Review of: "Can ChatGPT code the technical part of a Bachelor's Thesis in Informatics?"

Edgar León-Sandoval[1]

1 Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey (ITESM)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors used ChatGPT (version?) to design experiments and provide code to assess gender bias in Deep Learning models, all with a Bachelors thesis in mind. But in the conclusions, they state that they only evaluate the coding capabilities, but in order to do so, they utilize the experiments suggested by the system. They used a few examples for students simulating a bachelor's thesis, resulting in a wide variation between them. Such variation is not further specified, nor are the measurements taken or the direct methodology utilized, other than *critical dialog.*

I'd like to see more details of everything in this work, including methodology, analysis, code generated, sub-tasks evaluated, measurements taken, etc.

Style notes:

On one part, the authors state that "If a code snippet encountered an execution error, we adopted one of two approaches: if the error was evident or within our capacity to rectify, we addressed it directly; otherwise, we relayed the issue to ChatGPT for further guidance." Wouldn't this imply that there is code that is not understood but evaluated?

In the introduction and section 3, "As educators, we are acutely aware of the educational (Abd-Alrazaq, AlSaad, Alhuwail, Ahmed, Healy, Latifi, Aziz, Damseh, Alrazak, Sheikh et al., 2023) and ethical challenges (Kasneci, Seßler, Küchemann, Bannert, Dementieva, Fischer, Gasser, Groh, Günnemann, Hüllermeier et al., 2023) associated ." There are too many authors in the citation; APA uses "et al." for more than one. If these are multiple works, they should be separated by a semicolon.