



D. Mahesh Kumar, IFS (KN: 2011)

Director,

Centre for Disaster Management

Email: cdm.lbsnaa@nic.in

No. T-31015/6/2018-CDM

Disaster: Response and Management

ISSN: 2347-2553, Volume-XIII, Issue-I, 2027

Date: 18-09-2026

Respected Sir/ Madam

Subject: Invitation of Manuscripts for the CDM, LBSNAA Journal entitled "Disaster: Response & Management" (ISSN: 2347-2553, Volume-XIII, Issue-I, 2027) — regd.

As you are aware, the Centre for Disaster Management (CDM) is a research and training centre of Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA), Mussoorie, Department of Personnel & Training (DoPT), Government of India. The Centre is involved in training officers on various aspects of Disaster Management belonging to the All India Services (IAS, IPS & IFS) and other Group-A Central Civil Services at induction, Mid-Career and In-Service respectively.

We are inviting special articles/research papers on Disaster Management for the upcoming volume of the journal, which will be used as a training resource to enrich the knowledge of officer trainees and participants at the Academy.

Manuscripts are invited under the identified themes which are organised across the disaster management cycle (Pre-Disaster, During Disaster and Post-Disaster activities with indicative areas and guidelines/ information as given in the enclosed Annexures.

Important dates:

Item	Date
Last date of submission of manuscripts	14-12-2026
Intimation of acceptance	14-01-2027

We will appreciate the contribution from you/ your esteemed organisation in the form of special articles/research papers related to Disaster Management, covering the thematic areas as indicated in the Annexure. Only the digital version of the manuscripts which are submitted as per the guidelines will be accepted and intimated to the concerned. For more details please write to us on email at cdm.lbsnaa@nic.in.


(D Mahesh Kumar)

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी (भारत सरकार) मसूरी - 248179

Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (Govt. of India) Mussoorie – 248179

EPABX Phone: (0135) – 222-2000 | FAX : (0135) – 2632350 & 2632720

<http://www.lbsnaa.gov.in>

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS/AUTHORS

*Journal “Disaster: Response & Management” and
Case Study Book Series “Disaster Governance in India”*

Financial Year 2026-27

1. Thematic Coverage

In order to secure comprehensive coverage of the disaster management cycle, manuscripts are invited under ten thematic areas organised under the three phases of the cycle — Pre-Disaster, During Disaster and Post-Disaster. Each theme below is accompanied by indicative (illustrative, not exhaustive) areas.

PRE-DISASTER — Prevention, Mitigation, Preparedness & Planning
1. Risk Assessment, Hazard & Vulnerability Mapping Indicative areas: Multi-hazard risk assessment; capacity, vulnerability & exposure analysis; hazard mapping and zonation; disaster risk indices; use of GIS/remote sensing and AI in risk profiling; State/District disaster risk database.
2. Structural & Non-Structural Mitigation and Resilient Infrastructure Indicative areas: Retrofitting and disaster-resilient construction; land-use planning and building codes; nature-based solutions; critical infrastructure resilience; integration of mitigation in development plans and projects.
3. Early Warning Systems, Risk Forecasting & Risk Communication Indicative areas: Multi-hazard early warning systems; last-mile dissemination; forecast-based financing/action; use of technology (Common Alerting Protocol, AI/ML) in forecasting and communication.
4. Preparedness Planning, Capacity Building & Institutional Strengthening Indicative areas: Disaster management planning at National and Sub-National levels; mock drills and simulation exercises; training of government functionaries, first responders and communities; institutional strengthening including Urban Disaster Management Authorities
5. Disaster Risk Financing, Insurance & Mitigation Funds Indicative areas: Disaster risk financing instruments; Soliciting Mitigation Funds; innovative financing for DRR including private-sector and multilateral instruments.
DURING DISASTER — Response
6. Emergency Response, Search & Rescue Coordination Indicative areas: Search, rescue and evacuation operations; role and specialised capability of the NDRF/SDRF; inter-agency and multi-State coordination; use of technology (drones, robotics) in response.
7. Relief, Humanitarian Assistance & Emergency Services (Shelter, Health, WASH) Indicative areas: Relief camp management; emergency health care and trauma care; special provisions for vulnerable & elderly; equitable and inclusive relief.
8. Disaster Communication, Information Management & Community-Based Response Indicative areas: Emergency communication systems; real-time information management; coordination among Trans-boundary, Inter-State & Inter-District ramifications; community-based and volunteer-led response; role of media in disaster response.

