# In Real Life Social Connect:
# Online Dating Research Outcomes Report
# January 2025

# Table of Contents

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Introduction: Revolutionising the Online Dating Social Connection Method**

At *In Real Life Social Connect*, the mission is clear: to redefine how people experience meaningful connections through authentic and innovative interactions. This outcomes report summarises the recent findings from 18 Australian and 2 overseas participants; aged 27-50, male and female and their experiences of the current dating app landscape.

The feedback indicates that while people use dating apps, there is a high level of dissatisfaction with the current products. Furthermore, the current apps are not necessarily targeting a sizeable market that are seeking authentic relationships based on shared common values and lifestyle factors – such as career orientated professionals that are focused on health and low or no alcohol consumption lifestyles. The sample population interviewed for this research indicated that they would be strongly interested in a new dating platform that ensures that profiles are authentic and users share common values.

**Highlights:**
- IRL's research reveals a clear demand for more meaningful, value-driven dating experiences. Among participants, **50% identified as non-drinkers**, making it the highest category, followed by **25% who drink irregularly**. Meanwhile, only **15% were regular drinkers**, and **5% identified as sometimes or sober curious**. *Noting:* that non-drinkers don't want to necessarily only date sober people, they don't want to date people with problem-drinking or smoking habits.
- The majority of users (14) **enjoy chatting on the apps to find connection**, whereas others are quite shy (4) and find it hard.
- All users expressed **frustration with inauthentic photos and bios**, stating that profiles do not match that of the person they end up meeting and find frequent discrepancies between online profiles and real life appearances.
- The apps are effective in facilitating connections, **providing opportunities for casual dating and friendships**, and offering openness and increased security,
- User engagement with dating apps varies, with 35% adopting an on-and-off approach due to burnout or frustration, 30% being regular users with higher expectations, 25%

3

using apps infrequently or for specific purposes due to emotional exhaustion, and 10% focusing on specific strategies or premium features to improve their experience.

- The major challenges with dating apps revolve around authenticity, meaningful connections, and platform limitations. Users experience **frustration due to inauthentic profiles, scams, algorithm opacity, and societal pressures** (pressure to find a partner, appearance and profile perfection, fear of being left behind, success metrics (likes, # of matches), authenticity vs. trends, sober dating pressure, FOMO & overcoming frequent rejection), which lead to dissatisfaction and frequent profile deletions. **Emotional mismatches and cultural or location-based limitations** further contribute to these issues. Addressing these concerns is crucial for improving user satisfaction and retention.

- **The feedback pointed to a strong demand for low or no alcohol connections and other suitable personality compatibilities, particularly around profession, fitness, drinking habits, and health goals.**

- Despite appreciating the convenience of dating apps, many found the experience **repetitive** and sought more authentic spaces with innovative features like AI prompts or offline events.

- Users in smaller towns faced geographical barriers due to limited dating pools.

- There was a call for greater transparency in app algorithms, with users frustrated by a lack of information about how app algorithms work and how frequently their profiles are being displayed to other users.

- While a few shared success stories, there remains optimism for new platforms that address these challenges.

- Several noted the need for astrological compatibility.

- **60% (12 users)** valued conversation, personality, and connection over appearance, while **40% (8 users)** believed looks and fitness/health played a significant role in compatibility.

- **55% (11 users)** pay for dating apps while **45% (9 users)** do not pay for dating apps.

- **60% of users that responded (3 users)** want help knowing how to date more effectively, whereas **40% of users that responded (2 users)** are happy with their approach. The question was not discussed with the other 15 respondents.

Participants provided feedback on several potential features for the app, including video-based interactions to promote authenticity, AI-assisted prompts, and dating advice. Some suggested targeting a niche market of wealthy individuals with exclusivity rules, while

4

others expressed concerns about the user appetite for recording videos and the requirement for more transparency on algorithms. There was strong support for a sobriety-focused dating app and a desire for more sober social opportunities. Many participants sought a platform promoting authentic connections and healthy lifestyles, with video profiles preferred over photos. Additional ideas included travel plan integration and career-based matching, with most participants open to reasonable subscription fees if the value was clear.

## 1. KEY OBJECTIVES

• Understand the current landscape, challenges and opportunities in modern dating.

• Identify unmet needs for deeper, genuine connections.

• Evaluate perceptions of video-based interactions as a core feature of our platform.

