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#### Abstract

To evaluate flood (Discharge or water level) as well as rainfall frequency of given returns period, it is essential that one probability distribution function be used as a standard. In many countries one distribution function is used as a standard but in Bangladesh various frequency distribution function are in use. The main objectives of this study are to compare the probability distribution function for the application on flood and rainfall frequency analysis in Bangladesh. To compare it, three widely used distributions have been used namely: (1) Log Normal (Two parameters, LN2 and three parameters, LN3); (2) Extreme value Type-1 (EV1) or Grumbel and (3) Log-person type-3 (LP3) distributions. For this purpose, 5 set data of annual maximum runoff of different main rivers in Bangladesh and 3-days and 5-days rainfall data of Bhola Island (8 sets) have been used. The parameters of the distributions have been estimated by using the method of moments and method of maximum likelihood.
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## INTRODUCTION

Knowledge of the magnitude and probable frequency of recurrence of floods and rainfall is necessary for the proper design of hydraulic structures such as dams, bridges, culverts, levees, highways, sewage disposal plants, industrial building etc. Return periods are find as per design policy of such structures viz. flood of 50 years return period are evaluated for embankments and bridges, that of return period 100 years for barrage and culverts

In 1880-1890, Herchel and Freeman first applied the frequency analysis of stream flow data to flood studies by means of graphical procedure using flow duration curves. A large number of papers on the application of Fisher Tippet theory of extreme values to flood frequency analysis were published [6]. Later, many other hydrologists worked on the extreme value theory to flood frequency analysis, $[3,7,10,11,14,15,16]$

The frequency analysis of discharge data of West Bengal rivers by means of graphical procedures using flow duration curves has been studied by $[2,13]$ and discussed various issues related to section of probability distribution function for flood frequency analysis. In the various rivers discharge data in Bangladesh, MPO (1986), [1, 4, 12] have been used different probability distribution and suggested that LP3 distributions are suitable for Bangladesh for the frequency analysis of discharge data. It was found from all of the above study that they have used only discharge data but in our study discharge as well as rainfall data have been used.

The objective of this study is to compare the probability distribution function for the application of flood frequency as well as rainfall frequency analysis considering annul maximum runoff and rainfall data at different rivers and places in Bangladesh. In this study three widely used distributions have been compared by using 5 sets of annual maximum runoff data in different main rivers, 4 sets of $3-$ days rainfall data and 4 sets of 5 -days rainfall data of Bhola Island in Bangladesh. For the literature survey we have visited Surface water modeling center (SWMC), Bangladesh water development board (BWDB), Institute of flood control and drainage research (IFCDR), Roorkee university (India) etc. for several times and collected important literature related to the work mentioned above.

## METHODOLOGY

## Probability distribution functions used:

Probability distribution functions of discrete and continuos random variables are used to fit distributions in hydrology. There are many distributions that are found useful for the hydrological frequency analysis. The Bangladesh water development board which designs and implements all large-scale flood control projects uses the Gumbel distribution. A few departments and consulting firms use the log normal (LN) distribution. The log-Pearson type-3 (LP3) distribution has been used in the preparation of a national water plan. Three widely used probability functions were compared in this study. These three probability distribution function and the parameters involved in each function are given below.

## Log-normal distribution (LN)

The probability density function of this distribution in the case of three parameters (LN3) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=\frac{1}{(x-\theta) \sigma_{y} \sqrt{2 \pi}} \exp \left[\frac{-\left\{\operatorname{In}(x-\theta)-\mu_{y}\right\}^{2}}{2 \sigma_{y}^{2}}\right], x>\theta \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $\mu_{y}$ and $\sigma_{y}$ are the mean and standard deviation of the natural logarithms of x and $\theta$ is a number.

The probability density function of this distribution in the case of two parameters (LN2):

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=\frac{1}{x \sigma_{y} \sqrt{2 \pi}} \exp \left[\frac{-\left(\operatorname{In} x-\mu_{y}\right)^{2}}{2 \sigma_{y}^{2}}\right] \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $\sigma_{y}$ and $\mu_{y}$ are parameters stated above.
Extreme Value Type-1 or Grrmbel Distribution (EV1)
The probability density function of this distribution is

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=\exp \left[-\exp \left(-\frac{x-\xi}{\alpha}\right)\right] \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $f(x)$ s the non-excedence probability for the value of $\mathrm{x}, \xi$ is a location parameter and $\alpha$ is scale parameter.

