

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_97568
Title of the Manuscript:	Left-Handed Mothers and LGBTQ+ Child Acceptance: Exploring the Link through Empathy
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it explores an interesting connection between mother's handedness and acceptance of their children.</p> <p>The title is ok except that empathy is inferred rather than measured. It would be better to cite the actual likely intervening variable and then discuss empathy in relation to that variable.</p> <p>The abstract is fine except it might need changing after the author revises the paper in line with my suggestions.</p> <p>The subsections are fine.</p> <p>It's ok scientifically but needs or could use improvement.</p> <p>The references are sparse; there could be several relevant articles for each citation currently used.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the English is fine.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One limitation is that fathers were not sampled. The results might differ for fathers and the results for mothers should not be generalized to fathers. 2. There is another possible causal factor behind left-handedness. When I was growing up, teachers used to beat/scold left-handedness "out" of you. If you had the gumption to resist that abuse, you probably could resist other forms of oppression. Thus left-handed mothers may be more mature and able to stand up for their children's differences and fight with them against oppressive conventions. That is such mothers may be less conventional and more independent, factors that may be driving their greater acceptance rather than left-handedness per se. 3. Section 2.1 needs to be expanded on where and when the sample was collected and how randomness was attained. 4. Section 2.3 should present more data on the Cronbach alphas for each scale used and any prior validity testing, including construct validity. 5. Section 2.4 points to a regression analysis and we do have a test of interaction but I'd want to see a main effects analysis, using handedness, religiosity, education, age, minority race, and parent's own LGBTQ status to predict experience of rejection which then would predict acceptance of LGBTQ children. Why not do this? Then discuss the interaction effect. 6. Why was social desirability bias not measured? There are ways to do so (see Schumm, 2015, p. 40, Navigating Controversy, Comprehensive Psychology). 7. My calculation is that the effect size for rejection in early life was about 1.37 which was about the same effect size as for religiosity. If some of the mothers were LGBTQ, perhaps they felt rejection early in life for other reasons as well as handedness. 8. Section 3.1, the minimum and maximum ages of the mothers should be reported as well as the mean and SD. (it's one way to test if data are legitimate since the ratio of range to SD should be in the range of 3 to 8). 9. Overall, a nice report, but it can be improved. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Walter Schumm
Department, University & Country	Kansas State University, United States