

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Current Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJOCR_12621 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Factors Influencing Consumers Preference For Green Packaging In Enugu Metropolis, Enugu State, Nigeria. |
| Type of the Article | |

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|---|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This article offers significant insights into consumer behavior and environmental sustainability in emerging markets. The research offers significant insights into the perceptions and responses of Nigerian consumers, particularly in Enugu Metropolis, regarding green packaging initiatives, addressing a critical gap in the literature, as most existing studies concentrate on developed markets. The results concerning the correlations of recycled labeling, eco-labeling, and environmental advertising with consumer preferences are notably important, as they might guide governmental decisions and marketing tactics in emerging economies | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | It is generally suitable, but could benefit from some refinement. A more polished version could be: "Factors Influencing Consumers' Preferences for Green Packaging: A Study of Enugu Metropolis, Enugu State, Nigeria" | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p> | <p>The abstract of this article requires several improvements to better represent the research and conform to standard academic conventions. Let me analyze the current situation and give concrete recommendations for improvement.</p> <p>Current status analysis: The existing summary provides basic information about the aim of the study, sample size, methodology and key findings. However, it is missing some crucial elements that would make it more comprehensive and informative.</p> <p>Key Missing Elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research Context and Background: The abstract should begin with 1-2 sentences establishing the broader context and importance of green packaging research. A brief statement about why this research in Enugu Metropolis is significant would help readers understand the study's relevance. 2. Methodological Details: While the abstract mentions 480 participants and 300 responses, it doesn't explain the sampling method or data collection period. These details are important for understanding the study's scope and limitations. 3. Statistical Analysis: Though Pearson's correlation is mentioned, the abstract doesn't provide specific correlation values or significance levels, which would strengthen the presentation of findings. 4. Results Organization: The results are presented in a somewhat fragmented way, making it difficult to grasp the main findings clearly. | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <p>Scientific accuracy of this manuscript by examining several key aspects:</p> <p>Theoretical Foundation:</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>The manuscript builds on established theories, particularly Alderfer's ERG Theory. However, the connection between this theory and green packaging consumer behavior could be more clearly established. The theoretical framework would be stronger with the inclusion of more recent consumer behavior theories specifically related to environmental purchasing decisions.</p> <p>Research Design: The research design shows some methodological concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sampling procedure lacks sufficient scientific rigor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The transition from 480 to 300 participants isn't adequately explained - The randomization process isn't detailed - Potential sampling biases aren't addressed 2. The measurement instrument (questionnaire) has validity concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Content validity is mentioned but not thoroughly demonstrated - Construct validity isn't discussed - The reliability coefficient (0.99) is suspiciously high, suggesting possible methodological issues <p>Statistical Analysis: The statistical approach has several scientific limitations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Choice of Analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The use of simple correlation analysis may not be sufficient for understanding complex consumer behavior - More sophisticated multivariate analyses would be more appropriate - The assumptions underlying the statistical tests aren't verified or discussed 2. Data Reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standard deviations are reported but other important | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>statistical measures are missing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effect sizes aren't calculated - Confidence intervals aren't provided <p>Results Interpretation:</p> <p>There are some issues with how results are interpreted:</p> <p>1. Hypothesis Testing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The null hypotheses state "no significant relationship," yet the discussion suggests positive relationships - The rejection/non-rejection of hypotheses isn't clearly tied to the theoretical framework <p>2. Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some conclusions extend beyond what the data can support - Alternative explanations aren't adequately considered - The limitations of the findings aren't sufficiently acknowledged <p>Methodological Rigor:</p> <p>Several scientific procedures are missing or inadequately addressed:</p> <p>1. Control Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No discussion of potential confounding variables - Lack of control for social desirability bias in responses - No mention of data quality control procedures <p>2. Validation Procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The pilot testing process isn't adequately described - The expert validation process lacks detail - No mention of instrument refinement based on pilot results <p>Areas Needing Improvement for Scientific Correctness:</p> <p>1. Research Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include proper power analysis for sample size determination - Detail the randomization procedure - Address potential biases in sampling | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>2. Statistical Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use more appropriate statistical methods (e.g., structural equation modeling) - Test and report statistical assumptions - Include effect sizes and confidence intervals <p>3. Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen the connection between theory and methods - Add proper controls for confounding variables - Improve validation procedures <p>4. Results Reporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide more complete statistical information - Include appropriate visual representations of data - Better align conclusions with statistical evidence <p>5. Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Address study limitations more thoroughly - Consider alternative explanations - Better connect findings to theoretical framework <p>While the manuscript addresses an important topic and provides valuable insights, several aspects require improvement to meet rigorous scientific standards. The basic research framework is sound, but implementation and reporting need to be improved to ensure scientific accuracy. These improvements would strengthen the manuscript's contribution to the scientific literature on environmentally friendly packaging and consumer behavior.