## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

# VizCommender: Computing Text-Based Similarity in Visualization Repositories for Content-Based Recommendations

Michael Oppermann, Robert Kincaid, and Tamara Munzner

### 1. Additional Materials

stopwords.txt	List of stop-words that are applied to the whole corpus.							
stopwords_data_fields.txt	List of stop-words that are used to filter data fields generated by Tableau.							
triplets.csv	Lets.csv Triplets:							
	• Viz sheet specification IDs (reference_id, alternative_1_id, alternative_2_id)							
	• Number of participant votes (alternative_1_votes, alternative_2_votes)							
	• batch_id (triplets are divided into 3 batches of 45 triplets)							
viz_extracts.json	JSON file with viz sheet specifications.							

## 2. Viz-to-Viz Workbook Recommendation

#### **Reference Visualization Workbook**



Recommendations

Fig. S1. Example Recommendation. Text gets extracted from a reference workbook (viz workbook specification) and an NLP model (e.g., LDA) is applied to transform the bagof-words representation into a numeric document representation. A distance metric (e.g., Jensen-Shannon divergence) is used to compute pairwise similarity scores to other workbooks. Top results within a specified score range are selected as recommendations.

### 3. Visual Similarity vs. Data/Topic Similarity

After several experiments with our VizCommender interface and extensive discussions with collaborators, we decided to exclude visual encoding specifications when computing similarity between visualization workbooks. We argue that visual encoding features can add noise to the model when the task is information seeking in VizRepos.

Figure S2 shows simplified examples to illustrate some challenges with similarity perception. The pie charts in Figure S2a are perceived visually similar although they use different data and address distinct topics. In contrast, identical data may be visualized fundamentally differently, as shown in Figure S2.

We conclude that visual similarity is not an important factor for finding topically related workbooks but incorporating visual encodings to increase the diversity of recommendations and to improve the detection of duplicates would be an interesting direction for future work.



Fig. S2. Simple examples illustrating that visual similarity is typically topic independent.

#### 4. Model Investigation

In addition to the crowdsourced study, we informally investigated each NLP model based on the Tableau Public VizRepo (sample of 18,820 workbooks) and internal corporate VizRepo (3,424 workbooks).

After computing a numeric representation of each workbook with the four models and varying hyper-parameters, our first step was to use UMAP dimensionality reduction to create two-dimensional embeddings. A visual inspection of the scatterplot projections showed that very similar workbooks are indeed grouped together, but higher level semantic clusters were not obvious and it was not possible to identify whether any of the methods performed particularly well or poorly. For TF-IDF, we compared the representative keywords of each workbook, and for LDA and LSI, we analyzed the most important keywords describing individual topics. However, the generated topics were not always interpretable and meaningful because documents were often assigned to similar topics although we found them to be clearly distinct; this problem is a well-known issue in NLP [https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/2984093.2984126, http://dx.doi.org/10.3115/v1/W14-3110].

## 4.1. UMAP Projections of Document Representations

#### 4.1.1. Tableau Public VizRepo

The following UMAP projections are based on a corpus of 15,482 viz specifications (workbooks).



Fig. S3. UMAP applied to **TF-IDF** and **Doc2Vec** (100 and 300 dimensions) and **GloVe** (100 and 300 dimensions) document vectors.



Fig. S4. UMAP applied to LSI (15, 30, 75, and 150 dimensions) and LDA (15, 30, 75, and 150 topics) document vectors. 5

## 4.1.2. Tableau Corporate VizRepo

The following UMAP projections are based on a corpus of 15,482 viz specifications (workbooks).



Fig. S5. UMAP applied to **TF-IDF** and **Doc2Vec** (100 and 300 dimensions) and **GloVe** (100 and 300 dimensions) document vectors.



Fig. S6. UMAP applied to LSI (15, 30, 75, and 150 dimensions) and LDA (15, 30, 75, and 150 topics) document vectors.  $\phantom{1}7$ 

### 4.2. Keyword Probing

We use an approach that we call *keyword probing* to analyze the dominant topic of workbooks to better understand if document representations capture underlying topics.

For instance, we investigate workbooks from the Tableau Public sample VizRepo that contain the term "superstore" (220 out of 18,820 workbooks). Since we know that those workbooks are highly related, if they are assigned to a broad range of topics, it is an indicator that the model does not capture the content well enough.

