

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_129279
Title of the Manuscript:	Resolving the Hubble tension with a Late Dark Energy Modification to the $\Lambda$ CDM Model
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The Hubble tension is a critical test of our cosmological understanding modifying dark energy within $\Lambda$ CDM to address the tension represents a promising avenue, but it also demands rigorous theoretical development and observational validation. If successful, it could mark a paradigm shift in how we perceive the universe's expansion and its underlying forces. Overall this study gives brief explanation of Hubble tension with a Late Dark Energy Modification to the $\Lambda$ CDM Model of the Universe.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it 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.	Yes, no need to add or deletion of the points.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is scientifically correct and follows the scientific approach.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent; it covers almost the area of work done.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, easily understandable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Recommended for publication. Explanation, methodology and drafting was good. From my side the manuscript is approved for the publication.	

#### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kailas R. Borgade
Department, University & Country	Babasaheb Naik College of Engineering, India