Love and Partnership Profile

Greek love lenses for adult kink polyamory and ENM

Version 0.1 | Adults aged 18 and over | 18 October 2026

Use this profile to describe one relationship, identify what each person would welcome, and connect those preferences with the commitments the people involved can actually make. The result is a pattern of scores and agreements, rather than a single rank.

Original reflective tool. Not a validated psychological scale or a diagnostic assessment.

The partner-role tables are conceptual mappings. They suggest what to ask about a label; they are not measured correlations or expected scores for people who use that label. No partner designation is generated automatically.

Four parts of the profile

Part	What it records
Bond	Eros in three separate facets, plus Philia, Storge, Agape and Ludus.
Relationship context	Pragma for workability, Philautia for self-regard and Xenia for welcome in wanted network contact.
Separate reflection	Mania-related preoccupation and distress, kept apart from love and from conduct.
Partner and agreement map	Participant-defined labels, contact, priority, practical commitments, authority and network arrangements.

How to begin

- Each person completes a separate copy about the same relationship, using their own perspective. Sharing responses is optional and should be agreed.
- Record the review dates, answer the 27 prompts, then compare current and preferred experiences. Keep the individual answers visible.
- Choose the few differences that matter to you. Turn those into specific requests, then record what is freely offered and actually agreed.

This version contains original prompts. The historical vocabulary and community terminology informed the design; their sources do not establish the validity of the scores.

Rating instructions

Your identifier _____

Other person or relationship identifier _____

Current review period from and to _____

Preferred next review period from and to _____

Chosen labels and whether they are agreed _____

Current asks how much the statement describes your experience in the recorded period. Preferred asks how much you would freely welcome that experience in the next period. A preference about a feeling is an invitation to understand the relationship, not something another person can promise to produce.

Score	Anchor
0	Not at all
1	Slightly
2	Moderately
3	Strongly
4	Very strongly

Unknown means insufficient knowledge. N/A means not applicable. Leave either unscored; neither means zero.

Use a period that fits the connection

Start with the last four weeks. For a comet or other intermittent bond, choose a meaningful contact cycle and write its exact dates. Low contact does not establish low affection. Compare repeated profiles only when the periods and answered items are meaningfully comparable.

Interpret ratings in their own context

Higher is not automatically preferable. Someone who wants no romance and experiences no romance has a matched romantic rating. A deeply affectionate connection can still offer little practical availability. A relationship with limited practical merging can be very workable.

Record context such as a new relationship, conflict, illness, work pressure, distance, recent intense scenes or changes in capacity. Do not use eye contact, verbal fluency, rapid messaging or constant availability as proxies for affection.

Questionnaire part 1

0 Not at all 1 Slightly 2 Moderately 3 Strongly 4 Very strongly | Unknown or N/A remain unscored

Eros

Attraction considered as three separate experiences. This is a modern operational expansion, not a claim that the facets are interchangeable.

A low or zero romantic, erotic or sensual rating is a valid configuration. None is required for commitment.

Romantic I feel romantic attraction towards this person.

Current _____ Preferred _____

Erotic I feel erotic or sexual attraction towards this person.

Current _____ Preferred _____

Sensual I desire affectionate physical closeness with this person, whether or not it is sexual.

Current _____ Preferred _____

Philia

Affectionate companionship and interest in the other person.

This is not a measure of how quickly someone replies or how fluently they express affection.

I like this person for who they are.

Current _____ Preferred _____

I feel companionship when we connect.

Current _____ Preferred _____

I enjoy sharing thoughts or interests with this person.

Current _____ Preferred _____

Example or context that matters _____

Questionnaire part 2

0 Not at all 1 Slightly 2 Moderately 3 Strongly 4 Very strongly | Unknown or N/A remain unscored

Storge

Familiar tenderness and a sense of belonging.

Do not infer the score from cohabitation, duration, domestic roles or adult role-play titles.

I feel a familiar tenderness towards this person.
Current _____ Preferred _____

I feel settled and at ease in our connection.
Current _____ Preferred _____

I feel a sense of belonging with this person.
Current _____ Preferred _____

Agape

Care for the other person's wellbeing without measuring self-sacrifice.

Affectionate care and basic respectful conduct are different. Limits remain compatible with care.

I care about this person's wellbeing for their own sake.
Current _____ Preferred _____

I feel compassion towards this person when they struggle.
Current _____ Preferred _____

I want good things for this person, even when I do not benefit.
Current _____ Preferred _____

Example or context that matters _____

Questionnaire part 3

0 Not at all 1 Slightly 2 Moderately 3 Strongly 4 Very strongly | Unknown or N/A remain unscored

Ludus

A modern adaptation meaning mutually enjoyed playfulness, lightness and exploration.

