

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

Qihui Chen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> China Agricultural University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

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

The paper investigates an interesting topic: Which matters more for wildlife product consumption in Vietnam, perception of biodiversity or connection to Nature? A structural equation modeling framework was applied to a dataset with 500+ observations collected through an online survey. While I think the paper has done some decent analysis that can make a potential contribution to the literature, I also see a lot of room for improvement, as detailed below.

1. It's better to clearly state your research question[s], as well as the identified gaps in knowledge that your study intends to fill, in the Introduction. The logic of deriving your motivation from the existing literature is a bit odd. A more natural logic would be to describe the problem at hand first, look back at the literature to learn how much has been done to understand and resolve the problem, identify the existing gaps, and then talk about your own study design.
2. Many of the hypotheses were put forward rather hasty. For example, the first hypothesis proposed: "...urban residents would not prefer WPC". I guess it won't be hard to find some other studies that argue against this.
3. Related to my previous point and more generally, deriving all your hypotheses from the literature is really not a good way to conduct research. What about those possibilities that existing studies have yet to examine? This could be a potential loophole in your research design. I suggest that the authors think carefully about the underlying theory first, develop a solid theoretical framework, and then combine some of the literature to put forward some testable hypotheses.
4. The paper lacks a unified analytical framework at the beginning to guide empirical analysis. Only some separate hypotheses were proposed. But, the authors managed to identify some structure (e.g., Figure 9) from the data. So, I wonder: shouldn't you have some structure in mind first and then use your data to test this structure? In the current write-up, the development of the paper goes backward.
5. The way the authors state their hypotheses is problematic. For example, "Hypothesis 1: POB is associated with WPC." But anything is either associated with something else, or it is not. So, testing the association between two variables is not informative enough. At least, you should derive the direction of the association: Do you expect the association to be positive or negative?

6. The study sample was collected through a website. The authors ought to assess the representativeness of the sample.
7. As a scientific paper (as opposed to a term paper for a graduate course), there is no need to describe the (STATA) commands you used in the analysis. You could provide your codes as supplementary materials.
8. The paper needs some English editing efforts. Grammatical errors and other language problems (e.g., incorrect uses of articles and tense) can be found at times. For example, line 6 of the very first paragraph: “Javan rhinoceros from Vietnam in 2010 is extinct.” should be “Javan rhinoceros from Vietnam was extinct in 2010.” Also, the very first sentence of the Literature Review section: “Cities consists of...” should be “Cities consist of...”