Epileptic Seizure Detection based on Different Events with XAI and Early Aid System for Patient Aid

Biplov Paneru,

Dept. of Electronics and Communication Engineering,

Pokhara University, Nepal

Abstract:

The goal of this study is seizure detection in four class datasets for different seizure stages in epileptic patients. An early notification system is created to simulate the behavior of the patient experiencing a seizure receiving emergency assistance from caregivers, and a dataset acquired from Mendely is used to train different models. EEGNet's effectiveness against hybrid deep learning models is demonstrated by the outcome. On the full dataset, Bi-GRU with attention, BI-Directional LSTM-GRU models, and conventional ensemble techniques like XGBoost can all do remarkably well. Channel 9 data is the most important feature, according to the SHAP interpretability analysis, which is conducted on several models with the aid of SHAP plots. The email SMTP system is used to simulate an early warning prototype. This method is essential for categorizing different seizure types according to occurrences in order to provide early warning and for developing a home automation strategy that will help victims.

Keywords: *Epileptic seizure, Explainable AI, SHAP analysis, EEGNet, Bi-Directional LSTM-GRU, Internet of Medical Things*

Introduction:

As machine learning (ML) and artificial intelligence (AI) continue to advance, there is an increasing emphasis on using these technologies to improve clinical applications. Early disease diagnosis and prediction to facilitate early preventive intervention is a major objective in healthcare [1]. Researchers have focused a lot of emphasis on epileptic seizures, which are neurological disorders marked by particular patterns in electroencephalography (EEG) recordings. EEG signal feature extraction and pattern classification have been successfully accomplished using machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) approaches [2]. Recurrent seizures that result in unconsciousness or muscle spasms are a common neurological disorder called epilepsy, which has a major negative influence on a patient's health, everyday activities, and general well-being [3].

Because EEG recordings offer vital information about the electrical activity of the brain, they are widely employed in epilepsy research [4]. EEG data analysis using ML and DL techniques has

been the subject of numerous studies aimed at identifying and forecasting epileptic episodes [5,10,12]. More accurate seizure identification has been made possible by developments in EEG processing techniques, such as improved feature extraction methods, improved artifact removal, and improved time-frequency analysis [6]. About 50 million individuals worldwide suffer from epilepsy, which is one of the most common and dangerous neurological conditions, affecting 1% to 2% of the world's population [7]. Given the severity of seizures and their risks, alongside the pressing demand for more accurate and advanced therapeutic approaches have been developed to identify seizure activity and deliver targeted electrical stimulation to help suppress seizures and reduce their frequency [9].

This work solely focuses on development of hybrid models as well as ensemble, traditional ML models to find out the potentiality for deployment for aiding patient with epileptic seizure along with classifying it type and finally providing the aid as needed. The proposed research is divided into various section in which section I. is related to abstract, and general introduction along with related works. Section 2. Refers to methodology section in which various ML models are proposed and architecture proposed are shown. Section 3. Shows the results from the models as well as discussions from the results obtained finally. Comparing work with previous works and discussion on limitations of study. Final section deals with concluding the study describing its outcomes and potential application for real-world epilepsy related effects minimization with AI-powered technology. The work provides a framework for utilizing Medical Internet of Things (IoMT) for the purpose of early epilepsy detection and aiding patients.

Related works:

In recent years, substantial progress has been made in applying machine learning (ML) techniques to predict and detect epileptic seizures using EEG signals. Rasheed et al. [1] presented a comprehensive review of state-of-the-art ML methods for early seizure prediction, highlighting existing research gaps, challenges, and potential future directions to enhance robustness and generalizability. Several studies have utilized the UCI Epileptic Seizure Recognition dataset for classification tasks. For example, Kode et al. [2] evaluated multiple classifiers, including Extreme Gradient Boosting, TabNet, Random Forest, and a 1D Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), reporting accuracies of up to 99%, with their proposed 1D-CNN outperforming other models in accuracy, sensitivity, precision, and recall. Similarly, Kunekar et al. [3] compared conventional ML and deep learning (DL) approaches and found that Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks delivered superior performance in seizure detection. Vieira et al. [4] also proposed an LSTM-based method that achieved 97% validation accuracy while reducing features and channels, demonstrating that lightweight models leveraging Explainable AI (XAI) can achieve over 95% accuracy with only six features and five EEG channels, making them practical for mobile applications.

