Description:

You will be given the opportunity to resubmit your assignment for full points if you address my comments. **Please include this response to review document inside of your R project** when you resubmit. You should provide a response, **colored in red**, outlining how you addressed each comment. Here is a generic example of how this might look (this comment is not specific to any submission):

> The interpretation of your p-value in your "Methods" section is not fully correct. The p-value is NOT the probability that the null hypothesis is true. Please revise.
>
> The p-value interpretation has been revised to indicate that it represents the probability of observing something as far (or farther) away from the assumed average.

Assignment Comments:

Please add a very basic README that shows how to install the package and contains the GHA badge…even if that badge shows "failing". The readme gives a nice opening page for your github repository. Your README could literally be a copy/paste from the first section of your vignette.

The README has been added by reiterating the instructions from the first section of our vignette, giving an opening page to our github repository.

Please update the title and author fields in your package description.

The title and authors have been updated in the appropriate fields of the package description, and a basic description of the package and its functionality has been added.

Please either fix your lintr issues or add an assignment comment that explains why these global variable definitions are unavoidable. It is OK if you can't resolve the lintr issues regarding global variables, but I would like an explanation as to why somewhere.

The lintr issues were addressed by using **dplyr** instead of **tidyverse** in the rhv_tot data-raw file. This resolved most of the issues, but within the cleaning functions, some variables either needed to be called internally from the data (using .data$) or initially assigned a "NULL" value.

Also, just to clarify, the globals.R file in the R folder is included to eliminate warnings related to the variables contained in the package datasets, so if you're wondering why that's there, that's why.

Change all text to present text. Your function does not "will take", your function "takes". Change throughout the vignette as needed.

Adjustments were made in the vignette allowing the information to be written in present text, omitting future tense phrases from all sections.

Omit the clarification within the vignette about the package size. Your justification as an assignment comment is good enough.

The paragraph discussing package size has been removed from the vignette.

In your data section, please clarify the original source of the data.

The data section now specifies that the data was extracted from the USGS website (with the link included). Flood stage levels were obtained from the CNRFC website (link also included in the data section)

Please clarify what you mean by a streamflow “peak” and how your functions are determining when a peak has actually occurred. You can mention what packages you might be calling “under the hood” to accomplish this.

Clarification about peaks and how they were found using *peakwindow()* from the **cardidates** package was added to the sections describing the functions.

I would show only two examples of df_peaks_all() rather than the 5 examples you currently have. It is hard to wade through so many tables.

Three of the *df_peaks_all()* examples were removed and two were retained (and subsetted) to prevent the reader from having to scroll through so many pages of tables.

Please save the output of df_peaks_filt() to a variable and only show the first 6 rows of that table. This will help to streamline the flow (pun intended!) of your vignette.

Haha :) The *df_peaks_filt()* example was assigned to a variable and *head()* was then applied to only show the first 6 rows, simplifying our vignette flow.

Clarify in the text what you mean by a “major” and “minor” flood. You can mention where those definitions came from.

A section was added to the data section clarifying how major and minor floods are identified, for which stations that information is relevant, and where the cutoff definitions come from.

Please find a way to make your streamflow peak plots larger than they currently are. I think the first two figures are enough for demonstrating examples and the third figure can be omitted.

The third figure was omitted, while the height and widths of the first two figures were made larger so they are easier to read.

Please add a sentence or two to your summary to reinforce why the functionality you have outlined will make the lives of your users easier.

We added a couple of sentences to the end of the summary that list specific benefits that the package provides.