




Do We Love or Hate Tinder? Exploring Implicit Bias in Online Relationships through Story Completion Method

Melane Pilek^{1*}, Constance de Saint-Laurent¹

¹ National University of Maynooth Ireland

* Corresponding author email address: melane.pilek.2022@mumail.ie

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Mehdi Purmohammad  Department of Cognitive Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada purmoham@ualberta.ca	Reviewer 1: Kamdin Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Seyed Mohammad Hosseini  Assistant Professor, Department of Health and Rehabilitation in Sports, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: moh_hosseini@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction references various studies, such as Matthews (2023) and Statista (2024), but some citations are placed at the end of long paragraphs. It would be beneficial to integrate these references within the discussion to clarify which claim each citation supports.

The discussion on Bauman's (2003) 'liquid love' concept is relevant but underdeveloped. Expanding on how this theoretical framework informs the study's predictions about Tinder relationships would provide a stronger conceptual basis.

The study states that participants were "randomly assigned" to conditions but does not clarify the method used (e.g., computer-generated randomization). Adding a sentence explaining the randomization process would enhance reproducibility.

The ANOVA results in Table 1 report p-values for relationship outcomes, but the effect sizes (η^2) are very small (e.g., $\eta^2 = 0.004$). This suggests weak practical significance. Discussing the implications of these small effect sizes would help interpret the findings.

The Tukey HSD post-hoc test identified a significant difference between In-Person and Online Community relationships ($p < .001$). However, the manuscript does not explore why online community relationships were perceived more negatively. Expanding this discussion is necessary.

The study reports no significant effects on relationship duration across conditions ($p = .112$). Instead of simply stating the null result, discussing possible reasons (e.g., social desirability bias, limitations in the measurement scale) would add depth.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The research questions outlined in the introduction (e.g., "What are our current representations of online dating and the relationships it fosters?") should be explicitly linked to the study's hypotheses. How do these questions lead to the chosen hypotheses? Clarifying this would improve the logical flow.

The literature review primarily cites studies from 2018–2024. While this is appropriate for capturing contemporary trends, older foundational works on social stigma in online dating (e.g., early 2000s studies) should also be included to provide a historical perspective.

The attention check question ("The Sun is revolving around the Earth") is an interesting choice but might not measure attentiveness as intended. Were any participants excluded for failing this check? Consider justifying why this specific question was used.

The finding that Tinder relationships are not viewed negatively contradicts earlier studies (e.g., Timmermans & De Caluwé, 2017). Addressing this discrepancy explicitly would improve the study's contribution to the literature.

The study suggests Tinder-assisted in-person dates were perceived more positively than online community-initiated relationships. Could this be due to greater clarity in relational intent rather than the dating app itself? Addressing alternative explanations would strengthen the argument.

The use of story completion tasks allows for implicit bias detection, but it also introduces subjectivity. Did the study perform inter-rater reliability checks on participant responses? If not, consider discussing this limitation.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.