Ludus is Latin. This tool does not use Lee's game-playing or low-commitment definition. BDSM play need not be light-hearted.

I experience shared playfulness in this connection.
Current _____ Preferred _____

We enjoy moments of humour or lightness together.
Current _____ Preferred _____

Our connection includes mutually enjoyable novelty or exploration.
Current _____ Preferred _____

Pragma

How workable the actual relationship arrangements feel.

Rate the agreement this relationship has, rather than the amount of cohabitation, money or daily contact.

Our expectations are clear enough for the kind of relationship we have.
Current _____ Preferred _____

The arrangements we make fit our actual lives.
Current _____ Preferred _____

Our agreed commitments are followed through in practice.
Current _____ Preferred _____

Example or context that matters _____

Questionnaire part 4

0 Not at all 1 Slightly 2 Moderately 3 Strongly 4 Very strongly | Unknown or N/A remain unscored

Philautia

Self-regard within the relationship. This is a personal context measure, not love directed at the partner.

Freely chosen submission and delegated authority can be consistent with self-regard and one's own values.

My own needs and identity matter to me within this connection.

Current _____ Preferred _____

I regard my own wellbeing as worthy of care in this relationship.

Current _____ Preferred _____

My choices in this relationship remain connected to my own values.

Current _____ Preferred _____

Xenia

A modern extension of hospitality to welcome in mutually wanted network contact.

Use N/A when there is no relevant network contact. Parallel relationships do not require metamour friendship, shared events or public disclosure.

I feel welcome in the network contact we have mutually agreed.

Current _____ Preferred _____

I experience goodwill in the shared relationship spaces I choose to enter.

Current _____ Preferred _____

I feel accepted at the level of network participation I have freely chosen.

Current _____ Preferred _____

Example or context that matters _____

Preoccupation and agreement conditions

Use the same current review period and 0 to 4 anchors. This panel has no preferred score or gap.

Mania

Relationship preoccupation and distress, recorded separately from affection and behaviour.

The historical label is retained only to connect with the vocabulary. This is not bipolar mania, a diagnosis, an attachment classification or a measure of abuse. Keep the individual answers visible.

Thoughts about this relationship intrude when I want to focus elsewhere.

Current _____ Context or example _____

I feel driven to seek reassurance more often than I would like.

Current _____ Context or example _____

Fear of losing this connection disrupts the rest of my life.

Current _____ Context or example _____

Read the individual responses

Discuss any experience the respondent finds troubling, even when the mean is low. Missing someone, strong desire, jealousy or a need for reassurance does not by itself establish controlling behaviour. These prompts do not determine the source of distress.

Agreement conditions

Record yes, no or unsure and an example for each question. These are separate from the numerical profile; affectionate scores cannot compensate for an unwanted restriction or a breached agreement.

Can each person decline, pause or end an activity or the authority agreement without intimidation or retaliation?

Response and example _____

Are affected people accurately informed about arrangements relevant to their own agreements, within appropriate privacy boundaries?

Response and example _____

Do actual actions remain within the authority and relationship limits that were agreed?

Response and example _____

An unsure or no answer calls for understanding the specific situation and what needs to change. This short check is not a safeguarding instrument or an abuse assessment.

Calculating and recording the profile

For each of the seven three-item headings other than Eros and Mania, average the numeric current responses and average the numeric preferred responses. Require at least two answered items for each mean. Record the number answered. Keep one decimal place; round only after the calculation.

Calculate the paired gap by subtracting current from preferred for each item that has both numbers, then averaging those differences. Require at least two paired items. Eros facets each use their own single pair. Mania may have a current-only mean with at least two answers; retain all its item scores and never calculate a preferred value or gap.

Lens	Current	Preferred	Paired gap	Personal importance
Eros romantic	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Eros erotic	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Eros sensual	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Philia	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Storge	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Agape	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Ludus	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Pragma	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Philautia	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Xenia	___ n ___	___ n ___	___ n ___	_____
Mania reflection	___ n ___	N/A	N/A	Current only

Personal importance: Essential, Flexible, Not wanted or Undecided. This is a conversation priority, not a statistical weight or a requirement that someone feel differently.

Positive gap: I would welcome more. Zero: these ratings match. Negative gap: I would welcome less. The numbers are ordinal conversation cues; a gap of four is not established to be twice as significant as a gap of two.

