**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory REVISION comments</th>
<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</td>
<td>Yes. This paper “CONSUMER WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR ENERGY EFFICIENT REFRIGERATORS IN NAIROBI CITY COUNTY, KENYA” discusses how the Kenya Energy Star rating label affected consumer choices for refrigerators, further the impact on energy efficiency and environmental conservation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</td>
<td>Yes. But needs revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</td>
<td>No. Recent references for the year 2023 are to be included. Literature part is to be refined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minor REVISION comments**

| 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Need to improve the English in the manuscript. | |

**Optional/General comments**
Reviewer’s comment

The work done is good. Anyhow, some MAJOR changes are required to improve the quality of the work.

The authors are required to address the following comments to improve the quality of the paper.

1. It is always a good practice to write the keywords in alphabetical order.
2. Abstract needs revision. The result part in the Abstract could be better explained using quantitative information. Also, focus on improving English while revision.
3. Revise the literature by adding the latest references for the year 2023. It is also recommended to include references of very recent (preferably past 5 or 6 years). Remove very old references before the year 2015. Accordingly, revise the literature and contribution in the manuscript.
4. In Section 2.2 Sampling, the Table is not cited. Verify all identifiers of the tables and figures in the manuscript. Follow the template guidelines.
5. In Section 2.3 Data collection, the dataset details are not clear. Rewrite the dataset description.
6. Verify the equation numbers and follow the template guidelines for writing equation numbers. Also, explain the respective elements of every equation.
7. Abbreviations need to be defined on their first usage. Verify and revise the abbreviations in the manuscript.
8. Explain the significance of variables based on the results obtained.
9. The visualization of results will give a better understanding of the work to the reader. Verify the results and create graphs of the results wherever you can create. Accordingly, write the explanation for the graphs created.
10. Revise the Conclusion section.
11. The manuscript contains several errors such as spacing, punctuation, and grammar. Proofread the paper before submission.

Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?

(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)
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