

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

Yusuf Abdulkarim Daiyabu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

No.	HEADING	COMMENT
1	Title	The title capture the content of the paper. But is it appropriate to use a question mark in a title?
2	Abstract	The abstract is good. However, other contributions such as practical and literature contributions need to be highlighted like the theoretical contribution is mentioned.
3	Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The problem need to be strengthens to justify the research b. The study has already been conducted, thus, the last paragraph ".....the study aims at investigating consumers' choice....." need to change as the study already "investigated" the phenomenon. c. The structure of the paper should be given immediately after the introduction.
4	Theoretical Model and Hypotheses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. More current literature using TPB need to be cited. Example, Daiyabu, Y. A., Manaf, N. A. A., & Mohamad Hsbollah, H. (2023). Extending the theory of planned behaviour with application to renewable energy investment: the moderating effect of tax incentives. <i>International Journal of Energy Sector Management</i>, 17(2), 333-351. Look for more to enrich the literature review. b. The study claim to run mediation effect, but there is no hypotheses for that.
5	Methodology	<p>The methodology used seems good. However,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Source of the measurements need to be discussed i.e either self-developed, adopted/adapted from past studies. b. How many Likert Scale used? And what is the justification c. Preliminary testing of the instrument need to be highlighted as the case may be. d. The last paragraph under data source looked choked up. Perhaps need to be presented in a table.
6	Results	The result procedure need to be highlighted and the mediation result is not presented. Need to address the issue.
7	Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Under summary of the main findings ".....this study is not in line with Savari's et al (2023)" need to give a brief of their outcome to understand the difference. b. Discussion should be given as per each hypothesis and to be linked with existing literature.
8	Limitations	In my opinion is not good to mention that "the study has several limitations". Just highlight the limitations of the study in respect of may be the scope of the study, the variable used, the respondents, means of data collection, the statistical tools of data analysis used etc.
9	Conclusion	The conclusion is too scanty, thus, the need to be enriched. Perhaps you may consider merging the conclusion with the summary of the main findings under discussion. In a nutshell, make it a conclusion and recommendation.
10	References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Need to check and comply with the latest version of APA style referencing. b. Ensure all citations are in the reference and all references are cited.
11	General	The paper is well written. However, the language, spelling and use of punctuation marks need to be improved. Additionally, the issue of funding need to be fully disclosed. Whether there is funding or not need to be mentioned.

