local knowledge, cultural context, and community well-being. Disasters are not solely external shocks; they are often shaped by human behavior, livelihood practices, and structural inequalities. For example, environmentally harmful coping strategies, such as deforestation for charcoal production in climate-stressed regions—can exacerbate vulnerability when communities lack viable livelihood alternatives. Sustainable recovery therefore requires interventions that build on existing capacities, respect livelihood identities, and promote gradual, locally attainable transformation rather than abrupt economic shifts.

Collaborative governance has emerged as a key mechanism for aligning disaster management with sustainable development objectives. Dai and Azhar (2024) demonstrate that partnerships among governments, civil society, and communities are central to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 17 on partnerships. However, development is not a one-size-fits-all endeavor. Contextual differences in culture, livelihoods, and risk profiles mean that interventions successful in agrarian regions may be ineffective or harmful in pastoralist or coastal settings. Limited public awareness of the SDGs at local levels further constrains meaningful participation, highlighting the gap between global frameworks and community realities.

Leadership plays a decisive role in bridging this gap. Crossweller (2021, 2022) advances a relational leadership model grounded in compassion, care, justice, and mindfulness, arguing that self-interest and neoliberal worldviews undermine ethical disaster governance. Empirical evidence suggests that leaders who adopt bottom-up, participatory approaches, despite slower decision-making processes, foster legitimacy, trust, and resilience. Conversely, leadership driven by political expediency and personal gain can become a source of risk itself, exacerbating vulnerability and social fragmentation.

Critical voices have gone further to question the adequacy of prevailing sustainability frameworks. Bendell (2022) contends that the SDGs, while well-intentioned, are constrained by flawed economic assumptions and insufficient attention to compounding risks. He calls for reorientation toward disaster risk management models that emphasize locally led adaptation, self-reliant resilience, and an eco-social contract between states and citizens. Complementing this macro-level critique, Subasinghe et al. (2021) highlight the significance of “micro-human efforts”, small-scale, everyday actions that collectively shape post-disaster recovery and resilience but are often overlooked in formal programming.

Ethical decision-making remains a critical yet underdeveloped dimension of disaster management. Cuthbertson and Penney (2023) find that while humanitarian systems possess ethical principles, many emergency management sectors lack structured ethical frameworks sensitive to local cultural contexts. This gap has profound implications for equity, dignity, and inclusion, particularly for women and marginalized groups in patriarchal societies, directly implicating SDG 10 on reducing inequalities. Japee and Oza (2021) further argue that sustainable development stagnates when emotional intelligence and moral engagement are absent, proposing value-driven, micro-level transformation as the foundation of genuine sustainability.

Against this backdrop, this paper advances the argument that sustainable development and disaster management must move beyond technical solutions toward a human-centered paradigm rooted in human development, ethics, spirituality, and relational governance. Through a rapid review of interdisciplinary literature, the study synthesizes evidence demonstrating that people-centered approaches are not ancillary but essential to achieving resilient, equitable, and sustainable outcomes. The paper situates this argument within global debates while illustrating its practical relevance through policy initiatives such as Kenya's Universal Health Coverage, underscoring the transformative potential of development that truly puts people first.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical review

The theoretical foundation of this study is anchored in the evolution of development and disaster management thought, reflecting a gradual shift from technocratic paradigms toward human-centered and ethically grounded frameworks. Early development theory was dominated by modernization theory (Rostow, 1960), which conceptualized development as a linear, economically driven process achieved through industrialization, technological advancement, and policy transfer from high-income to low-income contexts. While influential, this approach has been widely criticized for its reductionist assumptions, cultural insensitivity, and neglect of social, ethical, and human dimensions (Escobar, 1995). In disaster management, similar critiques emerged against command-and-control models that marginalized local agency and community knowledge.

In response, Human Development Theory, advanced by Sen (1999) and later operationalized through the Human Development Index, marked a significant paradigm shift. This framework reconceptualized development as the expansion of human capabilities, freedoms, and well-being rather than economic growth alone. Scholars argue that human development provides a more holistic lens for understanding vulnerability and resilience in disaster contexts by emphasizing education, health, equity, and social protection (UNDP, 2016). However, critics note that despite its normative strength, human development theory often lacks explicit guidance on ethical leadership and moral responsibility in crisis governance.

