



Paper: “The Status of Female Garment Workers’ Health on STIs/HIV and the Role of Garment Factory Owners in Bangladesh”

Corresponding Author: Shakeel Mahmood

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n23p23

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mondira Dutta
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Mondira Dutta	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Garment factory owners' perception on female garment workers' health and HIV/AIDS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0722/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title has clarity and explains the main focus of the paper	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
The objectives are clearly elucidated	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
English grammar is of a high level and pretty clear	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The study methods are focused on literature reviews only. There are no primary sources of information collected	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<p>The body of the paper does not contain any primary sources of information and no tables at all. The whole paper is based on literature reviews alone. The literature focuses mainly on those published between 1983 and 2019.</p> <p>Nevertheless, some analysis based on these may be attempted.</p> <p>The literature studied could be tabulated or classified into time wise categories and show how the trend has changed or not. The 86 documents scanned on the basis of the key words used like 'owner', 'ready-made', 'readymade', 'RMG' 'sexually transmitted disease', 'human immune deficiency viruses', 'syphilis', 'gonorrhoea', 'chlamydia', 'violence', 'women and health', 'female', 'labour', 'labor', 'garment' or 'clothing' or 'fabric' or 'textile', and 'Bangladesh' could be tabulated to analyze the trend of the thought process of the garment factory owners. These key words may be grouped further and made into sub heads</p> <p>This would bring in a sharp quality display in terms of content and research-orientation in the study. At present just, a mere literature review does not throw much light on the quality of the paper.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The Conclusions can be made in the light of a content analysis of the sub heads. Otherwise the paper has begun very well but lacks in research orientation.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References are in APA style which is the standard mode of display. Some international organizations' publications may be included such as the UNDP, UN Women, etc	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is well started but lacks research orientation. Does need to include a few tables and graphs if necessary. This paper would be a very good piece of information.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Please do a plagiarism check before accepting it for publication.