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Summary:

The author described his replication work clearly, including the process of the data, the replication of the models and parameter optimization. He analyzed the data and put them into different models according to the paper. At last he got the R2 scores and compared them.

Strengths:

The report is easy to understand what the author did. He explained how and why in every replication steps. The coding style of the author is also formatted just like his report.

Weaknesses:

It seems that the author didn’t analyze the importance of these variables.

Clarity and writing: 5

Technical quality: 4