

What dating platforms tell you to watch for.

A cross-platform look at the safety advice published by dating and matchmaking services, what their safety signals can show, and where the advice stops.

Public-source snapshot: 22 July 2026

8 platform sources | 3 independent sources | No platform ranking

THE SHORT ANSWER

A safety signal can justify slowing down without proving who someone is.

This report is not a scammer database, a background-check service, or a scorecard for dating apps. It compares public safety guidance so readers can see the repeated boundaries, the useful differences, and the limits that are easy to miss.

FOUR FINDINGS

The useful pattern is in the overlap and the gaps.

THE STRONGEST CONVERGENCE

The same few boundaries appear across very different products.

Do not rush, keep control of personal and financial information, tell someone before meeting, and use block/report tools when a boundary is crossed.

THE IMPORTANT LIMIT

Verification is a narrow signal, not a safety verdict.

Photo, selfie, ID, phone, or video checks can answer a limited question about a moment or a submitted signal. They cannot establish honesty, income, relationship status, intentions, or future conduct.

THE USEFUL GAP

Most public advice says 'too soon' without defining a clock.

The sources warn about quick off-app moves and urgent requests, but rarely provide a universal number of hours or days. Look at timing, pressure, and the request together.

THE REGIONAL DIFFERENCE

Safety is not only about romance scams.

LGBTQ+ travel and location risk, image-based abuse, community privacy, family and marriage expectations, and local support access can change the safer next step.

What research adds beyond platform advice.

Academic and university research helps explain mechanisms, affected populations, and design limits. It is used here to sharpen education, not to label or score a person.

Digital dating violence, pressured sexting, and image-based abuse

Joris Van Ouytsel | Arizona State University

Evidence and scope: Peer-reviewed research listed through a university profile. Much of the cited work concerns adolescents and young people, including heterosexual and LGBTQ+ youth.

Limit: Used for private-image and consent education. It is not an all-age prevalence estimate or a person-level detector.

Source: <https://search.asu.edu/profile/3701993>

Consent and AI-generated self-presentation in online dating

Douglas Zytke | University of Michigan-Flint

Evidence and scope: Emerging peer-reviewed qualitative survey research of 113 online daters who reported using AI-generated profile or message content.

Limit: Used for verification and disclosure limits. It does not show that AI use causes harm or identify who used AI.

Source: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3772318.3791593>

Dating-app design, safety policy, marginalized users, and surveillance

Christopher Dietzel, Stefanie Duguay, Diana Parry, and collaborators

Evidence and scope: Academic analysis of how dating-app safety approaches can distribute responsibility and affect privacy, policing, and exclusion.

Limit: Used to explain why we do not rank platforms or treat a safety feature as proof that harm is prevented.

Source: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/29768624261438306>

Mapping safety, risk, and support across dating-app use

Diana Parry | University of Waterloo

Evidence and scope: University research project and public education tool describing safety, risk, and support across dating-app contexts.

Limit: Used for the report's stage-based information architecture. A map or guide is not an outcome evaluation.

Source: <https://uwaterloo.ca/health/news/swipe-right-safer>

Relationship development and movement between online and offline settings

Liesel Sharabi | Arizona State University

Evidence and scope: Relationship and communication research on mate selection, dating apps, and online-to-offline relationship development.

Limit: Used to describe stage changes without treating moving off-app or meeting as automatically unsafe. It is not a romance-scam prevalence study.

Source: <https://search.asu.edu/profile/1545812>

AI-enabled romance scams and support for older adults

Sanchari Das and Ruba Abu-Salma with collaborators

Evidence and scope: Research-in-progress / funded project announcement focused on older adults and an announced international research scope.

Limit: Used only as emerging-threat context. It is not a completed peer-reviewed finding and does not make age a diagnosis of vulnerability.

Source: <https://content.sitemasonry.gmu.edu/news/2025-12/gmu-professor-wins-google-award-to-protect-older-adults-from-romance-scams>

Reading rule: a study of a particular population or stage is not silently rewritten as a universal dating rule. The research evidence library keeps the source type, population, and citation limits visible: <https://realattraction.today/insights/dating-safety-research-evidence/>

A common risk path is a sequence, not a label.

01

A profile creates a fast sense of trust

A polished profile, badge, shared interest, or live call may answer one narrow question. It does not settle identity, honesty, intent, or future behaviour.

02

The conversation moves away from the app

Platforms repeatedly tell users to notice pressure to move quickly to text, email, a phone number, WhatsApp, Telegram, or another service.

03

A private, financial, or urgent request appears

The request may involve a private image, identity document, account detail, money, gift card, crypto, investment, travel cost, or emergency story.

04

Pressure makes a reversible choice feel urgent

The useful question is not 'Can we prove this person is a scammer?' It is 'What can I delay, refuse, or keep private while I think?'

05

A meeting or a problem leaves the digital space

A public place, independent transport, a charged phone, a trusted person, and an easy way to leave are recurring meeting-safety themes.

For reported romance-scam patterns involving off-platform messaging, money, cryptocurrency, gift cards, and sextortion, see the FTC data spotlight: <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/data-visualizations/data-spotlight/2023/02/romance-scammers-favorite-lies-exposed>

WHAT THE SELECTED SOURCES MENTION

The advice converges, but the emphasis changes.

