

# Review of: "Factors contributing to labour unrest at the garment factories in Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study"

Gregory Kunyenje<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Catholic University of Malawi

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I have reviewed a paper entitled "Factors contributing to labour unrest at the garment factories in Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study". This paper examined factors contributing to labour unrest among garment factory workers in Bangladesh and used hierarchical linear regression to analyse the case.

**Abstract.** The abstract provides clarity of the topic and is appropriate as it presents the aim, methodology, findings and contribution to new knowledge.

**Introduction.** A proper background based on the Bangladesh factory setting and adequately justifies the choice of the topic. However, the problem statement which is coming in the literature review section should be moved to the introduction section. A clear statement of the problem has been progressed within the introduction. Literature review section should merely be used to enhance the problem statement outlined in the introduction. In other words, the introduction section should not merely provide a description of the context of study but go beyond to show the gap. Further, at the end of the introduction, the authors should guide the readers of the paper by outlining what should be expected.

**Literature review.** The section properly articulates the gap to be studied. However, it may help to move some of the sentences to the introduction section to demonstrate what was to be studied. Currently, the entire introduction has been dedicated to the context instead of providing a review of what the actual gap supported with literature is. Also, the authors should provide the conceptual framework for the study within the literature review.

**Methodology.** The paper should clearly state the approach that was adopted in the study. Was it a mixed-method study? In one sense, the authors appear to suggest a quantitative approach while in another it is a mixed-method. Generally, a purposive sampling technique and in-depth interviews are associated with qualitative study. Once that has been clearly stated, the paper should continue providing justification for the sampling techniques and data collection instruments that were used. It is suggested that the paper provides justification supported with proper literature.

**Results.** Results are presented based on a quantitative approach. If a mixed-method approach was used, which does not seem to be the case, the authors must also present the qualitative findings. This is the more reason why the study should clearly state the approach that was adopted to avoid this confusion. It is best practice to restate the aim of the study at the start of the results section. In this case, under section 4, there could be a repeat of the gap that was under study to remind readers what the paper was about.

**Discussion.** The paper seems to have focused on an investigation although the problem statement was aimed at an examination. This inconsistency must be addressed in the paper.

**Conclusion.** Both discussion and conclusion sections seem to suggest that this was an investigation, and not an examination. The authors must review the paper and remain consistent in terms of the gap that was to be filled.

**Overall.** Publish with some corrections as suggested in this review.