

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

Obrian Ndhlovu¹

¹ University of Cape Town

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General Comments

The paper has a lot of typo and grammatical errors that affect the readability of the paper.

The paper has kind of followed the structure of a dissertation and not a journal article.

The methodology is generally weak and not adequately justified.

The analysis is also affected by the weak methodology. The analysis using cross tabulations and bar graphs is inadequate to arrive at conclusions.

Introduction.

The introduction need to cover the usual components of introducing the papers, a synopsis of literature review, identification of gaps, intention of the paper and rationale. This is not well presented. While some literature is presented, its not clear if this intended to highlight gaps in the literature.

The introduction does not introduce the paper.

Literature Review and Main Hypotheses

Literature Review must attempt to identify gaps in the literature in order to inform the paper. What is presented here reads more as statement and justification for the hypotheses.

Hypotheses must where possible indicate direction of relationship, whether positive or negative.

Methodology

Since the data is publicly available, there is no need to spend more on explaining it. Although you mention three stages on

top, the listing goes to the fourth. The usage of terminology such as “581 people got involved in the data collection” could be misleading. I guess the authors want to say 581 were enumerated.

There is too much on the definition of variables. There is also need to pay attention to how certain variables are constructed. For instance, the variable age is grouped with different intervals. This can affect the analysis and how the results should be interpreted.

Results

Sample characteristics should ideally be presented earlier as part of descriptive analysis.

Whenever there is a table, there is need for some introductory sentence, explaining what the table is all about to inform readers on how to interpret the numbers.

Table 1. I assume these are crosstabulations. It would help to indicate the sample size for each column.

Figures 3 to 9. The interpretation of the figures seems incorrect. For instance “In Figure 3,

bush meat consumers accounting for 15.7% have adequate biodiversity knowledge” would lead the reader to think the percentages under bush meat consumers add to 100%. May be it would help to indicate the numbers for “Yes” and “No” so that percentages are interpreted on the basis of these bases. In addition, phrases like “than those without” do not apply in the context of gender.

Figures 9 and 10 are presented without a corresponding introduction.

The academic contribution of the paper should have come earlier in the structure.

My conclusion.

The paper is overall weak, with weak methodology.