Moving beyond traditional architectures, Zhu et al. [5] introduced a multidimensional Transformer fused with recurrent networks (LSTM-GRU) to address the non-stationary and complex nature of EEG signals. Disli et al. [7] proposed a Continuous Wavelet Transform (CWT)-based depthwise CNN, which converted multi-channel EEG into image-like representations and achieved nearly 96% accuracy, outperforming earlier approaches without requiring additional feature extraction or classifiers. The potential of lightweight implementations for real-time use has also been explored; Tsanika et al. [8] developed a TinyML model using iEEG data, achieving up to 99% accuracy, highlighting the feasibility of deploying resource-efficient models in closed-loop neurostimulation devices. Similarly, Abhisek et al. [9] explored fractal features and non-linear dynamics, achieving 100% accuracy in classifying focal versus non-focal EEG signals in the Bern-Barcelona dataset and outperforming state-of-the-art methods in interictal and preictal state detection. Brari et al. [10] introduced a correlation dimension-based feature extraction method, delivering near-perfect classification accuracy with computational efficiency. Additionally, Rab et al. [11] integrated deep learning with domain knowledge—such as frequency bands, electrode locations, and temporal patterns—while introducing XAI4EEG, a SHAP-based framework designed to improve interpretability and reduce validation time for clinicians.

Architectural innovations combining CNNs and recurrent models have also proven highly effective. Mallick et al. [12] developed a hybrid architecture using 1D convolutional layers, bidirectional LSTM, GRU, and pooling layers, achieving up to 100% accuracy for binary seizure detection on the Bonn dataset and strong results in multi-class classification. Esmaeilpour et al. [13] focused on detecting preictal states with CNN-based feature extraction followed by ensemble methods such as random forests and support vector machines, obtaining a sensitivity of 90.76% on the CHB-MIT dataset. Meanwhile, privacy-preserving approaches have gained traction; Suryakala et al. [14] introduced a Federated Machine Learning (FML) method that trained decentralized EEG data models, achieving high sensitivity (98.24%) and specificity (99.23%) while ensuring patient data confidentiality. Collectively, these studies illustrate the breadth of techniques—from conventional ML and deep learning architectures to explainable and privacy-preserving methods—that are advancing the reliability and practicality of EEG-based seizure detection.

Despite these advances, further research is needed to address diverse seizure occurrences and strengthen early detection frameworks. The development of the Internet of Medical Things (IoMT) has introduced promising assistive strategies to improve patient care and quality of life. While earlier works often evaluated ML frameworks using only binary and four-class classifications [5], research has lagged in building models for three-class detection. With the dataset [15], we aim to develop ML models capable of both three-class and four-class classification of seizure events. Ultimately, the IoMT framework holds the potential to automate patient room and environmental monitoring while also enabling real-time emergency alerts to caregivers, thereby bridging clinical effectiveness with practical deployment.

Proposed ML modeling approach:

Dataset:

A preprocessed dataset from mendely source is collected and no exclusive filtering or further preprocessing methods are applied as data set was ML trainable ready [15]

Preprocesssing:

The preprocessing of EEG data here in the pipeline begins by loading raw .edf files for six patients (Patient 10 through 15), with each patient's dataset consisting of multiple EEG recordings. The EEG files are read using the mne library with preload=True to allow in-memory processing. For consistent channel configuration, certain channels are either dropped or reordered depending on the patient ID to ensure uniformity across all recordings.

Once the data is loaded, seizure annotations are extracted using a custom Seizure_times module. Each seizure's start time and duration are translated from real-time to sample indices using a sampling rate of 500 Hz. Based on these indices, seizure segments are sliced from the raw EEG matrix. These seizure segments are stored separately into three categories—CPS, electrographic, and nociceptive—depending on the patient ID and specific file conditions.

To balance the dataset, normal (non-seizure) EEG segments of equivalent length are also extracted from the parts of the signal that do not overlap with any seizure events. These normal and seizure segments are then broken into 1-second epochs (i.e., 500 samples per channel) and stored as 3D arrays with shape (epochs, channels, samples).

Each class of EEG data is normalized independently by dividing all values by the maximum absolute value within that class, ensuring that data scales are consistent across inputs. The labeled data are stacked together into a single feature matrix x, with labels assigned as follows: 0 for normal, 1 for CPS, 2 for electrographic, and 3 for nociceptive seizures.

