**Conclusions on the dataset**

1. “Theater”, “Music” and “Technology” are the categories with the highest number of funded projects, in this order. From these three, the projects in the “Music” category have had the highest rate of success, with 77% of them being successful. The lowest rate is for the “Technology” category, where only 35% of the projects accomplish or exceed their initial goal.
   * From the three sub-categories in “Theater”, “Plays” is the one with the highest number of successful projects and, also with the highest rate of success.
   * Among the nine sub-categories in “Music”, there has not been at least one successful project for “Jazz”, “Faith” and “World Music”. The rest of the sub-categories have had a 100% or near 100% success rate.
   * The “Technology” category has two sub-categories showing success: “Hardware” with a 100% success rate and “Space exploration” with 66%. Most of the projects in this category belong to the “wearables” or the “web” sub-categories, but they have shown a very low rate of success.
2. There is a clear relationship between the number of successful projects and the amount of money each one needs to be funded: most of the successful projects required small quantities to be funded whereas most of the failed ones required large amounts of money. From this, it can be said that generally, it is easier to achieve the goal when the amount is not large. Most of the successful projects belong to the “Theater” and “Music” categories, which suggests that these two segments offer an opportunity to succeed with low risk of failure.
3. Although most of the successful projects belong to the “Music” and “Theater” categories, the exceeding quantities raised, based on the initial goal for successful projects is generally larger for the “Technology” category, reaching percentages of over 1000% compared to those of the two first, which are generally slightly above 100%. This suggests that the revenue for the latter might be considerably larger, but it involves a higher risk of failure, as mentioned in the first conclusion.

**Limitations of the Dataset**

1. It gives very few information about the evolution of each project. Some of the ideas can be very good but might have failed due to poor execution.
2. We cannot know for sure if a single person or team participated more than once. If there’s a notable team which participated repeatedly in the fundraising, their gained experience would have helped them reach success more than one time and contribute to the results of one category or sub-category.
3. There’s no data on the nature of the backers or the amount of money each one contributed. Some of the projects might have got lucky and caught the attention of wealthy backers willing to contribute more due to their interest while the vast majority might have had to struggle to raise many small contributions instead.

**Additional graphs and tables**

* We can create a bubble chart with the X axis representing the initial goal, the Y axis representing the percent funded, each bubble representing a category and its size and color representing its state and the number of projects in that state. This chart could help us visualize the likelihood of success of each category and the range of the possible percent funded in case of success.
* We can make an additional table grouping the countries by region. Each region is likely to have a unique behavior, and this could help us find geographical trends.
* We can make an additional table and chart (bubbles suggested) showing the number of successful and fail projects by category and sub-category over time, to see if any of these has increased or decrease in its rate of success. Depending on the social, technological and economic conditions of each year, the interest of the market in a particular segment can change.