## Log Pearson Type-3 Distribution (LP3)

The probability density function of Person Type-3 distribution is

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=\frac{1}{\alpha x \Gamma(\beta)}\left[\frac{x-v}{\alpha}\right]^{(\beta-1)} \exp \left[-\frac{x-v}{\alpha}\right] \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $\alpha, \beta$ and $v$ are the shape, scale and location parameters to be estimated from the sample and $\Gamma(\beta)$ is the gamma function.

If the logarithm, $\ln x$ of a variable x are distributed as a Pearson Type-3 variable, then the variable x will be distributed as a Log Pearson Type-3 with probability density function

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=\frac{1}{\alpha x \Gamma(\beta)}\left[\frac{\ln x-v}{\alpha}\right]^{(\beta-1)} \exp \left[-\frac{x-v}{\alpha}\right] \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $\alpha, \beta$ and $\Gamma$ are the parameters as before.

### 1.2 Method of estimating distribution function parameters

The estimation methods techniques are used for estimating various parameters from sample values in such a way that they depart from the population parameters to a minimum. For estimating the parameters from the sample of data, method of moments (MM) and the method of maximum likelihood (MML) have been used in this study. The maximum likelihood
method is a standard statistical procedure used in fitting a variety of hydrological data [5, 8].

### 1.3 Data Used in this analysis

The annual maximum discharge and 3 days and 5-days rainfall data have been used in this study. The data have been found from the Bangladesh water development board and Institute of flood control and drainage research. For the computation of statistical probability distribution a total number of 5 sets discharge data and 8 sets of rainfall data have been selected for this study on various types of rivers and places in Bangladesh. The discharge data record covers up to the year 2000 and rainfall data covers up to 2000 in some cases as given in table-1. The length of annual maximum discharge data lies between 25 to 63 years and rainfall data lies between 11 to 35 years as given in table-2. Though there is some break in the period of observation, the data are assumed to be continuous in this study.

Table-1: Discharge data ( 5 sets) of 5 different rivers in Bangladesh.
Serial

| Number | Station \& River | Period of <br> Record <br> 1. | Number <br> of Years <br> 273Bhairab Bazar (Meghna) |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | 46-9L Bahadurabad (Brahmaputra) | 1964 to 2000 | 29 |
| 3. | 91-9L Baruria (Ganges) | 1966 to 1992 | 36 |
| 4. | 90 Hardinage Bridge (Ganges) | 25 |  |
| 5 | 229-5LMymensingh(Old Brahmaputra) | 1964 to 2000 | 63 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table-2: Rainfall data (8 sets) of 4 different rainfall station in Bhola
(3-days and 5-days)

| Serial | Rainfall | Period of Record | Number of Years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | Station |  |  |
| 1. | Bhola city | 1962 to 2000 | 35 |
| 2. | Burhanuddin | 1962 to 1994 | 25 |
| 3. | Charfassion | 1968 to 1978 | 11 |
| 4. | Daulatkhan | 1961 to 1994 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For computations of the flood and rainfall frequency analysis by the distribution LN2, LN3, EV1 and LP3 have been developed and then used for this study. The application of above mentioned distributions have been used for the estimations of T year's events (viz. 2, 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 years) through the method of moments and the method of maximum likelihood. All results are available in Appendices (in Appendix Al: Annual maximum discharge data of 5 sets in tabular from are given. In Appendix A2: Results of Discharge data are shown. B1: Rainfall data 3-days 4 sets and 5-days 4 sets in tabular form are given and Appendix B2: Results of Rainfall data are shown)

## CONCLUSION

From this study, it is found that LP3 distribution give reasonably good results for the flood frequency as well as rainfall frequency analysis. It gives moderate or average results out of the other distributions.

It is conclude that one may use LP3 distribution for the flood as well as rainfall frequency analysis in Bangladesh. For the present study (only six months duration) the limited number of flood (maximum discharge) and rainfall data have been used. For more confirmation a large number of data can be used for the further study.

