## Non-Research Tips for Information Science Researchers (Summer 2024)

May 1, 2024<br>Week 4: Tables and plots

https://non-research-tips.github.io/2024


Yusuke Matsui (UTokyo)

## Schedule

| Date (2024) | Contents | Presented by |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1, Apr 10 | Introduction. Review of fundamental concepts | Yusuke, Koya, Yuki, Jun |
| Week 2, Apr 17 | Equations and pseudo-codes | Yusuke Matsui |
| Week 3, Apr 24 | Presentation | Koya Narumi |
| Week 4, May 1 | Tables and plots | Yusuke Matsui |
| Week 5, May 8 | Figures | Koya Narumi |
| Week 6, May 22 | Videos | Koya Narumi |
| Week 7, May 29 | Invited Talk 1 | Dr. Yoshiaki Bando (AIST) |
| Week 8, June 5 | Invited Talk 2 | Prof. Katie Seaborn (Tokyo Tech) |
| Week 9, June 12 | GitHub in depth | Yusuke Matsui |
| Week 10, June 19 | Automation of research and research dissemination (Web, Cloud, CI/CD) | Jun Kato |
| Week 11, June 26 | Research community | Jun Kato |
| Week 12, July 3 | 3DCG illustrations | Yuki Koyama |
| Week 13, July 10 | Final presentations | - |


| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

Author

> My current table appears unprofessional. I want to create a more visually appealing table...

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |



Author

My current table appears unprofessional. I want to create a more visually appealing table...

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |



The table looks better! I often find this kinds of tables in top-conference papers.

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |



Author

My current table appears unprofessional. I want to create a more visually appealing table...

| Name | Height $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Weight $(\mathrm{kg})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |



Reviewer 2

The table looks better! I often find this kinds of tables in top-conference papers.

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

## 1. Structure your table. 2. Use the booktabs package.

| Name He <br> Lebron James  | 113 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Anthony Pavis | 208 | 115 |
| 208 |  |  |



Author
Whenever I display data, I always use a bar graph, but I feel like it doesn't provide enough information.


Author
Whenever I display data, I always use a bar graph, but I feel like it doesn't provide enough information.
AlexNet

VGG

DenseNet EfficientNet

Box plots seem better! Now, I can see that DenseNet's scores are scattered.


Author
Whenever I display data, I always use a bar graph, but I feel like it doesn't provide enough information.


AlexNet

Good job!

Box plots seem better! Now, I can see that DenseNet's scores are scattered.


Author
Whenever I display data, I always use it doesn't on.

## Tips for good plots



Box plots seem better! Now, I can see that DenseNet's scores are scattered.

## Reference

## booktabs

$>$ S．Fear，＂Publication quality tables in LaTeX＂，Official documentation for booktabs in CTAN， 2020. http：／／mirrors．ctan．org／macros／latex／contrib／booktabs／booktabs．pdf
＞M．Püschel，＂Small Guide to Making Nice Tables＂，https：／／people．inf．ethz．ch／markusp／teaching／guides／guide－tables．pdf Introduction of booktabs（I was inspired by this document．）

## Boxplot

＞M．Streit and N．Gehlenborg，＂Bar charts and box plots＂，Nature Methods， 2014. https：／／www．nature．com／articles／nmeth． 2807

## The original document for this lecture

＞松井勇佑，＂とにかくbooktabsを使おう＂，GitHub，2022．https：／／github．com／mti－lab／use booktabs anyway


## Powerpoint?

$>$ The contents of today's lecture are for rendering tables by TeX.
> When you want to render tables in Powerpoint, you can imitate the TeX's one, like:

|  | Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| But I don't like | Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |
| this space... |  |  |  |

$>$ Or you can do it in other ways, like:

| Example | Meaning |
| :--- | :--- |
| $a \in[2,7]$ | $2 \leq a \leq 7 \quad$ More informative than $a \in \mathbb{R}$ |
| $a \in(2,7)$ | $2<a<7$ |
| $a \in[2,7)$ | $2 \leq a<7$ |
| $a \in\{2,7\}$ | $a=2$ or $a=7$ |
| $a \in\{2, \ldots, 7\}$ | If naturally interpreted, $a=2$ or $a=3$ or $\ldots$ or $a=7$. |

## Disclaimer

$>$ The contents of today's lecture are based on Matsui's rule of thumb.
$>$ Please consider the contents as guidelines and apply them to your field at your discretion.
> If you have better tips, please always let me know!
$>$ I would like to offer you helpful tips and enhance the quality of your papers. (All of you!)