The results for the *superstore* example are shown in Figure S7. We try multiple NLP models with 15, 30, 75, and 150 topics. LDA is based on topic distributions and we can choose the topic with the highest probability as the dominant topic. For LSI (150 dim.), Doc2Vec (100 dim.), and GloVe (pre-trained; 100 dim.), we first compute the workbook vectors and then apply k-means clustering to identify the most dominant topic. LDA with 15 and 30 topics perform best because nearly all *superstore* workbooks are assigned to the same topic. With a larger number of topics, and across all models, those workbooks are distributed over many topics/clusters.



Fig. S7. Model comparison via keyword probing. Distribution of *superstore* workbooks into different topics/clusters. Each green block represents one topic and the height indicates how many *superstore* workbooks are assigned.

# 5. Crowdsourced Study

## 5.1. Experiment Interface

Progress
Document Similarity
Thank you for participating in our study.
Participants will be paid a flat rate honorarium of US\$ 4.00 USD on completion of the study. The average participant is expected to take 30 minutes to complete the study.
<ul> <li>The goal of the task is to select similar text documents.</li> <li>We will do a very brief screening to see if you are eligible to participate.</li> <li>You are only allowed to do the task once. You can't preview it. Once you have started the task by clicking on "Continue", you must complete it within 1 hour. Do not close your browser window or hit the back button in your browser.</li> <li>Take the time you need. Accuracy is more important than speed!</li> </ul>
🖻 Consent Form
<ul> <li>I consent to participate in the study</li> <li>I do not consent to participate in the study</li> </ul>
Continue



Compensation
Participants will be paid a flat rate honorarium of US\$ 4.00 USD on completion of the study. The average participant is expected to take 30 minutes to complete the study.
After completion of all steps, you will receive a code to paste into the box on the mturk website.
Important: Take the time you need to make meaningful judgments. Accuracy is more important than speed.
I agree with the conditions     I withdraw from the study Continue

Fig. S9. Additional note that all steps not be completed.

	iple sets (~45) of three tex	t documents each	
<ul> <li>Each document</li> </ul>	contains a number of term	s or short phrases (instead of full ser	tences)
		Reference	
Pro	otype		
Sec. Se	rch - Song		
Par	h Tag UBL Artist 1 Artist 2 Artist 3 Artist 6 Artist 5 Artis	6 Album 1 Album 2 Track Playcount Song	
	<b>O</b> A	8	
Business Report		Songs	
Time Analysis Adjusted ISO Time SUM(Sales)		Percent Difference in Song Streams Across the Year SUM(Streams) MONTH(Date)	
ISO time country category shipment	track name is subsmerid inbid sales	position track number artist streams of table name title artist lood valence length acoustic Artist (group)	release bpm energy dance
	c	ontinue >	

Fig. S10. Interface instructions.

For example: the first line of text ("Songs") is the document title      B      Title - Songe
O B
Title - Songe
Subtitle
Secondary Keywords - position track number artist streams urt table name title artist release bpm energy dance lou valence length acoustic Artist (group)

Fig. S11. Description of text document structure

<ul> <li>You are being asked to</li> <li>Please consider docur</li> <li>Do not just compare if</li> <li>Instead, ask yourself if</li> <li>Take the time you ne</li> </ul>	select one of two documents nents as a whole when you pic they contain identical words. ( the general topic of <u>alternal</u> ed to make meaningful judge	(bottom row) that is most related to a ref k the most related alternative. Consider all the text and not just the title. <u>live A or alternative B</u> is more similar to ments.	erence document (top). • the <u>reference</u> .
	Re	ference	
Prototyp	e		
Search - Song	Song		
Rank Tag	URL Artist 1 Artist 2 Artist 3 Artist 4 Artist 6 Artist 6 A	bum 1 Album 2 Track Playcount Song	
	• •	D	
Business Depert		ovings	
Business Report Time Analysis Adjusted ISO Time SUM(Sales)		Percent Difference in Song Streams Across the Year SUM(Streams) MONTH(Date)	

Fig. S12. Task description.

e selected alternat	ive B because it is more similar to the refere	ence.
		Reference
	Prototype	
	Search - Song Song	
	Rank Tag URL Artist 1 Artist 2 Artist 3 Artist 4 Artist 5	Artist 6 Album 1 Album 2 Track Playcount Song
	0 A	0 B
Business Report		Songs
Time Analysis Adjusted ISO Time SU	M(Sales)	Percent Difference in Song Streams Across the Year SUM(Streams) MONTH(Date)
ISO time country categor	y shipment track name customer id mbid sales	position track number artist streams un table name title artist release bpm energy dance loud valence length acquetic Artist (group)

Fig. S13. Example selection.