More recently, Community Resilience Theory has further advanced the field by emphasizing adaptability, social capital, collective learning, and local empowerment in the face of shocks (Norris et al., 2008; Imperiale & Vanclay,

2021). Unlike earlier frameworks, resilience theory explicitly challenges top-down approaches and highlights the relational and cultural dimensions of risk management. Nonetheless, some authors caution that resilience discourse risks shifting responsibility onto communities without addressing structural inequalities or ethical obligations of states (Béné et al., 2018).

Collectively, these theories illustrate a progressive intellectual movement from technical and economic determinism toward human-centered, participatory, and ethically informed approaches. This study synthesizes these frameworks to propose an integrative theoretical lens that situates sustainable development and disaster management within human development, community resilience, and moral responsibility, addressing both structural and lived dimensions of risk and sustainability.

2.2 Empirical Review of Literature

Empirical studies on sustainable development and disaster management increasingly underscore the limitations of purely technical or top-down approaches, highlighting the need for human-centered, contextually grounded interventions. Imperiale and Vanclay (2021) demonstrate that crises can serve as opportunities for learning and transformation in disaster risk reduction (DRR), yet persistent barriers, such as inadequate understanding of community resilience, methodological gaps, and paternalistic governance, undermine these potential gains. Their findings emphasize that sustainable interventions must be locally adaptable, culturally sensitive, and capable of building social capital, particularly in marginalized or resource-constrained communities. The Turkana pastoralist example illustrates how resilience emerges when interventions leverage existing livelihoods, while also cautioning that competition over new resources can exacerbate local conflicts.

Dai and Azhar (2024) extend this perspective by examining collaborative governance within the context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Their work highlights that partnerships and stakeholder engagement are central to achieving SDG 17 and enhancing community resilience, yet they note that contextual differences, such as livelihood systems, cultural practices, and knowledge gaps, often limit the effectiveness of universalized interventions. This aligns with Luetz et al. (2023), who argue that spirituality and ethical values, particularly in vulnerable and religiously diverse populations, are frequently undervalued in development programming, despite their capacity to enhance equity, legitimacy, and social cohesion.

Leadership and moral agency are recurrent themes in empirical studies. Crossweller (2021, 2022) emphasizes

relational leadership grounded in compassion, care, and justice, showing that self-interested or top-down decision-making undermines trust and resilience. Similarly, Subasinghe, Sutrisna, and Olatunji (2021) demonstrate that “micro-human efforts”, small-scale, community-driven actions, are critical for post-disaster recovery, though often overlooked in large-scale programs. These findings are reinforced by Cuthbertson and Penney (2023), who argue for ethical frameworks contextualized to local cultures to ensure dignity and equitable participation, particularly for marginalized groups.

Other studies highlight the systemic gaps in current frameworks. Bendell (2022) critiques the SDGs for insufficiently addressing structural inequalities and advocates for locally led adaptation and self-reliant resilience, while Japee and Oza (2021) underscore the role of emotional intelligence and moral engagement in achieving human-centered development. Collectively, these empirical insights converge on the principle that sustainable development and disaster management are most effective when interventions integrate ethical, spiritual, and human development considerations with participatory, locally grounded strategies. The Kenyan Universal Health Coverage initiative exemplifies such integration, operationalizing equity, compassion, and inclusivity in policy and practice.

Critique and Synthesis: While the reviewed studies provide compelling evidence for human-centered approaches, gaps remain in systematically linking ethical, spiritual, and resilience dimensions to measurable development outcomes. Furthermore, most research emphasizes post-disaster recovery rather than preemptive capacity building, suggesting the need for longitudinal studies that assess the effectiveness of integrated interventions over time. Comparative analysis indicates that interventions succeed when they combine community knowledge, participatory governance, and moral leadership, whereas top-down or technocratic approaches often fail to foster sustainable resilience.

3. Methodology

This study employed a rapid review methodology, an evidence synthesis approach designed to systematically identify, appraise, and synthesize existing research within constrained timeframes while maintaining transparency and methodological rigor. Rapid reviews accelerate the traditional systematic review process through streamlined procedures and targeted focus, making them suitable for informing policy-relevant research such as human-centered sustainable development and disaster management under evolving global conditions (Trish Greenhalgh et al., 2018; World Health Organization, 2017).

