

# Review of: "Young love in contemporary China: Attitudes and behaviors in romantic relationships"

Allison Uvelli<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Siena

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of: Young love in contemporary China: Attitudes and behaviors in romantic relationships

## 1. Original submission

### 1.1. Recommendation

The article needs to be greatly modified

## 2. Comments to Author

Overview and general recommendation:

The romantic relationships are a topic of interest to many disciplines and many authors. The Chinese perspective about this topic is relevant because aim to clarify a non-westernized point of view regarding attitudes and behaviors involved in the courtship.

Authors tried to evaluate differences and changes of approaching/being approached, start a serious relationship, and have casual sexual encounter of young people in modern China. Because of this, the current study is on a topic of relevance and general interest to the readers of the journal.

Although in the literature there are many studies about romantic relationships, most of these aren't recent. The current study attempts to verify if the traditional vision of serious relationship is still present in the new generations, despite cultural changes, or not.

Despite the topic of interest, the article needs to be greatly modified before it can be published.

I explain my concerns in more detail below.

### 2.1. Comments:

#### *Introduction*

1. Authors should be careful about their english. The entire article needs english editing to correct the grammar.
2. Is it really necessary the "animal part"? (pag. 1, line 1-2-3-4-5 of introduction). I suggest deleting it.
3. Why did you talk about intimate partner violence? (pag. 4, line 33-44). I suggest deleting it.

4. The specific method explanation must be inserted in its correct place (“Methodology”), not in “Introduction”! (pag. 4, line 48-51; pag. 5, line 1-4). I suggest deleting it.
5. The specific results explanation must be inserted in its correct place (“Results”), not in “Introduction”! (pag. 5, line 4-9). I suggest deleting it.
6. The rational must be inserted at the end of the introduction not in the middle of it! (pag. 5, line 10-26). I suggest moving it.
7. In the second research question there isn’t the hypothesis (pag. 5, line 17-18). I suggest inserting it.
8. The “hookup” explanation and the next text must be inserted before the rational (pag. 5, line 27-29, 34-47). I suggest moving it.
9. The limitation must be inserted in its correct place (“Limitation”), not in “Introduction”! (pag. 5, line 30-33). I suggest moving it.
10. It isn’t necessary explain the article structure (pag. 5, line 48-49; pag. 6, line 1-2). I suggest deleting it.

#### *Methodology*

1. Authors should explain why didn’t use a validated tool. Maybe it doesn’t exist in literature? Or a Chinese version? (pag. 6, line 1 of “Materials”). I suggest inserting it.
2. The “Procedure” paragraph is redundant (pag. 7). I suggest inserting the missing words inside “Materials” (pag. 6)
3. Data analysis isn’t complete. I suggest explaining all the statistical procedures in detail.

#### *Discussion and conclusion*

1. Why the limitation is before the discussion? (pag. 14). I suggest moving it after the discussion.
2. The discussion has very few references, it seems conclusions “invented” by the authors without it.
3. In table 8 there ins’t a box plot. Why did you call it in this way?
4. Unfortunately in many parts of the text the English isn’t clear.