

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
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.	The comparative study between Selenium and Playwright for software testing reliability addresses a timely and practically relevant issue.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 should include key numerical findings (e.g., specific uptime percentages and failure rates) to immediately convey the study's outcomes. The conclusion could briefly suggest areas for future research.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, However, the following observations may be addressed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study mentions the use of identical Python scripts but does not provide enough detail about the test actions. Including an appendix or a summary of these scripts would enhance reproducibility.</li> <li>Clarify if browser versions or system updates were controlled across both systems.</li> <li>While results are well-documented, the analysis could delve deeper into explaining the variability in Selenium's performance across time slots.</li> <li>A statistical analysis (e.g., confidence intervals or significance tests) for uptime and ROCOF differences would add rigor.</li> <li>Figure 1 could be better annotated to highlight key trends or anomalies in ROCOF performance.</li> </ul>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some references appear outdated (e.g., pre-2015 works). Including more recent studies would reinforce the manuscript's relevance.</li> <li>Ensure consistency in citation formatting (e.g., page ranges or journal abbreviations).</li> </ul>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>ACCEPT WITH MINOR REVISIONS.</b> Overall, the paper is well documented with thorough analysis on both the automated testing tools.	

#### 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:	S. Suguna Mallika
Department, University & Country	CVR College of Engineering, India

Review Form 3