Question

Please briefly describe
the paper's
contributions, and list its positive and its positive points.

The authors start from a small ( 16 centroids The authors
local descriptor $x$ by descending a list (aka inv to select the subtree. A pol $k$-means to alternalive to the hierarchical $k$-means
$\therefore$ bad method, flawed experiments
Definitely Reiect

Can we systematically overcome the typical mistakes that beginners make?

I have been thinking about such a thing for more than a decade ...

The review for my first
CVPR submission (2013)
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## Tables

> Basics
> Row-oriented structure
> Row grouping
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> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart


## Plots

> Basics
> Bar chart to box plot
> Control parameter
> Misc

## Basics

> Follow the 5 steps below.

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

```
¥begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|} ¥hline
    Name & Height (cm) & Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥hline
    LeBron James & 206 & 113 ¥¥ ¥hline
    Anthony Davis & 208 & 115 ¥¥ ¥hline
¥end{tabular}
```

```
¥usepackage{booktabs}
¥begin{tabular}{@{}lll@{}} ¥toprule
    Name & Height (cm) & Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥midrule
    LeBron James & 206 & 113 ¥¥ 
    Anthony Davis & 208 & 115 ¥¥ ¥bottomrule
¥end{tabular}
```


## Basics

## > Follow the 5 steps below.

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |


|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name | Height $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Weight $(\mathrm{kg})$ |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

Step 2: Delete all vertical lines.
$>$ i.e., $\{|c| c|c|\} \rightarrow\{c c c\}$
> If you table is well structured, you don't need vertical lines.
$>$ If you think you need vertical lines, I recommend splitting the table into smaller ones

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |


| Name | Height (cm) | Weight $(\mathrm{kg})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

```
¥usepackage{booktabs}
¥begin{tabular}{@{}lll@{}} ¥toprule
    Name & Height (cm) & Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥midrule
    LeBron James & 206 & 113 ¥¥ 
    Anthony Davis & 208 & 115 ¥¥ ¥bottomrule
¥end{tabular}
```

Step 3: Align left.
$>$ i.e., $\{\mathrm{ccc}\} \rightarrow\{111\}$
$>$ Left-align is beautiful (Remember "invisible lines" in Week 3!)
$>$ If you have problems with left alignment, try right or center alignment.

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |


|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name | Height $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Weight (kg) |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

```
¥begin{tabular}{\, c|c|c|
    Name & Height (cm) & Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥hline
    LeBron James & 206 & 113 ¥¥ ¥hline
    Anthony Davis & 208 & 115 ¥¥ ¥hline
¥end{tabular}
```

```
¥usepackage{booktabs}
```

¥usepackage{booktabs}
¥begin{tabular}{@{111@{}} ¥toprule
¥begin{tabular}{@{111@{}} ¥toprule
Name \& Height (cm) \& Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥midrule
Name \& Height (cm) \& Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥midrule
LeBron James \& 206 \& 113 ¥¥
LeBron James \& 206 \& 113 ¥¥
Anthony Davis \& 208 \& 115 ¥¥ ¥bottomrule
Anthony Davis \& 208 \& 115 ¥¥ ¥bottomrule
¥end{tabular}

```
¥end{tabular}
```


## Basics

> Follow the 5 steps below.

| Name | Height $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Weight $(\mathrm{kg})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

¥begin\{tabular\}\{|c|c|c|\} ¥hline
Name \& Height (cm) \& Weight (kg) $¥ ¥ ¥$ ¥hline Step 4: Put a magical spacer symbols, "@\{\}" $>$ i.e., \{111\} $\rightarrow$ \{@\{\}111@\{\}\}
$>$ This eliminates excess spaces.
> Many papers forget this.

