20 February 2026 ·

Qeios

Peer Review

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

Yuki Nishida[1]

1. Ritsumeikan University, Japan

I read the manuscript with great interest. While the study addresses an important topic, several aspects of the manuscript would benefit from further clarification and refinement.

--

1. Overstatement of the Claim

The conclusion that the absence of gender differences underscores the complexity of risk-taking behavior, as well as the influence of social norms and cultural contexts, appears somewhat overstated. While the lack of statistically significant differences between women and men is indeed an important finding, it may be more appropriate to frame the conclusion more simply: namely, that risk-taking behavior cannot be explained by gender differences alone. A more restrained interpretation would strengthen the argument and improve the overall clarity of the manuscript.

2. The Framework of a Television Program

The data analyzed in this study are based on the recorded behaviors of past contestants on *Jeopardy!*. The unique context of a television game show—where large sums of money are at stake—constitutes a highly specific and potentially influential setting. Discussing how this particular context may have shaped the observed results would add substantial value to the paper. For example, does such a high-stakes, public environment encourage riskier behavior, or does it promote more conservative decision-making? Elaborating on the theoretical and empirical value of examining risk-taking behavior within such an exceptional context would enhance the contribution of the study.

3. Importance of Examining Gender Differences

doi.org/10.32388/K6I13F

The introduction does not sufficiently articulate why examining gender differences is theoretically important. Although sex differences in risk-taking are briefly mentioned, the manuscript would benefit from a clearer explanation of why this issue warrants investigation, what theoretical debates exist in the literature, and which theories would be supported or challenged by the findings. Providing this background would help readers better understand the study's broader significance.

4. Statistical Issues

From a methodological standpoint, several issues remain. These include inconsistencies in the reporting of significant digits, the absence of reported effect sizes and their 95% confidence intervals, missing error bars in Figure 2, and the need for clearer justification for treating decade as a within-subject factor. Additionally, it remains unclear why the distribution of decades is unbalanced and how many observations were included in each category. Clarifying the total number of cases analyzed would also improve transparency.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

doi.org/10.32388/K6I13F