

Review of: "Gumbel's Extreme Value Distribution for Flood Frequency Analyses of Timis River"

Ramgopal Sahu¹

¹ Sandip Foundation

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article titled as "**Gumbel's Extreme Value Distribution for Flood Frequency Analyses of Timis River**" has been submitted for possible publication in the Qeios Journal. The topic of the article and the objectives selected for the study are not up to the mark. The study is missing any form of novelty. The figures and tables are not prepared properly. Overall, the article has an ill-formed structure. Apart from that, I acknowledge the author for the great effort and time spent during the research and preparation of the manuscript.

I will be straight with my recommendations: **'I will not recommend'** as there are too many flaws, typos, and uninterpreted statistics that are not properly presented. However, I have gone through the paper and identified some points where the authors can work to improve the presentation of the results and give proper direction.

Major Comments:

1. The paper should have a separate discussion section, and although many results are presented, they are not analyzed or put into context for the reader. Adding interpretation of the results would clarify the contribution to the field that this paper is providing and help convey information to stakeholders.
2. The literature review is quite exhaustive, but had the review been in some chronological order, reading and appreciating the literature would have been much better. Also, summarize your literature, which will give a clear picture of the need for the study.
3. The background study is vague and needs more study.
4. The conclusion is an important chapter where more care should be taken; you need to give shape to your findings (results).

Minor Comments:

1. Figure 1 is incomplete: "Project your study area on a country or continent scale"
2. Figure 1. The elevation scale is missing "units."
3. Figure 2. Y-axis label (Peak flood) is missing "unit."
4. In your manuscript, the unit mentioned for flow/flood is "mc/s"; I suggest using a standard unit.
5. Figure 4. Units are missing in the X-axis (discharge) and Y-axis (Return Period time) labels.

Apart from these, there are too many flaws and grammar mistakes; the entire article needs thorough proofreading.



*****All the best*****