</p> <p>The research is promising but requires significant revision to meet scientific publishing standards. These revisions would increase both the reliability and validity of the results, making them more valuable to the scientific community.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional</p> | <p>The manuscript's references range from 1994 to 2019, with many citations being over a decade old. For a study on green packaging and consumer behavior - a rapidly evolving field -</p> | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>more recent references are essential. A significant portion of the citations (approximately 60%) are from before 2015, which may not reflect current trends and developments in sustainable packaging and consumer preferences.</p> <p>Recommendations for Reference Management:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update Core References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace pre-2015 sources with more recent equivalents where possible • Maintain a balance between seminal works and current research 2. Expand Geographical Scope: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include more African studies • Add comparative studies from other developing markets 3. Strengthen Methodological Foundation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add recent papers on research design • Include current statistical analysis references 4. Enhance Industry Context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include recent industry reports • Add case studies of successful sustainable packaging initiatives 5. Improve Citation Quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all references follow a consistent format | |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verify all citations are accurately represented | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>My analysis of the manuscript's language quality and suggest improvements for scholarly communication.</p> <p>Writing Style and Clarity: The manuscript shows several language-related issues that affect its scholarly quality. The writing style is inconsistent, alternating between formal academic prose and more casual language. Many sentences are overly long and complex, making it difficult to follow the logical flow of ideas. For example, in the Introduction section, sentences like "People across the globe tend to prove the response towards many determinants that believed to stimulate one's purchase intention" contain grammatical errors and unclear phrasing.</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax: There are numerous grammatical issues throughout the manuscript that need attention:</p> <p>1. Subject-Verb Agreement Problems: Original: "The study, factors influencing consumer preference for green packaging in Enugu Metropolis, Enugu State aimed at determining..." Corrected: "The study of factors influencing consumer preference for green packaging in Enugu Metropolis, Enugu State, aimed at determining..."</p> <p>2. Incorrect Article Usage: Original: "It opens up new ways of making choices for consumers" Corrected: "It opens up new ways for consumers to make choices"</p> <p>3. Punctuation Errors: Original: "Consumer's purchase intention is well-known as a subjective and broad field in consumer behavior and part of purchase decision making." Corrected: "Consumer purchase intention is well-known as a subjective and broad field in consumer behavior and is part of</p> | |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>purchase decision-making."</p> <p>Academic Tone: The manuscript needs more consistent academic tone. Some sections use informal language that doesn't suit scholarly writing:</p> <p>Original: "Marketers are now beginning to appreciate the concept of 'environmentalism' and 'going green'" Improved: "Organizations are increasingly recognizing the importance of environmental sustainability in their marketing strategies"</p> <p>Structural Coherence: The text lacks smooth transitions between sections and ideas. Each section should flow logically into the next, with clear connecting statements. For example, the transition from the literature review to methodology is abrupt and needs better connection.</p> <p>Technical Terminology: While the manuscript uses appropriate technical terms, their usage isn't always consistent. Terms like "green packaging," "eco-friendly products," and "sustainable packaging" are used interchangeably without clear distinction.</p> <p>Recommendations for Improvement:</p> <p>1. Language Editing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have the manuscript professionally edited by a native English speaker - Use academic editing services specializing in scholarly publications - Consider having multiple reviewers check for clarity and consistency </p> <p>2. Structural Changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add clear transition sentences between sections </p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure parallel structure in lists and bullet points - Maintain consistent tense usage throughout sections <p>3. Technical Writing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define key terms clearly at first use - Maintain consistent terminology throughout - Use precise language to describe methods and results <p>4. Style Enhancement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Break up overly long sentences - Remove redundant phrases - Use active voice where appropriate - Maintain formal academic tone <p>5. Specific Section Improvements:</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make it more concise and focused - Present results more clearly - Use standard academic phraseology <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve flow between paragraphs - Strengthen topic sentences - Better establish research context <p>Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use more precise technical language - Clarify procedural descriptions - Add necessary methodological details <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present findings more systematically - Use consistent terminology - Improve clarity of statistical reporting <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen analytical language | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve logical flow of arguments - Better connect findings to literature <p>The manuscript requires substantial language revision to meet scholarly publication standards. While the research content is valuable, the current language quality may hinder effective communication of the findings. A thorough editing process focusing on grammar, style, and academic tone would significantly improve the manuscript's scholarly presentation.</p> <p>These improvements would help ensure that the valuable research findings are communicated effectively to the academic community and enhance the manuscript's potential for publication in respected scholarly journals.</p> | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | The manuscript requires extensive revision before it meets standard publication criteria. While the research topic is relevant and important, the methodological and analytical approaches need to be significantly strengthened to support the conclusions drawn. This review is intended to be constructive while identifying areas where improvement is needed to meet academic publishing standards. The authors have conducted useful research, but the manuscript requires extensive revision to fully demonstrate its scientific value. | |

PART 2:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Isaac N. Beas |
| Department, University & Country | Botswana Institute for Technology Research & Innovation, Botswana |