

Peer Review

Review of: "Enhancing Code LLMs with Reinforcement Learning in Code Generation: A Survey"

Paria Sarzaeim¹

1. University of Ontario Institute of Technology, Canada

This paper surveys RL methods used in code LLMs. It is well-structured and supported by figures and visualizations. It also evaluates the gaps in data, evaluation, and efficiency as a foundation for future research.

However, the writing style needs improvements. There are repeated explanations of abbreviations, e.g., PPO, RL, RLHF. Define these concepts once early in the paper, and then use them consistently without redefining or repeating. Additionally, there are some repetitive sentence structures that should be reconsidered.

One other point of improvement could be adding a more analytical/critical summary of how RL enhances the performance of different models and proposing some unanswered research questions. For example, you could assess the strengths and limitations of each technique.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.