SAC abbreviation is used multiple times before it is defined on line 135, please define on first use.

Line 139, make should be makes

Line 178 - I have concerns about only 2 obstacles maximum. Also one obstacle is sufficient if there are no size/shape constraints.

Font error for "o" on line 183

Line 305 spare should be 'sparse rewards' rather than 'spare reward'.

In Algorithm 2, it appears that line 17 will cause the loop from line to not terminate. I think maybe line 17 should be conditional on convergence.

I'm curious as to how SAC performs if its limited to as few obstacles as GSAC or if allowing more obstacles improves GSAC's generalizability.

On line 486, the word ‘respectively’ serves the same purpose as the Python function zip() so it appears to read that GSAC is tested on static environments and SAC is tested on dynamic environments.

In tables 4 and 5 it seems that "Optimal Path Length" refers to the best one found and not to the truly shortest path. If this is not the case, please explain how the optimal was found and why it varies.

Is the "3001-3500 episodes" on line 510 an error? Table 4 doesn't show corresponding results. Similarly, in Table 5 there are twice as many episodes shown for SAC as GSAC with no explanation given.

The captions for Figs. 9 and 11 have a) and b) reversed

Line 516 should be 'convergence'

I don’t understand the last sentence of lines 531/532 unless it is supposed to read that the difference in yaw angles between the two algorithms is negligable.

Line 533 says ‘static’ when it should be ‘dynamic’