

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_128913
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating Automating Software Testing in Terms of Reliability: A Comparative Study of Selenium and Playwright
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.	This manuscript offers an insightful comparison between Selenium and Playwright, two prominent frameworks in automated software testing. It evaluates key reliability metrics, such as uptime and failure rates, under controlled conditions. The focus on hardware configurations (SSD vs. HDD) and temporal performance trends addresses a critical gap in existing research. By providing actionable insights and practical recommendations for developers and testers, this work makes a valuable contribution to advancing best practices and improving framework selection based on specific operational requirements.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Investigating Automating Software Testing in Terms of Reliability: A Comparative Study of Selenium and Playwright," effectively captures the study's scope.	
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.	The abstract successfully outlines the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. To improve its utility for practitioners, consider explicitly mentioning the practical implications, such as scenarios where one framework outperforms the other. This addition would make the abstract more actionable and engaging for the intended audience.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript demonstrates strong scientific rigor, with clearly defined evaluation metrics, a transparent methodology, and comprehensive analysis. The inclusion of controlled experimental conditions and detailed hardware specifications further strengthens the reliability and credibility of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes an adequate mix of foundational and contemporary references. To broaden its relevance, you might consider adding references that explore the integration of these frameworks with emerging technologies, such as AI-driven test automation and optimization techniques.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is well-suited for academic writing, with clear and precise articulation of ideas. A final round of proofreading could help identify minor grammatical or punctuation issues, ensuring a polished and professional presentation.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Kodanda Rami Reddy Manukonda
Department, University & Country	IBM, USA