

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

Tuomo Kauranne

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article addresses a very important ecological issue with a robust statistical method and comes to a striking conclusion, but its exposition should be improved to make this conclusion both more comprehensible and more refined - precisely because it is so striking!

I am therefore putting only my major questions and suggestions here. The exposition is written in very good English and has appropriate references so no comments on these.

1. The article uses Bayesian logistic regression but the way it is used here is unfamiliar to me and yet I am generally well-versed in Bayesian modelling in a wider sense. So I would add a detailed description of this method and its parameters in the Methodology section. What are the epsilon's?
2. The REALLY striking conclusion that the article arrives at is the acceptance of the hypothesis $POB \rightarrow CTN \rightarrow WPC$, especially leather, and rejection of the alternative causal chain (if I understood the Figures 9 and 10 right - they do need more detailed explanation). So in words, "people that are aware of biodiversity loss feel strong connection to nature and therefore prefer wildlife products, such as leather clothing?" This chain seems so illogical that it needs further justification, e.g. by verbal questions to respondents, if possible. Such a conclusion begs three possible explanations: either there is some logical flaw in the deduction leading to the acceptance of such a strange hypothesis; or otherwise respondents are very incoherent in their thinking; or that the concept of CTN is seen in multiple different ways by Vietnamese environmentally oriented people (or two different subsets of such people?) that see CTN through the lens of POB, or through the lens of favoring "original nature products"?

So I remain baffled and intrigued by this conclusion and would love to understand more clearly what the careful quantitative analysis carried out is really telling us?