|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features (weight) | **MS-SQL** | **Oracle** | **SQLite** | **MariaDB** | **PostgreSQL** | **MS Access** | **LibreOffice** |
| Concurrency (1) | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Networkable (1) | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Replication (4) | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Firewall (1) | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Low Cost (5) | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Performance (2) | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| **Total** | 49 | 50 | 61 | 59 | 66 | 26 | 43 |

Reliable sources to begin this project are PostgreSQL followed by SQLite. They are open source and even if the project needs to scale, there is great probability of maintaining its use, because they can handle low to medium traffic. Also, they are very reliable in terms of performance, known for their ability to handle databases, avoiding data loss. When considering costs, not only open and close sources were considered, but in case of project growth, sometimes even open sources have licenses for enterprise usage. In terms of concurrency, it is important to consider that SQLite works fine when used by one or few users, but if this parameter changes, things may not go so fluidly. Notice that in terms of usability closed source resources may be easier to use, as companies probably make investments in user-friendly interfaces. All of them seems to have strong community support and resources for troubleshooting and learning, which can answer raised usability questions, and the open-source ones usually holds good documentation. The firewall feature considered security matters, is it easy to configure firewall, or does it need some knowledge, the security resources offered are few or a lot.

* **Weights considered:**

Concurrency: for the test only one user will use it.

Networkable: again, only one user, furthermore ability over server/client usage.

Replication: Python compatibility and access trough platforms.

Firewall: is it easy to configure and provides security.

Cost: considering open/closed source and prices/scalability.

Performance: for testing feasibility all of them looking great, but increased size was considered for final mark.