**Q1**.

Part A: raw data

1. no, chose drug (-0.11 years); 36% better off with drug
2. yes, chose placebo (-1.4 years); 45% better off with drug
3. yes, chose placebo (5.7 years); 5% better off with drug
4. no, chose placebo (-0.1 years); 48% better off with drug
5. yes, chose drug (0.089 years); 91% better off with drug
6. yes, chose drug (0.57 years); 51% better off with drug
7. no, chose placebo (-0.23 years); 33% better off with drug
8. yes, chose placebo (0.31 years); 38% better off with drug
9. yes, chose placebo (3.4 years); 26% better off with drug
10. yes, chose drug (0.05 years); 70% better off with drug

Part B: mean

1. yes, chose drug (0.4 years); 94% better off with drug
2. no, chose drug (-0.5 years); 61% better off with drug
3. yes, chose drug (0.65 years); 75% better off with drug
4. no, chose placebo (-0.63 years); 17% better off with drug
5. no, chose drug (0.27 years); 88% better off with drug

Part C: median

1. yes, chose placebo (0.24 years); 25% better off with drug
2. yes, chose placebo (-0.85 years); 32% better off with drug
3. yes, chose drug (-1.7 years); 87% better off with drug
4. yes, chose drug (-0.94 years); 87% better off with drug
5. yes, chose drug (1.8 years); 81% better off with drug

Part D: percentile range

1. yes, chose drug (0.55 years); 90% better off with drug
2. no, chose drug (-0.5 years); 95% better off with drug
3. no, chose placebo (-2.6) years); 29% better off with drug
4. yes, chose placebo (2.8 years); 13% better off with drug
5. yes, chose drug (0.48 years); 93% better off with drug

**Q2:** I would rather look at the mean because it gave the most reliable predictions

**Q1 (cont):**

Part E: bar graph range

1. yes, chose placebo (6.3 years); 9% better off with drug
2. no, chose drug (-0.085 years); 75% better off with drug
3. yes, chose placebo (2.3 years); 1% better off with drug
4. yes, chose placebo (0.21 years); 24% better off with drug
5. no, chose placebo (-0.62 years); 37% better off with drug

Part F: histogram

1. yes, chose placebo (0.0017 years); 37% better off with drug
2. no, chose placebo (-0.14 years); 43% better off with drug
3. no, chose drug (-0.92 years); 72% better off with drug
4. yes, chose drug (-0.12 years); 85% better off with drug
5. yes, chose placebo (-0.54 years); 19% better off with drug

Part G: cumulative histogram

1. yes, chose drug (0.18 years); 60% better off with drug
2. yes, chose placebo (7.8 years); 10% better off with drug
3. yes, chose placebo (-0.27 years); 4% better off with drug
4. yes, chose drug (-0.51 years); 46% better off with drug
5. yes, chose drug (0.13 years) 61% better off with drug

**Q3:** The cumulative histogram worked best for the game because it related values to percentiles of the population, making it easy to assess how the two treatment groups were affecting the populations as a whole. The histogram was only somewhat useful because while the information was clearly laid out as to what values had the highest representation in the group, estimates had to be used to compare how those individual point values were affecting the population as a whole. Finally, the bar graph was not very helpful because it just gave the point distributions across the whole population without any relation to the total population value. This made the data difficult to compare unless there were clear trends in the two treatment groups.