

Review of: "Religiocentric Expression, Intolerance, and Conflict between Majority and Minority Ethnic Groups in Bangladesh"

Elmira Lyapina

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for inviting me to review this article.

Writing this review from the perspective of the academic in international law, rather than a psychological sociology, I will not aim on commenting chosen statistical approaches and methods⁶ as well as technical features in the article, I would rather concentrate on the weak points of the article or unclear and missing points, which article lacks, for me, as a reader (or even as a stricter reader - reviewer).

Given the fact of eternal conflict between majorities and minorities, due to disbalance of the power distribution, the topic will be always relevant. Considering the recent clashes between the Hindus and Muslims in India, the topic brings more interest in the neighbor area with the opposite religious-power distribution, as in Bangladesh.

1. The chosen topic is very interesting and relevant.
2. The research question presented in "The Present Study" is not very correlating with the one presented in the "Discussion" chapter. Moreover, in my opinion, none of the presented questions were answered. The provided answers were merely weak connection between the statistical data and the general issue of minority-majority conflicts and partially religious intolerance (although not clear - how particularly).
3. In the "Theoretical Framework" were not considered/provided basis for review of religious views of the examined minorities – polytheism and animalism. Besides such important definitions as religiocentric expression are missing or provided in unclear terms.
4. With the research question and provided theoretical framework is also connected another weak point of this article: unclear concept which is followed in this research.
5. In regard to statistical data – there were missing more information on limitations, such as (1) incorrect or unclear questions, presented in the questionnaire, (2) simple random sampling in selecting the respondents (eg. - why then just men?), (3) was not explained the correlation between the social status and religion, although it was mentioned, (4) unclear final amount of respondents included in this research, (5) the nature of presented religions, (6) unclear ranging in the questionnaire - from 1 to 4, but with the ambiguous description (7) ways of religiocentric expression (especially within the chapter "Religiocentric Expression & Conflict").
6. In discussion of empirical studies, considering insignificant differences in numbers, are missing remarks and/or explanatory notes on particular limitations. In regard to limitations shall be mentioned other factors as social-political discourse of the country, recent developments, particular cases of conflicts or intolerance, legal framework, etc.
7. In "Methods" – "Religious Intolerance" quite ambiguous statements. Probably need to be double-checked.

8. Providing the Figure 1 – is quite unclear, whether the Religiocentric expression influences the social-political status?

Overall, the topic is very interesting, but I would suggest to consider the above-mentioned changes for better result of the research.

Best,

E.L.