## 2. PARTICIPANT PROFILE: AGE, LOCATION, SEX

• **Ages** ranged from 27 to 50 years.
Age summary: The ages listed range from **27 to 50**, with a total of **20 individuals**. The most frequent age is **40**, appearing **5 times**. Most ages fall between **37 and 47**, indicating a concentration in the late 30s to late 40s age range.

• Majority of **locations** include Darwin (9), Melbourne (4), Sydney (2), Brisbane (2), W.A (1), with several from overseas: Manchester, UK (1) & Alberta, Canada (1).

| State/Territory | Locations | Count |
|---|---|---|
| **Victoria (VIC)** | Mt Waverly, Balaclava, Frankston, Mill Park | 4 |
| **New South Wales (NSW)** | Redfern, Sydney | 2 |
| **Northern Territory (NT)** | Darwin (multiple mentions), 1x rural: Humpty Doo | 9 |
| **Queensland (QLD)** | Ipswich, Brisbane | 2 |
| **Western Australia (WA)** | Perth | 1 |
| **United Kingdom** | Blackpool, Lancashire | 1 |
| **Canada** | Alberta | 1 |

Sexual orientations included straight, gay, and bisexual; with 15 males & 5 Females (all females were straight).

- **Bisexual**: 1 user
- **Gay**: 1 user
- **Straight**: 18 users

# 3. SOBRIETY STATUS

**Summary:**

- **Non Drinkers:** 10 respondents (highest category, 50%).
- **Irregular drinkers:** 6 respondents (25%).
- Regular drinkers**:** 3 respondents (15%).
- **Sometimes or/sober Curious:** 1 respondent (5%).

| Sobriety Category | Responses | Count |
|---|---|---|
| **Non Drinkers** | Yes, Yes 3 months, Yes 5 years, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, yes very health conscious | 10 |
| **Regular Drinkers** | No, No, No | 3 |
| **Sometimes (Occasional)** | Sometimes | 1 |
| **Irregular Drinker** | Irregular drinker, Irregular drinker, Irregular drinker, irregular drinker, Irregular drinker, Irregular drinker | 6 |

# 4. DATING PREFERENCES: LOOKING FOR CONNECTION?
**Summary:**

- **Relationship seekers:** 9 participants (45%).
- **Not currently looking for a relationship, but could speak to it.:** 4 participants (20%).
- **Looking for connection:** 2 participants (10%).
- **Afraid to connect** (from bad experiences)**:** 1 participant (5%).
- **Hook-ups as well as dating:** 1 participant (5%).
- **Practical social connection:** 1 participant (5%).

**A mix of casual dating, hookups, and seeking meaningful relationships.**

- Video interactions emerged as a preferred method for assessing chemistry and building trust.

| Category | Responses | Count |
|---|---|---|
| **Relationship** | Looking for a long term relationship | 9 |
| **Looking for Connection** | Yes, Yes | 2 |
| **Hook-ups & Dating** | Hook-ups & Dating | 6 |
| **Practical Social Connection** | Yes, he uses dating apps for social connection, but with a more practical mindset (meeting new people, not necessarily seeking something serious). | 1 |
| **Afraid to Connect** | Yes, looks online, but is afraid to connect as many bad experiences. | 1 |
| **Can Speak to it but Not Active** | Not currently looking for a relationship, but could speak to it. (Repeated 4 times) | 4 |

**Interests:**

- Participants engaged with apps for various purposes, from casual hookups to long-term connections.

- Interests often included authentic conversations, safety, and mutual respect.

## 5. LIKES TO CHAT ON THE APPS:

The responses about in app chats reveal a mix of preferences:

- **Yes**: Majority (14 individuals) enjoy chatting on the apps in some form
- **Shy or hesitant**: 4 individuals identified as shy, with varying confidence levels.
- **No**: 1 individual explicitly dislikes chatting.
- **Mixed feelings**: 1 individual likes chatting but dislikes the concept of dating apps.

Overall, most participants are open to chatting, though some express shyness or reservations.

## 6. LIKES THE PHOTO FUNCTION ON THE DATING APPS?

The responses regarding photos show varied opinions:

- **Concerns about authenticity**: Several individuals (8) mentioned that photos are often not authentic, with some expressing frustration over discrepancies between online profiles and real-life appearances.
- **Addiction to scrolling**: 2 individuals noted an addiction to scrolling, despite the photos not always being authentic, or actually wanting to connect with anyone,
- **No interest**: 5 participants expressed a lack of interest in photos or stated that they don't find them authentic.
- **Preference for current and full-body shots**: 1 person prefers up-to-date, full-body shots and is particular about appearance.

