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I enjoyed reading this paper very much. The robustness and reliability criteria are different than the criteria I have seen used, which reflects my limitations.

I wish the theoretical foundation of the method were better explained; for example, why is it one can weight and then add the risk functions for the different weather patterns

I like MLEs and they have lots of advantages. However, in small samples the shape parameters for the GEV and GPD go out of control. One needs to employ some sort of regionalization. This is explored by Martins and Stedinger. We have proceeded to use Bayesian GLS regression to develop better regional models of the shape parameter
for the LP3 distribution used in the USA, and the GEV distribution used in many other parts of the world.

I think it is a very good paper and support its publication.

Minor comments

p-6760 line 8: PMF discussion could be supported by a citation.
Line 21: does Gradex work only with the exponential distribution?
I would have appreciated seeing the mathematics that clarifies this text.

p-6761 line 15. The authors may be interested in:


This addresses the relative efficiency of AM versus PDS.

Line 19: Please define seasonal sampling.

p-6762 line 21 – MLEs can have trouble with GEV and GP. See the paper above, and citations there in, including


p-6763

I am troubled by the claim the weights will reflect the relative frequency of each type of event, where the GP distribution would describe the distribution of each event.

This model just seems incorrect overall. See any of the discussions of the distribution of the maximum of several different events, whose number is Poisson. This model just seems wrong, except perhaps in the extreme, when there is a very small probability of
getting an event by any of these causes. The sum of the arrival frequencies is the total risk, and equals the probability of an arrival. But one needs to be clear that this approximation is only valid for a specified range (works if total risk is less than 10%). I am sure the authors know this, it is just not clear in the manuscript.

The weights are parameters. And they were estimated from some data. Just data from an expanded data set.

p-6765 The discussion of season-of-risk confused me. Was only that season modeled?

Figure 1 – I would have put the theoretical frequency on the horizontal axis.

p-6671 WHY are GEV and Gumbel identical to exponential.

Gumbel has an exponential tail, so that is possible. But GEV can have a different tail.

p-6672 See Martins and Stedinger – need to put some control on shape parameter of GPD. In small samples or else one gets this unrealistic results. Just going with Exponential is one solution.

p-6673 section 5.1

See Martins and Stedinger – need to put some control on shape parameter.

Other work, one is a journal, can be found in:


6775- Adding uncertainty into the computation of flood quantiles is an interesting idea. Some of the discussion in the following article and citations there in may be of interest.
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