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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:
The study is very interesting and novel. Further, it is theoretically motivated and informed, making it an interesting perspective on an understudied topic.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Abstract
* There are a few typos in the abstract (spacing issue around the age of the people in the sample).
* The abstract should potentially contain a bit more information about the specific research question and/or hypotheses.
Introduction / Lit Review

* Page 3, line 5, missing a comma after electrolysis
* Page 3, line 7, missing a word for clarity — perhaps, including from the more intimate parts (from would be the missing word)
* Page 3, line 15, change which to that
* Perhaps report some of the specific findings from past studies on the % of women who remove pubic hair
* Page 3, lines 43-45 - the first sentence of this paragraph is awkwardly worded — perhaps change which to that, or consider comma usage.
* Page 3, missing comma after "unsightly"?
  * I'm not sure which citation method you're using, but do you need a specific page number when using direct quotes?
* Page 4, line 28, to which instead of in which
* Page 4, line 30 - unclear sentence - re-word for clarity. Do you mean slowly instead of slowing?
* Page 4, line 31-32, missing comma after Hope
* In general, please look up proper comma usage around the word "which" and when to use which vs. that.
* Page 4, line 48, missing a space after the citations and the next sentence.
* The sentence "the current research includes an expiration of the influence of feminism on young ……" - should be factored into the abstract early on so that the reader knows that this is what the paper is about.
* Page 4, last line, missing comma after date
* Page 5, line 4, should decision after young women's be plural (given that women is plural)?
* Theory of planned behaviour can be repeated - adding TPB just adds to the reader's cognitive load
* Same for PBC - in general, avoid acronyms unless the acronym itself has interpretable meaning
* Same for PWM (which you sometimes write as PMW)

Current Research
* Perhaps use a bullet point / numbered list to make the hypotheses easier to read (and to avoid them reading like a long run-on sentence.

Method
* Page 7, line 11, missing spaces "$20,000ayear"

Procedure
* Change , to . After word "pages on line 28 of Page 7
* Are you able to tell how many participants came from the "Girls Advice" facebook page? This seems like a group that could somewhat lead to a skewed sample.

Measures
* Last paragraph on Page 7, missing commas
* Some of the characteristics listed for those who do not remove pubic hair seem contradictory (e.g., conservative and independent/alternative thinker?)
* Please provide more information than "based on established scales" and then the citations - provide the names and psychometrics of the established scales.
* The wording in the indirect beliefs measure seems confusing - or at least how it is written about. Was it clear to the participants that they were being asked to report who else would have an opinion about the participant's pubic hair removal, or who else would have an opinion about their Own pubic hair
removal. As it is written in the paper, it's hard to distinguish between these two possible interpretations.

* Page 8, subjective norm - there is a space and then a . And then a missing space before Perceived.
* I question the face validity of the sample item for subjective norms
* Spacing issues on page 9, line 2
* Privately visible seems like odd phrasing. Why was this used instead of pubic hair? Was the purpose to distinguish between bikini line and Brazilian areas?
* It seems that on line 17 of page 9, her would be a better word than their - technically, the sentence, as structured, implies how the participant feels about a woman who is removing the participant's pubic hair (i.e., a professional waxer)
* What was the precise wording of the question presented too participants?
* For Behavioural intention and hair removal behaviour, were the two items from each merged into a single item, hence the reporting of an r value? Perhaps be more explicit in describing this.

Results
* Page 10, line 8, spacing issue
* The use of "than" on page 10 in the second paragraph of descriptives is confusing. Do you mean then? This happens both times - than is a comparison, then is an order or list. "Then I went to the store and then I went to the movies."
* The use of acronyms makes it difficult to interpret the results without scrolling back to see what they mean.
* Page 12, missing comma before which on line 17
* It seems the critical beliefs section might make more sense after the regression predicting attention and then move on to the follow up data about behaviour?
* Are you able to do a mediation model given that you have the predictors of intention, and then intention is the strongest predictor of behaviour? Perhaps your other variables do predict behaviour, but are fully mediated through intention.

Discussion
* In the abstract and discussion section, when mentioning the association between feminist values and behaviour, I think it's important to keep noting the direction of the association.
* As a future research question, I wonder how beliefs about hair removal being painful would interact with desires to be attractive and comfortable? In other words, what is the threshold of motivation necessary, or what beliefs are crucial, to override the belief that hair removal is painful? How many women would like to remove but don't due to the pain, and how many want to so strongly that they accept the pain? How many simply don't experience pain or irritation, thereby making it irrelevant to their decision making process?
* Would partner's beliefs vs. Normative beliefs have potentially been a better predictor to use? It would seem that partner's beliefs and/or desires would be a more proximal predictor of hair removal behaviour than general societal beliefs about hair removal norms.
* I think more justification is needed to explain why you think that the remover traits were considered normal while the non-remover traits were not considered normal. Are you arguing that "self-confidence" is abnormal in women?
* Given that your sample was 23% non-heterosexual, did you consider any group analyses to compare by sexual identity?

Strengths and Limitations
* Page 15, line 30, missing spaces 13yearsorless
* You may also wish to add limitations noted above in your limitations section, such as the role of partners beliefs or how these behaviours may differ by sexual identity or relationship type
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