The final dataset is split into training and testing sets using an 90-10 ratio, and all arrays are saved in both .npy (NumPy) and .mat (MATLAB) formats for flexibility in further analysis or model training.

Features extraction:

All features were relevant so none exclusion was there. The training.npy available [15] on data source was used to train the models and test.npy sets for evaluating the model performance. So, no exclusive data splitting was required.



Fig 1: EEG signal variation plot for various events


Raw EEG Signal - All Channels (Merged Dataset, all classes)
Ch 1
Ch 2
Ch 3
Ch 4
Ch 5
Ch 6
Ch 7
Ch 8
Ch 9
Ch 10
Ch 11
Ch 12
Ch 13
Ch 14
Ch 15
Ch 16
Ch 17
Ch 18
Ch 19
Timepoints

Fig 2: EEG data plot for all channels

The EEG plots in the image illustrate representative signals across all 20 channels for one sample from each of the four classes. Class 0 (Normal EEG) shows low-amplitude, rhythmic waveforms without significant abnormalities, reflecting non-seizure brain activity. Class 1 (Complex Partial Seizure) exhibits moderate amplitude fluctuations and irregular patterns, indicating localized seizure onset. Class 2 (Electrographic Seizure) displays prominent amplitude shifts and gradual trends, characteristic of seizures detected solely through EEG. In contrast, Class 3 (Video-Detected Seizure) shows high-frequency noise-like patterns, possibly indicating seizure activity visible externally (e.g., motor movements) but less prominent in EEG amplitude.

10-20 System



Fig 3: 10-20 Electrode system

The standard 10–20 electrode system is a globally recognized technique for applying electrodes to the scalp in order to capture electroencephalogram (EEG) information. The term "10-20" describes the electrode placement, which occurs at intervals of 10% or 20% of the total distance between particular anatomical landmarks on the skull, including the preauricular points (sides), inion (back), and nasion (front). Electrodes are labeled with numbers that indicate the placements of the left (odd numbers) or right (even numbers) hemispheres, and letters that indicate the region of the brain (F for frontal, T for temporal, P for parietal, O for occipital, and C for

central). The 10-20 system is frequently used in neurophysiology, clinical diagnosis, and research to record brain rhythms, identify anomalies like epilepsy, and investigate cognitive processes.

Seizure directory:

The seizure dictionaries (seizures_10 to seizures_15) served as crucial metadata for the EEG data preprocessing pipeline. Each dictionary corresponded to a specific patient and contains information about the onset time and duration of seizure events recorded in different EEG sessions. The structure of the data—formatted as {record_number: [(hour, minute, second, duration), ...]}—allows precise temporal localization of seizure episodes within each recording file. During preprocessing, these timestamps are converted into sample indices using the known sampling rate (500 Hz), enabling the exact extraction of seizure segments from the raw EEG signals. This time-to-index conversion is essential for segmenting the data into meaningful 1-second windows for model training. These seizure labels also ensure that the data is categorized correctly into seizure and non-seizure classes (e.g., CPS, electrographic, nociceptive), which is critical for training accurate and clinically useful machine learning models. Without these annotated seizure dictionaries, it would not be possible to align the EEG data with the actual clinical events, thus significantly compromising the validity and effectiveness of the downstream classification tasks.

i. Bi-Directional LSTM GRU:

This model combines Bi-Directional Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) and Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) layers to capture temporal dependencies in sequence data from both past and future contexts. The bi-directional setup allows the network to understand patterns from forward and backward sequences, improving performance on time-series tasks like EEG signal classification.

ii. Extra Trees:

Extra Trees (Extremely Randomized Trees) is an ensemble learning method that builds multiple decision trees using random splits of features and thresholds. Unlike Random Forests, Extra Trees inject more randomness, often leading to faster training and sometimes better generalization. It is effective for tabular data classification and regression tasks.

iii. EEGNet:

EEGNet is a compact convolutional neural network architecture specifically designed for EEG signal processing. It efficiently extracts spatial and temporal features from EEG data using depthwise and separable convolutions, making it well-suited for brain-computer interface (BCI) applications with limited training data and low computational cost.



Fig 4: EEGNet architecture [16]

iv. Bi-Directional GRU with Attention:

This model enhances a bi-directional Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) network by incorporating an attention mechanism that allows the model to focus on important time steps in the sequence. The attention layer improves interpretability and performance by weighting relevant parts of the input, which is particularly useful for complex sequential data such as EEG signals [18].