## REFERENCE

[1] Chowdhury, J.U and Karim, M.A. (1993), Selection of Probability Function for Flood Frequency Analysis in Bangladesh. Institute of Flood Control and Drainage Research, BUET, Dhaka Final Report, RO1/93.
[2] Cunnane, C. (1989) Statistical Distribution for Flood Frequency Analysis, World Meteorological Organization, Operational Hydrology Report No. 33, WMONo. 718, Secretarial of the World Meteorological Organization Geneva, Switzerland.
[3] Chow V.T. David R Maidment, and Larry W. Mays (1992), Hand book of Applied Hydrology, McGraw-Hill book company, U.S.A., Chapter 12.
[4] Flood Hydrology study (1992), AFP-25: Flood Medelling and Management, Report of Kruger Consult and ECOM. Flood Plan coordination Organization.dhaka.
[5] Farago, T., and R.W.Katz., 1990. Extremes and design values in climatology. World Meteorological organization, TDNo.386, Geneva, Switzerland.
[6] Gumbel, E.J (1941), Probability Interpretation of the Observed Return Periods of Floods, Trans. American Geophysics unions, vol. 22.
[7] Johnson, N, L and Lotz, S. (1970), Distribution in Statistics, Continuous Univariate Distribution-1. A Wiley- and Son. NewYorkk.
[8] Kite,G.W,1977. Frequency and risk analysis in Hydrology. Water resource publications, Fort collins, co,224 p.
[9] Master Plan Organization (1986), Floods and Storms, Technical Report, No. 11
[10] Mutreja. K.N. (1986) Applied Hydrology, Chap-3 and Chap-13, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi.
[11] Nash. J.E and Amoracho, J. (1986), The Accuracy of Predication of Flood of High return Period. Water Resources Research vol. 2 No. 2.
[12] Rahman. M.R. and Ahmed. S.M.U. (1986), A Comparative Study of Flood Frequency Analysis in Bangladesh. Journal of the Institution of Engineer, Bangladesh. vol. 14 No.-2.Page 3137.
[13] Roy, S.K. (1985), Flood Frequency Studies for Bhagirathi River (West Bengal, Unesco Sponsored International Hydrology Course, Universityof Roorkee-247667, India.
[14] Subramanya, K. (1994), Engineering Hydrology, Chap-7, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi. (2nd edition)
[15] Singh, V.P. (1992), Elementary Hydrology, Chapter-25, Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.
[16] Sir William Hall Crow and Partmers Ltd. (1993) South West Area Water Resources Management project FAP4, Final report volume-3.

Appendix-A1 (I) (Detailed of discharge data, which have been used in this study, is given in the following tables)
Table 1: Annual maximum discharges (cumec) with year. Period of record used from 1961 to 2000, Number of years 29, Station Bhairab Bazar (273). River: Meghna. Designation of data set is D1

| Year | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxi Discharge | 13141 | 7590 | 9487 | 12300 | 12100 | 14400 | 12700 | 13300 | 11500 | 16400 |
| Year | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 |
| Maxi Discharge | 11500 | 12400 | 19500 | 12700 | 16700 | 11200 | 13500 | 16000 | 13600 | 14300 |
| Year | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 2000 |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 11100 | 15200 | 19800 | 15500 | 11700 | 14500 | 12800 | 19900 | 12394 |  |

Table 2: Annual maximum discharges (cumec) with year. Period of record used from 1956 to 1992, Number of years $=36$, Station: Baruria (46-9L). River: Brahmaputra. Designation of data set is D2

| Year | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxi Discharge | 60400 | 65500 | 71300 | 68500 | 64800 | 53800 | 59400 | 56400 | 63100 | 64200 |
| Year | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| Maxi Discharge | 68900 | 69600 | 62300 | 56000 | 75000 | 66600 | 67300 | 91100 | 52200 | 65600 |
| Year | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| Maxi Discharge | 66600 | 56600 | 66100 | 61200 | 66500 | 55900 | 56500 | 77000 | 63800 | 43100 |
| Year | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 |  |  |  |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 74000 | 98600 | 71100 | 64400 | 84100 | 67500 |  |  |  |  |

Table 3: Annual maximum discharges (cumec) with year. Period of record used from 1966 to 1992, Number of years= 25, Station Baruria (91-9L). River: Ganges. Designation of data set is D3

| Year | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxi Discharge | 81300 | 63600 | 80200 | 72700 | 84200 | 76600 | 90900 | 113000 | 93300 | 83500 |
| Year | 1977 | 1978 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 |
| Maxi Discharge | 81800 | 80400 | 109000 | 88200 | 89600 | 101000 | 107000 | 90500 | 81500 | 113000 |
| Year | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 132000 | 80000 | 83800 | 100000 | 726000 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4: Annual maximum discharges 'Cumec' with year. Period of record: 1934-35 to 1995-96 except 1971-72, 96-2000.Number of years $=63$, Station No $=90$, Station: Harding Bridge, River $=$ Ganges, Designation of data set is D4

