



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>
<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>Furthermore, it is expected of the author to make</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	University Of Maiduguri, Nigeria