POST-DISASTER — Rehabilitation, Recovery, Resilience & Reconstruction
9. Rehabilitation & Recovery — Psychosocial, Social and Economic Recovery Indicative areas: Psychosocial care and trauma counselling; livelihood and economic recovery; restoration of basic services; social, economic and hazard-risk resilience; gender-responsive and inclusive recovery programmes.
10. Reconstruction (Build Back Better) — Resilient Infrastructure and Development Integration Indicative areas: Build Back Better principles in reconstruction; disaster-resilient housing and infrastructure; integration of DRR into long-term development and reconstruction planning; monitoring and evaluation of post-disaster reconstruction programmes; lessons and case studies from major reconstruction efforts in India.

2. Criteria for Manuscript/Contribution Categories

Consistent with CDM’s earlier guidelines, contributions are invited under the following categories. Word limits indicate the expected quality of research; authors should write to the requirements of the category described below, rather than to the word limit alone.

Publication	Category	Word Limit	Defining Criteria
CDM Annual Journal “Disaster: Response & Management”	Special Article	8,000 words	A substantial, peer-reviewable contribution offering original research, empirical evidence, or a comprehensive analytical review of a significant policy, governance, or institutional issue in disaster management. Expected to be grounded in relevant literature and evidence, and to draw out clear implications for policy or practice.
	Research Article	4,000–5,000 words	A focused research or conceptual contribution examining a specific theme, case, technology, or governance issue within the disaster management cycle. Less exhaustive in scope than a Special Article, but methodologically sound with a clearly stated argument or analysis.
Case Study Book Series “Disaster Governance in India”	Case Study/Best Practice	4000-8,000 words	A structured, fact-based account of an actual disaster management event, programme, intervention, or institutional experience, written as a training resource. It may follow the decision-case format (see Guidance Note below), presenting a real situation or dilemma and equipping the reader with the relevant facts, or it may document a specific initiative or approach that has achieved tangible, replicable success — describing the practice, its context, the outcomes and impact achieved, and the factors enabling replication or scale-up. In both cases, the account should rest on verifiable detail and draw out generalizable, transferable lessons.
	Policy Brief	3,000 words	A concise, action-oriented note that distils a specific policy issue in disaster management, summarises the relevant evidence and context, and offers clear, implementable recommendations for decision-makers.

3. Manuscript Preparation and Sequence

Manuscripts should follow the sequence and formatting requirements summarised below:

1. Strictly submit your own intellectual property or real work rather than AI-generated manuscripts.
2. Manuscripts should be typed on one side of A4 paper, double-spaced throughout (including quotations, notes and references), preferably in Times New Roman, font size 12.
3. Pages should be numbered consecutively from the title page through text, reference list, tables and figure legends.
4. **Manuscript sequence: Title page** (Title, Authors, Affiliations, Corresponding author and address) → **Abstract** (not exceeding 100 words; convey the problem statement and outline the results, conclusion and significance of the study) → **Keywords** (not more than five) → **Text** (should be intelligible to readers across disciplines; technical terms should be defined; references should be cited uniformly throughout the manuscript) → **Acknowledgements** (brief) → **References**.
5. Tables and figures should be numbered separately and referred to by number, not by placement. Photographs/scanned images should be at a minimum of 300 dpi/1,500 pixels, in TIFF or JPEG format, submitted separately along with the main article, with reprint permissions obtained for any copyright-protected material.
6. **References** must be embedded in the text using the author–date system. In-text citations should include the author's surname, publication year, and page number for direct quotes, formatted within parentheses. When multiple sources are cited together, they must be ordered alphabetically by the first author's surname and separated by semicolons. **Parenthetical Citation Example:** (Ahmed, 1987; Ferroni et al., 2000; Leboffe & Pierce, 2010; Sarkar, 1987; Wignaraja, 1967); **In-Text Quote Citation Example:** (Dubey, 1989, p. 278).
7. **In the reference list** (as per APA 7th Edition), items are organised alphabetically by the author's last name. The author's initials are followed by the year in parentheses. Journal titles and volume numbers must be italicised, e.g.:

Laskowski, D.A. (2002). Physical and chemical properties of pyrethroids. *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, 174, 49–170.

Mazan, M. R., & Hoffman, A. M. (2001). Effects of aerosolized albuterol on physiologic responses to exercise in Standardbreds. *American Journal of Veterinary Research*, 62(11), 1812–1817.