Proposed Workflow:

First, models are feature extracted as preprocessing was already done on dataset they are trained and evaluated with various evaluation metrics. In order to find out the best performance, the nested cross-validation technique is applied. This enhanced the model development as well as ensured the model's performance isn’t compromised on different folds of the dataset. With this cross-validation technique, model performance on the entire dataset can be rigorously tested. Then, the trained model is proposed to be deployed on the proposed IoMT system-based concept to aid patients.



Fig 5: Proposed modeling concept

The various ML models are trained to make seizure detection models. Two hybrid models are conceptualized that performed well beyond EEGNet a common model in ML field. The dataset includes EEG segments (each of size 19 channels × 500 time points, i.e., 1 second at 500 Hz), and each segment is labeled with one of the following: The dataset labels are tabulated in table 1.

Label Definitions

Table 1: Labels on dataset

Label	Description
0	Normal EEG data (non-seizure)

1	Complex Partial Seizures
2	Electrographic Seizures
3	Video-detected Seizures (no EEG visible change)

Fig: Proposed conceptual block diagram

IoMT-based approach



Fig 6: Proposed system concept

With the proposed concept shown in figure 6, the patient can be aided early when a seizure is detected through the proposed model from real-time data input from the headset; the email or any other alerts can be transferred to early aid the patient with the seizure. Then, various appliances like fans and bulbs can be triggered to automate room conditions when a victim is affected by seizures. With this concept, early aid can be made available to facilitate the victim and prevent the deterioration of his/her health further. With early notification, the caretaker can be called early to aid the patient.

Evaluation metrics:

Accuracy, precision, recall and F1-score: Accuracy measures the overall correctness of a classification model by calculating the proportion of total predictions that are correct. Precision evaluates how many of the positive predictions made by the model are actually correct, reflecting the model's ability to avoid false positives. Recall (also known as sensitivity) measures the model's ability to identify all actual positive cases by finding the proportion of true positives detected out of all real positives, thus indicating how well the model prevents false negatives. The F1-score is the harmonic mean of precision and recall, providing a balanced metric that combines both aspects to obtain one performance measure, especially useful when the class distribution is imbalanced [17].

Accuracy = $\frac{TN+TP}{(FP+FN+TP+TN)}$ (1)

Precision= $\frac{TP}{(TP+FP)}$ *(2)*

Recall= $\frac{\mathrm{TP}}{(\mathrm{FP}+\mathrm{FN})}$ (3)

F1-Score =

$2 * \left(\frac{(Precision * Recall)}{(Precision + Recall)}\right)$ (4)

- **SHAP analysis:**

First, after training the Random Forest classifier on the scaled and flattened EEG data, we have used the SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) library to interpret the model's predictions on the testing dataset. We start by creating a TreeExplainer object specific to the trained Random Forest model, which efficiently calculates SHAP values. These SHAP values quantify the contribution of each feature to the prediction for each test sample. Since the problem is multiclass classification, the SHAP values are computed separately for each class, resulting in a list of arrays—one per class.

To visualize the impact of features for a chosen class, we have generated a SHAP summary plot, which displays the distribution and magnitude of SHAP values across all features and samples, highlighting how features influence model output. Additionally, a SHAP bar plot is created, showing the mean absolute SHAP values per feature as a measure of overall feature importance. Both plots provide intuitive insights into which features drive the model's decisions. Because the input features correspond to flattened time-series data across multiple EEG channels and timepoints, we also reshape the model's built-in feature importances back into the original two-dimensional shape (channels × timepoints).

Finally, by averaging feature importance values over timepoints, we produce a bar plot summarizing the relative importance of each EEG channel. This combined visualization

approach helps understand both granular and aggregated contributions of the input data to the classification results.

a. Bi-Directional GRU with attention method:



Fig 7. Confusion matrix for Bi-directional GRU with attention

The confusion matrix for Bi-Directional GRU with attention approach model obtained a training Accuracy: 0.89 and testing accuracy of 0.84. The confusion matrix plot in figure 7 is displayed as seen in figure in which for class ‘0’ 378 instances or testing feature set were correctly classified for class ‘0’ similarly, for class ‘1’ 230 instances were correctly classified as class ‘1’ and ‘43’ instances for class ‘2’.



