

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

Arun Kumar Udayakumar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Karpagam Academy of Higher Education

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author, Greetings. Good and Great Work. It is appreciable research carried out by you. The manuscript is very interesting, but the present manuscript needs revisions before publication. The following are the suggestions.

1. Write one or two lines for each reference cited in the article. Avoid lumped references.
2. Give more mathematical treatment of the proposed algorithms. What are their pros? Authors must explain.
3. What are the outcomes of the proposed technique? These should be added to the abstract and conclusion.
4. The abstract should be crisped by adding all fruitful outcomes of the proposed work.
5. What are the figure-of-merits on which the success ratio is calculated? Authors must explain.
6. Revise the abstract of the paper. Authors should add the motivations, problem, and solution statements in the abstract.
7. What are the novelties of the work? Authors must highlight them in the paper.
8. The sequence of the paper should be (i) introduction, (ii) related works, (iii) materials and methods, (iv) results, (v) discussion, (vi) conclusion, and (vii) future work.
9. The English and typo errors of the paper should be checked in the presence of a native English speaker.
10. Authors should add the future scope of the paper.
11. What is the computational complexity of the proposed technique? Authors must compare it with existing techniques.
12. What important parameters were selected for this work? Authors must add them to the paper.
13. The suggested papers must be cited in the paper; these are based on related topics-  
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00500-023-08224-7>  
<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/10395453/>
14. The conclusion section should be re-arranged, and the most important numerical results should be added.
15. Also, the authors may propose some interesting problems as future work in the conclusion.

16. The literature review presented here is highly insufficient and generalized. Please improve it using the papers mentioned above.

17. Few short forms have been used without giving full forms. Please cross-check throughout the paper properly.