

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

Manish Dadhich1

1 Sir Padampat Singhania University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Prof. Editor

I am writing to express my sincere gratitude for selecting me to review the manuscript for **Shopping bags: own or** plastic? Theoretical explanation of pro-environment consumer behavior in Vietnam". I am honored to be chosen as a reviewer for this manuscript and will do my utmost to provide a thorough and constructive review to refine the work further. I am excited about the opportunity to contribute to the academic community by providing feedback and insights on this work. It is a privilege to be a part of the scholarly review process, and I look forward to supporting academic excellence and the authors of the manuscript to help ensure that this work meets the high standards of academic excellence.

The manuscript is interesting but cannot be published in its current form.

- 1. The abstract needs to be strengthened by incorporating purpose, research design, findings, implications and conclusion.
- 2. The first letter of keywords should be capital.
- 3. There should be space between (BYOB(Nguyen, et al., 2022) on page 2; the same on page no. 4 (consequences(AC), ascription of responsibility(AR), and personal norm(PN), and Behavior (BE).
- 4. While interesting, the theoretical contribution of your manuscript is narrowly defined.
- 5. The future scope and limitations should be strengthened further.
- 6. The average credibility of the used sources and references is low and old.
- 7. 2 lines of the conclusion is not acceptable in any case.
- 8. The language of the paper needs careful proof editing. The paper should be rejected if the authors are unaware of the revision and language.

Qeios ID: GPZIX1 · https://doi.org/10.32388/GPZIX1