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

Lauriane S. Yehouenou[1]

1 Northwestern University

Introduction

The first paragraph is cluttered with too much information and citations. Can the authors rewrite it to distinctively show literature on the impact of WPC based on meat consumption, medicinal purposes, and trade. The last sentence is a bold conclusion since all the citations were not specific to Vietnam.

"Connection to nature" and "nature connection" were used interchangeably.

Paragraph 3 mentioned "socio-demographic factors" but the authors cited a wide variety of factors. Some citations did not mention the region of the study. For the ones specified, they all seem to be in Africa. The paper focus being on Vietnam, it will be great to have some citations from Asia to provide more context.

Literature Review and Main Hypotheses

This section did not clearly state the paper's objective. Each paragraph ended with bold speculations (after 2-3 citations). Abbreviations were confusing and required constant rereading, especially if the reader was not familiar with the subject matter. It may be helpful to redefine the abbreviations at the beginning of each section to improve clarity and understanding.

First line: Cities consist of…

Third line: A long-term ~~than~~ contemporary…

Paragraph 3: First sentence does not read well.

Methodology

Data source: The survey procedure was described in three stages, but a fourth stage was reported in the write-up. Just mentioning the data cleaning process without referencing a 4th stage will clear this confusion.

What do you mean by "insufficient age"?

How was the reliability index of WPC calculated? Using variables from the three questions? Adding a footnote to explain

the threshold of acceptability will be appropriate.

What is the rationale behind the threshold value selected to group the POB sub variables?

Adding an explanatory paragraph on the reliability index will be appropriate.

Why put no income, < 5 million VNĐ, and 5-10 million VNĐ in the same group? Adding a conversion rate in USD in a footnote can be helpful. It will also be interesting to see the descriptive statistics for each demographic factor before the grouping done by the authors.

Present the statistical analysis in the form of equation and define each variable appropriately.

Results

Figure 3-9 can be better presented to have the 3 variable of WPC side by side. As presented, it is difficult to follow or derive any pattern across all figures.

Is the number of observations in Table 2 reflecting only the respondents who answered yes to the 3 questions of WPC? If not, why the change in number of observations compared to Table 1?

The writing of table 2's results and the reading of the numbers in the table seem to contradict. If the reference is 1 and for "Less" group, then having 0.554 (0.362 -0.803) for the "more" group does not imply more likelihood. It is the opposite direction.

Saying "than those without" when comparing is inaccurate since your reference group reflects smaller scores and is defined differently for each of your main variables.

Saying "the respondents with high perspectives of potential consequences of biodiversity loss and in-house planting were more likely to consume bush meat than those without" is counterintuitive.

The authors failed to show how Hypotheses 1 and 2 were supported.

Please review the write-up on Table 2.

Define Models 1 and 2 in Table 3.

Discussion

"The effect of POB on WPC via CTN is greater than the effect of CTN on WPC via POB." contradicts "the effect of CTN via POB on WPC does not exist" written in the results section. No effect cannot be compared.

" Obviously, there are persons with active connection to nature and positive perception of biodiversity have high likelihood of consuming wildlife products in Vietnam." This sentence does not read well. As mentioned earlier, this seems counterintuitive: why people caring more about biodiversity and with a connection to nature consuming more wildlife products since this consumption can be link to loss of biodiversity?

What are the policy implications of the findings in Vietnam. The section on policy implications is very confusing. How did the authors reach this conclusion "Thus, nutrition and health education can serve as optimal solution to reduce WPC. If education has no effects, financial penalties are the necessary tools."?

Reviewer's take: Overall while this topic is an interesting one, the paper made bold conclusions/inferences that were not supported. The paper is not also well structured and has many typos. Many sentences do not read well. Will give it a 2.5/5 if it was possible.