



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	The author(s) of this manuscript seems that made a good job. The abstract is a good abstract. The introduction dealt concisely with what matters about the topic. The methodology, including sections well balanced about data and measures, analysis and limitations was clear and comprehensible. The results could be in a separate part of the manuscript, distinguishing better from the methodology. Tables and figures are good. The statistical analysis is the strongest weapon in this manuscript, supposed to criticise the finds of other authors. The discussion would be a little bit improved dealing with what mentioned before in the results. Conclusions are clear, objectives, and taking the main points worked. References are good and enough.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Some of the points below would be better if discussed appropriately in the discussion section.</p> <p>Between lines 383 and 390. How could be possible the co-presence of higher grade point average and school connectedness (advantageous) with anxiety and autonomy (disadvantageous)? Here the author says that will not discuss it, but in the discussion it pointed out! Why not talk a little bit in the proper place (discussion) about it?</p> <p>Between lines 475 and 482. It would be the case of more than the family type, the stability vs. instability decides if the child is more or less healthy?</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Between lines 585 and 589. So, intelligence is associated with mental problems, and mental problems are not associated with school problems?	
	Between lines 590 and 594. How to overcome this bias?	
<u>Optional/General</u> Comments	<p>We read and studied this manuscript, looking for the references to understand better what the author posted. We do learn with this paper. We believe we need such kind of scientific work being widespread to society, rising the knowledge about child and adolescent mental health in any situation. In fact, talking about the subject in such special field, as the same-sex parents are, make us aware of the poor knowledge we pursuit even nowadays, because of prejudice. We believe this manuscript would contribute a lot to our understanding not only about the topic searched, but indeed about the good science we deserve to be done, always.</p> <p>The manuscript is a study based on the previous data analysed by other authors ten years ago. The source of data is public, so there are no ethical issues in this manuscript.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paulo Verlaine Borges e Azevêdo
Department, University & Country	University of Goiás, Brazil