Responses to Reviewer's 3 comments

The work deals with how consumers' perceptions on DRS affect their participation to DRS and the topic is suited for the special issue. The manuscript contains some unique findings and it will contribute to improving the present DRS for a better recycle rate. The reviewer, however, expects the authors to revise the manuscript considering the following particular comments for publication.

1. Though it is stated the model shown in Fig. 3 was derived from previous studies, it is hard to understand which literature was the origin of a particular part of the model. The summary of previous works is given in Table 1, but it is better to indicate clearly which work was the basis for selecting each motivation indicator of MOT1-MOT5 and each perception indicator of PER1-PER3.

This is a very good point. It helped us to present and justify the theoretical framework/research model that we have used in our research. Specifically, we have,

- Added a new section titled "2.3 Conceptual Framework and Research Model and hypotheses development".
- Included in this section two subsections: "2.3.1 Motives for the adoption of Deposit Refund Systems" and "2.3.2 Perceptions for usage of Deposit Refund Systems", and
- Provided in each of the above subsections, a number of sources to support the corresponding research hypotheses by providing the required theoretical background.

2. The reviewer supposes the parameters of MOT1-MOT5, PER1-PER2, and REC1-REC3 were asked in the questionnaire, but it is not clearly stated in the methodology chapter. It is mentioned, "Since the questionnaire was based on questions included in published work, there were no issues of clarity and structure" in Line 188-189, but it is better to describe more about the contents of the questionnaire.

The "2.3.2 Perceptions for adoption of Deposit Refund Systems" section has been added to explain the linkage between theoretical framework and the questionnaire.

3. Just the motives of DRS are explained in Section 2.2, but the consumers' perceptions are not. Since the contents of questionnaire depend on these indicators, they should also be explained beforehand.

Perceptions were measured based on the following reflecting indicators: Ease of refund recycling (PER1), the degree to which they do not face technical or procedural issues with refund recycling (PER2), and the degree, which reflects their values about green thinking (PER3).

4. Notating just 'DRS' will be confusing for the readers, and 'adoption of DRS' is an exact notation of the variable.

We have replaced "DRS" with the "adoption of DRS".

5. The authors ignored the questionnaire data of those who are not using DRS, but presumably comparing questionnaire data between participants and non-participants of DRS will give some remarkable differences in the motives and perceptions of DRS. Why didn't the authors analyzed the questionnaire data of non-participants?

Thank you for providing a very interesting suggestion. This is not the scope of this current research. It will be our next research objective. We will aim to identify why customers do not use DRS. Moreover, we intend to sketch the profiles of DRS users and no-DRS users.

6. "It a tool to 32 collect high quantities of beverage containers for reuse and for high-quality recycling" in Line 32-33 is an incomprehensible sentence. Correct some other peculiar English expressions.

This sentence has been changed to "*The deposit-refund system is a means of gathering a significant amount of beverage containers for the purpose of reuse, promoting awareness of sorting waste, and adding value to the waste*."

7. What does '2939/2001 and 4496/2017' in Line 107 mean? Is this the standard numbering scheme of Greek laws?

Yes, that is correct. We mention that "*…created the alternative management framework operation in Greece.*"

8. Table 8 and 9 are referred to in Line 321 and 330, respectively, but no such tables are given in the manuscript.

Done.