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

Oswin Maurer[1]

1 Free University of Bozen

The paper addresses the conflicting interests between conservation of biodiversity and consumption of wildlife products.

It aims to deepen the understanding of how connection to nature and perception of biodiversity could contribute to the improvement of wildlife protection. The authors argue that a better understanding of individuals' connection to nature, perception of biodiversity and of socio-demographic factors related to wildlife product consumption would improve wildlife protection.

The authors were using publicly available survey data, whereas it remains unclear what kind of publicly available data has been used, and, for which purpose that publicly available data has been collected, how, when, etc.. This needs clarification, explanation and justification to be able to put results into real contexts.

However, according to the authors, data collections were performed through a web-based survey via Google Forms using a snowball sampling strategy. It remains unclear, if there have been two samples (the publicly available one plus a self-collected questionnaire) or one sample (the publicly available one). Please clarify, what data has been used.

If the publicly available data is the only dataset used, the above mentioned issues of purpose, objective, target, timing, distribution method, etc. becomes problematic, as surveying is subject, purpose, and time specific and combining datasets of different surveys creates certain data validity problems.

Hence, it is unclear to the reader where the 581 responses and the 535 responses included in the cleaned dataset came from and, even more important, how (if so) representative it is..

With regard to socio-demographics, some basic statistics should be presented as a basic table in the paper, such as frequency of respondents in age groups (currently: young/middle/older), income groups (currently: low/middle/high) , etc. Concise descriptive statistics of the sample are missing, socio-demographics (as baseline information) are presented in a rather confusing manner (see Table 1). Also, there is no justification why socio-demographics have not been analysed with regard to their mediating effect.

The analysis is using cross-sectional data. Using a cross-sectional design incurs critical issues such as the inability to determine cause-effect relationships, findings can be skewed (particularly if data from another sample with a different

objective is used), behaviour cannot be analysed over a period of time, etc.

My very basic suggestions for an updated and revised version

- Clarify, which data has been used, it's source, the objective of data collection and timing
- Assess and document the usability and validity of data to be used in your analysis
- Provide for a concise set of informative descriptive statistics to start with
- Define clear and concise objectives for your study
- Simplify and reduce the presentation of results/statistics to the necessary minimum, as tables across several pages are not acceptable
- Please improve written language, maybe using proof-reading services