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

```
¥usepackage{booktabs}
¥begin{tabular}(@{})@@{})}¥\mathrm{ toprule
    Name & Height (cm) &Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥midrule
    LeBron James & 206 & 113 ¥¥ 
    Anthony Davis & 208 & 115 ¥¥ ¥bottomrule
¥end{tabular}
```


## Basics

| W/O "@\{\}" |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |


|  | W/ 'œ@ $@$ " |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

No spaces. Beautiful! ©
Remember "invisible lines" in Week 3!

Anthony Davis \& 208 \& 115 ¥¥ $¥ b o t t o m r u l e$
¥end\{tabular\}

```
Step 5: Use "top/mid/bottomrule"
> i.e.,
    \checkmark ~ T h e ~ t o p ~ ¥ h l i n e ~ m ~ ¥ t o p r u l e
    \checkmark ~ T h e ~ n e x t ~ ¥ h l i n e ~ m ~ ¥ m i d r u l e ~
    \checkmark ~ T h e ~ b o t t o m ~ ¥ h l i n e ~ m ~ ¥ b o t t o m r u l e
    \checkmark ~ O t h e r ~ ¥ h l i n e s ~ = > ~ D e l e t e ! ~
\(>\) Well-structured tables require horizontal lines just a bit.
```


n) \& Weight (kg) va ¥hline

206 \& $113 ¥ ¥$ ¥hline

```
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\hline Name & Height (cm) & Weight (kg) \\
\hline LeBron James & 206 & 113 \\
Anthony Davis & 208 & 115 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
¥usepackage\{booktabs\}
¥begin\{tabular\}\{@\{\}11l@\{\}\} ¥toprule
Name \& Height (cm) \& Weight (k.g.)..\#¥. \&midrule
LeBron James \& 206 \& \(113 ¥ ¥\) !
Anthony Davis \& 208 \& 115
¥b゙ottoimirule
¥end\{tabular\}
```


## Basics

## > Follow the 5 steps below.

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

ミbegin $\{$ tabular $\}\{|c| c|c|\} ¥ h l i n e$ Name \& Height (cm) \& Weigit (kg) wnline LeBron James \& 206 \& 113 Anthony Davis \& 208 \& 115
 ¥hline kend\{tabular\}

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

[^0]¥toprule

## Basics

> You can always apply these 5 steps, and your table will be much more beautiful!

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

```
¥begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|} ¥hline
    Name & Height (cm) & Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥hline
    LeBron James & 206 & 113 ¥¥ ¥hline
    Anthony Davis & 208 & 115 ¥¥ ¥hline
¥end{tabular}
```

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |

```
#usepackage{booktabs}
¥begin{tabular}{@{}lll@{}} ¥toprule
    Name & Height (cm) & Weight (kg) ¥¥ ¥midrule
    LeBron James & 206 & 113 ¥¥ 
    Anthony Davis & 208 & 115 ¥¥ ¥bottomrule
¥end{tabular}
```


## Tables

> Basics
> Row-oriented structure
> Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart


## Plots

> Basics
> Bar chart to box plot > Control parameter

## Row-oriented structure

$>$ A table should be a stack of rows, i.e., row-oriented.
> The best structure: "header" + "row1" + "row2" + ...

| Header | Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) | Each row should be semantically same level i.e., instances (rows) of the same class (header) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Row1 | LeBron James | 206 | 113 |  |
| Row2 | Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |  |

> Each row should be semantically interchangeable.

| Name | Height $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Weight $(\mathrm{kg})$ |  | Usually, rows are sorted <br> by some criteria. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 | 113 |
| LeBron James | 206 |  | Yet, rows should be <br> interchangeable. |  |

