

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_129279
Title of the Manuscript:	Resolving the Hubble tension with a Late Dark Energy Modification to the Λ 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.	Dark energy plays a crucial role in the understanding of the universe's expansion. The Lambda-CDM (Λ CDM) model, the current standard cosmological model, incorporates dark energy (represented by the cosmological constant, Λ) and cold dark matter (CDM) to explain the structure, formation, and evolution of the universe. This paper successfully describes a modification that numerically integrates the Λ CDM equations with Λ_r substituted for Λ . The author has given a graphical analysis and compared it with observational data. Also, the author matched the new model to the best-fitting Λ CDM models for the early universe and late universe observations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article 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, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The author provides mathematical and graphical analysis with observational data. The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author should check the paper for grammar and typos with some software.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is recommended for 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:	DMukunda Dewri
Department, University & Country	Bodoland University, India