Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IAARJ_100397**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Plausible Implication of the Universe Accelerated Expansion on Extragalactic Radio Source Luminosity.**
Type of the Article	**Short Research Article**

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journaliaarj.com/index.php/IAARJ/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.7

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Yes, it is** **Yes, it is.** **Yes.** **Yes.** **Yes, it is correct.** **The author(s) can add some refs, such as**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes it is.	
Optional/General comments	Dear editor(s), in this work the authors connect the expansion of the universe with the luminosity of radio sources such as quasars and radio galaxies. The main conclusion is that, as the universe expands the luminosity of these sources decreases. Doing a linear regression, they extract the relation between logL and log(1+z). The slope for the samples is 0.04 and 0.07 (75% difference). I suggest to authors to draw the best fit linear curve in fig 1 and fig 2. Thus, they will have a complete view of the results and how different is the best fit lines. One possible extension could be with the luminosity of supernova Ia (Pantheon or Union2 data, (DOI:10.1088/1475-7516/2010/12/012, DOI:10.1093/mnras/stad451) Also, the citations are not enough. I suggest to authors to include some important works in this field such as DOI:10.1038/s42254-019-0137-0 and refs therein.	

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:	**Ioannis Antoniou**
Department, University & Country	**University of Ioannina, Greece**