

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_130061
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrating Deep Learning and Ensemble Techniques for Improved Epileptic Seizure Detection
Type of the Article	Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study highlights the strong performance of the Voting Classifier as a highly accurate and efficient solution for automated seizure detection, with the DWT-based DNN also showing promise for rapid processing applications. The proposed future directions, including optimizing computationally intensive models, exploring hybrid approaches, and validating on diverse datasets, demonstrate a clear commitment to advancing the field. The emphasis on real-time integration for improved patient care adds significant practical value, making this research both impactful and forward-looking.	Thank you for the insightful and positive feedback regarding the manuscript
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. It is Appropriated.	Thank you for confirming that the title of the article is suitable. No changes have been made to the title as it aligns well with the manuscript's content and focus.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract should be rewritten. It should be Comprehensive summary of the Research study. Author has mentioned headings in abstract. Writing an effective abstract for a research paper involves summarizing the key aspects of your work concisely and clearly.	Thank you for the valuable feedback regarding the abstract. I have rewritten the abstract to provide a concise and clear summary of the research without the use of headings. The revised abstract highlights the key aspects of the study, including the problem statement, methodology, results, and future directions. The updated abstract has been incorporated into the manuscript and changes have been highlighted as requested
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript presents the proposed methodology, encompassing the results, observations, and comparative analysis.	Thank you for your positive feedback. I appreciate your acknowledgment of the scientific correctness of the manuscript, including the methodology, results, and comparative analysis. No further changes were made to this aspect of the manuscript, as it aligns well with the research objectives and findings.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the reverences are recent.	Thank you for your feedback on the references. I have reviewed the reference list to ensure they are up-to-date and relevant. As most references are recent, no further additions were deemed necessary. However, if the reviewer has specific recommendations for additional references, I am happy to consider them for inclusion
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is ok.	Thank you for confirming that the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. I appreciate your feedback.
Optional/General comments	Abstract should be rewritten.	Thank you for your suggestion. As per your feedback, I have rewritten the abstract to provide a more concise and comprehensive summary of the research study. The revised abstract no longer includes headings and highlights the key aspects of the study, including the problem, methodology, results, and future directions. The updated abstract has been incorporated into the manuscript and changes have been highlighted as requested.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No, there are no ethical issues in this manuscript. The study was conducted following ethical guidelines, and the data used for the research were either publicly available or appropriately obtained from recognized sources. If required