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In the 8th and 9th sentence of 6th Paragraph of ‘Discussion’ section of the article, we erroneously mentioned that “Similarly, Dinno et al., in their review on the effect of homosexuality on traditional heterosexual marriages, stated that allowing same-sex marriage would undermine respect for the unique status of traditional marriage, and this could lead to further deinstitutionalization, including an increase in out-of-wedlock births, divorce etc. The same concerns were shared by respondents in our study.” This statement was originally stated by Clark et al. in his review “The problems of Perry: Exposing the flaws of its assault on traditional marriage. The Human Life Review 2011;59:97–128.” while quoting a statement by David Blankenhorn, an expert witness for the defendants in one of the proceedings at United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Perry that “allowing same-sex marriage would undermine respect for the unique status of traditional marriage, and this could lead to further deinstitutionalization, including an increase in out-of-wedlock births, divorce, etc”. The same concerns were shared by respondents in our study. However Dinno et al. in his review disagreed with the statement and concluded that legalization of same sex union or same sex marriages have no effect on the rates of opposite sex marriages.

The 8th and 9th sentence should read: Similarly, researchers have expressed concerns about the effect of same-sex marriage on the traditional marriages. Clark et al. had quoted a statement by David Blankenhorn, an expert witness for the defendants in one of the proceedings at United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Perry that “allowing same-sex marriage would undermine respect for the unique status of traditional marriage, and this could lead to further deinstitutionalization, including an increase in out-of-wedlock births, divorce, etc”. The same concerns were shared by respondents in our study. However Dinno et al. in his review disagreed with the statement and concluded that legalization of same sex union or same sex marriages have no effect on the rates of opposite sex marriages.


The authors apologize for any inconvenience caused by these errors.