

Review of: "Perception of Biodiversity versus Connection to Nature: Which Can Influence Wildlife Product Consumption in Vietnam?"

Marija Cerjak

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting study but with many shortcomings.

The literature review is not well structured. The earlier works cited in this paragraph are not adequately explained in relation to the current study.

Relationship between e.g. nature connection, well being, urban/rural residence etc. should be better explained.

The topic of the study is relevant and u-to-date. However, the study has many shortcomings.

The literature review is not well structured. The earlier works cited in this paragraph are not adequately explained in relation to the current study.

The connection to nature should be better explained, as well as the link with well-being,

Please explain why "According to Theory of Change, CTN and POB cannot possibly lead to WPC. But this judgment has been obviously violated in Vietnam"

The motivation for this study should be better explained.

The description of the studies in the Methodology section should be expanded. What was the sample in the second study? What was the aim of the third study? How did it differ from the second study?

Some variables have unacceptable reliability. How did you deal with this?

What does it mean that "WPC: bush meat, products for medical treatment and products made from animal skin/leather/fur) are combined empirically into a single integrated system."

The results are described very extensively, and without sufficient explanation.

The results of the factor analysis are not presented.

Based on the research results, how did you come to this conclusion: "With respect to Vietnam, conservation efforts are requisite to preserve biodiversity and protect endangered species and their habitats."?

The paragraph that starts with "The fact that part of Vietnamese consumers preferring wildlife products can partially explained by consumer behaviour in the wildlife trade....." Fits more in the introduction section than in the "Explanations of main findings"

The link between results and findings from the literature is not adequately explained.

English proofreading is recommended.

The paper needs major corrections to be published.

