

Review of: "Shopping bags: own or plastic? Theoretical explanation of pro-environment consumer behavior in Vietnam"

Yuen Onn Choong¹

¹ Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for allowing me to review the paper entitled "Shopping bags: own or plastic? Theoretical explanation of pro-environment consumer behavior in Vietnam" Here are some suggestions to improve the paper:

1. There are many studies conducted on pro-environment consumer behaviour with the adoption of theory of planned behaviour and norm activation norm. The rationale and intention of conducting this study is very superficial and untenable. Authors should provide a thorough explanation why there is needs to conduct this study. Why these two theories were used to predict the individuals' choice of shopping bags. Thus, the introduction of the study needs further clarification to establish a strong rationale for the research. Please make a stronger case as to why your paper is needed and how you contribute to current academic discussion.
2. Authors should refer relevant past studies to highlight deficiencies or gaps in the existing literature. The authors should offer a more comprehensive analysis of the limitations present in previous studies. By doing so, they can provide valuable insights into how their own research diverges from and addresses those gaps. This will help establish the novelty and unique contributions of their study.
3. The current literature review lacks depth and critical analysis. Many of the discussions in the literature review section are superficial, lacking a comprehensive review of the existing literature. It is crucial for the authors to provide a critical and thorough examination of the relevant studies to highlight the gaps and limitations in the field.
4. The current version of research method is not sufficiently written. Should have two sub-sections: (1) research procedure and samples and (2) research instrument.
5. Should clearly define the target respondent.
6. Since the paper survey or physical engage with respondents yielded higher response rate, why both online survey and paper survey were adopted?
7. The authors should discuss the generalizability and representativeness of their sample in relation to the target population. They need to clearly explain how the chosen sample is intended to be representative of and reflective of the larger population. Any strategies employed to ensure a diverse and inclusive sample should also be highlighted. This will increase the credibility of the research findings and help readers understand the extent to which the results can be generalized to the broader population.
8. It is essential to provide a clear explanation of the sampling technique used in the study, along with the rationale for its

selection. The authors should describe how they utilized this sampling technique to select respondents for the survey, ensuring generalizability and representativeness towards the targeted population. By doing so, readers can better understand the methodological approach and the potential limitations associated with the sample selection.

9. To improve the paper, including control variables is crucial, and the authors should provide reasonable justifications for their inclusion. Control variables help account for potential confounding factors that may influence the study's results. By explaining why certain control variables were selected and how they contribute to the research's validity, the authors can strengthen the overall methodology of the study.
10. The authors should provide adequate justification for the use of the software in this study. They should explain why this particular software was chosen and how it aligns with the research objectives. By elaborating on the software's specific functionalities and how it supports the analysis of the data, the authors can enhance the validity and reliability of their findings.
11. I would suggest author to structure their conclusion part of the manuscript as follows: (1) Discussion, (2) Implications, (3) Limitations and Future Research Recommendations, and (4) Conclusion.
12. There should be a standalone section for implications. How can you imply from the findings? This section should discuss the implications of the study's findings and how they contribute to the existing theoretical knowledge. Summarize the key findings and their relevance to the existing theoretical frameworks or models. Analyze how the findings align with or challenge current theoretical perspectives and concepts (service quality) related to all the key concepts of this study. Discuss any theoretical insights or advancements that the study provides and highlight how the findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the research area.