Smart, N., Fang, Z. Y., & Marwick, T. H. (2003). A practical guide to exercise training for heart failure. *Journal of Cardiac Failure*, 9(1), 49–58.
8. Affiliations with complete postal and email addresses of all contributors must be provided with the manuscript.
9. Submission of a manuscript implies it has not been previously published and is not under consideration elsewhere; if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere.

10. All submissions are to be emailed as Word documents to the Centre for Disaster Management (cdm.lbsnaa@nic.in). All submissions will be screened through anti-plagiarism software (Turnitin) to check the similarity index.
11. Manuscripts will be reviewed by expert evaluators respective to themes, nominated by the CDM Editorial Board and Editorial Advisors.
12. Manuscripts will first be assessed by the Editorial Board/editorial members; papers found unsuitable in terms of the overall requirements will be returned to the authors. Selected authors will be notified of acceptance as per the dates communicated in the invitation letter.
13. Illustrations and other material reproduced from other publications must be properly credited; it is the author's responsibility to obtain prior permission for reproduction of figures, images, text, tables, etc. from published sources (copies of letters of permission should be sent to the editor along with the manuscript).

4. Guidance Note for Case Study Authors

Case studies should be drafted in line with the theme of the case study book series. Authors are required to document a unique professional experience or best practice relating to disaster risk reduction across the disaster management cycle (Prevention, Mitigation, Preparedness, Response, Rehabilitation, Recovery, Resilience and Reconstruction). The case should ideally focus on an aspect of public service delivery or project management, such as:

- a. Innovation in service delivery;
- b. Project formulation;
- c. Implementation and management of projects/schemes.

To maintain uniformity across submissions, cases should follow the decision-forcing (or descriptive) case format used in leading Business School case studies (e.g., Harvard Business School), with the following structure:

- **Opening:** a brief scene-setting paragraph that introduces the protagonist and the choice or decision they face, drawing the reader in.
- **Body:** the background to the issue, including all facts, context and stakeholders relevant to understanding the situation.
- **Return to the decision point:** the narrative returns to the situation outlined in the opening, laying out the decision to be made along with all related facts, so the reader can, in effect, stand in the protagonist's shoes and work through the same choice.
- **Names:** the names of the protagonist, key actors and places may be retained or changed at the case writer's discretion, particularly where confidentiality needs to be protected.

4.1 Writing a Case Study — A Detailed Note

This note expands, for authors less familiar with the tradition, on the decision-case format that CDM's Case Study category follows. A well-written case reads like a true story, not a report or a circular: it withholds judgement, lets the facts and the protagonist's own reasoning carry the narrative, and leaves the reader to work through the same choice the protagonist faced — rather than being told what the “right” answer was.

A. The Case Method — Purpose and Use at CDM

The case method has been developed at Harvard Business School as a way of teaching judgement rather than technique: instead of being told the theory and then given as an example, the reader is placed inside a real, unresolved situation and asked to decide what they would do, with only the information the protagonist actually had at the time. At CDM, this is used to train officer trainees and participants to think through the unstructured, time-bound, multi-stakeholder decisions that arise in disaster management — where a District Magistrate/field functionary had to act under uncertainty. A good case does the training; the author's job is to construct the situation faithfully, not to draw the lesson for the reader.

B. Choose Your Case Type

- **Decision-forcing case:** ends at the moment of decision, before the protagonist has acted. The reader is left to decide. This is the preferred format where the case is meant to be discussed and debated in a classroom/training session.
- **Descriptive (retrospective) case:** narrates a decision or initiative that has already played out, including what was done and what resulted. This suits Best Practice submissions in particular, where the value lies in the documented outcome and its replicability, rather than in an open classroom debate.

C. Anatomy of a Case — Section by Section

1. **The Opening (Hook):** start in the middle of the action, at a moment of tension — not with institutional background or a chronological “Introduction.” A strong opening names the protagonist, the moment, and the stakes, in two or three tight paragraphs, and ends by posing (implicitly or explicitly) the question the reader will spend the rest of the case answering.
2. **Protagonist and Setting:** establish, briefly, who the protagonist is, their role and mandate, and the institutional/geographic setting — enough for the reader to understand the authority and constraints the protagonist was working within, without turning into a biography.
3. **Body — Chronology and Context:** the largest section of the case. Lay out the sequence of events, the institutional and regulatory context, the stakeholders and their competing interests, and the information (and misinformation) available at each stage, in the order the protagonist encountered it. Where useful, use sub-headings, dates and a chronological flow rather than a thematic essay structure.
4. **The Decision Point / Dilemma:** the narrative returns to the moment introduced in the opening. Restate, explicitly, the decision to be made, the options genuinely available to the protagonist,

and the constraints (time, resources, authority, political context) bearing on each option. For a decision-forcing case, stop here — do not reveal what was actually decided.

