**Crowdfunding Report**

Once sorted the data provided into graphs, we can clearly notice a big number of projects within the categories *theater*, *film & video*, and *music*. These categories may switch spots depending on the country however, they will always occupy the top three positions with the highest number of projects launched. Furthermore, it is interesting that when analyzing the sub-categories, it’s evident that *plays*, the only subcategory registered under *theater’s* category, is the one with the highest number of projects, and this scene repeats in every country listed.

Another point presented in these data is the outcome comparison versus category, where the number of successful projects seems very proportional to failed ones, creating almost a trend line over the categories.

However, the same statement cannot be made when analyzing the outcome throughout the months and years. At a first sight, when all months, years, and categories are being compared together, it is possible to see a correlation between the successful and failed number of projects. But when each year is analysed separately, it doesn’t seem to be the case anymore. This scenario could occur for different reasons, further analysis would be needed to produce a better statement of a possible correlation.

One limitation is the lack of data starting in 2020, which restrict the analysis of the current scenario. Also, another limitation is the currency of the donation and how it reflects on the costs of each project. Lastly, the blurb of some campaigns don’t seem to be matching its categories and sub-categories, for example, Campaign ID 26, has the following blurb description “*Optional responsive customer loyalty*”, and it’s displayed as *Theatre, Plays*. Scenarios like this may exemplify campaigns registered in the wrong category, which would explain the popularity of this category, and consequently jeopardize the analyse.

A graph that would provide good insights of this data is the one presenting a comparison between the pledged and the outcome, showing if the projects that received a higher loan tend to be more successful or not. Also, a goal analysis versus outcome, when maybe a lower goal has more chances of success. Another good table could show the average of pledge per country, to understand if there’s any country influencing in the outcome, or the categories of the projects, and checking the progression per year of the amount being loaned and project possible trends. Furthermore, the time between the deadline and when the project was launched could have some influence on its pledge and outcome as well.

**Statistical Analysis Report**

It is evident that both outcomes have an asymmetric distribution, which means a big variance and standard deviation, and the data is very spread and probably with a lot of outliers. In this case the median summarizes better the data provided, because it won’t get distorted by the outliers.

Giving the range between the maximum and minimum number of backers each successful project had is higher than the unsuccessful, we can state the successful campaigns have more variability.

This conclusion does make sense, because the same scenario is observed when analysing the standard deviation of each outcome, the interquartile range and the variance.