Unlike full systematic reviews, rapid reviews use methodological shortcuts, such as limiting databases, narrowing inclusion criteria, or simplifying quality appraisal, while still adhering to core principles of evidence-based synthesis (World Health Organization, 2017; Hilla Tricco et al., 2017). These reviews have become increasingly common in public health, policy analysis, and disaster management research because they provide timely and actionable evidence for decision-makers facing urgent social and environmental challenges (Hilla Tricco et al., 2017; Trish Greenhalgh et al., 2018).
Review Design and Rationale

A rapid review was chosen to efficiently aggregate diverse empirical evidence across fields, including disaster risk reduction (DRR), community resilience, sustainable development, ethics, spirituality, and governance. Rapid reviews are a form of knowledge synthesis that accelerates the traditional systematic review process by streamlining or simplifying certain methodological steps in order to produce evidence in a shorter timeframe while maintaining transparency and methodological rigor (Garrity et al., 2021; Tricco et al., 2022). This approach balances rigor and timeliness by preserving core elements of systematic evidence synthesis—such as clearly defined inclusion criteria, explicit search strategies, and structured data extraction—while implementing pragmatic methodological shortcuts, including reduced database coverage, limited screening procedures, or targeted searches (Haby et al., 2016; Tricco et al., 2015). Rapid reviews are particularly valuable in policy-oriented and applied research contexts because they provide timely, evidence-informed insights that can support decision-makers in addressing urgent or complex societal challenges (Tricco et al., 2017; World Health Organization, 2017). Consequently, this methodology is well suited for interdisciplinary research areas where emerging issues require timely synthesis of evidence to guide frameworks, policies, and interventions.

Search Strategy

Four major electronic databases—Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and PubMed—were systematically searched for literature published between 2010 and 2025 to ensure relevance to contemporary debates on sustainable development and disaster management. The use of multiple databases is recommended in evidence synthesis because no single database provides complete coverage of scholarly literature across disciplines, and combining multidisciplinary citation indices with broad search engines improves the comprehensiveness of retrieval (Klerings et al., 2023; Martín-Martín et al., 2018). Scopus and Web of Science are widely recognized as comprehensive citation databases covering high-impact peer-reviewed research across diverse academic fields,

while PubMed provides extensive coverage of health and biomedical literature relevant to disaster and community resilience research (Klerings et al., 2023). Google Scholar was additionally included to capture grey literature and publications from journals or repositories not indexed in traditional citation databases, thereby improving the breadth of the search (Martín-Martín et al., 2018).

Keywords and Boolean combinations were used to structure the search strategy (e.g., “community resilience” AND “disaster management,” “sustainable development” AND “governance,” “ethical leadership” AND “disaster risk reduction,” “spirituality” AND “sustainability”), enabling systematic identification of interdisciplinary literature. The use of Boolean operators and keyword combinations is a standard methodological practice in systematic and rapid reviews to refine search precision and ensure retrieval of relevant studies (Klerings et al., 2023). Search terms were refined iteratively following preliminary exploratory searches in order to balance comprehensiveness with feasibility, a common approach in rapid review methodologies were streamlined but transparent search strategies are employed to produce timely evidence syntheses (Garritty et al., 2021; Klerings et al., 2023).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Eligibility was determined using predefined criteria: peer-reviewed empirical studies, authoritative reports, and literature reviews that investigate human-centered dimensions of development and disaster management. Studies focused solely on technical or engineering aspects without relevance to human, social, ethical, or governance dimensions were excluded. Grey literature was included selectively when it offered substantive empirical or policy insights.

Screening and Selection

Titles and abstracts were initially screened by the first reviewer; subsequently, full texts of potentially relevant sources were retrieved. Due to resource constraints typical of rapid reviews, a second reviewer conducted cross-checking on a randomized subset of selections to minimize bias and enhance the reliability of inclusion decisions, as recommended in rapid review guidance.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Key information from each included article, such as study context, objectives, methods, findings, and implications, was extracted using a standardized form. The synthesis adopted a thematic narrative approach, enabling comparison across contexts and identification of emergent patterns relating to community resilience, governance,

leadership, spirituality, and ethical decision-making. Themes were iteratively developed through qualitative coding and grouping of findings, ensuring that findings were integrated with the conceptual and theoretical anchors of human-centered sustainable development.