| Year | 1934-35 | 1935-36 | 1936-37 | 1937-38 | 1938-39 | 1939-40 | 1940-41 | 1941-42 | 1942-43 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxi Discharge | 46600 | 44000 | 45300 | 39400 | 47800 | 35900 | 39100 | 38300 | 44700 |  |
| Year | 1943-44 | 1944-45 | 1945-46 | 1946-47 | 1947-48 | 1948-49 | 1949-50 | 1950-51 | 1951-52 |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 43300 | 43300 | 42200 | 49100 | 51200 | 61100 | 52600 | 52600 | 42200 |  |
| Year | 1952-53 | 1953-54 | 1954-55 | 1955-56 | 1956-57 | 1957-58 | 1958-59 | 1959-60 | 1960-61 |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 52600 | 50900 | 58600 | 60300 | 60100 | 46200 | 56200 | 52700 | 48000 |  |
| Year | 1961-62 | 1962-63 | 1963-64 | 1964-65 | 1965-66 | 1966-67 | 1967-68 | 1968-69 | 1969-70 |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 73200 | 58700 | 56100 | 49000 | 36800 | 41900 | 50800 | 45200 | 55200 |  |
| Year | 1970-71 | 1971-73 | 1973-75 | 1973-74 | 1974-76 | 1977-77 | 1976-78 | 1977-79 | 1978-80 |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 48700 | 38200 | 50700 | 50700 | 51100 | 65400 | 51100 | 67900 | 36900 |  |
| Year | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 | 1983-84 | 1984-85 | 1985-86 | 1986-87 | 1987-88 | 1988-89 |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 57600 | 47900 | 61600 | 60000 | 56500 | 50600 | 53500 | 76000 | 72300 |  |
| Year | 1989-90 | 1990-91 | 1991-92 | 1992-93 | 1993-94 | 1994-95 | 1995-96 | 1999 | 2000 |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 31600 | 51300 | 56000 | 41900 | 44800 | 46100 | 49100 | 55019 | 60952 |  |

Table 5: Annual maximum discharges (cumec) with year. Period of record used from 1964 to1992, Number of years 26, Station Baruria (228-5) River: Old Brahmaputra. Designation of data set is D5

| Year | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxi Discharge | 2830 | 3230 | 3490 | 3000 | 2900 | 2770 | 3250 | 3820 | 3060 | 3210 |
| Year | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| Maxi Discharge | 3550 | 2770 | 2630 | 3340 | 2690 | 2470 | 2370 | 4780 | 3070 | 1930 |
| Year | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 |  |  |  |  |
| Maxi Discharge | 3230 | 4910 | 2180 | 2060 | 2900 | 1490 |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix-A2 (I) (Results and figures of discharge data)

Table 1: Comparison of flood frequency results using data D1 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods

| Return periods <br> (Years Distribution) | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EV1 (cumec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM: X ${ }_{\mathrm{T}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 13584 | 16101 | 17767 | 19366 | 21435 | 22985 |
| LN2 (cumce) | 13519 | 15456 | 16739 | 17970 | 19563 | 20757 |
| MM and MML X | 13742 | 15878 | 17125 | 18227 | 19553 | 20490 |
| LN3 (cumce) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM: $X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 23584 | 15741 | 17120 | 18411 | 20053 | 21271 |
| MML: $X_{T}$ | 8751 | 10776 | 11921 | 12914 | 14086 | 14901 |
| LP3 (cumce) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM (Direct): $X_{T}$ | 13599 | 16598 | 17039 | 18300 | 19914 | 21121 |
| MML (Indirect) $X_{T}$ | 13487 | 15641 | 17111 | 18556 | 21985 | 21985 |



