



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Education, Society &amp; Behavioural Science</a>
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

**PART 3:**

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The study is not only interesting but contributes to discourse. The author(s) seek to understand the effect on children of same-sex parenting or otherwise. I agree with the reviewer (third) that this paper is controversial based on conclusions drawn: “on a wide range of child well-being measures, opposite-sex marriage is associated with improved outcomes, but same-sex marriage is associated with lower outcomes”. Since the question asked males and females were different,</p> <p>I am still not clear how the author(s) defined “man-woman” parent and “same sex” parents. OR at least, how did Udry et al. define “same sex”, maybe this have might have eluded my reading. Although I recommend with some degree of caution, there is need to at least have a limitation section to clarify this alongside those of the third reviewer.</p> <p>There is a limitation section required on this paper, alongside how the conclusions drawn.</p>	<p><b>Thank you for this positive comment and for the reasonable questions and concerns noted below.</b></p> <p><b>Only the one question varied by gender, all the rest were the same for males and females. I have added a sentence clarifying this.</b></p> <p><b>This is reported at 154-55, which reads:</b> “WRP identified same-sex parents by comparing the sex of the responding mother with the reported sex of a partner with whom she reported that she was married or living in a marriage-like relationship.” At 169 I report that I followed the same procedure. The entire section 154-212 discusses this definition at length, providing much more detail, including how the sex of each person was identified, and my critiques and corrections of WRP's definition of children with opposite-sex versus same-sex parents. (Udry et al., who designed the survey, did not define “same sex”, but did devise how sex was measured generally.)</p> <p><b>For sure, the small sample size warrants great caution about these findings, despite their strong statistical significance.</b> <b>A “Limitations” paragraph, so titled, with strong disclaimers is located just prior to the Conclusion section. For convenience, what I have said there is copied below.</b></p> <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Despite the signal strengths of Add Health as a large nationally representative dataset, and notwithstanding the strong significance for contrast effects reported above, due to the small sample sizes involved, the findings of this study should be considered only provisional and exploratory until and unless they are confirmed by further research. In particular, the findings presented in Table 4 and related analyses are based on very small or sparse categories and should not be considered definitive without corroboration. Although Add Health enables longitudinal analysis, this study examined data from only one wave, and thus, as with any cross-sectional data, causal inference is not possible. The findings presented in this study are focused on an assessment of measures presented in prior studies, and should not be taken as presenting a comprehensive profile of parenting outcomes.</p>