Quality Assurance and Limitations

While rapid reviews streamline certain procedures, care was taken to maintain transparency and minimize bias through clear reporting of search strategies, eligibility criteria, and synthesis methods. Limitations inherent to rapid reviews, such as potential omission of relevant studies due to restricted search scope or limited reviewer cross-validation, are acknowledged, and findings are interpreted with caution in light of these constraints.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents empirical evidence synthesized through a rapid review of 42 peer-reviewed studies and authoritative reports, following a structured search strategy across Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and UN repositories. Studies were selected based on their relevance to human-centered sustainable development, disaster management, community resilience, ethics, and spirituality. The findings are organized thematically to highlight patterns, contrasts, and critical insights.

4.1 Community Resilience and Risk Governance

Imperiale and Vanclay (2021) emphasize that crises and disasters offer opportunities for learning and transformation in disaster risk reduction (DRR). Their review identifies barriers including inadequate understanding of community resilience, methodological gaps, and paternalistic governance structures. Empirical examples, such as pastoralist communities in Turkana, illustrate that resilience-building requires locally adaptable interventions that leverage existing livelihoods while avoiding dependence on external aid. These findings inform the rapid review by illustrating the importance of context-specific, community-driven strategies in disaster preparedness and recovery.

4.2 Collaborative Governance and SDG Integration

Dai and Azhar (2024) examine collaborative governance in disaster management, emphasizing partnerships and multi-stakeholder engagement as critical to achieving SDG 17. The study highlights contextual constraints, such as differing livelihood systems and low community

awareness of global frameworks, which limit policy effectiveness. This aligns with the rapid review's focus on inclusive, participatory governance, providing empirical evidence that locally contextualized interventions outperform one-size-fits-all approaches.

4.3 Spirituality and Ethical Dimensions

Luetz et al. (2023) reveal that spirituality is integral to sustainable development, particularly in Pacific Island contexts, yet remains underrepresented in development programs. Integrating ethical and spiritual values enhances equity, legitimacy, and cultural appropriateness. Similarly, Abumoghli (2023) shows that religious and moral frameworks can shape individual and institutional behaviors, improving environmental stewardship. These studies support the rapid review's emphasis on human-centered approaches beyond technical solutions, demonstrating the empirical significance of integrating spirituality into policy and practice.

4.4 Leadership and Micro-Human Efforts

Croweller (2021, 2022) highlights relational leadership grounded in compassion, justice, and mindfulness, showing that self-interest and top-down decision-making undermine trust and resilience. Complementing this, Subasinghe, Sutrisna, and Olatunji (2021) identify "micro-human efforts", small-scale, community-led actions critical for post-disaster recovery but often overlooked in large-scale programs. Cuthbertson and Penney (2023) further demonstrate that ethical frameworks contextualized to local cultures ensure dignity and equitable participation, particularly for marginalized groups. The rapid review synthesizes these findings to show that effective disaster management requires leadership that is both ethically informed and participatory.

4.5. Systemic Challenges and Innovations

Bendell (2022) critiques the SDGs for insufficiently addressing structural inequalities, advocating for locally led adaptation, self-reliant resilience, and eco-social contracts between citizens and states. Japee and Oza (2021) stress emotional intelligence and moral engagement as prerequisites for genuine human-centered development. Together, these studies reinforce the rapid review's overarching conclusion: sustainable development and disaster management are most effective when interventions integrate ethical, social, spiritual, and community resilience dimensions alongside technical solutions.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

This study underscores that sustainable development and disaster management cannot rely solely on technical solutions, policies, or top-down interventions. The rapid review of 42 peer-reviewed studies and authoritative reports demonstrates that human-centered approaches, grounded in ethics, spirituality, community engagement, and moral leadership, are essential for achieving resilient, equitable, and contextually appropriate outcomes. Evidence from diverse contexts, including Kenya, Pacific Island countries, and other climate- and disaster-prone regions, consistently shows that interventions integrating community knowledge, participatory governance, and ethical stewardship outperform purely technocratic models in fostering long-term sustainability and recovery (Imperiale & Vanclay, 2021; Dai & Azhar, 2024; Luetz et al., 2023).

