

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

Tatnawat Chaiyesh

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear the author (s)

Describing pro-environmental behavior by applying the TPB and the NAM makes this manuscript interesting. However, I define some issues which need to be addressed:

## 1. introduction:

1.1 First paragraph: Before concluding that utilization of own shopping bags is pro-environmental behavior, the author(s) should add the definition of the pro-environmental behavior. The presentation of the body to the conclusion is not smooth and gives conflicting feelings.

1.2 The third paragraph to the fifth paragraph: The author (s) should check the accuracy of the presentation in the first two sentences of the third paragraph and should also add the introduction of relevant studies that use that use the NAM to connect with TPB in the fourth and fifth paragraphs.

## 2. theoretical model and hypotheses

2.1 The author (s) should provide details about the theories (TPB, Relationship Quality Model, Model of Goal directed Behavior) and provide a short definition of AT, SN, PBC, as well as validation the BE in the H1d (BE: choice of shopping bag) and the H1e (BE: intention choice of shopping bag).

2.2 NAM: The author (s) should adjust the content in the same way as 2.1.

2.3 Theoretical framework of extended TPB and TAM: The author (s) should provide details about the theories (value-belief-norm theory, TAM, Health Belief Model)

## 3. Method

3.1 Data source: The author (s) should check the accuracy of the first paragraph.

3.2 Since the question contains positive and negative questions in some variables, the author(s) should provide more details.

## 4. Tests of model and hypotheses

4.1 According to 3.2, the results obtained from the third table may be inaccurate in the relationship direction of the variables in the H1e (negative) and H1i (positive).

4.2 From p-value, the H3l, H3m, and H3o are not statistically significant.

## 5. Discussion

The discussion is quite unclear and the sequence of sentences is not continuous.

6. There are some *grammatical errors* in this manuscript which *should* be corrected.

warmest regards,