

Peer Review

Review of: "STEAM-EEG: Spatiotemporal EEG Analysis with Markov Transfer Fields and Attentive CNNs"

Lutfi A. Al-Haddad¹

1. Mechanical Engineering Department, University of Technology - Iraq, Iraq

1. While the abstract introduces a novel STEAM-EEG framework, it lacks any quantitative results or performance metrics (e.g., accuracy, F1-score) to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Markov Transfer Fields and the computer graphics techniques in actual EEG analysis.
2. Although the abstract mentions enhanced data exploration and decision-making, it does not provide specific examples or case studies showing how the framework outperforms existing EEG visualization or analysis methods, leaving the real-world utility of STEAM-EEG unclear.
3. The introduction should clearly conclude with a distinct paragraph that highlights the novel contributions of your work.
4. The literature review should benefit from more exploration of previous studies.
5. The discussion section needs to be expanded to more thoroughly analyze the results.
6. The first paragraph of the conclusion should succinctly summarize the contributions of the study in past tense, clearly stating what has been accomplished and the impact it has on the field.
7. The second paragraph of the conclusion should provide clear and actionable future recommendations.
8. Some equations are not properly cited.
9. Kindly avoid clustering references within the sentences of the introduction.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.