Figure 1: Comparison of flood frequency using the results given in Table 1


Figure 2: Comparison of flood frequency using the results given in Table 2

Table 2: Comparison of flood frequency results using data D2 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods

| Return periods <br> (Years Distribution) | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EV1 (cumec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${\text { MM: } X_{\mathrm{T}}}^{\text {MML: } X_{T}}$ | 64555 | 75023 | 81954 | 88603 | 97208 | 103657 |
| LN2 (cumce) | 64760 | 75150 | 82029 | 88627 | 97168 | 103569 |
| MM and MML X |  | 65357 | 74585 | 79918 | 84607 | 90214 |
| LN3 (cumce) |  |  |  |  |  | 94158 |
| MM: $X_{T}$ | 64715 | 740064 | 79939 | 85388 | 92247 | 97293 |
| MML: $X_{T}$ | 60607 | 69873 | 75416 | 80397 | 86480 | 90837 |
| LP3 (cumce) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM (Direct): $X_{T}$ | 64762 | 73929 | 79694 | 85059 | 91852 | 96882 |
| MML (Indirect) $X_{T}$ | 64791 | 74158 | 80024 | 85469 | 92344 | 97423 |

Table 3: Comparison of flood frequency results using data D3 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods

| Return periods <br> (Years Distribution) | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EV1 (cumec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${\text { MM: } X_{T}}^{\text {MML: } X_{T}}$ | 87646 | 103796 | 114489 | 124746 | 138022 | 147971 |
| LN2 (cumce) | 87477 | 101229 | 110334 | 119068 | 130373 | 138844 |
| MM and MML X |  | 88674 | 102446 | 110479 | 117583 | 126128 |
| LN3 (cumce) |  |  |  |  |  | 132166 |
| MM: $X_{T}$ | 87933 | 101846 | 110505 | 118486 | 128473 | 135783 |
| MML: $X_{T}$ | 85637 | 99731 | 108856 | 117481 | 128543 | 136813 |
| LP3 (cumce) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM (Direct): $X_{T}$ | 88014 | 101568 | 110012 | 117823 | 127655 | 134897 |
| MML (Indirect) $X_{T}$ | 87512 | 101477 | 110589 | 119282 | 130561 | 139104 |



Figure 3: Comparison of flood frequency using the results given in Table 3


Figure 4: Comparison of flood frequency using the results given in Table 4

Table 4: Comparison of flood frequency results using data D4 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods

| Return periods (Years Distribution) | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EV1 (cumec) <br> MM: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49350 \\ & 49380 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58513 \\ & 58728 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64581 \\ & 64916 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70401 \\ & 70852 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77934 \\ & 78536 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83579 \\ & 84294 \end{aligned}$ |
| LN2 (cumce) <br> MM and MML $X_{T}$ | 49984 | 58395 | 63342 | 67741 | 70358 | 76833 |
| LN3 (cumce) <br> MM: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50081 \\ & 45914 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58462 \\ & 54462 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63324 \\ & 59580 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67611 \\ & 64183 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72751 \\ & 69809 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76373 \\ & 73841 \end{aligned}$ |
| LP3 (cumce) <br> MM (Direct): $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | Does Not Exist |  |  |  |  |  |
| MML (Indirect) $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 87512 | 101477 | 110589 | 119282 | 130561 | 139104 |



Figure 5: Comparison of flood frequency using the results given in Table 5

Table 5: Comparison of flood frequency results using data D5 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods

| Return periods <br> (Years Distribution) | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EV1 (cumec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${\text { MM: } X_{\mathrm{T}}}^{\text {MML: } X_{\mathrm{T}}}$ | 2883 | 3668 | 4188 | 4686 | 5332 | 5815 |
| LN2 (cumce) | 2890 | 3645 | 4146 | 4626 | 5247 | 5712 |
| MM and MML X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LN3 (cumce) | 2906 | 3584 | 4000 | 4379 | 4849 | 5191 |
| MM: $X_{T}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MML: $X_{T}$ | 2918 | 3594 | 4000 | 4364 | 4810 | 5130 |
| LP3 (cumce) | 2887 | 3555 | 3944 | 4287 | 4700 | 4991 |
| MM (Direct): $X_{T}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MML (Indirect) $X_{T}$ | 2965 | 3619 | 3975 | 4272 | 4608 | 4831 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix-B1 (Rainfall data [(I) 3-days-4 sets (II) 5-days-4 sets])

