



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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article looks more like a dissertation</p> <p>The article needs reformatting the methods and selection of parents and analysis of present study as separate clear sections at the beginning</p> <p>Critical analysis of the previous study should follow after the results of the present study</p> <p>Too much details are given regarding previous study and some sections are repeated as line 150-161 and 162 to 167</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>As the title indicates, this is a <i>replication</i> study, which means that it is necessary to describe in some detail the sample and procedures of the study being replicated prior to reporting my own results. The primary purpose of reporting my own results is to contrast them with those of the previous study.</p> <p>However, in response to this comment and those of another reviewer, I have reformatted, clarified and separated the critique from the presentation of results more clearly, in ways that address much of the concerns that you state.</p> <p>Lines 150-161 is an extended quote from the previous study describing some of the characteristics of their sample. In lines 162-167 I describe the corresponding</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>How the control 44 selected is not clear</p> <p>and the reason for using weightage values not clear</p> <p>Line 168- to 205 not clear. If written after the present study analysis of data it better</p>	<p>characteristics of my sample, which are the same, to show that I have successfully replicated their sample. This is not a repetition; the fact that the same numbers are reported in the two sections is necessary to confirm that the replication was successful.</p> <p>Very true; this is one of my critiques of the prior study. I did not use the control 44 in my study, as I discuss in the paper.</p> <p>I think this is fully explained in the methods section, which explains that this is a complex multi-stage probability sample which is rendered population representative through the use of post-stratification weights. To perhaps clarify better, I have renamed the DATA AND MEASURES section to DATA AND METHODS. Also see lines 285-312, which discusses the weighting in detail. If this is still unclear, please let me know exactly what is unclear and I will sharpen the language to address the lack.</p> <p>Again, I think the key to understanding this section is to understand that this is</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 270 407 can be summarized for reader to understand the critical analysis</p> <p>Clarify the ethical issue: Did the writer obtain permission from previous authors and ethical clearance for present study is very important as sexual abuse etc is studied</p>	<p>describing a replication. This section reports my attempts to replicate the previous study's sample; discovery of their errors; and my correction of them.</p> <p>Again, this is describing the replication. The main heading in this section is "Step Two: Replication". Understanding the replication is necessary in order to understand the critical analysis and re-analysis.</p> <p>Thank you for raising this point. Both the previous authors and myself are using publicly available data collected under a US government, so there is no ethical issue of this nature involved (as another reviewer notes). However, your comment indicates that I failed to make that clear enough, and you are correct that I have not acknowledged my ethical oversight for this research. In response to this comment, I have added the following sentences to the beginning of the Methods section. All but the last sentence are contractually stipulated by Add Health, and should have been included in the original draft. Thank</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>you for pointing out this important omission.</p> <p>This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis. The author's management and use of the data has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Catholic University of America.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		