

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	

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>

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 manuscript highlights the basic root problem faced by the patients. The data base considered is a preprocessed data set for which pre processing procedure is mentioned,which can be excluded. The study should diagnosing tools for analysis.	<p>Thank you for your valuable feedback and suggestions. I appreciate your insights into the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Regarding the importance of the manuscript, I have emphasized the potential impact of this research on the scientific community in the updated abstract and conclusion, focusing on how the proposed techniques can improve automated seizure detection and real-time monitoring for better patient care.Concerning the preprocessing procedure, I understand your point, and I have reconsidered the mention of the preprocessing steps in the manuscript. I have decided to exclude detailed discussions of preprocessing in the revised version, as it is secondary to the main focus on the detection methods.I have also made sure to highlight the importance of diagnostic tools in the manuscript, reinforcing how the proposed system offers an efficient tool for seizure detection, with a focus on real-time applications for improved diagnosis and management of epilepsy. <p>Thank you again for your valuable input. The revisions have been made accordingly.</p>
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Performance analysis of Integrated DeepLearning and Ensemble Techniques on Epileptic seizure Data sets	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. I appreciate your input on the title. After considering your feedback, I have revised the title to:</p> <p><i>Performance Evaluation of Integrated Deep Learning and Ensemble Methods for Epileptic Seizure Detection</i></p> <p>I believe this title more accurately reflects the focus of the study on both performance evaluation and the application of integrated methods for seizure detection. Thank you again for your valuable feedback.</p>

Review Form 3

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.	Include the statements which will justify the title of the work. The performance of the model should be discussed in brief stating it's importance for society.	<p>Thank you for your helpful feedback. I agree with your suggestion to include statements that justify the title and emphasize the importance of the model's performance.</p> <p>In response, I have revised the abstract to include a brief discussion of the model's performance and its societal impact. Specifically, I have highlighted the key findings, such as the Voting Classifier's superior accuracy and efficiency, and how this can benefit real-time seizure detection, leading to better management and care for individuals with epilepsy. These additions should help align the abstract more closely with the title and underline the practical importance of the proposed methods.</p>
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The model performance will generally depend upon the data sets and the features considered for analysis. The discussion in the manuscript is scientifically correct, however the combination of the voting classifier used in the work should contain some details as it uses 2 different data sets	<p>Thank you for your helpful feedback. I agree with your suggestion to include statements that justify the title and emphasize the importance of the model's performance.</p> <p>In response, I have revised the abstract to include a brief discussion of the model's performance and its societal impact. Specifically, I have highlighted the key findings, such as the Voting Classifier's superior accuracy and efficiency, and how this can benefit real-time seizure detection, leading to better management and care for individuals with epilepsy.</p> <p>However, I was also advised by the journal to reduce the word count of the abstract, which limited my ability to include further details. Despite this, I have tried to ensure the abstract remains concise while addressing the key points.</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	Thank you for your feedback. I appreciate your confirmation that the references are sufficient. I have reviewed the reference list, and I believe it includes the most relevant and recent studies in the field. If any further references are suggested or required in the future, I will gladly include them.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	Thank you
Optional/General comments	Statistical analysis if represented in charts would be attractive for viewing.	<p>Thank you for your insightful suggestion. I agree that presenting statistical analysis in chart form can enhance the readability and visual appeal of the results. I plan to incorporate this in future versions of the paper, and I will consider using visual aids such as charts for the statistical analysis in subsequent publications of this journal.</p> <p>I appreciate your valuable input, and I will take this into account for future improvements.</p>

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	