

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_110014
Title of the Manuscript:	Non-Stationary Modeling of Annual Flood Peak Heights of Mahanadi River Basin with The q-Generalized Extreme Value Distribution
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community because floods are a disaster that often occurs in almost all regions of the world. So this research can be used as a reference in modeling floods and as a basis for formulating policies about floods.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. The abstract is less comprehensive. The section "The findings also indicate that nonstationarity is present in the MRB due to climate change" is still poorly explained in the abstract.</p> <p>4. Yes, they are.</p> <p>5. Yes, I do. The contents of the manuscript are the result of scientific research.</p> <p>6. I think the references used are several years old. It's better to look for a more recent journal. The oldest effort is in the last 10 years.</p> <p>It would be better if the graphs in discussion were given an explanation of each result that the graph represents. In the conclusion section, it would be better if the findings, benefits, and suggested strategies that can be implemented by the government and other readers were written in a coherent manner.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, it is.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sukma Laksita Rahma
Department, University & Country	Diponegoro University, Indonesia