



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18393
Title of the Manuscript:	Regional variation in the secondary sex ratio in Sweden, 1749-1869
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Line No 45: Why was the data transferred to traditional definition? ie per 100 females(instead of accepted definition- per 1000 females)-Please justify	All changes are yellowed and deleted parts are strikethrough. Berg's data are old and recent data are usually given per 100 females. Therefore, the transformation so that the readers can more easily compare different studies
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Repetition of comments of high SR and low SR counties in lineNo.189-193 and again 200-202. Author/s can avoid repetition and mention only once. • Line 101-> None of the family parameters—paternal age, maternal age, age difference of parents could explain the time trends. Line 218-219->The difference (lower fertility)most <u>marked in the higher age group</u> seems to indicate an early influence of birth control. Explain these two contradictory statements in the context of SR.	The short sentence, line 200-202 are deleted and the long one, 189-193 is kept Line 101 correspond to Vartiainen et al. and line 218-219 to Hofsten & Lindström. There is a slight contradiction, but this (my) study has no information about maternal age so that decisions can be made. Hence, the contradictory statements must speak for themselves.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Manuscript should end with a note on “ Conclusion.”	My opinion is that the first paragraph (lines 190-199) of the discussion explains the conclusions and should be moved to a Conclusion section.