Review of: "EEG-based Emotion Classification using Deep Learning: Approaches, Trends and Bibliometrics"

Gaurav Tripathi

My Decision: Major Revision Required

After careful consideration and a thorough review of your manuscript, it has become clear that a major revision is necessary for this paper to reach its full potential and align with the high standards of publication in the field of EEG-based emotion classification. Your work, which is basically a review paper, stands out for its innovative combination of bibliometric analysis and literature review, holds significant promise for contributing to the understanding of emotion classification. However, there are few areas that require attention to elevate the manuscript to a professional level.

Expanding Literature Sources

I fail to understand why this analysis is based solely on the Scopus database, which, although valuable, might not capture the entirety of relevant research in this field. This limitation risks overlooking key studies and skewing the analysis. Explain this anomaly?

What to Do Next: I recommend broadening your search to include more databases like PubMed, IEEE Xplore, and Google Scholar. This will not only enrich your review but also ensure a more balanced and comprehensive overview of the field, making your conclusions more robust and reliable.

Deepening the Methodological Review

Your manuscript provides an overview of various methodologies but lacks a deep dive into their limitations and the implications these might have on the field's advancement. Real-life cases such as future legal systems, crowd behaviour systems, large crowd gatherings, busy public places cases can be taken up in discussions.

What to Do Next: Enhance your review by critically analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the methodologies employed in the studies you discuss.

Standardization

You've rightly identified the need for standardization in emotion classification research but stopped short of proposing concrete solutions. As an author, what are your thoughts on standardization? Maybe you could have proposed something.

State-of-the-Art (SOTA) Analysis

While you mention several advanced methodologies, a detailed comparison with current benchmarks is missing, which is

crucial for situating your work within the broader research landscape.

Practical Applications and Future Directions

The manuscript briefly mentions potential applications but lacks depth and specificity regarding how the findings can be applied in real-world settings or what future research paths could be most fruitful. Take all sorts of practical futuristic scenarios which can give a boost to your paper.

Conclusion

Addressing these areas requires a considerable effort, but I am confident that such revisions will significantly enhance your manuscript, making it a valuable contribution to the field. Your innovative approach and the potential implications of your work are too important not to be fully realized. I look forward to seeing how you integrate these recommendations into your revised manuscript and am eager to witness the positive impact your research can have on the field of emotion classification.