Missing answers can change the arithmetic

If current answers are 4, 0, 0 and preferred answers are 4, 4, Unknown, the displayed current mean is 1.3 and the preferred mean is 4.0. The paired gap is 2.0, using only the two matched items: differences of 0 and 4. It is not the difference between the two independently calculated means.

No overall love score, percentage compatibility, clinical cut-off, security category or primary-readiness score is produced. Scores from different people describe different perspectives and need not be identical.

Mapping priority and practical partner labels

For each label, record the participants' own definition before interpreting it. The following is a proposed question map, not a claim that any category has a characteristic numerical love profile.

Label	What to clarify	Lenses and agreement questions
Primary	Agreed priority in specified circumstances.	Use Pragma to explore whether priority works in practice. Record time, decisions, support and future promises separately from all affection scores.
Secondary or tertiary	A position in an acknowledged hierarchy.	Clarify the actual limits and opportunities. Explore whichever love lenses matter to the people involved; the label provides no upper limit on affection.
Nesting	A shared home.	Consider Storge and Pragma separately. Ask about domestic work, privacy, resources and preferred affection. Cohabitation does not establish primacy.
Anchor	A participant-defined source of steadiness or significance.	Explore Philia, Storge and Agape if relevant, then define dependable in terms of support, continuity and practical availability.
Non-hierarchical	An approach to avoiding or reducing preassigned relationship ranks.	Use Pragma and Philautia to discuss how decisions work. Describe real differences in duties and resources without assuming equal contact.
Solo polyamorous	A person's approach to autonomy and practical merging, rather than a partner tier.	Explore Philautia and Pragma. Ask what commitment means without presuming a goal of cohabitation, financial merging or casualness.

Evidence behind the distinction

Arter and Bunge interviewed 51 adults with CNM experience and found wide variation in how primary and secondary labels were understood, used or rejected. Their qualitative findings support asking about specific arrangements; they do not establish love-score norms. [4]

The solo-poly description draws on an original community account that allows significant commitment alongside practical independence. Participants' own usage remains decisive. [8]

Label we use and the commitments it actually means _____

Where our definitions differ _____

Mapping different kinds of connection

Polyamory, open relationships and swinging sit within the broader CNM or ENM umbrella, while BDSM describes another set of practices and roles that can intersect with any of these arrangements. Record the bond being considered instead of treating all non-monogamy as the same structure. [5,6]

Connection	Question for the profile	Practical distinction to record
Romantic partner or lover	Which Eros facets are present? How do companionship, belonging and care feel?	What romantic or erotic connection means to each person; whether it includes exclusivity, daily life or particular promises.
Friend with benefits	Which parts of Philia, erotic Eros and Ludus are wanted?	The friendship itself and the actual expectations around erotic contact, communication and continuity.
Casual sexual or swinging connection	Which attraction and enjoyment are wanted in this particular contact?	Individual preferences and the surrounding non-monogamy agreements. Low attachment does not reduce the need for respectful conduct.
Queerplatonic or non-romantic significant partner	Which forms of belonging, care, touch and practical commitment are meaningful?	The people's own account of the bond. Do not use low romantic Eros to infer low significance.
Comet or intermittent partner	Does the chosen contact cycle fit the affection and continuity each person wants?	Actual frequency, distance and expectations between meetings. A high Pragma score can describe a well-kept occasional-contact agreement.
Long-distance partner	What is present emotionally and what is feasible practically?	Distance is a contact constraint, not a measure of affection or a synonym for comet.
Activity or kink partner	What bond exists around the shared activity, and what is wanted outside it?	An activity role, friendship, romance, erotic attraction and authority must each be described independently.

Comet and other community labels vary in use. These prompts operationalise the descriptions for this worksheet, without turning them into fixed definitions. [9]

What we mean by our kind of connection _____

What is welcome outside the main activity _____

Mapping BDSM activity and authority roles

The activity someone performs and the authority they hold are separate fields. NCSF distinguishes top and bottom from Dominant and submissive, and describes switching and ongoing authority roles. This profile uses that distinction without assigning emotional scores from titles. [7]

