

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55349

Title: How Do The Design Choices, Dataset Constructions, And Evaluation Practices Used In Facial Emotion Recognition Research Limit The Reliability Of These Systems Outside Controlled Benchmark Settings?

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) ...

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality				Y
Techn. Quality				Y
Clarity				Y
Significance				y

Reviewer Name: Dr.Shaweta Sachdeva

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. The manuscript does not present any original empirical contribution, experimental validation, or novel dataset, limiting its suitability for a research journal.
2. Although framed as a critical review, the paper lacks a clearly defined review methodology (e.g., selection criteria, databases searched, inclusion/exclusion process), which undermines scholarly rigor.
3. The manuscript is excessively long and repetitive, with substantial overlap across chapters, particularly in discussions on benchmarks, labeling ambiguity, and reliability limitations.
4. Many arguments are conceptual restatements of existing critiques in the FER literature, offering limited novelty beyond what is already established in recent surveys.
5. The paper does not propose actionable evaluation frameworks, metrics, or experimental protocols, making its contribution largely descriptive rather than constructive.
6. Claims regarding reliability, interpretation risk, and deployment fragility are not supported by empirical evidence, case studies, or quantitative analysis, reducing their scientific impact.
7. The work repeatedly critiques task framing but fails to define clear scope boundaries for when FER systems can be considered valid or useful.
8. The absence of comparative analysis across specific models or benchmarks weakens the technical depth of the review.
9. Ethical and deployment discussions, while important, remain detached from measurable system behavior, limiting their relevance for methodological advancement.
10. The manuscript does not sufficiently differentiate itself from existing state-of-the-art surveys, raising concerns about redundancy and contribution overlap.
11. Given its length and narrative style, the paper appears more suitable as a position paper or commentary rather than a peer-reviewed research article.
12. Overall, the manuscript lacks the novelty, methodological transparency, and empirical grounding required for publication in a high-quality academic journal. it needs major revisions