Dear authors,

Thank you for submitting your paper to the Energies. I think your paper is an informative paper that can be published after a major revision.

**Comments:**

1. It is not clear what the research gap that the paper is addressing. What is the objective of this paper? Please clarify somewhere clearly all your contributions.
2. The literature review is not goal-oriented. The process should be as follows:

i) Critical evaluation of the literature; ii) identifying the gap based on this critical evaluation of the literature; iii) proposing your hypothesis to address the identified gap; iv) posing the appropriate and relevant research question based on your proposed hypothesis, and finally explaining your proposed method to answer this research question. Therefore, you will have a systematic way of conducting your research. Right now, the literature review section has no clear objective.

1. A thorough editorial check and English improvement are needed. Please kindly proofread the entire manuscript.
2. The conclusion part is also needed to be revised; which questions are answered, what is the value/originality/contribution of the paper, how the proposed method answers the research questions that previous methods are not able to answer?
3. It feels you need a king of aggregating results somewhere clearer.
4. Please provide more explanation for Figure 21. Also, there are too many figures in the paper. Please reconsider combining some of them together.
5. An adequate literature review and a clear gap identification have been tried to be conducted. However, authors have ignored some research that has been done in the area. I strongly recommend the authors to provide a more comprehensive literature review in the introduction section. The following papers are recommended:

* Significant wave height forecasting via an extreme learning machine model integrated with improved complete ensemble empirical mode decomposition. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 104, 281-295.
* A wavelet-Particle swarm optimization-Extreme learning machine hybrid modeling for significant wave height prediction. Ocean Engineering, 213, 107777.
* Managing computational complexity using surrogate models: a critical review. Research in Engineering Design, 31(3), 275-298.
* Near real-time significant wave height forecasting with hybridized multiple linear regression algorithms. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 132, 110003.
* Significant wave height and energy flux prediction for marine energy applications: A grouping genetic algorithm–Extreme Learning Machine approach. Renewable Energy, 97, 380-389.
* Outlook on biofuels in future studies: A systematic literature review. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 134, 110326.
* Statistical models for improving significant wave height predictions in offshore operations. Ocean Engineering, 206, 107249.
* Regional ocean wave height prediction using sequential learning neural networks. Ocean Engineering, 129, 605-612.
* Ensemble of surrogates and cross-validation for rapid and accurate predictions using small data sets. AI EDAM, 33(4), 484-501.
* Prediction of significant wave height; comparison between nested grid numerical model, and machine learning models of artificial neural networks, extreme learning and support vector machines. Engineering Applications of Computational Fluid Mechanics, 14(1), 805-817.

1. Please propose and suggest more possible future studies related to the current study.
2. If you can, please make a small comparison between what did you do and what others did before, as a conclusion.
3. The abstract is not deep enough and Is not well prepared. Please try to re-write it better. The problem should be clearly stated and the gap in which you are going to address the need to be clarified. Simply explain your contributions and key findings.
4. There are some errors in your reference list. Please check and fix the errors.