**Crowdfunding Platform Data Report**

**Point #1:** Data Conclusions

First and foremost, the success and failure of a crowdfunding campaign is largely affected by the types of projects with some parent categories being generally more popular than the others. These include the parent categories of ‘film & video’ at total of 178, ‘music’ at 175, and ‘theater’ leading overwhelmingly with 344. Likewise, the success rate of each are above 50% with failure scores below 40%. However, variations may occur depending on the country of origin. Country’s such as China had more success rates with music based projects over any other category while Australia saw a technology based project exceed music’s success. Likewise, while the top three still remain popular in most countries, Denmark’s ‘publishing’ projects trailed music by only one project and are far more likely to succeed there than ‘music’. Lastly, Great Britain, Italy, and the US lead the most in crowdfunding projects of the big three.

Another point of interest within the sampled data are the sub-categories. These categories further break down the different layers of our main parent categories. The most popular being ‘plays’ among all countries at a total of 344 projects. The closest second sub-category is ‘rock’ at 85 total projects. When broken down further, the total number of ‘plays’ fall within one of the three major parent categories of ‘film & video’, ‘music’, and ‘theater’. Although these are the most successful, countries like Australia had more success in sub-categories, such as ‘web’, that fell in the original parent grouping of ‘technology’.

Furthermore, there seems to be a correlation between the time of year and project number/success. Although the correlation is weak and variable dependent on year and category, the most crowdfunding projects seem to be attempted from May through July. With the highest success rates occurring in June and July. Moreover, there are seasonal variations on project attempts/success dependent on the category as well. For example, ‘Food’ and ‘Music’ projects are far more prevalent in July. This is probably encouraged by the ability to have outdoor venues. While, ‘Film & Video’ projects seem to be less seasonal dependent and experience of their highest success in February.

**Point #2:** Limitations of Dataset

The dataset aims to understand trends in crowdfunding platforms like Kickstarter and IndieGoGo. However, it has limitations. With a predominant 76% of projects originating from the US project, global trends are underrepresented, making it challenging to generalize characteristics of successful projects. More data globally would allow us to approach crowdfunding more holistically to see what could work with the largest audience possible. More comprehensive data, potentially including regional breakdowns to state, provincial, and city levels, would provide insights into how local socioeconomic factors influence project success.

Another limitation to understanding these trends is the lack of information regarding the budget and size of each company’s project. The information provided is a partial story with most of the guess work being inferred from the ‘goal’, ‘backer\_count’, and ‘pledge’ columns to see the projects’ size. However, this does not give the analyst a clear indication of how much money was spent on potential marketing, types of donors, or even any indication of a spending breakdown. While the analyst can get glimpses of a story being told here, it is better to have concrete numbers on budget and size when gauging success rather than using a more vague metric like year or category/subcategory.

Lastly, when reading the blurbs and the category/subcategory columns many were either too vague to be placed in certain categories, some often miscategorized, or not enough information in the blurb for the analyst to make in depth analysis. For example, the blurb for the Gallegos-Cobb company says they are crowd funding for an object-based directional function with the parent/sub-category being ‘music’/’rock’. This doesn’t really give the analyst a clear indication of the connection between the company, what they are crowdfunding for, and the categories. A more clear categorization will aid in understanding the success/failure rates of projects without skewing the overall data. This will also help prevent mis-categorizations or mis representations in potentially incorrect groupings.

**Point #3:** Additional information

An additional table that charts total time would be beneficial. Only charting date launched under the ‘date analysis’ sheet gives a partial story. What we see now is only what time of the year would be most beneficial to start crowdfunding project but much is left to be desired. For example, having a table with a total time frame graph will show us if length of time affects crowdfunding. Moreover, comparing the outcomes with total times will allow any future interested party determine a general minimum time scale that a project has to implement for it to reach its’ success.

Likewise, a graph comparing ‘backers’ and ‘outcomes’ would allow us to see whether the cumulative number of backers played a significant role in a project’s overall success and determine a potential average metric for minimal number of backers needed for success. A filter option of categories will provide a clearer indication of a particular category has more backer. Moreover, you could see the average number of backers each category needs to be successful. Adding a ‘country’ filter is another layer need to determine if there is a correlation between number of backers to a category within a specific country. Understanding which categories in which countries are more popular could potentially attract the most backers and yield the highest success.