

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_97371
Title of the Manuscript:	.NET tools for software development: tool selection, key benefits of .NET web applications
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

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)	<p>This is rather engineering and practical study than a scientific paper. It provides a review of .NET technologies and the comparison of .NET tools according to their features. But the paper lacks of experimental part.</p> <p>The paper title is suitable enough.</p> <p>Methodology and Results parts do not fit their content.</p> <p>Material and Methods sections continues the state-of-the-art review.</p> <p>It lacks of experimental part and do not expose the methodology behind Rating points given in section 3.6</p> <p>I suggest to consider decision-making methods to be considered for extension of experimental part, as well as inclusion of respective references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The proofreading should be done for this paper.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrii Kopp
Department, University & Country	National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute", Ukraine