

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

Válber César Cavalcanti Roza¹

¹ ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The present work conducted a bibliometric analysis of the temporal evolution of research related to emotion classification.

Abstract

Line 4: Avoid using personal pronouns throughout the paper, for instance, 'We, I, ...'. Replace them with 'In this study, a comprehensive bibliometric analysis was conducted....' Verify this across all journals.

L6: Unusual expression. Replace it with 'WE METICULOUSLY..'

L9: Remove possessive and personal expressions, e.g., 'OUR...' Verify this across all journals.

L13-15: The expression is difficult TO COMPARE and duplicate study findings due to A LACK of PRECISE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA. To address this problem, it's crucial for researchers TO COLLABORATE and develop a COMMON knowledge'. In my point of view, In such expressions, there are a bunch of mistakes.

I'm a researcher in this area for years. First, it's not actually true that it is difficult to COMPARE and duplicate study findings. Since until now, the studies about emotions are not trivial, and of course, each study shall have a different pattern of analysis and acquisition. If some study or research area achieves an equity of analysis, it means that such an area is not so novel at all. If some area converges, it means that the problem was solved or close to it. So, not always will it be possible to compare the research clearly, but always there is at least a point of communication between them.

Second, I don't know exactly how you research in the scope of the area, but I don't see that there is a LACK of ASSESSMENT CRITERIA. Regarding emotions, A PRECISE criteria means the area is close to being solved, which is not true. Emotion analysis and acquisition have a high level of uncertainty, and no absolute precision is found anywhere, so to find precision in that context is wrong. Third, there is nothing to address to figure out a problem that doesn't even exist like a problem indeed. The researchers already collaborate, publishing their achievements, and this is the most important way to collaborate. Fourth, a common knowledge was not reached yet on emotion research. This is why there are several researches trying to find emotion patterns precisely around the world.

Table 1 forgot to reference EmotionxDeepLearning papers of Mr. Roza, Válber, and Mr. Postolache, Adrian, among others.

Final remarks:

The amount of research that was considered was too low. Since we have a massive number of interesting researches around the world about emotion classification and deep learning, like the several researches of Mr. Roza, Válber, and Mr. Postolache, Adrian, since 2016-2021, that is a reference paper that wasn't considered, among others.

Since I review several journals around the world, it is expected that at least 40 to 100 papers will be inside the context presented in Table 1.

Due to that, I don't recommend the present paper to be accepted before such reviews and another phase of more rigorous review, due to some not-so-true facts also related to the beginning of the paper.