Role or description	What it identifies here	What to ask and record
Play partner	A person with whom kink activities or scenes are shared.	Ask about the desired relationship outside scenes, contact and aftercare. Ludus measures mutual playfulness here, not scene intensity or technical skill.
Top or bottom	Who performs or receives an activity.	Record the activity role independently of negotiated authority. Eros, romance and emotional attachment remain open questions.
Dominant or submissive	An agreed direction of authority.	Record who has authority, the domains, times and limits. Explore Pragma and Philautia as context; any level of affection can coexist with these roles.
Master and slave or owner and property	Participant-defined authority or commitment titles.	Write the exact agreement. The title supplies no automatic score for love, practical priority, authority breadth or the ability to end the agreement.
Switch	A person who may occupy different activity or authority roles.	Specify the role in this connection and whether it changes by occasion, domain or partner. Do not treat switching as an average of other roles.
Service partner or other named dynamic	A relationship organised around a specified role or activity.	Record what service or the named role means, its scope and any affection or practical obligations. The title does not establish dependency or romance.
Collared or ongoing authority arrangement	A symbol or duration of commitment whose meaning is defined by participants.	Ask what is promised, who understands it, which domains apply, and how it changes. Authority can be extensive while practical primacy lies elsewhere.

Authority details

Who has authority and in which domains _____

When it applies and what remains outside it _____

What happens if someone declines pauses or ends it _____

Chosen asymmetry in authority is not a numerical deficit in self-regard. Actual freedom and conduct are explored in the agreement conditions, separately from the affection ratings.

Mapping the relationship network

Network position describes who is connected to whom. Network contact describes how much shared social life is wanted. These are separate from the love profile and from practical priority. Community vocabulary provides useful starting points, while each network defines its arrangements. [6,9]

Position or arrangement	How to use the metric
Metamour	A partner's other partner. Do not assume a direct romance or erotic bond. If you want to profile the metamour relationship itself, name it explicitly and use only relevant lenses.
Hinge and V	The hinge has two direct partnerships. Complete a profile for each direct partnership. The other two people may have a separate metamour relationship; do not assume a third partnership.
Triad or throuple	Complete profiles for AB, AC and BC, each from both people's perspectives. Then record separate three-person agreements. No single group score replaces these dyadic experiences.
Quad or wider polycule	Map the actual direct relationships. Four people create six possible pairings, but the network need not contain all six as partnerships.
Kitchen-table contact	Clarify the wanted degree of shared social life. Xenia can explore whether that agreed contact feels welcoming; nobody earns a higher love rank through attendance.
Parallel contact	Clarify separate relationship space and appropriate information boundaries. Xenia can be N/A. Limited metamour contact need not signal hostility.
Occasional shared events	Sometimes called garden-party polyamory. Record which events are welcome and by whom. Different ties within one network may use different contact arrangements.
Relationship anarchy or bespoke organisation	Ask which commitments are actually chosen and how they are decided. Do not infer absence of responsibility from the absence of conventional ranks.

Three person record

Relationship	Separate profile completed	Agreements requiring review
AB	_____	_____
AC	_____	_____
BC	_____	_____
ABC group	Group agreements only	_____

Partners should decide what may be shared beyond each dyad. A profile about one relationship does not automatically become a document for everyone in the network.

Partner structure record

Complete this independently of the numerical scores. Record what is currently agreed, what is only hoped for, and where the people involved understand the arrangement differently.

Participant-defined labels

Which labels does each person use, what does each label mean, and is the description agreed or only proposed?

_____

_____

Bond and attraction

Romantic, erotic or sexual, sensual, friendship, queerplatonic, kink, companionship, service, or a combination. State what is and is not wanted.

_____

_____

Priority and decisions

What has priority in which circumstances? Who is consulted? Are there existing agreements that limit changes involving other relationships?

_____

_____

Practical entanglement

Record shared home, finances, domestic work, caregiving and future plans separately. Do not add them into a status score.

_____

_____

Contact and continuity

Record distance, meeting frequency, communication expectations, continuity between meetings and any time limits.

_____

_____

Authority and network record

Use this page with the partner structure record. Describe each relevant relationship and agreement, including the practical consequences of declining or changing an arrangement.

Kink activity and authority

Record activity roles separately from authority roles. State who has authority over what, when, with what limits, and how the agreement can be revisited. What happens if someone declines, pauses or ends an activity or the authority agreement?

_____

_____

_____

Network position

Identify direct partnerships and metamour ties. For a triad record AB, AC and BC separately, plus the three-person agreements.

_____

_____

_____

Network contact

Record parallel, occasional shared events, kitchen-table or bespoke contact preferences for the relevant people. Do not assume one network style fits every tie.

_____

_____

_____

Visibility and privacy

Record who knows what, desired recognition, information boundaries and the disclosures needed for affected people's informed agreements.

