



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJESBS_19337
Title of the Manuscript:	The Unexpected Harm of Same-sex Marriage: A Critical Appraisal, Replication and Re-analysis Of Wainright and Patterson's Studies of Adolescents with Same-sex Parents Same sex
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Generally, the research is well conducted and of course, well written. The Author has exhibited a kind of skills, fairness and an in-depth study in the course of appraising and re-analysing the existing research on this subject matter. All the Data and variables used in the research seem to be correct and well-analysed. All the tables and figures used portrayed and reflected the data and outcome of the research. Finally, the references on the paper indicate not only the richness about the paper but also supports and corroborates the quality and quantity of the data.</p> <p>However, in a research of this nature, and of course, regardless of its theme and focus, it is expected of the author to go beyond a sociological aspect of the research. He should make pithy reference also to the legal aspect of same-sex marriage in order to ascertain the implication of its prohibition in some jurisdictions. That is t say, whether or not the harm experienced by children of same-sex couples forms the basis of the prohibition. To this end, the author may wish to lay his hand on the article of David C. Walker, [Counsel of Record, 2000]. He may also wish to see the U.S Supreme Court decision on the matter, particularly the case of James Obergefell & Brittani Henry et al v. Richard Hodges'</p>	<p>Thank you for this very perceptive comment and for your kind comments above. I am very familiar with David Walker's amicus brief (for the American College of Pediatricians) submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court in the case you cite, which cites a preliminary version of the research reported more fully in this paper. I do not feel it is appropriate, in this scientific paper, to explicitly address the legal questions implicated in this research, which indeed may differ from country to country. However, I have addressed the pertinent underlying arguments and truth-claims of the legal issues in the discussion section. I have revised this section somewhat to</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Furthermore, it is expected of the author to make attempt to address some lacunas identified in Wainright & Patterson's study of adolescents [2004]. These include the implication of the study on public policies and the justification for discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in matters related to adoption and child custody.</p>	<p>make this more clear.</p> <p>Also, to include before now the explicit citation you note would have violated the anonymity of blind peer review, but (since you have been so perceptive as to make the connection) I will add that reference following this round of review and comment. This will enable the reader to easily find a clear and explicit application of this research to the legal questions, at least for the United States.</p> <p>I think it was wrong of Wainright and Patterson to make such applications in their study, and do not want to repeat that mistake in my study. I certainly encourage the use of this research in support of policy decisions such as you mention, however I am not an expert on the standards for adoption and custody, and do not feel qualified to make such policy claims myself. Of course I may express my opinions in a separate editorial at some point, but I prefer not to do so in a scientific paper,</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		