

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

Jianglin Lu¹

¹ Shanghai Customs College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall, the innovation of this research is insufficient, which needs to be strengthened and fully demonstrated in the subsequent revision process. The specific suggestions are as follows:

1. The introduction lists some literature, and what is the correlation between these literature and the innovation of this research? The innovation of this research is not well reflected in the introduction. In fact, the author is using mature research methods without much innovation, and there are also many related studies using these methods. This requires the author to emphasize and showcase the innovation of this research, and it is recommended to improve it.
2. Theoretical analysis and research hypotheses are relatively lacking, and the research hypotheses here lack literature support and analysis.
3. What is the basis for selecting the time points for the research at 9:00 am and 10:00 am? The analysis results obtained in this way are clearly biased. In fact, from the descriptive perspective of Table 1, the representativeness of the sample is not sufficient, whether it is in terms of age, gender, or distribution of education and employment status. Different time periods should have sample coverage, which may result in richer and more accurate analysis results. Therefore, it is recommended to supplement the sample. If the sample cannot be supplemented, the collection method and reasons for the sample data must be fully demonstrated. In addition, the location of the sample and the distribution of the respondents' residences have not been explained yet. Rural and urban areas clearly belong to two groups of people, and the author only chose two large cities. What is the reason for this? Need to be explained. The measurement of variables is too arbitrary and lacks literature support. Suggest supplementing and improving.
4. The analysis of the results is relatively lacking, which is the same as the problem in the theoretical analysis and hypothesis section. The author lacks analysis of the impact, that is, why? The author only pointed out what it is. This is obviously not enough. Moreover, in the key analysis section, the author has listed a large number of literature, and the relationship between these literature and the laws revealed in this article is not yet clear. Further analysis is needed to ensure logical coherence.
5. The research conclusion is too simple, and it is recommended to strengthen it. Does this research have any practical significance or policy implications for government departments to formulate pro environmental policies? Suggest

supplementing in the conclusion section.

I hope the above suggestions are helpful for improving the paper! Thanks!