Remember that my null hypothesis for all bivariate results is that there is no difference between in metacritic score/sales of games and the alternative hypothesis is that there is a difference (significant result).

**Publisher**

* Significance in ANOVA for metacritic score, sales N.A., Europe, and total
* Japan and other did not have enough observations to perform the test

**Genre**

* Sports games reviewed the best, but sold the worst. It’s a “safe” genre. Also might have the lowest percentage exclusives (check that)
* RPGs sold the best on average. It also had the fewest number of games.
* “Other” genre (which is made up of games with few number of releases) also nearly tied RPG. Guess Nintendo gamers flock to uniqueness? Or something?...
* RPG is the only genre with more exclusives than non-exclusives. That’s why sales are so high. Gotta control for that variable
* The ANOVA test only showed significance for the metacritic score. Not sure why. Sports, and action adventure games have the biggest influence in the test. They might be the reason why
* Theres like no correlation between genre and sales in all regions
* There is a strong significance between genre and metacritic score though

**Release Year**

* Games sold on average a lot better in 01/02. Is that because there were few options and everyone just bought whatever they could?
* Pretty evenish looking metacritic spread
* No significance with Year X Metacritic score or year X Sales. Slightly negative but that’s because later games had less time on the market

**ESRB Rating**

* No significance regarding rating to metacritic score. However e/e10 reviewed slightly worse than t/m
* e/e10 games sold significantly better across all regions especially in japan.
* Nintendo may have a big part to do with this. I should control for Nintendo be excluding them and do the test again.
* Does esrb rating effect sales more than metacritic score? t/m reviewed a little better, but sold significantly worse.
* Also why is japans z so much higher than the other regions? Is it “significantly higher? Can I test that?

**Multiplayer**

* ANOVA test showed significance in multiplayer X metacritic score and multiplayer X sales Japan
* Japan buys a lot of 4 player games, then 1 player games than 2 player games
* Same order for metacritic score which, oddly enough, often times doesn’t count for Japanese games and Japanese reviews

**Metacritic Score**

* US and European markets are more similar in this category. Are they similar in others?
* Japan has the lowest correlation between metaritic score and sales. Is it significant? Can I test that? They also had the strongest correlation between esrb rating and sales. How much does Nintendo play into this?
* Can I test significance in difference of the correlations? Like ANOVA it in some way?

**Exclusivity**

* Exclusive games reviewed significantly better than non-exclusives. Nintendo has a big influence as their games sell and review very well. I should control for Nintendo by removing them.
* Exclusives should sell more on average because the sales for the game won’t be spread out to different consoles. That was the case. However, non-exclusives should sell some percentage worse than exclusives based on how much the gamecube sold relative to the ps2 and xbox. However some none exclusives are GCN/PS2, others are GCN/Xbox, and others are GCN/PS2/Xbox so that will be difficult to accurately track
* I should probably just ignore exclusivity vs sales because I’d have to track too many details regarding 2 console and 3 console non-exclusivity
* Exclusives reviewed a lot better but not significantly better. When Nintendo games are removed, the exclusives review worse than non-exclusives, but its not significant. Is there significance in the change?

**Sales**

* Are Sales in different regions related