		Reference						
Sheet	1							
airpla AVG(	airplane safety AVG(Age) Sex Embarked							
pclass survived name sex age sibsp parch ticket fare cabin embarked boat body home.dest								
perass	surveu name sex age susp parch ticket rare car	in  embarked   boat   body   home.dest						
perass		n embarked loat lody home.dest						
Prinss National Parks		B Flight incidents						
National Parks Sheet 7 Park Name   AVG(Recreation Visitors	A	B Flight incidents Q2 SUM(Survived) Sex						

Fig. S14. Screening test.

### 5.2. Demographics

Participants were asked to fill out a post-experiment questionnaire which asked about their gender, age, educational background, and their experience during the study.



Fig. S15. Age distribution. Mean=38; Median=36



Fig. S16. Gender distribution.



Fig. S17. Educational background.

5.3. Judging Similarity



Fig. S18. Experience ratings on 5-point Likert scale. Task difficulty from 1 (=very easy) to 5 (=very difficult). Number of times participants thought both alternatives were equally related to the reference (1=Never to 5=Very often). Number of times participants thought none of the alternatives were related to the reference (1=Never to 5=Very often).

### 5.4. Agreement Between Model Predictions and Human Judgements

We use Fleiss' Kappa  $\kappa$  to quantify the chance-corrected agreement between models and human judgements.

Model abbreviations: D2V = newly trained Doc2Vec model; GloPre = Pre-trained GloVe model; GloTF = Pre-trained GloVe model that we further trained on viz specifications. Numbers next to the model abbreviations indicate the number of top-ics/dimensions.

	LDA_30	LDA_75	LDA_150	LSI_15	LSI_30	LSI_75	LSI_150	D2V_100	D2V_300	GloPre_100	GloPre_300	GloTF_100	TF-IDF	LDA_15
LDA_75	.951													
LDA_150	.926	.946												
LSI_15	.762	.765	.785											
LSI_30	.828	.834	.859	.894										
LSI_75	.885	.897	.941		.904									
LSI_150	.908	.921	.965	.801	.884	.968								
D2V_100	.902	.92	.967	.77	.833	.913	.938							
D2V_300	.906	.925	.971	.772	.838	.918	.942	.986						
GloPre_100	.909	.933	.976	.778	.854	.93	.952	.952	.956					
GloPre_300	.913	.937	.98	.782	.855	.931	.952	.956	.96	.995				
GloTF_100	.925	.948	.991	.781	.855	.936	.963	.969	.973	.981	.986			
TF-IDF	.924	.948	.991	.78	.855	.937	.963	.968	.973	.98	.984	.998		
LDA_15	.863	.876	.86	.683	.754	.813	.838	.846	.846	.848	.85	.86	.86	
GIoTF_300	.925	.948	.992	.781	.855	.937	.964	.969	.974	.981	.985	.999	.999	.861

Fig. S19. Agreement between model predictions and human judgements for 135 triplets.

	LDA_150	D2V_100	D2V_300	LDA_30	TF-IDF	GloPre_100	GloPre_300	GloTF_100	GIoTF_300	LDA_75	LDA_15	LSI_75	LSI_150	LSI_30	LSI_15
D2V_100	1														
D2V_300	1	1													
LDA_30	.969	.969	.969												
TF-IDF	.967	.967	.967	.936											
GloPre_100	.967	.967	.967	.936	1										
GloPre_300	.967	.967	.967	.936	1	1									
GIoTF_100	.967	.967	.967	.936	1	1	1								
GIoTF_300	.967	.967	.967	.936	1	1	1	1							
LDA_75	.934	.934	.934	.903	.966	.966	.966	.966	.966						
LDA_15	.909	.909	.909	.881	.877	.877	.877	.877	.877	.844					
LSI_75	.906	.906	.906	.877	.936	.936	.936	.936	.936	.903	.821				
LSI_150	.906	.906	.906	.877	.936	.936	.936	.936	.936	.903	.821	1			
LSI_30	.843	.843	.843	.815	.872	.872	.872	.872	.872	.838	.761	.938	.938		
LSI_15	.815	.815	.815	.788	.843	.843	.843	.843	.843	.809	.735	.848	.848	.848	
Human	1	1	1	.969	.967	.967	.967	.967	.967	.934	.909	.906	.906	.843	.815

Fig. S20. Agreement between model predictions and human judgements for 92 triplets with higher consensus (at least 80% agreement between all participants and agreement between the majority vote and the expert's gold standard)



Fig. S21. Agreement between model predictions and human judgements for 43 triplets with lower consensus (less than 80% agreement between participants or disagreement between the majority vote and the expert's gold standard.)

