



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	

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The author's efforts in understating the political and demographic scenarios of countries world wide is commendable. However there are few issues that need clarification in this manuscript. They are as follows – Results and discussion sections should be modified with more clarity on the following – 1. The result section does not describe whether the outliers were present only for the five countries that feature in the article during the reference period. 2. For Chile, there was a fluctuation in the secondary sex ratio between 1967-71 with decrease in the alternate years, this fluctuation has not been explained in the results and also not discussed adequately. 3. No explanation is there for the increased M/F ratio in 1988 in Argentina. Limitations of the study should be added.	1. This has been dealt with in the methods section, see "Access was provided directly to the download area by WHO authorities (Mie Inou – personal communication). During the data processing of M/F at continental level, several outlier years were noted. These were Chile..." 2. This has been dealt with in the discussion section under this country, with an addition to the paragraph beginning "Economic stress may be hypothesized.." 3. No explanation was found for the 1988 spike and this is now mentioned in the discussion. Several limitations have been mentioned as per previous reviewers (1-3).
Minor REVISION comments	1. Please clarify which events are considered as population stress. Can the world cup tournament be considered as population stress? 2. Whether the assessment was done for all the countries for which reports were available needs to be mentioned.	1. Stressful events that have been shown to reduce M/F are now included in the introduction. The World Cup was not mentioned as a stressful but as yet another influence on M/F. 2. This is now mentioned in the discussion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. The period for which the mortality data was analysed should also be mentioned in the methods section. 4. There could have been many confounders for the assumed associations. 5. From this study it is not possible to conclude that M/F ratio is a sensitive indicator of population stress as there is no accounting for any confounders and whether the events described are cause enough for population stress. The events discussed are contextual evidence and may not be causal.	3. Mortality was not studied. Mortality is only mentioned as the name of the WHO database. 4. This has been acknowledged as a limitation just before the methods section. 5. The fact that M/F may be a useful indicator albeit not necessarily a sensitive one has been acknowledged by changing the last sentence of the discussion.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Methods section can give the detail on how the local situations and events described as population stress were arrived at and whether any local institutional help was sought in this regard.	This is now mentioned in the methods section. The fact that no local institutional help is also mentioned as requested.