Figure 8. Training and loss history plot

The model shown good development over epochs with improvements. The training history plots illustrate how the model learns over approximately 45 epochs. In the left plot showing accuracy, both training and validation accuracy rise sharply in the initial epochs, indicating that the model quickly captures key patterns in the data. The training accuracy stabilizes around 0.88–0.90, while the validation accuracy plateaus slightly lower, around 0.83–0.85, suggesting that the model is fitting well but retains a modest gap between training and validation performance. In the right plot, depicting loss curves, both training and validation loss decrease steeply at first and then flatten out, maintaining similar levels from about epoch 10 onward as shown in figure 8. The close alignment between training and validation loss throughout training suggests that the model generalizes reasonably well and does not suffer from significant overfitting or underfitting. Overall, these plots indicate a stable and effective training process, achieving good performance while maintaining consistency between training and validation results.

EEGNet:



Fig 9. Model history curve for EEGNet

The model shown in figure 9 history curve good development over epochs with improvements. The model performance over epochs as displayed in figure seem to gradually improve in training as well as validation over epochs. The overall testing accuracy of 95.05%. and finally EEG based classification is mostly supported by this EEGNet model as shown in figure 9.

Fig : EEGNet history curve



Fig 10: Confusion matrix plot for model

The model EEGNet obtained an accuracy of 94.05%. The confusion matrix plot is displayed as seen in figure 10 in which for class ‘0’ 411 instances or testing feature set were correctly classified for class ‘0’ similarly, for class ‘1’ 249 instances were correctly classified as class ‘1’ and ‘67’ instances for class ‘2’.

The model Extra Trees classifier obtained a training Accuracy: 0.967 and testing Accuracy: 0.90 and confusion matrix is depicted in figure 11.



Fig 11: Confusion matrix plot for Extra Trees Classifier model

Random Forest model

The model obtained a training accuracy of 100% as well as testing accuracy of: 0.88. The confusion matrix plot is displayed as seen in figure in which for class ‘0’ 404 instances or testing feature set were correctly classified for class ‘0’ similarly, for class ‘1’ 247 instances were correctly classified as class ‘1’ and ‘34’ instances for class ‘2’ as shown in figure 12.



Fig 12: Random forest model confusion matrix plot

Bi-Directional LSTM GRU:

The model obtained a training Accuracy: 0.89 and testing accuracy of 0.84. The confusion matrix plot is displayed as seen in figure in which for class ‘0’ 371 instances or testing feature set were correctly classified for class ‘0’ similarly, for class ‘1’ 236 instances were correctly classified as class ‘1’ and ‘41’ instances for class ‘2’ as shown in figure 13.



Fig 13: Confusion matrix plot



Fig 14: Bi-Directional LSTM GRU training and loss history

The model as shown in figure 14 show good development over epochs with improvements. The training history plots illustrate how the model learns over approximately 120 epochs. In the left plot showing accuracy, both training and validation accuracy rise sharply in the initial epochs, indicating that the model quickly captures key patterns in the data. The training accuracy stabilizes around 0.88–0.90, while the validation accuracy plateaus slightly lower, around 0.83–0.85, suggesting that the model is fitting well but retains a modest gap between training and validation performance. In the right plot, depicting loss curves, both training and validation loss decrease steeply at first and then flatten out, maintaining similar levels from about epoch 10 onward. The close alignment between training and validation loss throughout training suggests that the model generalizes reasonably well and does not suffer from significant overfitting or underfitting. Overall, these plots indicate a stable and effective training process, achieving good performance while maintaining consistency between training and validation results.

XGBoost model:



Fig 15: Confusion matrix plot for XGBoost

The confusion matrix plot in figure 15 is displayed as seen in figure in which for class ‘0’ 403 instances or testing feature set were correctly classified for class ‘0’ similarly, for class ‘1’ 251 instances were correctly classified as class ‘1’ and ‘59’ instances for class ‘2’. The model obtained an accuracy of 100% on training set and Testing Accuracy: 0.92 accuracy on testing set.