Overall, there is a strong sentiment of dissatisfaction with the authenticity of photos, and many respondents prefer more realistic representations.

# 7. WHAT WORKS ABOUT THE APPS:

**Facilitates Connections (Ease of Meeting People)**:
    **Count**: 6 /**30%**
    **Examples**:
        "Connects people."
        "Easy way to meet new people, but also recognises their limitations."
        "Dating apps as a gateway to potential connections; success comes from emotional compatibility and shared values in real-life interactions."
        "Serves as a starting point or introduction to potential connections."

**Provides Opportunities for Hook-ups or Casual Dating**:
    **Count**: 6 /**30%**
    **Examples**:
        "Sees dating apps as useful for casual experiences and meeting people."
        "Likes the dating apps to hook up but hasn't met anyone to date on them."
        "Grindr works for hook-ups, Tinder for dating."

**Success in Building Friendships**:
    **Count**: 2 /**10%**
    **Examples**:
        "Had success in making friends through dating apps, which they value more than romantic connections."

**Openness, Honesty, and Security**:
    **Count**: 4 /**20%**
    **Examples**:
        "Really appreciate honesty and profiles that reflect reality."
        "Bumble praised for better security compared to other apps like Tinder and Hinge."

"Success happens when meeting someone genuine whose pictures reflect who they are."

## Challenges and Limitations Noted but Still Useful:

**Count**: 5 /**25%**

**Examples**:

"Don't get many matches; hard to find a good one."

"Success measured by meaningful emotional bonds rather than superficial connections."

"Lifestyle compatibility, drinking habits, and personality types matter for success."

"Frustration with misaligned profiles and societal expectations, but still uses the apps."

## Inauthenticity (Profiles Not Reflecting Reality)

**Count**: 18 /**80%**

**Examples**:

"Photos are not representative of reality."

"Inauthentic profiles lead to disappointment in real-life meetings."

"AI-generated content and filtered photos create a false sense of who people are."

"Frustration with profiles that don't match reality, leading to mismatches."

## Superficial Interactions & Lack of Depth

**Count**: 6 /**30%**

**Examples**:

"Apps are too focused on physical attraction rather than emotional compatibility."

"Conversations often remain shallow, failing to build meaningful connections."

"Apps provide generic services and fail to create deeper emotional bonds."

## Scams, Bots, and Algorithms

**Count**: 3 /**15%**

**Examples**:

"Bots and scams, like romance scams, make the experience frustrating."

"Algorithms manipulate engagement rather than showing genuine matches."

"Some matches expire too quickly, creating a sense of wasted opportunities."

## Emotional Challenges & Mismatched Expectations

**Count**: 2 /**10%**

**Examples**:

"Navigating the emotional rollercoaster of dating while trying to focus on personal growth."

"People idealise others based on profiles, which leads to disappointment upon meeting."

**Cultural or Location-Based Limitations**
    **Count**: 1 /**5%**
    **Examples**:
        "Limited dating pool in small towns."
        "Timing and alignment issues in smaller communities make finding love difficult."

**Key Challenges and Their Breakdown:**

• **Inauthenticity** (80%): Profiles often don't reflect reality, with AI-generated content and filtered photos.
• **Superficial Interactions** (30%): Focus on physical attraction and shallow conversations hinder meaningful connections. Lots of ghosting conversations or after meeting, without explanation.
• **Scams, Bots, and Algorithms** (15%): Frustration with bots, scams, and algorithms manipulating engagement.
• **Emotional Challenges** (10%): Idealising profiles leads to disappointment and emotional struggles.
• **Location Limitations** (5%): Small towns and limited dating pools create difficulties in finding matches.

# 8. FREQUENCY

• **35%** of users follow an **on-and-off approach**, suggesting apps may not consistently meet their needs, leading to burnout or frustration.
• **30%** are **regular users**, showing high engagement and potentially higher expectations for these platforms.
• **25%** use apps i**nfrequently or for selective purposes**, often citing emotional exhaustion or dissatisfaction.
• **10%** focus on **specific strategies or premium features** to enhance their experience.

