Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_129430**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Reliability of the Type System in TypeScript**
Type of the 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/

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 article provides an overview of type systems in TypeScript. It highlights the configuration settings required to enforce stricter type checking. Common mistakes in type usage are discussed, along with an example of more robustly typed code that accounts for unexpected errors.	Noted and corrected
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Enhancing Code Reliability: An Overview of TypeScript's Type System and Best Practices**	Revised
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 aligns well with the article's description.	Noted
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.	Noted
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and appear to be recent.	Ok

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	Noted
<u>**Optional/General**</u> comments	1. A sharp transition from discussing the issue of the any type to popular programming languages feels abrupt and lacks smooth connection. Figure 1 is unnecessary, as it does not provide any informative value within the context of this article. 2. Excerpts from various scientific works are presented without being unified by a common theme or idea. 3. The disadvantages highlighted, such as those affecting the scalability of machine learning, seem disconnected from the subsequent focus on TypeScript architecture, compiler principles, and static code analysis. These criticisms of the referenced scientific works suggest that improvements in machine learning scalability would follow, but this is not the case. It is recommended to remove mentions of machine learning and instead emphasize the article's intended focus. 4. Figure 2 does not provide valuable original insights from the author and merely describes general characteristics of typed languages. It would be better to create a diagram illustrating the configuration approaches for TypeScript's type system, as discussed in the subsequent code examples. In the code listing example "Example using Type Guard," there is a type-checking function for a specific type. Creating a separate function for each new type is not an optimal solution. What happens if a library with new types is added to the project? Describing all types in a new library does not streamline the development process. Additionally, the code uses throw new Error(). How is this error handled? The error lacks a detailed description of its cause. If this type-checking approach is used, a more universal and abstract solution would be preferable.	All suggestive correction have been made accordingly

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)*
<u>**Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**</u>	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	