Detailed of rainfall data, which have been used in this study, are given in the following tables.
Table 1: Annual maximum rainfall (3-days) in "mm" with year. Period of record used from 1962 to 2000.Number of years $=37$, Name of station: Bhola. Designation of data set is 'R-1'

| Year | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum rainfall | 226.6 | 258.8 | 293.2 | 159.5 | 281.7 | 212.1 | 226.8 | 380.2 | 192.8 |
| Year | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 |
| Maximum rainfall | 215.2 | 262.2 | 177.2 | 237.0 | 248.3 | 279.4 | 165.1 | 354.3 | 219.3 |
| Year | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 |
| Maximum rainfall | 212.9 | 235.0 | 205.5 | 236.2 | 251.4 | 256.1 | 464.8 | 292.1 | 267.7 |
| Year | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
| Maximum rainfall | 563.3 | 581.3 | 463.4 | 348.0 | 149.1 | 165 | 342.5 | 176.6 | 350.0 |
| Year | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 275 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2: Annual maximum rainfall (3-days) in "mm" with year. Period of record used from 1962 to 1981 to 1994.Number of years $=25$, Name of station: Borhanuddin, Designation of data set is ' $R-2$ '

| Year | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum rainfall | 219.7 | 33.4 | 295.1 | 215.1 | 351.5 | 310.0 | 302.8 | 505.5 | 271.7 |
| Year | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 |
| Maximum rainfall | 215.8 | 192.6 | 302.0 | 318.0 | 388.1 | 290.2 | 232.9 | 259.3 | 268.0 |
| Year | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 |
| Maximum rainfall | 165.1 | 176.5 | 295.1 | 180.4 | 202.5 | 638.0 | 132.0 |  |  |

Table 3: Annual maximum rainfall (3-days) in "mm" with year. Period of record used from 1968 to 1978. Number of years = 11,Station: Charfession, Designation of data set is ' $\mathrm{R}-3$ '

| Year | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum rainfall | 288.8 | 220.0 | 535.4 | 331.0 | 226.4 | 461.3 | 367.0 | 625.4 | 358.1 |
| Year | 1977 | 1978 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 252.4 | 294.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4: Annual maximum rainfall (3-days) in "mm" with year. Period of record used from 1961 to 1994, Number of years = 22.Station: Designation of data set is ' $\mathrm{R}-4$ '

| Year | 1961 | 1962 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1971 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum rainfall | 221.4 | 182.9 | 240.1 | 122.7 | 316.6 | 347.7 | 292.1 | 249.0 |  |
| Year | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 227.8 | 223.5 | 188.0 | 457.2 | 660.4 | 359.3 | 330.2 | 237.5 |  |
| Year | 1981 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 |  |  |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 185.9 | 474.4 | 616.4 | 118.9 | 487.2 | 255.5 |  |  |  |

Table 5: Annual maximum rainfall (5-days) in "mm" with year. Period of record used from 1962 to 2000. Number of years = 37,Station: Bhola. Designation of data set is 'R-5'

| Year | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum rainfall | 250.7 | 287.8 | 319.4 | 228.3 | 282.2 | 305.1 | 294.9 | 407.7 |  |
| Year | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 221.8 | 264.2 | 311.2 | 202.6 | 286.9 | 291.7 | 329.2 | 181.6 |  |
| Year | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 478.8 | 258.9 | 329.8 | 245.4 | 240.0 | 370.8 | 251.4 | 269.2 |  |
| Year | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 272.2 | 438.2 | 375.8 | 182.8 | 267.7 | 32.0 | 598.6 | 275.3 |  |
| Year | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |  |  |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 330.1 | 350.5 | 274.4 | 525.0 | 361.5 |  |  |  |  |

Table 6: Annual maximum rainfall (5-days) in "mm" with year. Period of record used from 1962 to 1982, 1990 to 1994. Number of years $=25$. Station: Borhanuddin. Designation of data set is 'R-6'

| Year | 1962 | 1963 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum rainfall | 274.2 | 357.0 | 296.6 | 232.9 | 415.2 | 401.2 | 343.6 | 562.4 |  |
| Year | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 356.1 | 279.3 | 200.0 | 328.6 | 427.5 | 482.6 | 339.5 | 281.1 |  |
| Year | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 288.3 | 315.0 | 283.2 | 209.6 | 291.0 | 300.6 | 399.0 | 591.1 |  |
| Year | 1994 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 175.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7: Annual maximum rainfall (5-days) in "mm" with year. Period of record used from 1968 to 1978,Number of years = 11.Station: Charfession. Designation of data set is 'R-7'

| Year | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum rainfall | 383.1 | 250.9 | 272.5 | 408.7 | 282.2 | 462.3 | 514.3 | 917.5 |  |
| Year | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 41.9 | 406.1 | 351.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8: Annual maximum rainfall (5-days) in "mm" with year. Period of record used from 1961 to 1982, 1990to 1994. Number of years $=22$. Station: Daulatkhanh. Designation of data set is ' $R-8$ '

| Year | 1961 | 1962 | 1965 | 1966 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum rainfall | 299.3 | 189.5 | 273.1 | 205.3 | 349.9 | 445.1 | 381.0 | 260.8 |  |
| Year | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1981 |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 274.3 | 261.7 | 523.3 | 685.8 | 486.3 | 340.4 | 276.4 | 276.4 |  |
| Year | 1982 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 |  |  |  |
| Maximum rainfall | 272.3 | 283.9 | 326.9 | 122.0 | 219.7 | 95.5 |  |  |  |

