

Review of: "Negative and Extrapositive Attitudes Towards Cold-Blooded Tetrapods Among Students of the Secondary Education Course: Ethical and Normative Aspects"

I. Made Astra¹

¹ Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Materials and Methods

1. The authors need to explain the research method and statistics that were used in the research
2. The authors have not explained whether the questionnaire used was made by themselves or someone else; in addition, the authors have not explained the validity and reliability of the questionnaire used. Have validity and reliability tests for the questionnaire been carried out?
3. The authors had explained the origin of the respondents (grades and schools of origin); however, there's no explanation about the data collection technique or the reasons for how or why the respondents were chosen.

Discussion Section

1. The discussion section should begin with your findings, followed by supporting references.
2. In the 5th paragraph, the authors explained about social attitudes; this section should be explained in the introduction section. Instead of explaining about attitudes, why not mention other studies that really discuss the influence of communities'/students' attitudes on animal conservation?
3. In the 6th paragraph, the word "the so-called" at the beginning of the sentence may make the authors seem to downplay the theory mentioned next. I think it would be better if this word were replaced.

Conclusion Section

The authors need to re-explain the findings obtained: a negative attitude towards snakes and an overly positive attitude towards turtles.

Also, at the beginning of the sentence, the authors explained that this study shows students' ignorance. I think the authors can re-explain the ignorance in question because the term "reptile biology and ecology" seems to be too broad.

References

There are 15 references published more than 20 years ago. The oldest references were published in 1928 and 1935. Please reconsider whether all of these references are really important and should be used. Can they be replaced with more recent and relevant references?

The authors should also add more recent supporting references to the discussion section to support their findings.