Name	email	Comments
Clarence Chang	clchang@anl.gov	• comment 1 • comment 2
Laura Mersini-Houghton	mersini@physics.unc.edu	Comment 1: can we include these 3 papers with R Bond and J Braden in the Topological defects discussion in the papper please,https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.02162 ; https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.01857 ; https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.5591 . They have the most recent through discussion on what signatures defects leave on the CMB.
		Comment 2: Can we remove the word quantum gravity and simply wrap it up under the 'new physics' beyond the the SM of cosmology in Intro and Conclusions sections? There is a coherent explanation of all anomalies in https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0612142 ; https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0611223 predicted before they were observed from this theory https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0511102 , simpler version here https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0512070 . The status of the theory predictions against Planck data was done with E. di Valentino here for three types of inflation, including Starobinsky https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.08334 , https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.09588 , https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.10833
Scott Watson	gswatson@syr.edu	I think there should be a small reference to the effective field theory approach to dark energy (which has recieved significant attention in the community).
		First appearing in these papers: https://arxiv.org/abs/1210.0201. https://arxiv.org/abs/1211.7054 a nice review is by these authors: https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.03150
		and more recently in this paper using Machine learning techniques to address modifications of gravity versus DE.
		https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.02866