The synthesis highlights several interrelated dimensions. First, community resilience depends on locally adapted interventions that leverage existing skills, resources, and cultural values, while mitigating reliance on external aid. Second, collaborative governance and stakeholder engagement are critical for contextualizing development goals, enhancing social cohesion, and ensuring the equitable distribution of benefits. Third, leadership anchored in compassion, mindfulness, and relational accountability strengthens trust, reduces human and ecological harm, and empowers communities to participate meaningfully in decision-making processes (Croweller, 2021, 2022). Finally, ethical and spiritual frameworks provide normative guidance, reinforcing moral responsibility and human dignity in both policy formulation and disaster response (Abumoghli, 2023; Cuthbertson & Penney, 2023).

While human-centered strategies demonstrate clear advantages, gaps remain in systematically measuring outcomes and integrating ethical-spiritual dimensions into formal development and disaster management frameworks. Future research should focus on longitudinal assessments and the operationalization of these principles across diverse sociocultural and ecological contexts.

In conclusion, moving beyond technical solutions toward human-centered, ethically grounded, and participatory

approaches is not optional but necessary. Policymakers, development practitioners, and disaster managers must prioritize community engagement, moral leadership, and context-sensitive interventions. This integrative approach enhances resilience, promotes equitable human development, and advances the global agenda for sustainable development, demonstrating that people, not technology alone, are the cornerstone of sustainable and resilient societies.

5.2 Recommendations

- **Prioritize Human-Centered Interventions-** Development and disaster management policies should integrate ethical, social, and spiritual considerations alongside technical solutions to enhance resilience and long-term sustainability.
- **Strengthen Community Engagement-** Active participation of local communities at all stages, from planning to implementation, is essential for ownership, cultural relevance, and effective adaptation of interventions.
- **Foster Contextualized Governance-** Collaborative governance frameworks should be tailored to local social, economic, and cultural contexts, recognizing that one-size-fits-all approaches often fail to achieve sustainable outcomes.
- **Promote Ethical and Relational Leadership-** Disaster and development leaders should adopt relational, compassionate, and justice-oriented approaches to decision-making, fostering trust, accountability, and inclusive participation.
- **Leverage Spiritual and Moral Values-** Incorporating community belief systems and ethical frameworks can guide behavior, reinforce social cohesion, and enhance the legitimacy and effectiveness of interventions.
- **Support Micro-Human Efforts-** Policies should recognize and empower small-scale, community-driven initiatives that contribute to post-disaster recovery and sustainable development, complementing larger institutional programs.
- **Monitor and Evaluate Human-Centered Outcomes-** Longitudinal studies and systematic monitoring should be implemented to assess the effectiveness of interventions that integrate ethical, social, and spiritual dimensions, ensuring evidence-based policy refinement.
- **Invest in Capacity Building and Knowledge Dissemination-** Training programs, awareness campaigns, and accessible information platforms should equip communities and stakeholders with the knowledge and skills necessary to actively participate in sustainable development and disaster risk reduction initiatives.

References

- Abumoghli, I. (2023). *The role of religions, values, ethics, and spiritual responsibility in environmental governance and achieving the sustainable development agenda*. <https://doi.org/10.30965/27507955-20230008>
- Bendell, J. (2022). Replacing sustainable development: Potential frameworks for international cooperation in an era of increasing crises and disasters. *Sustainability*, 14(13), 8185. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14138185>
- Croweller, M. (2021). *Disaster management and the need for a relational leadership framework founded upon compassion, care, and justice*. *Climate Risk Management*, 35, 100404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2022.100404>
- Croweller, M. (2022). *Disaster management leadership and the need for virtue, mindfulness, and practical wisdom*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4100299>
- Croweller, M. (2022). *Disaster management leadership and the need for virtue, mindfulness, and practical wisdom*. *Progress in Disaster Science*, 16, 100248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2022.100248>
OUCI
- Cuthbertson, J., & Penney, G. (2023). *Ethical decision making in disaster and emergency management: A systematic review of the literature*. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X23006325>
- Cuthbertson, J., & Penney, G. (2023). Ethical decision making in disaster and emergency management: A systematic review of the literature. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 38(5), 622–627. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X23006325>
- Dai, J., & Azhar, A. (2024). *Collaborative governance in disaster management and sustainable development*. *Public Administration and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.2071>
- Garrity, C., Gartlehner, G., Nussbaumer-Streit, B., King, V. J., Hamel, C., Kamel, C., Affengruber, L., & Stevens, A. (2021). Cochrane rapid reviews methods group offers evidence-informed guidance to conduct rapid reviews. *Journal of*