## Appendix-B2 (Results and figures of rainfall data)

Table 1: Comparison of Rainfall Frequency analysis results using data R1 obtained by different methods of various desired return

| Return periods <br> Distributions | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LN2 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM and MML: $X_{T}$ | 259.7 | 353.7 | 415.7 | 475.0 | 552.0 | 610.0 |
| LN3 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM: $X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 257.3 | 350.3 | 414.1 | 476.5 | 559.4 | 623.3 |
| MML: $X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 251.3 | 342.5 | 412.3 | 485.5 | 589.7 | 674.8 |
| Lp3 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM (direct) $: X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 258.1 | 349.0 | 411.2 | 472.2 | 553.8 | 617.1 |
| MM (indirect) : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 248.9 | 338.0 | 409.5 | 488.5 | 608.2 | 712.7 |
| MML: $X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 251.0 | 338.0 | 407.0 | 480.5 | 588.9 | 681.3 |
| EV1 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM : $X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 261.6 | 368.4 | 439.1 | 507.0 | 594.8 | 660.6 |
| MML : $X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 259.2 | 336.8 | 388.2 | 437.2 | 501.2 | 549.0 |



Figure 1: Comparison of rainfall frequency analysis using the results given in Table 1


Figure 2: Comparison of rainfall frequency analysis using the results given in Table 2

Table 2: Comparison of Rainfall Frequency analysis results using data R2 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods (in years)

| Return periods Distributions | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LN2 (mm) <br> MM and MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 263.5 | 360.8 | 425.2 | 487.0 | 567.4 | 628.2 |
| LN3 (mm) <br> $\mathrm{MM}: \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 259.9 \\ & 260.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 355.7 \\ & 355.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 422.6 \\ & 421.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 489.0 \\ & 487.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 578.3 \\ & 576.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 647.9 \\ & 645.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Lp3 (mm) <br> MM (direct) : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MM (indirect) : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 261.3 \\ & 257.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 354.1 \\ & 351.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 418.7 \\ & 422.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 483.1 \\ & 495.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 570.4 \\ & 600.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 639.1 \\ & 687.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| EV1 (mm) <br> MM: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 266.0 \\ & 264.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 379.5 \\ & 350.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 454.7 \\ & 406.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 526.8 \\ & 461.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 620.1 \\ & 531.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 690.0 \\ & 584.3 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3: Comparison of Rainfall Frequency analysis results using data R3 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods

| Return periods <br> Distributions | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LN2 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM and MML: $X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 326.3 | 449.8 | 532.0 | 611.1 | 714.3 | 792.5 |
| LN3 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 334.7 | 458.7 | 534.3 | 603.0 | 687.9 | 749.4 |
| MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 303.6 | 449.9 | 579.9 | 730.7 | 966.8 | 1176.6 |
| Lp3 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM (direct) $: \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ |  |  |  |  | 803.4 | 933.8 |
| MM (indirect) $: \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 316.2 | 444.7 | 543.4 | 649.0 | 1069.4 | 1387.0 |
| MML $: \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 296.3 | 440.1 | 579.3 | 756.3 |  |  |
| EV1 (mm) |  |  |  |  | 839.3 | 939.5 |
| MM : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 331.8 | 494.5 | 602.2 | 705.5 | 73.9 |  |
| MML $: \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 326.5 | 438.2 | 512.2 | 583.2 | 675.1 | 743.9 |



Figure 3: Comparison of rainfall frequency analysis using the results given in Table 3


Figure 4: Comparison of rainfall frequency analysis using the results given in Table 4

