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Summary:

I think this is a good job for replication paper. G18 tell us how to del with data, how to pick parameter, what is the model result very specifically. Besides, G18 also rethink the result why there is a huge gap between their work and paper’s result and they still want to improve the R2 in the future.

Strengths:

Many models used in this work and deal with data carefully. G18 also rethink the result why there is a huge gap between their work and paper’s result and they still want to improve the R2 in the future.

Weaknesses:

Some typo in this paper, like p4, p14.

Some sentences are not professional enough. But I know that we may all have the problem. it takes time to practice.

The structure of model parts is not same, this may be different mate write their own parts. Some parts have feature importance but some not.

It is better to analyze why some model is good, but some not.

Clarity and writing:

Some typo in this paper, like p4, p14.

Some sentences are not professional enough. But I kwon that we may all have the problem. it takes time to practice.

The structure of model parts is not same, this may be different mate write their own parts.

Technical quality:

Many models used in this work and deal with data carefully.