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Summary:The original paper is roughly replicated, and the expression is relatively clear. However, in some places, there are some differences from the original paper. At the same time, when interpreting the results, it did not look for the reasons like the original paper, but only expressed the results.

Strengths:The method in the paper is used when processing data, and at the same time, further improvements are proposed for data processing in the final summary.

Weaknesses:1. In the validation part, the parameters are not adjusted based on the performance in the validation part, but the parameters are specified. 2. In the feature importance and other parts, they use the R2 in the python package instead of the R2 defined by the paper. 3. The figures and analysis are not put together, resulting in a bit unclear. 4. The analysis of the last important feature has only five figures, and there should be at least six figures. 5. There is no further analysis of the reasons for the strange results, but the paper has. 6. The prediction is based on the entire testing set, instead of monthly and annually prediction results like the original paper.

Clarity and writing:The structure of the article is clear, but the results and analysis are not put together, which makes reading difficult.

Technical quality: Replicate most of the paper, but there are still some places that have not been replicated. Rarely give reasonable explanations for strange results.