

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_129430
Title of the Manuscript:	Reliability of the Type System in TypeScript
Type of the Article	A review paper

#### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	<b>This review paper as is a guide for some programmers to understand the essence and the reliability of the Type System in TypeScript. This is a requirement to the scientific community as it guides software developers and beginners with the understanding and methods for efficiency in Type Checking. Principles, vulnerabilities and practice in code analysis are explicitly enumerated.</b>	Noted and corrected
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>NO! Reliability of the Type System in TypeScript in Software Development</b>	Ok
<b>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.</b>	<b>The abstract could not explain the usefulness of the research findings to the stakeholders, programmers and corporate professionals. The author should provide some specific essence to the stakeholders</b>	Noted and corrected
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes! But the author should recast the <b>Materials and Methods</b> and expunge the <b>Related Literature</b> from it which is supposed to stand alone on its own.	Noted and corrected
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes. The references are recent and absolutely relevant to this article	Noted
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes!	Ok
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	