



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_14429
Title of the Manuscript:	Population stress, civil unrest and the male to female ratio at birth in Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Australia and Finland
Type of the Article	Statistical correlation/Epidemiology/Public Health

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		Changes in text made in highlighter yellow
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	How do the authors rule out other factors, in addition to the ones offered by them to explain fluctuations? The same event (e.g. the World Cup may cause happiness, and excitement or sadness and stress,, potentially having opposite effects. What is the evidence that stressed women spontaneously abort more frequently male than female products? The explanation provided in paragraph 2 of introduction seems reasonable, but teleological. Have any mechanisms for such "preferential" abortion been advanced? The proposal that in Australia one individual (Mr. Vladimir Petrov) single handedly changed the male to female birth ratio seems unlikely, and impossible to support. When using qualifiers throughout the text, such as: may, possible, wonders, somehow, hints, etc; it is difficult to conclude that the results (transient stress) provide a "sensitive indicator".	Very true, a limiting factor since only birth data was available. This is now acknowledged just before the methods section. Bruckner's study after September 11 showed an excessive of male foetal losses in the entire US. This is now cited. I apologize for the oversight and should have cited this paper in the first instance. The individual only precipitated the events which escalated between the two parties. This is now amplified and a new reference has been added. (McHenry DE). Agreed, and the term sensitive has been changed to possible which is more in keeping with the overall tone of the paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		