Detailed response to the reviewer comments

Editor comments

Besides the remarks of the reviewers, please also adjust the references and bibliography to the journal's standard.

**References and bibliography have been adjusted according to the journal’s standard.**

Reviewer A:

Methods need to be more elaborated. This section is not presented on a clear manner and some methods are missing or not described in detail in another section, such as in results section.

Changes to be made before publishing the article:

1.Include sample size validation. Having 34 items and only 101 cases, the ratio is as low as 2.9

2. Method section only includes a short text on the survey, please include the methodology you have applied for this study.

**The method section has been revised and extended, providing more information about the measurement model and reliability and validity issues**

3. If I understood correctly, Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied in this study, therefore, Method section should include it.

**This study did not use Exploratory Factor Analysis. The scales used have been validated in earlier research. Confirmatory Factor Analysis and PLS have been used. PLS is appropriate with small sample sizes.**

4. All tables and figures must be introduced in the text prior to the table’s appearance, check tables 3 and 4 specifically.

**This has been checked and resolved throughout the paper.**

5. PLS and HMRA method description should be included in the Method section.

**The description regarding PLS and HMRA has been moved to the method section.**

Reviewer B:

Some sources are not up-to-date.

**We have checked the references and added more recent and relevant publications to the paper. More specifically, the following references have been added to the paper:**

**Baxter, J., Gram-Hanssen, I. (2016), Environmental message framing: Enhancing consumer recycling of mobile phones, “Resources, Conservation and Recycling”, vol. 109, 96-101.**

**Borthakur, A., Govind, M. (2017), Emerging trends in consumers’ E-waste disposal behaviour and awareness: A worldwide overview with special focus on India, “Resources, Conservation and Recycling”, vol. 117, 102-113.**

**Hobson, K., Lynch, N., Lilley, D., Smalley, G. (2018), Systems of practice and the Circular Economy: Transforming mobile phone product service systems, “Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions”, vol. 26, 147-157.**

**Kissling, R., Coughlan, D., Fitzpatrick, C., Boeni, H., Luepschen, C., Andrew, S., Dickenson, J. (2013), Success factors and barriers in re-use of electrical and electronic equipment, “Resources, Conservation and Recycling”, vol. 80, pp. 21-31.**

**Paiano, A., Lagioia, G. Cataldo, A. (2013), A critical analysis of the sustainability of mobile phone use, “Journal of Resource Conservation and Recycling”, vol. 73, pp. 162-171.**

**Sabbaghi, M., Behdad, S., Zhuang, J. (2016), Managing consumer behavior toward on-time return of the waste electrical and electronic equipment: A game theoretic approach, “International Journal of Production Economics”, vol. 182, 545-563.**

**Wilson, G. T., Smalley, G., Suckling, J. R., Lilley, D., Lee, J., Mawle, R. (2017), The hibernating mobile phone: Dead storage as a barrier to efficient electronic waste recovery, “Waste Management”, vol. 60, 521-533.**

Changes to be made before publishing the article:

It should be explained in the aim of the paper, that the research refers to Dutch users of mobile phones.

**The focus on end-consumers in the Netherlands is now added in the Aim of the paper.**

Two sections: 2.2 and 2.3. should be more inter-related. It should be more clearly said (e.g. at the beginning of the section) that the list of factors described in section 2.3 is the basis for the design of the survey research (this would be an explanation as well why they are grouped in 8 categories).

**We have added a clarification in the beginning of section 2: This section provides a review of the literature and associated hypotheses, covering the life cycle extension of mobile phones, and the factors influencing consumer propensity to recycle.**

It should be more clearly explained, why there were about 100 respondents surveyed (e.g. a pilotage research / preliminary survey). The sample should account for more than 350 respondents (confidence level 0.95, fraction 50% and acceptable error 5%).

**The purpose of the paper is to describe an exploratory (pilot) study. It is not intended to formulate conclusions applicable to the whole population, but rather to provide a model which can be further applied, validated and extended.**