	LDA_30	LDA_75	LDA_150	LSI_15	LSI_30	LSI_75	LSI_150	D2V_100	D2V_300	GloPre_100	GloPre_300	GIoTF_100	TF-IDF	LDA_15
LDA_75	.951													
LDA_150	.926	.946												
LSI_15	.762	.765	.785											
LSI_30	.828	.834	.859	.894										
LSI_75	.885	.897	.941		.904									
LSI_150	.908	.921	.965	.801	.884	.968								
D2V_100	.902	.92	.967	.77	.833	.913	.938							
D2V_300	.906	.925	.971	.772	.838	.918	.942	.986						
GloPre_100	.909	.933	.976	.778	.854	.93	.952	.952	.956					
GloPre_300	.913	.937	.98	.782	.855	.931	.952	.956	.96	.995				
GIoTF_100	.925	.948	.991	.781	.855	.936	.963	.969	.973	.981	.986			
TF-IDF	.924	.948	.991	.78	.855	.937	.963	.968	.973	.98	.984	.998		
LDA_15	.863	.876	.86	.683	.754	.813	.838	.846	.846	.848	.85	.86	.86	
GloTF_300	.925	.948	.992	.781	.855	.937	.964	.969	.974	.981	.985	.999	.999	.861

Fig. S22. Within-model agreement for all 4,211 generated triplets.

### 5.5. Confidence of Model Decisions

For the triplet judgement task, models produce predictions by independently computing the pairwise similarity scores between the reference document and one of the alternatives. The model compares the two scores and the alternative with the higher score is deemed to be more similar.

The delta between two scores is an indicator for the confidence of model predictions. Are both scores very close, and in fact, both alternatives are relevant or is there a significant difference?

We normalized the pairwise similarity scores for each model and compared the difference.



Fig. S23. Model comparison based on normalized similarity score deltas. The median difference between pairs of similarity scores is slightly higher for TF-IDF. All other models are in a similar range.

#### 6. Study Analysis Tool

We implemented an interactive visual analysis tool to both clean the crowdsourced data and to better understand the results and the implications for the model selection.

	Partic	ipants Triplets	Model	s														
	Par	ticipants (7	5)										Filter	triplets D	isagree with	majority	\$ Unifo	rm alignment 🕴
	ID	TIMING			TOTAL RT	AVG. RT	MEDIAN RT	MIN. RT	MAX. RT	POS A	POS B	INTRA-RATER AGREEMENT	INTER-RATER AGREEMENT	EXPERT AGREEMENT	DIFFICULTY	BOTH RELEVANT	NONE RELEVANT	DEMOGRAPHICS
	187				17min (19)	22s	16s	4s	2min	21	26	100%	96%	97.87%	3/5	2/5	2/5	54, female, Training
	184				12min (15)	16s	13s	7s	37s	21	26	100%	91%	93.62%	2/5	2/5	2/5	57, female, Training
	183				10min (10)	12s	7s	2s	2min	22	25	50%	85%	82.98%	4/5	4/5	2/5	30, male, College, no degree
$(\cdot)$	182				17min (21)	22s	18s	8s	60s	27	20	100%	91%	89.36%	3/5	4/5	2/5	34, female, Bachelor's degree
(a)	181				5min (6)	6s	5s	3s	32s	24	23	100%	83%	85.11%	2/5	4/5	3/5	40, male, Bachelor's degree
	180				7min (10)	9s	7s	3s	34s	21	26	100%	98%	95.74%	1/5	3/5	1/5	26, female, Bachelor's degree
	179				7min (11)	9s	8s	4s	24s	22	25	50%	87%	85.11%	5/5	3/5	3/5	53, male, Bachelor's degree
	176				6min (8)	8s	7s	3s	25s	24	23	50%	91%	89.36%	2/5	2/5	1/5	31, male, College, no degree
	175				7min (9)	10s	6s	3s	32s	26	21	100%	98%	95.74%	2/5	3/5	2/5	32, female, Bachelor's degree
	174				10min (13)	13s	10s	5s	37s	25	22	100%	96%	93.62%	1/5	2/5	1/5	35, female, Bachelor's degree
	173				11min (13)	15s	12s	4s	55s	20	27	100%	98%	95.74%	5/5	2/5	1/5	28, male, College, no degree
	172				8min (10)	11s	8s	3s	1min	17	30	50%	87%	85.11%	2/5	5/5	1/5	30, male, College, no degree
	171				6min (7)	8s	7s	3s	29s	27	20	100%	98%	95.74%	2/5	1/5	2/5	23, female, Bachelor's degree
					7min	10						10.007	0.101	01.101/	0.0		0.15	47. female. Bachelor's
	169				(9) 14min	105	95	45	20s	22	25	100%	94%	91.49%	2/5	2/5	2/5	degree 39. male. Bachelor's
	168				(16) 13min	185	/s	35	amin	2/	20	100%	74%	/0.0%	4/5	2/5	5/5	degree 40 female Bachelor's
	167				(17) 20min	165	145	45	1min	22	25	100%	8/%	89.36%	2/5	3/6	2/6	degree 40 male Associate
(b)	166				(28)	26s	12s	4s	3min	23	24	100%	81%	78.72%	2/5	3/5	2/5	degree 30 female Bacholor/s
	165				(17)	18s	7s	3s	4min	22	25	100%	91%	89.36%	2/5	2/5	2/5	degree 26 male Pachelor's
	164				- (7) 14min	5s	5s	2s	10s	25	22	100%	89%	91.49%	1/5	2/5	2/5	degree
	163				(15)	18s	15s	4s	44s	22	25	50%	91%	89.36%	4/5	2/5	3/5	degree
	161				(9)	9s	8s	4s	20s	28	19	50%	98%	97.87%	3/5	2/5	2/5	degree