5. **Exhibits:** supporting data, timelines, organograms, maps, budgets, photographs or extracts from official documents that a reader would need to analyse the decision, placed at the end of the case as numbered Exhibits and referred to by number in the text (see Section G below).
6. **Closing — Resolution and Lessons (descriptive/Best Practice cases only):** briefly narrate what the protagonist actually decided and did, the outcome/impact, and the generalisable lessons for disaster management practice elsewhere. Decision-forcing cases omit this section from the case itself.

D. Voice, Tense and Style

- Write in the third person, past tense, as a narrator reporting facts — not as an advocate for, or a critic of, the protagonist's eventual choice.
- Do not editorialise or state your own opinion on what the protagonist should have done; let the facts, data and quoted dialogue carry the tension and the ambiguity.
- Prefer short, declarative sentences and concrete, specific detail — names, dates, figures, quoted remarks — over generalities and abstractions.
- Direct speech or quotations from interviews may be used sparingly, in quotation marks, to bring a moment alive, but should not be invented.
- Every fact, figure, date or quotation in the case should be traceable to an interview, document or verifiable record — a case is a work of non-fiction, however narrative its style.

E. Researching and Verifying the Case

- Base the case on first-hand interviews with the protagonist and, where possible, one or two other participants or witnesses, supplemented by official records, minutes, reports, media coverage and data.
- Cross-check facts across sources; where different participants' accounts genuinely differ, it is often more honest to note the discrepancy than to silently resolve it in the narrative.
- Prepare interview questions in advance, built around the eventual decision point, and probe specifically for what the protagonist knew (and did not know) at each stage — not only for what is known with hindsight.
- Retain interview notes/recordings and source documents; the CDM Editorial Board may ask for these to verify facts before publication.

F. Confidentiality and Permissions

- Where the events described could embarrass an individual, institution or an ongoing process, or where an interviewee requests it, disguise the names of persons, places and, if necessary, identifying institutional details — while keeping the substance of the facts and the decision intact.

- Obtain the interviewee's or institution's consent (even an informal release over email) before submitting a case built substantially on personal interviews.
- Where real names and institutions are retained, ensure no material fact is misstated — a real case with real names carries a higher standard of factual accuracy than a disguised one.

G. Exhibits and Supporting Data

Present supporting material as numbered Exhibits (Exhibit 1, Exhibit 2, ...) placed after the main text and referred to by number at the relevant point in the narrative, rather than embedded inline. Typical exhibits include timelines of key events, organograms, maps, budget or damage/relief data tables, and photographs — each with a title, source/date, and, for photographs or third-party material, appropriate credit and permission.

H. A Note on the Teaching Note (Optional)

Many Harvard Business School-style cases are accompanied by a separate Teaching Note for instructors, summarising the pedagogical objective, suggested discussion questions, and an analysis of the options available at the decision point. Authors are welcome, though not required, to submit a short (one- to two-page) Teaching Note alongside the case; CDM may use these to structure discussion sessions at the Academy.

I. Common Pitfalls to Avoid

- Writing the case as an after-the-fact report or press release, rather than as a live narrative building towards a decision.
- Revealing the eventual outcome or decision too early, which removes the reader's reason to deliberate.
- Passing personal judgement on the protagonist's choices within the case narrative itself, rather than leaving that to the reader (or to a separate Teaching Note).
- Overloading the case with institutional or historical background that does not bear on the decision at hand.
- Including unverified, embellished or invented dialogue, figures or events.

J. References

- Giles, D. W. (2018). *A cascade of emergencies (A): Responding to Superstorm Sandy in New York City* (HKS Case No. KS1264). Harvard Kennedy School Case Program.
- Giles, D. W. (2018). *A cascade of emergencies (B): Responding to Superstorm Sandy in New York City* (HKS Case No. KS1265). Harvard Kennedy School Case Program.
- Harvard Business Publishing. (n.d.). *Teaching disaster management* [Case collection]. <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/catalog/collections/teaching-disaster-management>