

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

Relevance

Moderated

Novelty

Low or very low

Presentation and writing

Moderated

Comments for authors: Be as accurate as possible when making your comments. List each recommendation so that it is easy for authors to respond appropriately to each one. Indicate in a timely manner where changes should be made (i.e. paragraph 2 of the method section).

1. The abstract presents limited results for both types of relationships.
2. There are statements in the theoretical framework that must be supported by citations.
3. The first paragraph requires more clarity to be understood.
4. The research justification lacks strength.
5. In the description of the sample, it is not specified how the random sampling that they indicate was carried out, nor the characteristics of the 764 women studied.
6. the instruments used do not correspond to the descriptions in the results tables, and they also have very limited response formats and different formats from one question to another.
7. Likewise, the instruments lack psychometric quality since only one judgment was made and no analyzes were carried out to confirm their value to measure what they intend to measure.
8. In the results, the description does not correspond to what is reported in the tables, they confuse and mix the percentages with correlations.
9. The discussion increases the value of what is found in the study and affirms things in ways that are not justified theoretically and empirically.

Interacciones seeks greater transparency in the review process and to provide credit to reviewers. If the editors decide to accept the manuscript, **would you like your name to appear as a reviewer of the article?**

No

Reviewer T:

The paper is very interesting, with some improvements (in the attached file), in general, it is suggested that the purpose of the study be clarified.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

AUTHORS' RESPONSE

Following review of the observations and comments, these have been addressed and are highlighted in yellow in the corrected version attached hereto, as detailed below:

	REVIEWER COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Abstract	The abstract presents limited results for both types of relationships.	More information corresponding to the most important findings has been added.
	How was the data obtained? detailing is suggested. (pag. 1, line 3)	OK, has been added (p. 1, line 3).
	A comparison between the two with similarities and differences and preferences is not visualised...the results should be corrected (p. 1, line 6-10).	The results show that the perception of cohabitation is very similar to the perception of marriage (p. 1, line 6-10).
Theoretical Framework	There are statements in the theoretical framework that must be supported by citations.	The necessary citations have been added.
	The first paragraph requires more clarity to be understood. (pag 2, paragraph 1)	The wording has been corrected accordingly (p. 2, paragraph 1).
	The research justification lacks strength.	The justification has been improved.
	What does this mean? What does it refer to? (pag 2, paragraph 1)	The explanation has been elaborated (pg 2, para 1).
	What is the implication of this, and how does knowing the perception of marriage and cohabitation make it possible to support power-oriented public policies? Power? Reach? Of the family? (pag 2, paragraph 1)	The argument has been clarified (pg 2, paragraph 1).
	There is not cite. (pag 2, paragraph 1)	Citation has been added. (pg 2, paragraph 1)
	Missing references (pag 2, paragraph 2)	The quotes have been added. (pg 2, paragraph 2)
	How did these "arrangements" come into existence? (pag 2, paragraph 2)	Explanation added (pg 2, paragraph 2)
	It is not a correct inference, it is new information, it should be cited. (pag 3, paragraph 1)	Both data come from the comparison between the 1981 and 2017 censuses. The sentence has been rephrased to make the information more understandable (p. 3, paragraph 1).
	Which? (pag 3, paragraph 2)	This is about demographic changes. The sentence has been reworded to make this information more understandable (p. 3, paragraph 2).
	Point out the evidence (pag 3, paragraph 3)	Added citation (pg 3, para 3).
	Or male and female? (pag 3, paragraph 3)	Standardised as man and a woman (pg 3, para 3).
	Or man and a woman? (pag 4, paragraph 1)	Standardised as man and a woman (pg 4, para 1).
	It seems excessive to me. (pag 5, paragraph 1)	Reworded (pg 5, para 1)
	Regulation? (pag 5, paragraph 2)	"Regulation" has been exchanged for "law" (pg 5, para 2).
	I think the argument for research should be strengthened. (pag 5, paragraph 2)	The argument has been strengthened (page 5, paragraph 2).
	Is it speculation or well-founded assertion? base (pag 6. Paragraph 3)	The wording has been corrected (page 6, paragraph 3).
The purpose is not clear, if you just want to know the perception, or its relationship with Peruvian laws (pag 7, paragraph 2)	The purpose is to find out the perception of preference and whether the laws make it easier to meet this expectation. (pg 7, para 2)	
Sample	The citation and sampling procedure are missing. And what other characteristics did these women have (page 7, paragraph 1)?	Further details of the sample, sampling, and citation were given (pg 7, para 1).