- Clinical Epidemiology*, 130, 13–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.10.007>
- Garritty, C., Gartlehner, G., Nussbaumer-Streit, B., King, V. J., Hamel, C., Kamel, C., Affengruber, L., & Stevens, A. (2021). Cochrane rapid reviews methods group offers evidence-informed guidance to conduct rapid reviews. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 130, 13–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.10.007>
- Greenhalgh, T., Thorne, S., & Malterud, K. (2018). Time to challenge the spurious hierarchy of systematic over narrative reviews? *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 48(6), e12931.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/eci.12931>
- Haby, M. M., Chapman, E., Clark, R., Barreto, J., Reveiz, L., & Lavis, J. N. (2016). What are the best methodologies for rapid reviews of the research evidence for evidence-informed decision making in health policy and practice: A rapid review. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 14, 83.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-016-0155-7>
- Imperiale, A. J., & Vanclay, F. (2021). Conceptualizing community resilience and the social dimensions of risk to overcome barriers to disaster risk reduction and sustainable development. *Sustainable Development*, 29(5), 891–905.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2182> OUCI
- Imperiale, A., & Vanclay, F. (2021). Conceptualizing community resilience and the social dimensions of risk to overcome barriers to disaster risk reduction and sustainable development. *Sustainable Development*, 29(6), 1114–1129.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2182>
- Japee, G., & Oza, P. (2021). Redefining sustainable development. *Psychology and Education*, 58(2), 2981. <https://doi.org/10.17762/pae.v58i2.2981>
- Klerings, I., Robalino, S., Booth, A., Escobar-Liquitay, C. M., Sommer, I., Gartlehner, G., Devane, D., & Waffenschmidt, S. (2023). Rapid reviews methods series: Guidance on literature search. *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine*, 28(6), 412–417.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjebm-2022-112079>
- Luetz, J. M., Nichols, E., du Plessis, K., & Nunn, P. D. (2023). Spirituality and sustainable development: A systematic word frequency analysis and an agenda for research in Pacific Island countries. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2201.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032201>
- Luetz, J. M., Nichols, E., Plessis, K. D., & Nunn, P. (2023). Spirituality and sustainable development: A systematic word frequency analysis and an agenda for research in Pacific Island countries. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2201.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032201>
- Martín-Martín, A., Orduna-Malea, E., Thelwall, M., & Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2018). Google Scholar, Web of Science, and Scopus: A systematic comparison of citations in 252 subject categories. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(4), 1160–1177.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.09.002>
- Subasinghe, C., Sutrisna, M., & Olatunji, O. (2021). *Multidisciplinary perspectives of micro-human efforts in post-disaster recovery*. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/02807270210390010>
- Tricco, A. C., Antony, J., Zarin, W., Striffler, L., Ghassemi, M., Ivory, J., Perrier, L., Hutton, B., Moher, D., & Straus, S. E. (2015). A scoping review of rapid review methods. *BMC Medicine*, 13, 224.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-015-0465-6>
- Tricco, A. C., Khalil, H., Holly, C., Feyissa, G., Godfrey, C., Evans, C., Sawchuck, D., Sudhakar, M., Asahngwa, C., Stannard, D., Abdulahi, M., Bonanno, L., Aromataris, E., McInerney, P., Wilson, R., Pang, D., Wang, Z., Cardoso, A. F., Peters, M. D. J., ... Munn, Z. (2022). Rapid reviews and the methodological rigor of evidence synthesis: A JBI position statement. *JBI Evidence Synthesis*, 20(4), 944–949.
<https://doi.org/10.11124/JBIES-21-00371>
- Tricco, A. C., Langlois, E. V., & Straus, S. E. (2017). *Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: A practical guide*. World Health Organization.
- Tricco, A. C., Langlois, E. V., & Straus, S. E. (Eds.). (2017). *Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: A practical guide*. World Health Organization.
- World Health Organization. (2017). *Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: A practical guide*. WHO.
- World Health Organization. (2017). *Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: A practical guide*. WHO Press.