

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_122836
Title of the Manuscript:	Probability Distribution Analysis of Annual Maximum Precipitation in the Niger Delta: A Critical Step Towards Effective Flood Risk Management.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The subject of the research is important because 1) Essential for making informed decisions in water resources engineering. 2) Enhance understanding of local rainfall patterns, ultimately informing decision-making processes to mitigate flood impacts in the region. 3) Determination of the extent of peak rainfall for different return periods is an essential ingredient for the accurate design of hydraulic structures such as drains, dams and culverts as well as detection of flood risk areas.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author methodology is clearly defined. The tools and techniques employed are consistent with it. The research ideas are clear and sequentia.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References are adequate and up-to-date.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the research is acceptable.	
Optional/General comments	1-Comments on Tables 1 are missing. Add comments about. 2- On page 5, the written paragraph talks about Table No. 3, not Table No. 1. 3- In Table 2, it is better to write their equation. 4- In page 5, x_i must be written x_i and \hat{x}_i must be written \hat{x}_i 5-Comments on Fig 2, 3 and 4 are missing. Add comments about it. 6- The accuracy of Figures 3 and 4 is unclear. Please increase the resolution and clarity of the image.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Doaa Abd Khalil Elhertaniy
Department, University & Country	University of the Holy Quran and Taseel of Science, Sudan