**PROJECT 1 Analysis**

Given the provided data we can assume the following:

1 – Crowdfunding campaigns are not a guarantee of a successful project. The total number of successful projects was 565 versus 435 for projects that were cancelled, failed or currently live.

2- Most campaigns recorded were based in the US, and the most popular category to crowdfund for was plays. July was the month was the highest rate of successful plays.

3 – Using the parent category filter, all the Journalism category projects were successful with no failures. This is the only parent category to be 100% successful, however there were only four projects so this could be down to the smaller size rather than the category.

In terms of limitations of the dataset, the constraints were the size of the data set, this was limited to 1000 and a lot of the data was also US based which could give a skewed representation.

I think graphs showing the goal vs pledged would be useful, to see how many campaigns reach their targets, this could prevent campaigns going forward if they are not funded enough if it shows correlation. Another useful graph would be the time taken for each campaign to be completed versus whether they were successful or not as if there was a trend this could be used to amend the time taken for the campaigns to finish to improve the success rate.

**Bonus Analysis**

1 – I think the mean better summarises the data in this instance. This is because the spread of data is quite large, and a lot of the data is at either end of the range meaning an average may be more representative of the data as opposed to the median.

2 – There is a lot more variability with the successful campaigns and the number of backers rather than the unsuccessful ones. I would say this is due to there being a lot of successful campaigns in the middle of the data and a chunk of them being towards the tail end and beginning also, unlike the failed ones.