Table 2: Models performances comparison

Model	Class	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	Support
Bi-Directional GRU with Attention	0 (Normal)	0.84	0.91	0.87	416
	1 (CPS)	0.84	0.80	0.82	289
	2 (Electrographic)	0.88	0.63	0.74	68
	Accuracy			**0.84**	**773**
	Macro Avg	0.85	0.78	0.81	773
	Weighted Avg	0.84	0.84	0.84	773
EEGNet	Normal	0.91	0.99	0.95	416
	CPS	0.98	0.86	0.92	289
	Electrographic	1.00	0.99	0.99	68
	Accuracy			**0.94**	**773**
	Macro Avg	0.96	0.94	0.95	773
	Weighted Avg	0.94	0.94	0.94	773
Extra Trees Classifier	Normal	0.86	0.98	0.92	416
	CPS	0.98	0.83	0.90	289
	Electrographic	0.92	0.68	0.78	68
	Accuracy			**0.90**	**773**
	Macro Avg	0.92	0.83	0.87	773
	Weighted Avg	0.91	0.90	0.90	773
Random Forest	Normal	0.85	0.97	0.91	416
	CPS	0.96	0.85	0.90	289
	Electrographic	0.81	0.50	0.62	68
	Accuracy			**0.89**	**773**
	Macro Avg	0.87	0.78	0.81	773
	Weighted Avg	0.89	0.89	0.88	773
Bi-Directional LSTM GRU	Normal	0.85	0.89	0.87	416
	CPS	0.80	0.82	0.81	289
	Electrographic	0.93	0.60	0.73	68
	Accuracy			**0.84**	**773**
	Macro Avg	0.86	0.77	0.80	773
	Weighted Avg	0.84	0.84	0.84	773
XGBoost	Normal	0.90	0.97	0.93	416

	CPS	0.97	0.87	0.92	289
	Electrographic	0.88	0.87	0.87	68
	Accuracy			**0.92**	**773**
	Macro Avg	0.92	0.90	0.91	773
	Weighted Avg	0.93	0.92	0.92	773

Table 3: Model performances

Model	Testing Accuracy
Bi-Directional GRU with Attention	0.84
EEGNet	0.94
Extra Trees Classifier	0.90
Random Forest	0.89
Bi-Directional LSTM GRU	0.84
XGBoost	0.92

Across various models as shown in table 2 and 3, EEGNet achieved the highest testing accuracy of 94%, followed by XGBoost at 92%, Extra Trees Classifier at 90%, and Random Forest at 89%, while Bi-Directional GRU with Attention and Bi-Directional LSTM GRU both attained 84%; further, nested cross-validation confirmed consistent performance, with fold-wise test accuracies ranging from 90.29% to 92.45%, yielding an overall average accuracy of 91.50% and a low standard deviation of 0.0070, indicating the models are stable and generalize well across different data splits.

Table: Model performance analysis through Nested cross validations

Fold	Test Accuracy
Fold 1	0.9173
Fold 2	0.9245
Fold 3	0.9167
Fold 4	0.9134
Fold 5	0.9029
Average	**0.9150**
Std Dev	**0.0070**

SHAP analysis results:



Fig 16: SHAP plot summary



Fig 17: SHAP importance bar plot

The Random Forest feature relevance for each EEG channel, averaged over timepoints, is shown in this bar plot, which shows how much each channel influences the model's classification choices. Interestingly, Channel 9 (Ch-9) has the highest mean feature importance, indicating that it contains the most discriminative information for the task. This could indicate that there is a large amount of brain activity associated with the condition under study. While some channels contribute less and cluster closer to zero, others, like Ch-4 and Ch-5, also have very significant relevance. By identifying important brain regions for additional research or focused electrode installation, these insights enhance the interpretability of the model and its potential for clinical use. The figure emphasizes the importance of feature selection in EEG-based machine learning by demonstrating that not all channels are equally useful.

4-classes Predictions:

The 4-class predictions are important in dataset as to predict the video-detected seizures too using ML approaches even though samples were very less in comparison to normal requirement to train ML models still this classification is vital to build models that can in future help creating advanced and enhanced algorithm for epileptic seizure classifications of such types.

The traditional ensemble XGBoost model obtained testing accuracy of 91% and training accuracy of 100%. Similarly, EEGNet +Bi-GRU with attention a proposed hybrid network obtained an accuracy of 91%. The performance is compared as shown in table 4 and model hyperparameters in table 5.

