

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

Darryl N. Jones<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Griffith University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Overview

This MS presents a fascinating and ambitious attempt to discern possible links between some prescribed measures of perceptions of biodiversity and connection to nature with the consumption of bush meat in Vietnam. This is an important issue in many parts of the world and the outcomes of the study could provide valuable insights for policy makers and anyone interested in enhancing biological conservation.

The study is well introduced through a useful set of other studies of a similar vein. The examples used are relevant and sensible. These provide a useful context for the overall aims of the study although these are pragmatically reduced to a series of traditional hypotheses to be tested (see below).

The data collection process and analytical techniques employed are described reasonably well (but see below) although the justification for the particular questions are not made clear.

The findings are mainly clear and conspicuous, with the hypothesised connections being found largely as anticipated. This is welcome and satisfying but alarming when considering the meaning this has for reality.

The interactions between the model components and their implications are quite well explained as are the lessons for policy makers.

In short, this is an important and illuminating study with serious outcomes but somewhat undermined by a lack of clarity in a number of places. These concerns will be outlined below.

## Issues

The otherwise informative and clearly written Introduction provides a useful description of the complexities and potential interactions between the numerous dimensions that are at play in this context. Human perceptions, actions and intentions are difficult to disentangle at the best of times. Therefore, to reduce these complexities to the four hypotheses as presented at the end of the Introduction is almost perverse. I would remove them completely. The paper does not need them; these 'hypothesizes' are not mentioned again.

I was confused by the primary data source. A large part of the Methods details the various questions posed to the respondents yet the section begins with: "This study employed publicly available survey data...". Please clarify.

I will focus on the crucial element of CTN here but the same concerns relate to them all. I assumed that the set of questions posed were derived from other studies but can find no evidence for this. To adequately interrogate a concept as critical and complex as human connectedness to nature with only five questions, and two of these questions relate to house plants (!) seems extraordinary. Please provide some justification for these questions. If there are none, this could prove fatal to the entire study.

I am not familiar with the style policies of this journal, but I would be surprised that including the enormous tables of statistical details would be acceptable. This is mainly in reference to Tables 1 and 2.

Finally, there were many instances of poor or problematic English (though overall the quality was excellent) but I gave up listing these. The quality of the MS would certainly be improved if these could be corrected.