

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

Tak Jie Chan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Multimedia University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Abstract

1. **Incomplete sentence.**..."Controlling for socioeconomic factors, mediation analyses showed that personal norms mediated the relationship between"?

## Introduction

1. The author should provide the background on the plastic bag issues in the country's understudies, e.g. Vietnam by providing relevant statistics to support the study.
2. The extension of the TPB, by including the NAM constructs (this section is not well discussed in the literature gaps on the NAM).
3. Therefore, this study aims to investigate consumers' choice of shopping bags by integrating TPB and TAM (why are the missing gaps with TAM?, why have to include TAM Construct? The academic gaps are not well justified.

## Literature Review (not enough LR to support the formulation of those hypotheses)

1. " Figure 1, a structural diagram depicts the theory. Moreover, it has been extensively replicated in purchase behavior studies (Yadav & Pathak, 2016, 2017; Cheng & Huang, 2013; Hansen, et al. 2004; Sun, et al., 2007). (*references were outdated*).
2. The LR was not sufficient to establish those hypotheses, more review of recent past literature is needed (Major).
3. The TAM constructs not appearing in the model, but the author claims to use the TAM model.
4. The abstract claims to do mediation, however, on the hypothesis development, there aren't any discussion on the mediation.

## Methodology

1. What type of sampling was utilized?

## Findings & discussion

1. Since this study wants to test the integration of TPB and NAM (integrated model), why there is a need to run the model

separately? Author should focus on the SEM results of the integrated model rather than on the TPB and NAM as different models.

2. Missing discussion on the NAM construct since there are hypotheses from the NAM constructs that were accepted/rejected.
3. For those hypotheses being rejected, what are the reasons and justifications? The discussion is very surface, as the author just mentioned the current findings align with the previous studies, but lack of in-depth discussion.

## **Conclusion**

1. Missing academic and practical implications.
2. Missing suggestions for future study/ research.