

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

Wan Noordiana Wan Hanafi¹

¹ Universiti Tenaga Nasional

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article explores the prevalent issue of wildlife product consumption in Vietnam, shedding light on the underlying factors and potential policy implications. The study employs a variety of statistical methods to analyze the data, including Bayesian logistic regression and structural equation models (SEMs). While the article offers valuable insights into the subject matter, several aspects require attention and clarification.

Strengths:

Methodological Approach: The use of Bayesian logistic regression and SEMs is commendable, as these techniques provide a robust framework for exploring the causal relationships and mediating effects discussed in the study. It is evident that the authors have invested in a rigorous statistical analysis.

Relevance: The research addresses a pertinent issue in Vietnam - the consumption of wildlife products - and underscores the need for conservation efforts in the face of biodiversity loss. This relevance is important in the context of both environmental conservation and public health.

Interdisciplinary Contribution: The article's contribution to various fields, including biological conservation, governmental management, regional development, and consumer behavior, is noteworthy. This interdisciplinary approach enhances its significance.

Weaknesses:

Sample Representativeness: The study mentions that the sample may not be nationally representative due to the web-based survey strategy. This limitation raises questions about the generalizability of the findings. To strengthen the study's validity, the authors should discuss potential biases introduced by the sampling method and suggest ways to mitigate them.

Causality: While the study identifies associations between socio-demographic factors, perceptions of biodiversity (POB), connectedness to nature (CTN), and wildlife product consumption, it relies on cross-sectional data. As such, it cannot establish causal relationships definitively. The authors should acknowledge this limitation explicitly and discuss the potential for future research using longitudinal data to explore causality.

Socioeconomic Factors: The article mentions that socioeconomic factors are not thoroughly analyzed in the mediating effects. Given the importance of socioeconomic variables in understanding consumer behavior, it is advisable for the authors to consider incorporating these factors into their analysis or provide a rationale for their exclusion.

Suggestions for Improvement:

Data Collection and Analysis: To enhance the representativeness of the sample, consider combining web-based surveys with other data collection methods, such as face-to-face interviews. Additionally, explore the possibility of obtaining nationally representative data to validate the findings.

Causal Inference: Acknowledge the limitations of cross-sectional data and consider discussing potential directions for future research, such as longitudinal studies or experiments that can help establish causality.

Inclusion of Socioeconomic Factors: Provide a more comprehensive discussion of why socioeconomic factors were not included in the mediating effects analysis and explore potential avenues for their inclusion in future research.

In conclusion, this article offers valuable insights into wildlife product consumption in Vietnam and its implications for biodiversity conservation and public health. However, addressing the limitations related to sample representativeness, causal inference, and the role of socioeconomic factors would strengthen the overall contribution of the study.