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

Keisuke Kokubun

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper attempts to clarify the causes of anxiety among workers in garment factories in Bangladesh. It's a very worthwhile endeavor. However, I think there are some big problems.

There is a leap in the interpretation of variables. Are those who believe that labor unions are responsible for their employees' unrest to be, as the author says, the ones who have been badly incited by labor unions? Rather, shouldn't they be regarded as people who have a good understanding of the definition of labor unions? From the fact that 94.6% of the respondents agreed, it can be seen that this question is not functioning as intended by the author.

Is the following sentence correct? "This study found that workers who lacked the motivation to work were less likely to engage in labor unrest activities."

Relatedly, is the dependent variable "labour unrest" or "engage in labor unrest activities"? Since the details of the questionnaire used in the questionnaire are not written, it is difficult for readers to judge how the author interpreted the results.

The author writes that rumors are the main cause of labor unrest. However, the rumor did not become significant in the multiple regression analysis.

Usually, empirical research papers set a hypothesis in the first half and test it in the second half. However, this paper deviates from that style.
It's definitely an interesting experiment. However, the article is written in an ambiguous way as a whole, so it is difficult for me as a reviewer to evaluate it.