

JOIBS: November 2025. ISSN 2992-9253

JOIBS © 2025 Krueger

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Review of Rohrer (2025)

Joachim Krueger, Brown University, United States. E-mail: joachim_krueger@brown.edu

Funding: None.

Competing interests: None.

Citation: Krueger, J. (2025). Review of Rohrer (2025). *Journal of Open Inquiry in the Behavioral Sciences*, 4(5). <https://doi.org/10.58408/issn.2992-9253.2025.04.05.0002>

Rohrer's paper is a 100-yard-dash, in record time. Here's my 50-yard dash response.

The main message and narrative are crystal clear, as are the design and the results. There is nothing to bemoan from my end. I will, of course, float a few ideas the author might take under consideration, either for a revision or for a future extension of this inarguably important piece of research.

[1] I understand the difficulty to find the best measure, and I think the author found a good one. Yet, it should be noted that with this measure there is no way to *overestimate* the speed of the fastest female. Might this create a bias if the only way to err is in the direction predicted?

[2] More could be said about what the respondents might be thinking, however speculative the effort. I suspect respondents might be engaging in some sort of Kahnemanian attribute substitution exercise. They find it hard to imagine men and women of different ages running side by side, but find it easy to imagine men and women of the same age running.

[3] If so, one might ask where the woman is at the moment the man crosses the finishing line (or any line; now the woman might, in theory, be ahead, which addresses point [1]). One could also ask when, if ever, the sex difference will disappear (or reverse; again, making bi-directional errors, in principle, possible).

[4] The skeptical description of the misleading literature should be improved, not in the least so that the author can protect himself from having his own concern of bias among others thrown back at him.

[5] Is the author suggesting that folks get their equalitarian ideas from the few papers he critiques? That is just not likely. So, where do the ideas come from? General equalitarian ideology may play a role, a simple-minded critique of the "patriarchy," or mechanisms of imaginability as noted above.

[6] Incidentally, the tenor of this paper reminds me of anecdotal claims, made by intelligent and well-meaning women, that women have a much higher pain tolerance than men. This strikes me as false, but I am not aware of research (one would have to dig a little).