Table 4: Classification report for the models

Class	Precision (XGBoost)	Recall (XGBoost)	F1-Score (XGBoost)	Precision (EEGNet+BiGRU)	Recall (EEGNet+BiGRU)	F1-Score (EEGNet+BiGRU)	Support
Normal (0)	0.89	0.96	0.93	0.86	1.00	0.92	416
CPS (1)	0.96	0.86	0.91	1.00	0.75	0.86	289
Electrographic (2)	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.97	1.00	0.99	68
Class 3 (3) (Video-detected Seizures)	1.00	0.67	0.80	0.67	1.00	0.80	6

Table 5: Model Architecture & Training Hyperparameters Comparison

Category	Parameter	EEGNet-GRU-Attention (EGA-Net)	XGBoost Classifier
Input	Input Shape	(19, 500, 1)	Flattened (9500 features)
Feature Scaling	Method	Z-score normalization	Z-score normalization
Model Core	Base Architecture	EEGNet + GRU + Attention	Gradient Boosted Trees (XGBoost)
CNN Filters	F1	8	–
	F2 (SeparableConv2D)	16	–
	Kernel Length	64	–
	Depth Multiplier (D)	2	–
Dropout	EEGNet Blocks	0.5	–
	FC Layer	0.3	–
Temporal Modeling	Recurrent Layer	GRU (64 units)	–
Attention Mechanism	Attention Layer	Yes (custom, after GRU)	–
Fully Connected	Dense Units	32	–
Output Activation	Activation Function	Softmax	Softmax (via tree-based voting)
Loss Function	Loss	Categorical Crossentropy	Multi-class Log Loss (mlogloss)
Optimizer	Optimizer	Adam	Tree-based
	Learning Rate	0.001	–
Training	Epochs	200	–
	Batch Size	32	–
	EarlyStopping	Yes (patience=20)	–

	ReduceLROnPlateau	Yes (factor=0.5, patience=10, min_lr=1e-6)	–
	Checkpointing	Best model saved on val_loss	–
	Class Weights	Inverse frequency × max count	–
XGBoost Specific	max_depth	–	50
	n_estimators	–	1000
	use_label_encoder	–	False
	eval_metric	–	mlogloss
	random_state	–	42



Fig 18: Training and loss history plot for model EEGNet+Bi-GRU with attention

The model performance history plot is shown in figure 18. The bar chart displays the average feature importance of different EEG channels (Ch-0 to Ch-18) as computed by the Random Forest model. Each bar represents how much a particular channel contributes to the model's predictions on average across timepoints. Among all channels, Ch-9 stands out significantly, showing the highest mean feature importance by a large margin. This indicates that Ch-9 carries the most critical information for distinguishing between classes in the seizure detection task and SHAP values also quantify how strongly each feature influences model predictions. Therefore, this confirm that Ch-9 has the greatest impact on model performance, suggesting it may capture key patterns or signals relevant to epileptic activity in the EEG data.

With this system early warning can be triggered and early alert notification can be sent via IoT on email. This system aids in automating appliances using microcomputers-based processing of the EEG signals from victim so that when the affecting onset is predicted by model the patient room conditions can be automated to open bulb, fan or similar devices using relay-based triggering. In summary this system acts as a feedback for making an IoMT (Internet of Medical Things) home automation for seizure victim aid and managing favorable condition to provide a relief aspect to victim. Thus, patient can be aided easily with help of the early warning and notification system along with control mechanism for various devices in home environment.

Limitations and Future works:

Thus, the proposed approach shows a significant concept in EEG signal classification for detecting various kinds of seizures and is vital to identify their impacting features, the channels that much affect the prediction, as well as choosing the best model for performance enhancement. With current work, the main drawback is the lack of enough training data for class 3 (videographic seizures), and for that purpose, in the future, such data need to be included with higher volume. The models developed shall be enhanced, as still 93-94% accuracy isn't best suited for real-time deployment for purposes of IoMT ecosystem development. As proposed work has depicted an IoMT concept for aiding patients, a real-time evaluation couldn't be made due to a lack of EEG headsets and more advanced devices. In the future, rigorous testing for such prototyping can be carried out.

Conclusion:

To conclude, an ML model like EEGNet with predefined architecture has a higher potential to gather greater performance for EEG results. The models trained on the dataset show that prior to various epileptic conditions, early warning can be triggered using ML-based detection via victim EEG data. The EEG window segmentation applied allowed the models to perform and learn patterns very well. For 3 classes of classifications, the EEGNet model performed best with 94% accuracy, and 91% with hybridization with GRU with an attention layer on the EEGNet model for the 4-class dataset. This approach can be useful for deployment in real-time prototyping for IoMT edge and medical device development. With this approach, future intelligent biomedical systems based on EEG can be enhanced.