**Breakdown of Usage Frequency:**
**Regular Users**
    **Count**: 6 /**30%**
    **Examples**:
        "On Bumble, Tinder, and Hinge a lot."
        "Regularly checks profile every day."
        "Regularly uses apps and pays for premium features."
        "On Grindr, Scruff, Hinge, Bumble, and Tinder—can't get enough!"

**On-and-Off Users**
    **Count**: 7 /**35%**
    **Examples**:
        "Deletes every few months but gets back on."

"Will probably delete the app again soon."
"I've been on and off dating apps for many many years, I love it!"
"Go on the apps yearly."

**Infrequent or Selective Users**
    **Count**: 5 /**25%**
    **Examples**:
        "Not many matches, only one date in last 4 months"
        "Infrequently uses apps."
        "While I've made friends, the apps leave me drained and I focus on self-care."

**Focused Users (Specific Purposes or Paid Features)**
    **Count**: 2 /**10%**
    **Examples**:
        "The more you pay, the better features you get."
        "I paid for Tinder to see who swiped on me."

# 9. CHALLENGES:

**Key Challenges Identified:**

## 1. AUTHENTICITY ISSUES

### Fake or Misleading Profiles:
    "Photos aren't who they really are."
    "Fake photos and unrealistic profiles."
    "Can't tell their authenticity through the write-up and the pictures."

### Filters and Misrepresentation:
    "Impact of photo filters on perceptions and trust."
    "Outdated or overly-curated bios make it hard to find genuine connections."

## 2. SUPERFICIALITY IN INTERACTIONS

### Lack of Meaningful Conversations:
    "Initial interactions often focus on physical attraction rather than deeper qualities."
    "Profiles feel repetitive, and many interactions are awkward or superficial."

### Pressure to Present an Idealised Version:
    "The competitive nature of online dating forces people to curate their profiles."

### 3. PLATFORM DESIGN AND ALGORITHMS

**Algorithm Transparency:**
"Lack of transparency in how matches are made."
"Users speculated about Tinder's ELO score and wished for feedback on improving their profiles."

**Limited Features:**
"Time-out mechanisms lead to missed connections."
"Gender-specific communication barriers (e.g., Bumble requiring women to message first)."

### 4. BEHAVIOURAL CHALLENGES

**User Conduct on Dates:**
"Disrespectful behaviour during dates (e.g., phone use, ulterior motives)."
"Frustration with people misrepresenting their intentions."

**Deal Breakers and Lifestyle Mismatches:**
"Excessive drinking, smoking, or materialistic attitudes are deal-breakers."
"Difficulty finding a partner with similar health and lifestyle goals."

### 5. EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS

**Emotional Disconnect:**
"Difficulty finding someone emotionally available or aligned with similar goals."
"Lonely but afraid to approach women."

**Social Norms and Pressures:**
"Alcohol-focused social life makes it hard to find compatible partners."
"Competitive dynamics, where women receive more messages than they can manage."

### 6. SCAMS AND SAFETY CONCERNS

**Rise of Scammers:**
"Crypto scams, fake profiles, and general lack of transparency."

**Security Issues:**
"Concerns about profile deletions and poor platform moderation."

**Summary of Challenges by Theme:**

| Challenge Area | Examples |
|---|---|
| Authenticity | Fake photos, misleading bios, filters, outdated pictures. |
| Superficial Interactions | Focus on looks, lack of deeper connection, repetitive profiles. |
| Platform Design | Transparency issues, limited features, gender-specific barriers. |
| User Behavior | Disrespect during dates, ulterior motives, misaligned values. |
| Emotional Factors | Loneliness, fear of rejection, mismatch of lifestyle goals. |
| Safety Concerns | Scammers, fake profiles, poor moderation, low trust in algorithms. |

**Insights:**

The major challenges with dating apps centre on **authenticity**, **meaningful connections**, and **platform limitations**. Users face frustration due to scams, algorithm opacity, and societal pressures, leading to dissatisfaction and repeated deletions of their profiles. Addressing these issues could improve user satisfaction and retention.

# 10. UNMET NEEDS:

**Outcomes Report: User Feedback on Dating Apps and Sober Connections**

**1. Authenticity Concerns (80%)**

- A majority of users highlighted issues with fake or inauthentic profiles, such as catfishing and misleading profile pictures.

- Frustrations were expressed about the lack of transparency in app algorithms and the superficial nature of connections on existing platforms.