Share of the eight reviewed official platform sources that explicitly address each topic in the captured public material. This is guidance coverage, not a safety score, incident rate, or product ranking.



Coding rule: an item counts when the official source gives direct guidance or describes a related safety feature. A blank topic is not evidence that a platform has no such policy.

READ THE SIGNAL, NOT THE LABEL

What common checks may show, and what they cannot show.

Signal	May show	Cannot show
Photo or selfie verification	A submitted image matched a platform's limited check.	A real name, income, honest story, or future behaviour.
ID verification	A document and a person were checked under a platform process.	That every profile detail is current or that a boundary will be respected.
Live video call	Someone appeared live at that moment.	That their story, request, location, or intentions are true.
Respect for 'no'	How someone responds when you slow down or set a boundary.	A guarantee that future pressure or harm will not occur.

THE FIRST SOURCE SET

Eight official platform sources, kept in context.

The library records what each source says, not whether the platform's safety program works. Features and help pages change, so every entry carries a last-checked date and a direct source link.

Platform	Context	Topics	Original source
Tinder	Mainstream Global	off-app, money, privacy, meeting, verification, reporting	https://tinder.com/safety-tips/ Last checked 22 July 2026
Bumble	Mainstream Global	privacy, meeting, verification, reporting	https://safety.bumble.com/en_US Last checked 22 July 2026
Hinge	Relationship-focused Global	off-app, money, privacy, meeting, verification, reporting	https://help.hinge.co/hc/en-us/articles/360007194774-Safe-Dating-Advice Last checked 22 July 2026
Match	Relationship-focused Global	off-app, money, privacy, meeting, verification, reporting	https://help.match.com/hc/en-us/articles/6991442293787-Dating-Safety-Tips Last checked 22 July 2026
Coffee Meets Bagel	Relationship-focused Global	off-app, money, privacy, meeting, reporting	https://coffeemeetsbagel.zendesk.com/hc/en-us/articles/4407351975699-Dating-Safety-Tips Last checked 22 July 2026
Grindr	Niche / LGBTQ+ Global	privacy, verification, reporting	https://www.grindr.com/assets/pdf/g4e/1022_G4E-HolisticSecurityGuide-English.pdf Last checked 22 July 2026
Muzz	Niche / Muslim matchmaking Global	privacy, meeting, reporting	https://muzz.com/us/en/safety/ Last checked 22 July 2026
Shaadi.com	Niche / South Asian matrimony India and global diaspora	money, privacy, meeting, reporting	https://www.shaadi.com/info/customer-relations/faq/privacy-tips Last checked 22 July 2026

A useful guide cannot treat every dating context as interchangeable.

Broad dating, LGBTQ+ dating, marriage-focused dating, and image/privacy risk can require different language and different next steps. The report includes these differences without turning them into group-level judgments.

Broad dating

Off-app moves, money requests, personal information, verification limits, and first-meeting planning are recurring themes.

LGBTQ+ dating

Location exposure, outing risk, hostile legal environments, travel, privacy, and device security can change the safest next step.

Marriage-focused dating

Identity, family expectations, financial help, serious-intent claims, and community privacy need their own language.

Image and privacy risk

Private images, account access, blackmail, and unwanted sharing require a different response from ordinary profile uncertainty.

METHOD, SCOPE, AND LIMITS

How this report was put together.

1. Selected a representative first set: eight products across mainstream, relationship-focused, LGBTQ+, Muslim matchmaking, and South Asian matrimony contexts. It is not a claim to cover every dating product.
2. Used official platform material for platform claims. Safety centers, help pages, and public guides are the source for a feature or recommendation attributed to a platform.
3. Used independent sources for broader risk context. Government and regulator material helps explain complaint patterns and system-level risks; it is not blended into platform marketing claims.
4. Added a separate academic evidence layer. Research is used to explain mechanisms, populations, and design limits. It is not converted into an individual risk score, identity claim, or investigation.
5. Coded topics, not outcomes. The chart counts whether a topic appears in the captured source. It does not measure how often harm occurs, how quickly reports are handled, or which product is safer.
6. Recorded the snapshot date. Public pages change. A last-checked date is part of the citation. Corrections can be sent to hello@realattraction.today.

Important limit

Public safety tips are a record of what platforms tell users to do. They are not independent evidence that a feature prevents harm. User reports are not used here to identify people, investigate incidents, or build a risk score for individuals.

INDEPENDENT SOURCES

Sources used for context.

Publisher	Source	URL
U.S. Federal Trade Commission	Romance scammers' favorite lies exposed	https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/data-visualizations/data-spotlight/2023/02/romance-scammers-favorite-lies-exposed
eSafety Commissioner	Online dating safety guidance	https://www.esafety.gov.au/key-topics/staying-safe/online-dating
Ofcom	Dating and social discovery: online safety risks	https://www.ofcom.org.uk/online-safety/illegal-and-harmful-content/dating-and-social-discovery-know-the-online-safety-risks-rules-and-how-to-comply

Suggested citation

RealAttraction Research. Dating Safety Signals Report 2026: What dating platforms tell users to watch for. Public-source snapshot 22 July 2026. <https://realattraction.today/insights/dating-safety-signals-report/>

RealAttraction.today is dating safety education, not an investigation. It cannot identify people, prove intent, collect evidence, recover money, or replace official or emergency help.