REFERENCES

[1] Rasheed, K., Qayyum, A., Qadir, J., Sivathamboo, S., Kwan, P., Kuhlmann, L., O'Brien, T. and Razi, A., 2021. Machine learning for predicting epileptic seizures using EEG signals: A review. IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering, 14, pp.139-155. https://doi.org/10.1109/RBME.2020.3008792

[2] Kode, H., Elleithy, K. and Almazaydeh, L., 2024. Epileptic seizure detection in EEG signals using machine learning and deep learning techniques. IEEE Access, 12, pp.80657-80668. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3409581

[3] Zhu, R., Pan, W., Liu, J. et al., 2024. Epileptic seizure prediction via multidimensional transformer and recurrent neural network fusion. Journal of Translational Medicine, 22, p.895. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12967-024-05678-7

[4] Kunekar, P., Gupta, M.K. and Gaur, P., 2024. Detection of epileptic seizure in EEG signals using machine learning and deep learning techniques. Journal of Engineering and Applied Science, 71, p.21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s44147-023-00353-y

[5] Vieira, J.C., Guedes, L.A., Santos, M.R. and Sanchez-Gendriz, I., 2023. Using explainable artificial intelligence to obtain efficient seizure-detection models based on electroencephalography signals. Sensors, 23, p.9871. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23249871
[6] Jaiswal, D., Singh, R. and Prajapati, B., 2025. Advances in EEG signal processing and machine learning for epileptic seizure detection and prediction. Journal of Population Therapeutics and Clinical Pharmacology, 32(2), pp.355-364. https://doi.org/10.53555/drbcyr98
[7] S, A., S, S.K., Mohan, N. and KP, S., 2024. EEG based automated detection of seizure using machine learning approach and traditional features. Expert Systems with Applications, 251, p.123991. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.123991
[8] Dişli, F., Gedikpınar, M., Fırat, H., Şengür, A., Güldemir, H. and Koundal, D., 2025. Epilepsy diagnosis from EEG signals using continuous wavelet transform-based depthwise convolutional neural network model. Diagnostics, 15, p.84. https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics15010084
[9] Tsakanika, E., Tsoukas, V., Kakarountas, A. and Kokkinos, V., 2025. High accuracy of epileptic seizure detection using tiny machine learning technology for implantable closed-loop neurostimulation systems. BioMedInformatics, 5, p.14. https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedinformatics5010014
[10] Brari, Z. and Belghith, S., 2021. A novel machine learning approach for epilepsy diagnosis using EEG signals based on correlation dimension. IFAC-PapersOnLine, 54(17), pp.7-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2021.11.018
[11] Raab, D., Theissler, A. and Spiliopoulou, M., 2023. XAI4EEG: spectral and spatio-temporal explanation of deep learning-based seizure detection in EEG time series. Neural Computing and Applications, 35, pp.10051-10068. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-022-07809-x
[12] Mallick, S. and Baths, V., 2024. Novel deep learning framework for detection of epileptic seizures using EEG signals. Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience, 18. https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2024.1340251
[13] Esmaeilpour, A., Tabarestani, S.S. and Niazi, A., 2024. Deep learning-based seizure prediction using EEG signals: A comparative analysis of classification methods on the CHB-MIT dataset. Engineering Reports, 6(11). https://doi.org/10.1002/eng2.12918
[14] Suryakala, S.V., Vidya, T.R.S. and Ramakrishnans, S.H., 2024. Federated machine learning for epileptic seizure detection using EEG. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 15(4). https://doi.org/10.14569/ijacsa.2024.01504106
[15] Nasreddine, W., 2021. Epileptic EEG dataset. Mendeley Data, V1. https://doi.org/10.17632/5pc2j46cbc.1
[16] Xu, Fangzhou & Miao, Yunjing & Sun, Yanan & Guo, Dongju & Xu, Jiali & Wang, Yuandong & Li, Jincheng & Li, Han & Dong, Gege & Rong, Fenqi & Leng, Jiancai & Zhang, Yang. (2021). A transfer learning framework based on motor imagery rehabilitation for stroke. Scientific Reports. 11. 19783. 10.1038/s41598-021-99114-1.
[17] Powers, D. M. (2020). Evaluation: from precision, recall and F-measure to ROC, informedness, markedness and correlation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.16061.

[18] Paneru, B., Thapa, B., Paneru, B., & Sapkota, S. C. (2025). EEG right & left voluntary hand movement-based virtual brain-computer interfacing keyboard using

hybrid deep learning approach. *Advanced Engineering Informatics*, *65*, 103304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2025.103304