



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Some mention is necessary why so different countries from South America to Australia have been included. 2. In methods period of data needs inclusion. 3. What events increase the ratio and what events decrease the ratio may be clearly mentioned. Second para of introduction creates confusion. 4. In discussion it is mentioned that the fall in ratio may be quite sudden, occurring in less than nine months but the figures do not support it. Author may give reasons for that. 5. Author says 0.515 is normal value; Chile has remained for considerable period below the normal statistic, hence author should give some explanation. In fact excepting 1972 wherein sudden rise was noted it has remained below expected value. 6. Argentina has also remained throughout below the expected value. Author may explain.	1. This is explained in the methods section, an inspection of outlier values from several continental studies. 2. Done. 3. Introduction modified to include these factors (some of them) 4. Agreed, hence the following statement has been added: "Thus, it appears that some of the influences reduced M/F after just a few months while others may have exerted their ultimate influence after nine months." 5. True, hence the statement (rather intransigently) claiming a normal M/F of 0.515 has been eliminated and replaced – see last sentence of first paragraph of introduction. 6. As above.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Population sex ratio, sex ratio at birth is understood differently in South East Asian countries. Therefore some mention of different definition may be included. 2. Discussion mentions effect of September 11 attacks on M/F ratio in California and the reason given is media exposure. In fact whole of the world was watching the event, why only California perceived the change? 3. What was the proportion of birth registration in these countries in the mentioned long period?	1. This is now mentioned in the second paragraph of the methods section, as a limitation. 2. The paragraph has been expanded to include mention that the entire US was affected. 3. It is assumed to be close to 100% but this cannot be completely certain and this limitation is mentioned in the methods section with regard to the caveats that WHO categorically states re. the accuracy of its data, which is totally dependent on accurate



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Can the registration be differential in stress period? 4. The sex ratio at birth in South East Asian countries is affected by sex selection and elimination. Some assertive statement mentioning absence of such scenario may be included. 5. In each figure different scale is used. It suggested that common scale may be used. 6. The reason given for rise in Argentina in 1978 seems to be too theoretical. 7. Author not mentioned any reason for sudden drop in the ratio in 1990. 8. Author has tried to explain high value in Australia in 1956. The changes are gradual and contradictory to what is mentioned in starting portion in discussion.	reporting. 4. A sentence to this effect has been added to the first part of the introduction. 5. This was done deliberately in order to use as much of the graph charting area as possible. The range for all M/F ratios is wide and using the same scale would have left very large parts of graphs empty. But this change can be done if the editor insists. 6. Agreed but this was the only potential reason that could be found! 7. There is no drop in 1990 for Argentina (figure 2). 8. The potential gradualness, as well as suddenness of M/F changes has been mentioned in several places in the paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. It seems that author has first reviewed the data and then trying to explain the reasons for peaks and troughs. Instead author may clearly define what events may lead to tress; Like general election, war, mass casualty etc. Then list out from the history the years in which such events occurred and then analyse the data.	The methodology has been further expanded to explain how the study was done.