10 February 2026 · CC-BY 4.0

Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Are Bidding Behaviors of Jeopardy! Gameshow Contestants Influenced by Gender/Sex?"

Daniel Lee[1]

1. University of Delaware, United States

Thank you to the authors for letting me review their manuscript "Are Bidding Behaviors of Jeopardy! Gameshow Contestants Influenced by Gender/Sex?." I was quite excited to read this as gender differences in risk-taking are a strong component of my research agenda, while Jeopardy! viewing is a true passion of mine—indeed, I watch every day. As such, I feel uniquely suited to comment on the work.

The manuscript at hand asks whether there are gender

Overall, I feel the manuscript is *promising* but unfinished. To that end, I will focus my comments on the three main points that I believe will help finalize it.

1. Place in the literature

As the authors rightfully note, much ink has been spilled on the concept of gender differences in risk attitude. To that end, I would have appreciated more time spent on describing the importance of this particular study and its place in the literature. Is the idea that to get on Jeopardy! one must go through multiple rounds of auditions and so we're observing a (highly selected) sample of experts and that's why the differences disappear? Is the idea that daily double wagering is solely to get the players to Final Jeopardy and so we're less observing a risky gamble and more an equilibrium strategy? Note, I think the readership of Qeios could be reasonably convinced of lots of different stories here, but the broader point is the authors need to tell that story in their manuscript.

To that end, I was surprised at the limited engagement with the literature here. Notably, Rachel Croson (who many consider an expert here) was not cited, and further, the authors seem to use sex and gender interchangeably when a distinction is justified.

doi.org/10.32388/8F6EZ7

1. Data collection

The hand coding of episodes from both PlutoTV and KXAN is certainly an admirable task, and given the amount of Jeopardy! one must watch, hopefully an enjoyable one, but I'm curious about it as a design choice, as it lends itself to gaps in the data and opportunities to miscode. Indeed, I think scraping the full set of Daily Doubles (and perhaps Final Jeopardy!) wagers from J!Archive would have been more appropriate to the question at hand (https://j-archive.com/). Now, in fairness to the authors, hand coding has several benefits not afforded by J!Archive that may help with extensions of the research, for instance, do men take longer to wager, or perhaps a sentiment analysis to see if they appear more or less certain about their wagers. However, hand coding is less appropriate for the inquiry at hand and, at a minimum, needs to be justified as a design choice.

1. Estimation

The authors make use of a mixed-effects ANOVA to conclude that there are no gender differences in bidding behavior, but given the wealth of information in a given episode of Jeopardy!, I think a multiple-regression framework would perhaps be more instructive. Such a frame would allow the authors to control for (*inter alia*), the gender of the other participants, all-in bets, and whether or not the player was in the lead (and by how much), where on the board the double was (with higher "value" clues being more difficult), the type of category, whether it is masculine or feminine coded, whether the player has a stated affinity for the category[1], and so on.

All in all, I commend the authors on an excellent start to what I hope is a long and productive research career.

[1]To the authors' credit, things like stated affinity or player background are one of the aforementioned benefits of hand coding.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.