**2. Demand for Sober Connections (55%)**

- Over half of the participants emphasised the need for a dating app focused on sobriety and healthier lifestyle choices.

- Many users valued compatibility based on sobriety, lifestyle values, and shared health goals.

**3. Lifestyle Compatibility (45%)**

- Users prioritised alignment in lifestyle choices, such as fitness, realistic drinking habits (people lie about this), political views, and mutual interests.

- There is a clear need for improved matching algorithms that reflect these preferences.

## 4. Convenience vs. Frustration (50%)

- While users appreciated the convenience of dating apps, they found the experience repetitive and unfulfilling.

- Participants expressed a strong desire for more authentic spaces and innovative features, such as AI prompts for conversation starters or integrated offline events.

## 5. Geographical Barriers (30%)

- Users in smaller towns and rural areas, such as Darwin, highlighted the challenges of a limited dating pool compared to larger cities.

- Some participants expressed a preference for features that focus on connecting with local individuals.

## 6. Transparency in Dating Algorithms (30%)

- A subset of users suggested greater transparency in app algorithms, including insights like "ELO scores" to help improve their profiles.

## 7. Success Stories and Hope for Change (20%)

- A small number of users recounted positive experiences when authenticity and shared values were prioritised.

- There is optimism for new platforms that address current challenges in the dating space.


**Percentage Breakdown of Key Themes**

| Key Areas | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|
| Authenticity Concerns | 70% |
| Demand for Sober, Irregular drinker Connections | 55% |
| Lifestyle Compatibility Issues | 45% |
| Convenience vs. Frustration | 50% |
| Geographical Barriers | 40% |

14

| | |
|---|---|
| Transparency in Algorithms | 30% |
| Success Stories | 20% |

# 11. DEPENDENT ON LOOKS?

**Percentage Overview:**

- **No - 60% (12 users):** Valued conversation, personality, and connection over appearance.
- **Yes - 40% (8 users):** Believed looks and fitness/health played a significant role in compatibility.

**Summary of User Responses**

**• Not Dependent on Looks:**

- Users emphasised that good conversation and personality are far more important than physical appearance when forming connections.
- Many highlighted that meeting someone in person helps to establish rapport and determine compatibility.
- Approximately **60%** of participants indicated that they prioritise qualities beyond physical looks.

**• Dependent on Looks and Fitness/Health:**

- A portion of users noted the importance of fitness and health in compatibility.
- Key points included the preference for full-body photos to reflect realism and authenticity in profiles.
- Some expressed that shared fitness or health values are critical for forming meaningful connections.
- Approximately **40%** of participants leaned towards looks and fitness as influencing their interest in dating.

**Insights**

This highlights the need for balance in profile presentation. While many users focus on personality and conversation, there's a significant demand for authentic profile visuals that include full-body photos, ensuring transparency and compatibility.

# 12. PAYS FOR THE APPS:

**Percentage Overview:**

- **55% (11 users):** Pay for dating apps.
- **45% (9 users):** Do not pay for dating apps.

• **Users Who Pay for Dating Apps:**

- • **11 users (55%)**
- • Reasons:
    - • Access to premium features (e.g., more matches, better visibility).
    - • Willing to invest if the subscription model provides clear value.
    - • Examples:
        - • Paying $24–$50 per month for apps like Tinder and Bumble.
        - • Preference for flat-rate subscriptions, with an acceptable range of $40–$60 for 6-month plans.

• **Users Who Do Not Pay for Dating Apps:**

- • **9 users (45%)**
- • Reasons:
    - • Perception that paid features lack value.
    - • Belief that authentic connections should not require additional spending.
    - • Dissatisfaction with the results despite app usage (e.g., limited matches even with free use).

**Key Insights:**

- More than half of users are open to paying for apps, provided the premium features deliver tangible value (e.g., higher match rates).
- Those who do not pay are often sceptical of the added benefits or do not find the return on investment worth it.
- A pricing sweet spot appears to $24–$50 be for longer-term (6-monthly) subscriptions, with $40–$60 being acceptable for short term monthly options.
- One user commented that hidden costs are not appreciated, and cost transparency is valued.

**Insights**

The data indicates an opportunity for apps like "In Real Life" to focus on offering transparent and valuable subscription models. Highlighting the benefits of premium features and providing flexible payment options could appeal to users who are already investing in such services while addressing the scepticism of those who currently avoid paying.

