

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

Doroteja Mandarić<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fachhochschule Burgenland

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Firstly, I want to express my gratitude for entrusting me with the task of reviewing this article. Congratulations on its publication! I would like to offer some constructive feedback aimed at enhancing the article's quality.

1. The article requires thorough proofreading due to the presence of numerous grammatical errors and typos. For instance,  
in the Introduction: "... reusable bags (Muralidharan & Sheehan, 2016).As a result,..."; "... (Misgana & Tucho, 2022).A study..." - there is a missing space;  
in the Literature review: "Since NAM developed by Schwartz (1973) in Figure 3..." - The phrasing is incorrect. It might be better phrased as: "Schwartz (1973) developed NAM, as seen in Figure 3..." or "Since NAM was developed by Schwartz (1973), which is presented in Figure 3"; "The integrated theoretical model is presented in Figure5, ..." - a space is missing, etc.

In terms of writing style, it's advisable to refrain from using arrows (→). Instead, consider explaining the relationships between variables using words within the text.

2. The abstract doesn't clearly convey the article's content. Expanding it by one or two sentences to clarify the article's purpose (addressing a specific knowledge gap) and the study's results would be beneficial.
3. The Introduction lacks an engaging lead-in to the subject. It would be more effective to commence with a concise and captivating introduction that outlines the problem addressing—environmental concerns related to shopping bags.
4. In the Theoretical Model and Hypotheses section, the hypotheses need to be presented in a more concise format. The hypothesis numbering exhibits redundancy (H1d, H1e, H1f numbers reappear in H1g, H1h, H1i at the beginning). Revising and renumbering is needed to mitigate confusion.  
Whenever stating something like "Socioeconomic factors play a vital role in consumer behavior," there is a source citation needed to substantiate the claim.

5. The Methodology section needs more comprehensive details about the data collection process. It should be elaborated further on the online survey method, since there is some confusion about the methodology, as it references both an online survey via Google Docs and a field survey. Clarify the methods employed.
6. When presenting the Results, it might be beneficial formatting them in a manner that is more reader-friendly, facilitating a quick understanding of the key findings through well-constructed sentences.
7. Within the Discussion section, it might be better to refrain from using abbreviations. This allows readers to readily grasp the summary of the research outcomes. Furthermore, the implications of the findings for pro-environmental behavior research, policy formulation, and consumer behavior need to be underscored.
8. In the Limitations section, the reference to "the purchase intention of green beauty products" lacks clarity. Elaborate on why this is mentioned exclusively here and how it pertains to the research and its limitations.
9. The Conclusion is rather brief. It necessitates a concise summary of the primary findings and their implications. Consider discussing potential directions for future research in this domain. Moreover, explicitly state the research's purpose and the practical applicability of the results.

By implementing these suggestions, the article will become more organized, easier to follow, and more engaging for the readers. Best of luck with the article!