

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

Jose Lopez-Collado¹

¹ Colegio de Postgraduados

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Paper:

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

General comments

The paper is interesting because it covers the conflicting interests between consumers of wildlife products and biodiversity conservation. Conclusions are somewhat weak because the analysis is based on the perception of interviewees.

Regarding the hypothesis, maybe reduce the number to just one that include considering the association of POC and CTN with WPC and their interactions. There is no clear operationalization of the proposed variables in the methodology. Also, should better describe logistic analysis in terms of model parameters, not software commands. Manuscript need to be checked to provide a clear understanding of the ideas authors try to convey. For example, in the abstract it says "... Wildlife product consumption (WPC) is a serious conservation challenge for biodiversity loss in Vietnam...", rather WPC is a challenge for biodiversity conservation. Conclusions like penalties are beyond the scope of the paper. Also, check the redaction by a native speaker.

Specific comments:

Abstract

First statement is kind of misleading, should indicate that wildlife conservation is challenged by consumption, not the other way.

Materials and Methods

Should describe model construction as model structure and parameter estimation rather than software commands.

Results

Move main (significant) results of table 2 to text and just mention which relationships were not significant.

Simplify result presentation to a minimum of statistical test results.

policy implications

"...Low level of diversity knowledge is the main determinant of current dramatic biodiversity loss..." is not supported by the research, the paper only reflects opinions of people but did not directly quantify diversity loss directly.

Strengths

The objective of the paper was not to compare regression methods, so there is no point to conclude which method is better than other.

Limitations

Questions regarding general knowledge of biodiversity assume that interviewees understand the concept of biodiversity.

Conclusions

Limit conclusions to main findings. Exclude first conclusion. Also, suggesting penalties to reduce WPC is a little bit over reaching, maybe education about biodiversity conservation could be another alternative but is beyond the purpose of the paper.