	<p>They do not show the strata of the population. Also, if it is a sampling of at least two stages, how was the second stage done, that is, after knowing the sample number of the strata, what sampling was used for that second selection? (pagina 7, paragraph 1)</p>	<p>The percentages according to SES have been explicitly indicated both within the text and in Table 1. As well as the sampling strategy (page 7, paragraph 1).</p>
	<p>The table is not self-explanatory, the socio-economic levels should be specified and the text should refer to the table.</p>	<p>Table 1 (page 7, paragraph 1) was explained.</p>
Instrument	<p>This does not correspond to what is mentioned in table 3</p>	<p>Tables 2 and 3 were amended to be consistent with the paragraph</p>
	<p>This description does not correspond to what is reported in the results...see table 2.</p>	
	<p>I was expecting an exploratory study. Are the measures non-equivalent between cohabitation with 8 items and marriage with 6, also some are dichotomous, and the ones that do not have different response options (1 with 8 and the other with 7)? Both instruments should measure the same thing and they are assessing different things (page 8, paragraph 1).</p>	<p>As this is an exploratory study, a survey-type instrument was created, hence the diversity of response options. In addition, differentiated questions are shown for both marriage and cohabitation due to the nature of both types of union.</p>
	<p>This procedure is not sufficient to have a valid and reliable measure that gives us reliable information on the variables studied (page 8, paragraph 2).</p>	<p>As indicated in the previous commentary, this instrument is not a test; therefore, only the judges' criteria and internal consistency reliability were used for validity and reliability.</p>
Procedure	<p>How were the houses selected?</p>	<p>It was indicated that the SES of the respondents was taken into account for the selection of the sample (p. 8, paragraph 4).</p>
Results	<p>In none of the tables does the bivariate analysis appear, it is suggested to consider it.</p>	<p>The explanation of the bivariate analysis for Tables 2 and 3 has been removed to avoid confusion. In addition, notes have been added to Tables 4 and 5 with the chi-square values.</p>
	<p>Description of Table 2: I don't understand this, they are talking about correlations and they mention a percentage (page 9, paragraph 1).</p>	<p>To improve understanding and consistency with tables 2 and 3, the chi-square relationships with SES have been removed.</p>
	<p>Description of Table 3: The description of the results is not congruent with the table and by mixing percentages with correlations, it is confusing (page 9, paragraph 2).</p>	
	<p>Description of Table 4: Why is there no breakdown by socio-economic level (page 9, paragraph 4)?</p>	<p>The breakdown by SES has been incorporated and a note with the relationship has been added to Table 4.</p>

	Description of Table 5: The table is not reporting correlations but frequencies and because they have different numbers of people per cell, the numbers look inflated and unrealistic...the result they show for divorced women (88.9%) refers to 8 women!!!! And the way the data is presented and discussed, it looks like a lot of people (page 10, paragraph 2).	A note has been added to Table 5 with the values of the relationship. Taking into account that in the table the percentages are presented, it can be taken into account that there are only 9 divorced persons.
Discussion	The discussion increases the value of what is found in the study and affirms things in ways that are not justified theoretically and empirically.	This has been corrected.
	It presumes a relationship with different data. It could mislead the reader into believing that there are more married women as a result (page 11, paragraph 1).	Corrected (p. 11, paragraph 1).
	Correct (Kuzembayeva, 2020). (pag. 14, paragraph 3)	It has been modified according to the suggestion. (pg 12, paragraph 3)
	An expression could be added: "it is that respect" (pag 12, paragraph 2)	It is considered that "Therefore" better expresses the sense of what is proposed here. (pg 12, paragraph 2)
	Is there anything that supports that age influences the decision? (pag 12, paragraph 4)	This information has been corrected by pointing out the difference between the samples of the two studies. (p 12, para 4)
	Correct: (Tang et al., 2014). (pag 13, paragraph 2)	Modified according to the suggestion. (p 13, para 3)
	bibliographic support of this trend. (pag 13, paragraph 3)	The required citation has been added. (p 13, paragraph 3)
	Correct: (Chaney et al., 2014). (pag 14, paragraph 4)	Modified according to the suggestion. (pg 14, paragraph 4)
	The support of the supposed stability has already been questioned, previously. Consider. (pag 14, paragraph 2)	This suggestion has been taken into account. (pg 14, paragraph 2)