1. A lot of them have weirdly short periods of time to raise money. Whether a project is “staff picked” or “spotlighted” doesn’t seem all that impactful.

2. I’m not entirely familiar with all the crowd-funding websites and apps, but in this case, it seems incredibly black and white labeling projects “successful” or “failed” when quite a few projects reach above 60-90%. I’d imagine if a project raised 89%, they would be more than willing to alter plans around what was raised rather than calling it a “fail”.

Another limitation would be getting an average with limited information. Most donations made are typically going to be in the single digit range, not an average of 90 or so dollars.

Not to mention all sorts of valuable information and context that could be missing from the dataset. For all we know Johnson-Gould cancelled his fundraiser because he was outted as a box turtle killer. Not in a “I’m a survivalist on TikTok, so I kill and eat turtles” way, but more so in a “I kill and eat box turtles and am probably on multiple FBI watchlists” type of thing.

3. Social media and the internet have changed wildly since 2011, I think there’s a lot of factors that could potentially left out. I would even maybe suggest segregating the years/dates based off how the website has operated during certain periods/quarters. A good thing to factor in is how and where these projects were mostly marketed, too.