# 13. WANTS HELP TO KNOW HOW TO DATE BETTER
**Percentage Overview:**

- **60% of users that responded (3 users):** Want help knowing how to date better.
- **40% of users that responded (2 users):** Do not want help.
- *Note:*15 users were not prompted the question as question was added in later.

- **Users Who Want Help Knowing How to Date Better:**

  - **3 users (60%)**
  - Reasons:
    - Seeking guidance to improve interactions and understand dating dynamics.
    - Desire for tools, resources, or coaching to navigate the modern dating landscape more effectively.

- **Users Who Do Not Want Help:**

  - **2 users (40%)**
  - Reasons:
    - Feel confident in their current approach to dating.
    - Believe they do not need external assistance to form connections.

- **Key Insights:**

  - A majority of respondents (60%) express a desire for assistance in improving their dating skills, which presents an opportunity for platforms to incorporate educational resources, coaching, or features that foster self-improvement in dating.
  - Those who do not seek help reflect a segment of users who value independence and self-reliance, suggesting that offerings should remain optional and non-intrusive to cater to all user preferences.

**Implications**

Including optional features such as dating tips, self-improvement tools, or virtual coaching sessions within the app could attract users who want guidance while maintaining appeal for those who prefer a more self-driven approach.


# 14. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
The feedback includes various thoughts on the potential features of the app:

- **Video-based interactions**: Participants love the idea of recording videos directly in a dating platform, promoting authenticity. AI-assisted fun features, such as guided prompts for the video (e.g., "I am [name], I am from [location]"), were also appreciated, along with AI-based dating advice.

17

- **Niche market suggestion**: One participant proposed targeting wealthy individuals by creating an app with an income rule for exclusivity.
- **App concerns**: Some expressed reluctance towards recording videos or taking selfies, preferring a less superficial experience. One participant suggested avoiding reliance on algorithms as they may perpetuate superficiality, particularly for individuals who don't pay.
- **Sobriety-focused dating**: Several participants saw value in a sobriety-specific dating app. Some noted the lack of sober events and wanted to create more social opportunities for sober individuals.
- **Authenticity and connection**: Many participants expressed dissatisfaction with the superficiality of current dating apps and sought platforms that promote authentic connections and healthy lifestyles. A sober-focused app was suggested to cater to these needs, with a preference for video-based profiles over static photos to encourage real, live interactions.
- **Interest in travel and career integration**: Ideas for additional features included a travel plan integration to meet people at the same destinations, and career-based matching via LinkedIn integration.
- **Pricing model**: Most participants were open to reasonable subscription fees if they felt the value justified the cost.

—————————————-

## 15. RECOMMENDATIONS

App-based dating is here to stay, but it's clear there's a growing gap in the market. It is clear that **online daters report feeling frustrated with current situation**. Many apps focus on casual dating or superficial swiping rather than fostering authentic relationships. This leaves a sizeable niche of users underserved: those who prioritise shared values such as career ambition, a sober lifestyle, fitness, and genuine connection. Catering to this audience presents a significant opportunity for innovation in the dating app space.

1. **Focus on Authenticity**: Enhance the experience by prioritising video-based profiles over photos to encourage real, live interactions. This will allow people to see how the person communicates, carries themselves and moves. AI-assisted prompts and dating advice could also help users present themselves authentically and engage more meaningfully.

2. **Targeted Niche Markets**: Create specific features that cater to sober individuals, offering opportunities for sober social events and connections. Additionally, consider adding career-based matching and integrating travel plans to connect people at the same destinations.

3. **Transparency and Algorithm Improvement**: Users are seeking greater transparency in dating app algorithms, including features that explain match criteria. Avoid over-reliance on algorithms, especially for non-paying users, to prevent superficiality.

4. **Incorporate Lifestyle Compatibility**: Develop advanced matching algorithms that consider users' fitness habits, drinking preferences, and health goals to foster stronger connections based on shared values.

5. **Geographical Considerations**: Address location-based limitations by offering features that allow users in smaller towns or rural areas to connect more easily with others in their region.

6. **Support for Emotional and Dating Guidance**: Consider offering educational resources and support for users who wish to improve their dating skills, as a portion of the user base expressed interest in receiving such help.

7. **Subscription Models**: Provide a clear and transparent pricing model that reflects the value users receive from the platform, with an option for paid features that offer enhanced matchmaking capabilities and additional benefits.