"CHOSE DIE" -> need to clarify that the player specifically picked a die and not randomly took one from the bag

"if you can choose which die you want, you don't need to see the outcome of the roll. (just choose the all-blue die.)nalso, it seems in this game, even if you play honestly, you can play a winning strategy just by choosing blue every time."

Using **probability** in explanation

"In a casino, it would be very hard to get by with the player choosing the die due to all of the security measures. However, if the player was able to see the die, he/she would have a better chance of winning if any die except the 10red/10blue die was chosen."

Takes into account "**difficulty of cheating**" and **probability, prior knowledge**

"It is my understanding that to cheat one would need to see the results before betting on a color. It is not clear that the die differ from each other."

Cheating confusion

"I tend to agree with agents who said the player could not see the dice or the color. they players was on a lucky roll and the casino was not so lucky."

Data didn't match explanation (gave 7's to player choosing die and 6 to to player having complete knowledge, but 7 to player knowing nothing). Then failed manipulation check and said, "the rules of the games seem so inconsistent. if the player can choose a color after the games starts, it is not a wagering game, it is a give away." in the comments for that. (possible **prior knowledge**)

"1.the player probably cheated by looking at the results before rolling the dice 2.the player had to see the results to gain an advantage 3.The players probably moved the dice to manipulate a result"

Cheating confusion (#3)

"I thought the explanation was better when it included more information. Providing only two observations seems insufficient."

Opposite of simplicity measure, but data doesn't match, low scores to player choosing die, high score to knowing die but not roll.

"I must not understand very well. I picked a neutral score because there isn't enough information to make a judgement."

Spent 7:28 on it, and didn't understand anything, gave all 4's (results not included in data)

"I don't think a player would both see which die was drawn AND see what color came up as Agent Alex did. Also, I don't see how a player can choose the die from the bowl as agent Jacob did. Also, agent Emily had no good reasons at all."

Using **prior knowledge** about casinos, **confused** about choosing

"Each judgment is average because each one is a possibility." (said same thing on manipulation check)

"If the player saw the die drawn from the bowl then there was chance that the drawn die was the die that was entirely blue. And even if the die was drawn randomly, if the player did see the drawn die and did see the result of the roll before choosing the color the random die draw would not get in the way of an unfair advantage., That would mean that he/she would not need to see the result of the roll before choosing a color."

Data reflects this, but is opposite of simplicity measure.

"They are all different, the security needs guidelines to follow."

Confused

"The option that a player chose their own die would be incorrect as it states that it is random. It would be more plausible that they did see the die or did see the roll before choosing."

Confused about cheating

.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Ratings	4	5	1	3	2	2	the chances of seeing what color is rolling is high
Manipulation Check (all blank)	6	4	6	7	4	3	easy to see