_____

_____

_____

From preferences to agreements

Choose one important profile difference at a time. Translate it into a request about a specific behaviour or arrangement. Record what each person is willing and able to offer; these can differ. Then record the agreement, including when it will be reviewed.

For example, wanting more Storge may lead to a discussion about predictable contact or affectionate time together. Those actions are offers, not guarantees that a particular feeling will develop.

1 Contact or meetings

What I would welcome _____

What the other person freely offers and can sustain _____

What we actually agree _____

Review date and what would prompt an earlier review _____

2 Support or communication

What I would welcome _____

What the other person freely offers and can sustain _____

What we actually agree _____

Review date and what would prompt an earlier review _____

3 Kink or authority

What I would welcome _____

What the other person freely offers and can sustain _____

What we actually agree _____

Review date and what would prompt an earlier review _____

4 Another chosen area

What I would welcome _____

What the other person freely offers and can sustain _____

What we actually agree _____

Review date and what would prompt an earlier review _____

Copy this page for other domains such as domestic responsibilities, continuity, erotic contact, privacy or network involvement. A request and an offer do not become a promise until the people involved agree.

Checking practical overlap

Use numbers for concrete quantities only when the units, time period and type of activity are the same. Do not subtract an attraction score from an offer of time.

Acceptable ranges

Write the lowest and highest amount each person freely considers acceptable for the same shared arrangement. There is a possible overlap when the greater of the two lower bounds is no larger than the smaller of the two upper bounds.

Example	Person A accepts	Person B accepts	Possible overlap
Meetings per month	2 to 4	1 to 2	2 meetings
Meetings per month	4 to 6	0 to 1	None
Hours in an agreed visit	2 to 3	1 to 4	2 to 3 hours

Overlap identifies an option, not an obligation to choose it. Check travel, duration, predictability, quality of contact and other responsibilities as well as the count. A shared number can still describe very different experiences.

When an offer is a maximum

If one person would like two visits and the other can offer up to four, the extra capacity is not a mismatch. If the request is four visits and the freely offered maximum is one, the possible shortfall is three visits. That says something about available contact, not how much either person loves.

Keep indispensable requirements visible

Ask whether a particular arrangement is essential, flexible, unwanted or still undecided. A mismatch on an essential condition should remain visible even if many other preferences align. The tool provides no numerical rule for when to stay, renegotiate or leave.

Domain and units	A acceptable range	B acceptable range	Agreed overlap or unresolved issue
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

Worked examples

All examples are fictional adult relationships created to demonstrate interpretation. The values are not typical profiles, cut-offs or suggested targets for any partner role.

Strong attraction with unmet wishes for continuity

A person describes a regular kink partner as a possible anchor partner. Their erotic attraction is already at the level they want, while belonging and practical workability are below their own preferences. All items in each three-item heading have the values shown, so the means are exact.

Lens	Current	Preferred	Paired gap
Eros erotic	4	4	0
Philia	3.0	3.0	0.0
Storge	1.0	4.0	+3.0
Pragma	1.0	4.0	+3.0

The useful question is what anchor would mean in practice. If one person requires four predictable meetings per month and the other can offer one, attraction does not resolve that contact gap. They can discuss a different arrangement or recognise that the desired role is unavailable.

An agreed D and s connection without romance

Both people describe an ongoing D/s relationship with erotic Eros of 4 and romantic Eros of 0, and both prefer that configuration. They report workable agreements and strong self-regard. Their authority map specifies the agreed domains and review arrangements.

There is no romantic deficit merely because the romantic rating is zero. The authority relationship is described by its own agreement. It cannot be inferred from either the erotic rating or a total affection score.

A wanted comet connection

Two people meet occasionally and record a longer contact cycle. They describe strong companionship and belonging, while their occasional-contact agreement is reliably kept. They do not want to share a home or increase contact.

Their low frequency belongs in the structure record. It need not lower Pragma, because Pragma concerns the workability of their actual agreement. Their role remains self-defined, regardless of how affectionate the profile appears.

Using the profile carefully

What the scores can contribute

The profile can make a conversation more specific. It can show that someone wants greater companionship without greater erotic contact, more reliable arrangements without more authority, or less shared network contact while retaining strong affection. It also makes room for uncertainty and for different experiences within the same relationship.

What the scores cannot establish

This version has no demonstrated reliability, factor structure, clinical cut-offs, population norms or predictive validity. Its descriptive means do not prove that the headings measure independent psychological traits. Its ordinal differences are not calibrated units of love or relationship health.

