

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

Hsiao-Ping Chang

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General Comments

The author states the paper is intended to analyze individuals' choice of shopping bags with the integrated model of theory of planned behavior (TPB) and norm activation model (NAM). Though this is a paper which contains interesting topics, and is very important for the pro-environment consumer behavior, the author is required to make **major revision** to let some blind points much clear. There are several areas where it could be strengthened prior to publication consideration.

Criteria

• Suitable of contents for this Journal:

I think the subjects ("Shopping bags: own or plastic? Theoretical explanation of pro-environment consumer behavior in Vietnam") are suitable for making known in this Journal.

• Soundness of arguments and information:

The general building up of the paper should be revised. A serious effort should be done with regard to statement of the problem and building up of the article in the introduction, literature review, research design, conclusions and recommendation logically as well as theoretically.

• Proper and complete references:

The efforts of literature sitting and references containing in the study are relatively inclusive, but the concepts and meanings of theories (i.e. theories regarding qualitative conceptual research by demonstrating concept extraction of the consumers' choice of shopping bags by integrating TPB and NAM) are required to be embraced intensively.

Recommendations

The following are observations on how the paper could be improved.

1. The introduction is interesting but too long, some of the information should be placed academically as well as systematically. As I know, the most critical articles and foundational theories listed in the section (though the author

indicate “there are no published studies relating to choice of shopping bags). For the reason, it seems that the backgrounds of the research should be developed more theoretically and comprehensively.

2. It has a well-established introduction, as shown in part of “INTRODUCTION,”(p.1-2) but it also seems that the motivation and contributions contained in the research are not understandable and solid. It let us not easily to make persuasive connections between “INTRODUCTION” and “LITERATURE REVIEW” in this article! (for example, what’s the critical reason for the author to investigate consumers' choice of shopping bags by integrating TPB and TAM(NAM??)(p.2) The motivation and the contributions contained in the research should be demonstrated more specify!

3. We believe that the author tried to provide the theoretical basis/model for the research. Though, the theories the author addressed seem not sufficiently. Specifically, the reason of theoretical model adopted was only inspired by the integration of the TPB and NAM (Chunan Zhao, et al., 2019)? What’s the theoretical meaning and the necessary of the integrated theoretical model used in the study? It is important to note that the section of “Literature Review” should be established to develop systematical and general review the theories as well as references sited in the research, especially focus on description of the section “(p.2-6) Theoretical model and hypotheses”.

4. A serious effort must be done on the following points: How does this study contribute to the existing literature and theory? The conclusions and recommendation of the study should be described logically as well as theoretically(p.18). Besides, it is not suitable enough to follow the reasoning conclusions based on theories and literature review. The gap in the literature needs to be more clearly laid out in the conclusion and literature review sections.