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

Martha Mariela Zarco-González

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Although it could be an interesting exercise to evaluate whether the perception towards or contact with nature influences the consumption of wildlife products, unfortunately from the evaluation of the variables, the hypotheses, the analyzes applied, and even the conclusions, reflect confusion of the authors regarding concepts and inferences that invalidate the information generated.

Since the manuscript does not have the numbered lines to refer to them, I placed each paragraph in quotes and then the observation about it.

1. Authors said: “Thus, published studies to date provide evidence that socio-demographic factors may be confounding factors in the associations of CTN and POB with WPC. Even though the ecological impacts of WPC have been well studied, social aspects of CTN and POB are still poorly explored.” These sentences are contradictory, especially considering that in previous paragraphs they mention some socioeconomic variables and how they influence perception and WPC, so it is not consistent that they later say that there is no prior information.
2. “However, there is no strong evidence of a correlation between potential benefits of pro-environmental perspectives and reduction in wildlife protect consumption” It should say wildlife product consumption.
3. Hypotheses 1 and 2 are too simple, they could have at least addressed them, in 3 and 4 they could also have explained in what sense the association they mention is.
4. Introduction too long and repetitive.
5. “Do you have any products made from animal skin/leather/fur? The response options are no (=0) and yes (=1).” However, it would have been interesting to include the “don't know” response option, as people may not always be aware of the ingredients or origin of the products they consume.
6. “The reliability index of WPC in the present study is unacceptable ($\alpha = 0.4033$).” Is this a writing mistake? Because as it is, the reader can interpret that the information regarding the WPC is not reliable? So what sense does the rest of the analysis have? Or how useful is the information generated? The same thing happens with the CTN section.
7. Why not calculate a single reliability indicator for all questions focused on analyzing perceptions about biodiversity instead of one for each subsection?
8. Regarding the questions to evaluate the objects affected by biodiversity loss, instead of asking about different scales or personal contexts (my life, my family, my neighborhood, and my city), it would probably have been more interesting to ask about different aspects directly related to the person, for example: my health, my recreation space, my

economy, my job... etc. Although this is just an opinion because perhaps it is already considered in the first section of questions.

9. Description of the study site is missing.
10. I think there could be questions that would better inform about contact with nature, instead of asking if they have plants or pets, for example if they enjoy outdoor activities such as camping or hiking, if they know of any nature reserves, etc.
11. Based on what criteria were the age class divisions made, as well as the rest of the socioeconomic variables?
12. “There are significant differences between bush meat consumption among potential consequences of biodiversity loss, public park nearby, and gender” This wording is strange, it would be better to describe what the relationship is like, that is, do people with pro-environmental behavior have less tendency to WPC? Or the oldest ones? Or the women? Because as they are written, the results don't really say much, only that there are differences, but the reader cannot know in what sense those differences are. This is also not easy to infer from the results presented in the tables.
13. “General knowledge of biodiversity is reflected by biodiversity knowledge and perception.” Is necessary to correct the wording.
14. Biodiversity knowledge is reflected by the question: “How do you assess your knowledge about biodiversity?” The response options are “never heard about”, “poor”, “adequate”, and “good”. What they are evaluating is not the knowledge of the interviewee, but their perception of their own knowledge. They would have had to apply questions whose answers they could classify as correct or incorrect to really talk about knowledge.
15. Biodiversity perception is reflected by the question: “What is your thinking of biodiversity loss?” You cannot evaluate the perception of biodiversity by asking about loss of biodiversity, they are different things, so the answer to that question will be giving different information than what was intended to be evaluated.
16. It is not appropriate to talk about “obvious” differences as the authors mention, what they must show is whether there were statistically significant differences.
17. “In Figure 3, bush meat consumers accounting for 15.7% have adequate biodiversity knowledge. In Figure 4, bush meat consumers accounting for 35.0% consider biodiversity loss as a major problem. In Figure 5, traditional medicine consumers accounting for 12.0% have adequate biodiversity knowledge. In Figure 6, traditional medicine consumers accounting for 24.9% consider biodiversity loss as a major problem. In Figure 7, skin/leather/fur consumers accounting for 8.4% have adequate biodiversity knowledge. In Figure 8, skin/leather/fur consumers accounting for 17.2% consider biodiversity loss as a major problem.” This doesn't say much, nor do the graphs.
18. “In table 2, 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. Also, the respondents with high preventive measures of biodiversity loss were more likely to consume traditional medicine than those without. Similarly, the male respondents with petting, aesthetic plants/pets affect, willingness to visit a national park were more likely to consume skin/leather/fur than those without. Moreover, the respondents with preventive measures of biodiversity loss were more likely to consume traditional medicine and skin/leather/fur than those without. Thus, hypotheses 1 and 2 are supported.” All of this seems contradictory to what the authors presented as background information in the literature review, and it is not understood in any way how this supports their hypotheses, if in addition, the hypotheses did not raise anything concrete.