

Part II Review and Critique

From the Retiree age at death graph, we can see that this is indeed a wide and right skewed distribution, with most retirees live until their 70s to 90s. As the claim indicated, our sample has lower mean than U.S. citizens, and part of the reasons might be the long left tail in the distribution lowered the overall mean.

However, the claim conclusion may need further discussion though.

In order to compare two distinct research and get justifiable conclusions, I think we can research in following directions:

1) Investigate two researches' established time and time range. Also understand whether if our sample size differs from the US research sample size. More sample size usually means the sample mean will be closer to real mean. In this example, our sample size is potential much more smaller than the US research and thus lead to a biased conclusion.

2) Analyze the ratio of woman and man in our sample compare with the US research if we want to compare two conclusions directly. The claim mentions the research conclusion that draw from man and woman lifetime distribution, whereas current graph didn't segment candidates based on sex.

3) Draw the distribution of different educational backgrounds levels, job categories distribution and other potential variables affect life span, that are embedded in two samples. For example, if our sample indicate a narrower distribution of job categories that usually leads to stress, thus potentially one of the reasons lead to few retirees' short life span. And we could definitely explain more on that side.

Above are some of the directions we can dig more into it to enhance our conclusions, but more importantly we can tell our audience what lead to this conclusion with more details. I think we can definitely work more in those direction and find more interesting insights! Also please feel free to critique and add more! You're more familiar than those topics than me!"