

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

Dr Saurabh Kumar¹

¹ Jamia Hamdard

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Peer review report on

Qeios ID: 32LD1O · <https://doi.org/10.32388/32LD1O>

Article Type: Original research article

Recommendation: **Major revision**

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

Comments to Editor:

Thank you for the opportunity to review your work.

Comments to Authors: Major revise

Note: *It was not considered necessary to elaborate on the flaws of the paper. Some minor flaws were also overlooked.*

The manuscript deals with a timely and novel topic that is worthy of investigation. However, the paper as it stands invites some criticism. I have some comments that may help the authors improve their article.

- The paper needs some improvement in each section including the Title and Abstract. Author(s) have indifferent way of writing the research paper.
- This paper need to provide a planned, systematic, organized, and clear introduction; clear and compelling research gaps, implications, and the limitations. Check for mistakes and imperfections also.
- Ensure appropriate selection of words.
- Topic can be improved. Why "own or plastic" bags are mentioned. Do people not have the option of bringing bags other than plastic bags (eco-friendly or not) to Vietnam?

- Abstract can be improved. Either remove first line or do justice with it.
- Keyword: for a keyword shopping bags is not specific but it is up to the author.
- Introduction: It seems unplanned. Make it more organized and systematic. Some sentences should be written with clear understanding and in a persuasive manner; Many lines don't go with the running text. Rewrite sentences and make it more complementary to the ongoing text. Some sentences need to be adjusted to bring order.

Pg 1, Line 7: What psychological factors. Please clear. Pg 2, Line 2 onwards: First of all, LR content can be seen in the introduction at several places. The findings of previous studies have been mentioned in a superficial manner. Several statements from the extent literature need proper explanation /elaboration. Line 4: What situational factors?

- Research gaps are underrepresented, and not properly identified and explained. It is unclear how the contribution of this research can fill the research gap?
- There are too many hypotheses. Nevertheless, it is up to the discretion of the author to put forward all hypotheses and test them. Usually prefer less. Author doesn't need to test all the relationship between variables. Just Stick to the main objectives. It is done in PhD work. But it is up to the author.
- LR: Indifferent way of mentioning extent studies and the relationship between variables, especially Theoretical Model.
- Method: Provide Response Rate (RR). You can provide Demographic/personal characteristics in a table format. Some table be merged. Table format can be improved and make more reader friendly and instructive. But it is upt to the author.
- Discussion is not standalone. Kindly include justifiable number of studies in support or contrary to your findings. Including demographic factors.
- In my view, it would be better if author merged the TPB and NAM model as an extension and also examine the combined effect of all the exogenous variables on the Endogenous Var. There would be less figures and the model would be more robust. But it is up to the Author.
- Improve last Section. Honestly, it is poorly written. Conclusions should include extract of the findings, contributions, implications, limitations/suggestion for the future work etc. If you do accordingly, please avoid references in Conclusions.

Best Wishes

Reviewer