Fig. S24. Our custom analysis tool provides an overview of all MTurk participants. The responses of each participant are displayed along a timeline, (a) either laid out uniformly or (b) by reaction time, and color-coded based on the agreement with the gold standard or majority vote.



Fig. S25. A separate view in the analysis tool allows us to compare model predictions with human judgements for individual triplets. Each row corresponds to one triplet (out of 135). The first two columns show the reaction time followed by two columns that summarize the number of human votes that each alternative received. The yellow circle inside the blue boxes indicates which alternative the expert annotator has picked. Model predictions are shown using diamond symbols. For each triplet, models produce one similarity score for alternative A and one score for alternative B. We have pre-selected 6 models which leads to 12 symbols per triplet. Similarity scores are between 0-1 and the values are encoded through the x-position. The alternative with the higher score is considered more similar and shown in blue; otherwise in gold. For these example triplets, we can see that nearly all models agree with the human majority that alternative A is more similar to the reference. There are only three triplets where one model predicted that alternative B is more similar (blue diamonds in column B).



Fig. S26. Hovering over rows shows a preview of the triplet the way that it was presented to participants. The alternative that received more votes is shown on the left.



Fig. S27. Predictions that belong to a model instance can be connected with lines and all columns can be sorted to identify patterns. In this screenshot, triplets are sorted based on the standard deviation of model predictions (column A). All models computed high similarity scores for alternative A and diverging but lower scores for alternative B. The number of human votes mostly align with the models but in some cases human consensus is not as clear (e.g., triplet with 16 participant votes for alternative A and 10 votes for alternative B).



Fig. S28. Triplets can be filtered based on low or high human consensus. Model instances can be shown or hidden interactively. In this example, the triplets are sorted based on the number of participant votes alternative B received. Triplets with none or low human consensus are shown at the top. LDA and GloVe-TF are selected and all other model predictions are hidden.

## 7. Proof-of-Concept: VizCommender



Fig. S29. Early VizCommender prototype that incorporated both visual and topic features. The interface allowed us to change the weights of these features (see right column) and observe how recommendations change. Later prototypes focused on text-based similarity because investigations and discussions with collaborators indicated that specific visual encodings are less relevant for information seeking in vis repositories.



Fig. S30. VizCommender Overview.



Fig. S31. VizCommender Overview. Screenshot shows results for the search query "medal". A workbook titled "OlympicGames" is selected and the quick view on the right side provides further details and recommendations. The similarity model identified related workbooks and several workbooks that use similar data sources.



Fig. S32. VizCommender Overview. Five near-duplicate workbooks are shown and one is selected. Both similarity facets ("use similar data" and "similar versions") correctly reveal the relationship between the workbooks in the quick view sidebar. Future work could investigate how the viz-to-viz similarity measure can be used to bundle nearduplicates and to show only one representative in the interface.