



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_27676
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Influencing Green Purchasing Behaviors: Some Insights from Tamale, Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Page 2 of manuscript--Include more citations from the marketing literature with respect o sustainable consumption behaviors; there are many cites in Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Journal of Consumer Research, European Journal of Marketing, etc. Page 2 of manuscript—provide justification or better rationale for selecting Tamale Metropolitan area of Ghana and using this location for sampling, can the results be generalized? Page 7 of manuscript—provide more information about how the TPB variables were adapted and modified.	We have cited 6 more relevant articles (Chan, 2000; Laroche, 2001; and Lee, 2009 in journal of consumer marketing; Follows and Jobber, 2000- in European journal of marketing; Kumar & Ghodeswar, 2015; Wang,2014- in Marketing intelligence & planning) We have highlighted the strategic location of the city of Tamale in the west African sub-region (Ghana, Burkina Faso, Niger, Mali and the northern part of Togo). Notwithstanding, we have taken note of the question of generalizability of the results and indicated this in the limitation section of the manuscript. We modified the wording of the questionnaire items in previous studies to suit the purpose of this study, taking into account the 'principle of correspondence' requirement in the measurement of theoretical constructs. We have indicated this appropriately.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 8 of manuscript—Why did you not contextualize the questionnaire; that is, provide specifics to the respondents regarding products to think of when answering, prices they would be willing to pay for more “green” products, etc.? Page 9 of the manuscript—did you compare the results across the three samples—2 shopping center and a cluster of supermarkets—otherwise, your sample can be considered a convenience sample only, making generalizing the results impossible? If you have sufficient N for the three locations, they could be compares using simple nonparametric statistics tests to see if they were different or the same. Without doing so, I’m not certain that you should be combining the three locations into one sample.	Because the TPB is an expectancy-value theory, which should be applied to choice situations in a balanced way, we provided two kinds of products attached to the introduction of the questionnaires: a recycled tissue paper, adopted to represent a green product and a virgin tissue paper, adopted to represent the conventional alternative. This is indicated in page 7 of the manuscript (around Line 194-196) Actually we are dealing with a single sample (residents of the city of Tamale). The Forsmuel Shopping Centre and the Quality First Supermarket offer similar products to consumers. These 2 shopping centers are located within the same premises, separated by a banking hall (Prudential Bank, Tamale branch). The majority of our respondents (N=225) came from this location. Following the anonymous reviewers’ comment, we have undertaken Independent samples T-test and found no significant difference between the sample at this location and the one from the other side of the city (N= 100).
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 6 of manuscript—are the demographic attributes moderators or mediators? Specify what they are. Page 9 of manuscript—on line 217, what specifically does “survey results may reflect the real situation”? Page 10 of the manuscript—include a table showing item correlations. Page 11 of the manuscript—Section 4.4 would benefit from more discussion and rigor when examining the hypotheses. Page 11 of the manuscript—on line 275, the increase from 0.147 to 0.152 is non-significant. Page 14 of the manuscript—you make a number of statements (line 240-341; 344-349; 364-367) that are not necessarily supported by your data.	Page 6, demographic attributes are moderators in this study. This has been indicated in the manuscript Page 9, line 217 “survey results may reflect the real situation” refers to the income levels as revealed by the results of this study, when compared with the official data for the Tamale metropolis Done (See Table 4 around page 10 of the manuscript) Section 4.4 is only a presentation of the results, a thorough discussion is done under section 5 Page 11, line 275. Noted. This has been modified by deleting the phrase “with the beta increasing from 0.147 to 0.152” Even though the statements are not specified by the anonymous reviewer, we have read through these lines and made some modifications
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Page 1 of manuscript—refrain from editorializing (e.g., “If we are serious about the SDGs”) Better proofreading of the manuscript is possible.	Page 1. We have deleted the statement “If we are serious about the SDGs, then the relatively poorer countries of Africa and Asia deserve more concerted efforts from researchers and development agencies”. Done
---	--	--