

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

Laxmi Prasad Devkota<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nepal Academy of Science and Technology

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I thank the author of the article for the effort he made in preparing it. However, it needs a complete rewriting to be published as a scientific paper. My observations on this paper are given below.

## Introduction:

The Introduction section should present the context, establish the significance of the research, outline the objectives, and summarize the content of the paper in brief, and present the limitations if any, etc. However, I do not find these aspects in this paper.

## Methods:

- i. The methodology part is complete.
- How to calculate the frequency factor is not there.
- The definition XT of provided in the text is not correct (It is the flood of return period T)
- i. Equation (3) is missing.
- ii. The equations are cited in the text but not specified in the equations.
- iii. The equations are not written the way they should be written.

## Results and Discussion:

- i. Presentation of results in the forms of graphs and tables is not of good quality.
- ii. I do not find any interpretation of the findings of the study.
- iii. This study is not the first of its kind. It is one of the millionth studies on the use of the Gumbel distribution in the estimation of floods of various return periods at a particular location on the river. Comparison of the findings of this study with those of previous studies is, therefore, required. Further, a discussion on the similarities or differences between the results of this study and the existing literature should be in the paper. If the results of the study support previous research, it is to be explained how they contribute to confirming or extending existing knowledge. If the results contradict previous findings, a discussion on the possible reasons for the difference should be presented.
- iv. There is no mention of highlights on the strengths and contributions of the study.

## References

Having very few literatures reviewed in this study (there are only two), literature review and references are not enough for the paper to be published as an article.