It cannot diagnose attachment style, bipolar mania, abuse or relationship suitability. It cannot select primary partners or determine whether a person is truly Dominant, submissive, polyamorous or committed. Role maps guide questions; they do not provide empirical correlations.

Historical meanings and deliberate adaptations

Greek love vocabulary overlaps rather than forming one fixed ancient scale. Eros, Philia and Agape have broad philosophical histories; Storge concerns affection, particularly familial affection; Philautia concerns self-love. This instrument adapts those ideas for present-day adult relationships. [2,3,10]

Ludus is Latin. Here it means mutual playfulness, rather than the game-playing style in Lee's theory. Pragma is adapted to the workability of agreements. Xenia is adapted from hospitality to wanted network welcome. Mania is used only as a historical heading for a separate preoccupation reflection. These are new operational choices. [1,10,11]

A route towards actual empirical correlations

A later research project could first ask varied participants what these items and labels mean to them, revise unclear or overlapping prompts, and examine whether the proposed groupings behave consistently. Romantic, erotic and sensual responses should remain separate unless evidence supports another choice.

Only after appropriate measurement development could a study estimate associations between scores and clearly recorded relationship characteristics. Such a study would need to account for multiple relationships reported by one person and people linked in the same network, report uncertainty, and avoid treating labels as causal explanations.

This is a proposed development route. No such validation or correlational analysis has been carried out for version 0.1.

Sources and scope of evidence

Sources were checked on their publisher, institutional or original community pages. The references support historical meanings and terminology. None validates the prompts, scoring rules, worked examples or partner-role mappings in this profile.

1 Lee, J. A. (1977). A Typology of Styles of Loving. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3(2), 173-182.

https://doi.org/10.1177/014616727700300204

Historical background to modern love-style theory; does not validate this tool.

2 Helm, B. (2021 revision). Love. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/love/

Overlapping meanings of eros, philia and agape.

3 Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, Book IX, section 8. Translation by W. D. Ross. Internet Classics Archive.

https://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.9.ix.html

Different interpretations of self-love.

4 Arter, J., and Bunge, S. (2025). What Does Primary Mean? A Qualitative Investigation of Hierarchies in Consensually Nonmonogamous Relationships. Sexuality and Culture, 29, 1281-1296.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-025-10323-6

Original qualitative study showing variation in hierarchy terminology. It establishes no correlations for this metric.

5 APA Division 44 Committee on Consensual Non-Monogamy. About.

https://www.div44cnm.org/about

CNM umbrella terminology. Committee resource, not an endorsement of this tool by the APA.

6 National Coalition for Sexual Freedom (2024). What Professionals Need to Know about Consensual Non-Monogamy. Version 1.2.

https://ncsfreedom.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/What-Professionals-Need-to-Know-about-Nonmonogamy-2024.pdf

Community terminology and professional context.

Further sources

7 National Coalition for Sexual Freedom (2024 edition). What Professionals Need to Know about Kink. Version 1.2.

https://ncsfreedom.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/What-Professionals-Need-to-Know-about-Kink-2024.pdf

Activity roles, authority roles and participant-defined kink relationships.

8 Aggie Sez (2014, 5 December). What is solo polyamory? My take. Solo Poly.

https://solopoly.net/2014/12/05/what-is-solo-polyamory-my-take/

Original community account of solo polyamory, not a universal definition.

9 Boyle, L. Polyamory Glossary. Ready for Polyamory.

https://www.readyforpolyamory.com/polyamory-glossary

Community terminology including anchor, comet and network positions; not a prevalence study.

10 Liddell and Scott lexicon entries for storge and xenia. Perseus Digital Library.

https://atlas.perseus.tufts.edu/dictionaries/entry/urn%3Acite2%3Ascaife-viewer%3Adictionaries.v1%3Alsj-n97036/

Lexical background for familial affection. Xenia entry: https://vocab.perseus.org/lemma/56653/

11 Lewis and Short. A Latin Dictionary. Entry for ludus. CLD, Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

https://cld.bbaw.de/lemma/lat/ludus

Latin origin of ludus.

Version record

Version 0.1 introduces the 27 original prompts, independent Eros facets, seven descriptive current and preferred indices, separate current-only preoccupation prompts, paired-gap rules, participant-defined partner mapping and a concrete agreement worksheet.

For repeat use, retain the item wording, scale anchors, date range and version. Record any changes to the wording or omitted items before comparing results.