Table 4: Comparison of Rainfall Frequency analysis results using data R4 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods (in years)

| Return periods Distributions | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LN2 (mm) <br> MM and MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 274.8 | 500.6 | 685.0 | 887.4 | 1187.7 | 1442.3 |
| LN3 (mm) <br> MM: $X_{T}$ <br> MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 275.8 \\ & 274.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 504.0 \\ & 468.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 688.4 \\ & 641.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 889.5 \\ & 840.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1185.8 \\ & 1150.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1435.7 \\ & 1425.4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Lp3 (mm) <br> MM (direct) : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MM (indirect) : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 258.9 \\ & 273.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 438.8 \\ & 452.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 628.2 \\ & 615.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 886.2 \\ & 814.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1380.2 \\ & 1146.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1919.8 \\ & 1464.2 \end{aligned}$ |
| EV1 (mm) <br> MM: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 311.3 \\ & 307.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 615.0 \\ & 464.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 816.1 \\ & 568.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1009.0 \\ 668.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1258.7 \\ 798.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1445.8 \\ 894.9 \end{gathered}$ |

DETERMINATION OF PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION FOR DATA ON RAINFALL AND FLOOD LEVELS IN BANGLADESH

Table 5: Comparison of Rainfall Frequency analysis results using data R5 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods (in years)

| Return periods Distributions | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LN2 (mm) <br> MM and MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 276.9 | 365.0 | 421.8 | 475.3 | 543.7 | 594.6 |
| LN3 (mm) $\mathrm{MM}: \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 282.1 \\ & 225.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 369.9 \\ & 310.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 422.4 \\ & 357.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 469.6 \\ & 398.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 527.2 \\ & 445.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 568.4 \\ & 477.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lp3 (mm) } \\ & \text { MM (indirect) }: X_{T} \end{aligned}$ | 328.6 | 346.3 | 347.1 | 353.9 | 377.5 | 409.0 |
| EV1 (mm) <br> MM: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 277.1 \\ & 281.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 377.0 \\ & 393.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 443.2 \\ & 467.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 506.6 \\ & 537.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 588.7 \\ & 629.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 650.3 \\ & 698.2 \end{aligned}$ |



Figure 5: Comparison of rainfall frequency analysis using the results given in Table 5


Figure 6: Comparison of rainfall frequency analysis using the results given in Table 6

Table 6: Comparison of Rainfall Frequency analysis results using data R6 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods (in years)

| Return periods <br> Distributions | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LN2 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM and MML: $X_{T}$ | 322.6 | 414.4 | 472.5 | 526.4 | 594.6 | 644.9 |
| LN3 (mm) | 323.9 | 415.7 | 472.7 | 525.0 | 590.4 | 638.1 |
| MM: $X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 321.9 | 414.7 | 474.4 | 530.6 | 602.2 | 655.6 |
| MML: $X_{T}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lp3 (mm) | 321.7 | 414.2 | 474.1 | 530.7 | 603.4 | 658.0 |
| MM (indirect) : X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EV1 $(\mathrm{mm})$ | 321.7 | 428.4 | 498.9 | 566.7 | 654.3 | 720.0 |
| MM $: X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 412.0 | 472.5 | 530.6 | 605.7 | 662.0 |  |
| MML $: X_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 320.6 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7: Comparison of Rainfall Frequency analysis results using data R7 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods (in years)

| Return periods <br> Distributions | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LN2 (mm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MM and MML: $X_{T}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 7: Comparison of rainfall frequency analysis using the results given in Table 7


Figure 8: Comparison of rainfall frequency analysis using the results given in Table 8

Table 8: Comparison of Rainfall Frequency analysis results using data R8 obtained by different methods of various desired return periods (in years)

| Return periods Distributions | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LN2 (mm) <br> MM and MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 286.0 | 403.8 | 483.6 | 561.2 | 663.5 | 741.9 |
| LN3 (mm) <br> $\mathrm{MM}: \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 290.9 \\ & 293.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 409.9 \\ & 411.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 486.0 \\ & 485.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 557.4 \\ 553.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 648.3 \\ & 639.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 715.8 \\ & 702.7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lp3 (mm) } \\ & \text { MM (indirect) : } \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}} \end{aligned}$ | 301.3 | 416.0 | 478.0 | 529.7 | 585.7 | 621.6 |
| EV1 (mm) <br> MM: $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ <br> MML : $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 291.2 \\ & 290.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 431.4 \\ & 409.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 524.2 \\ & 488.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 613.2 \\ & 563.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 728.5 \\ & 661.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 814.8 \\ & 734.5 \end{aligned}$ |