## Row-oriented structure

$>$ A table should be a stack of rows, i.e., row-oriented.
$>$ The best structure: "header" + "row1" + "row2" + ...

| Header | Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) | Each row should be semantically same level i.e., instances (rows) of the same class (header) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Row1 | LeBron James | 206 | 113 |  |
| Row2 | Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |  |
| Each row should be semantically |  |  | ```class Person: def __init__(self, name, height, weight): self.name = name self.height = height self.weight = weight row1 = Person('LeBron James', 206, 113) row2 = Person('Anthony Davis', 208, 115)``` |  |
|  | Anthony Davis | 208 |  |  |  |
|  | LeBron James | 206 | 113 | interchangeable. |

## Row-oriented structure

> For each column,
$\checkmark$ The header defines the type, i.e., "int".
$\checkmark$ Each row shows the value, i.e., "34".
$>$ Seems obvious? But it's not easy to strictly follow this principal.


## Daus_nriantad ctructura

$>$ From S. Ren+, "Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object Detection with Region Proposal Networks", TPAMI 2017 (30K+ citation paper)
$>$ Object detection papers do not follow this principal (because \#class is $\sim 20$ and can fit the paper, thus it's possible to write everything one line).
$>$ One may restructure this table clearer as we'll show later, but it requires more spaces. $>$ Everything up to the situation!


## Exceptional cases: e.g., average values

$>$ There are several exceptions, such as a row of average values
$>$ Such row is a special and cannot be swapped to other rows (usually placed at the bottom).

| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |
| D'Angelo Russell | 193 | 88 |
| Average | 202 | 105.3 |
|  |  |  |


| Name | Height (cm) | Weight (kg) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LeBron James | 206 | 113 |
| Anthony Davis | 208 | 115 |
| D'Angelo Russell | 193 | 88 |
| Average | 202 | 105.3 |

$>$ Creating tables: Following the row-oriented structure as much as possible while aiming for the clearest presentation.
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Tables

> Basics
> Row-oriented structure
> Row grouping
> Row hierarchization

## Plots

$>$ Basics
> Bar chart to box plot
> Control parameter
> Misc

## Row grouping

> You can group rows to improve the readability.

A good table. Rows are interchangeable.

| Method |
| :--- |
| $\left\{\begin{array}{lll}\hline & \text { Runtime (ms) } & \text { Accuracy } \\ \hline \text { XYZ } & 16 & 0.32 \\ \text { XYZ } & 32 & 0.61 \\ \left\{\begin{array}{lll}\text { Ours } & 9 & 0.47 \\ \text { Ours } & 18 & 0.99\end{array}\right. & 0.21 \\ \hline\end{array}\right.$ |


| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
|  | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
|  | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |


| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
|  | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
|  | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |

However, there are repetitive descriptions, which makes the table unnecessarily wordy. $\mathscr{O}_{\circ}^{\circ}$

## Row grouping

> You can group rows to improve the readability.

| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
| XYZ | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
| Ours | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |


| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
|  | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
|  | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |


| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
|  | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
|  | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |

$>$ You can simply group some rows. $\because$
> Delete unnecessary descriptions.

## Row grouping

> You can group rows to improve the readability.
$>$ You can further draw a $¥ m i d r u l e$

| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
| XYZ | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
| Ours | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |


| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
|  | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
|  | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |


| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
|  | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
|  | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
| Ours | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |

$>$ You can combine rows if you want.
$>$ ¥multirow

## Row grouping



$>$ You can combine rows if you want. $>$ ¥multirow

## Row grouping

> Many prefer the third one.
$>$ Personally speaking, the second one is straightforward enough in many cases (simpler is better).
> Choose what you like!

| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
| XYZ | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
| Ours | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |


| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
|  | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
|  | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |


| Method | $k$ | Runtime (ms) | Accuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| XYZ | 16 | 0.32 | 0.21 |
|  | 32 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
| Ours | 9 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
|  | 18 | 0.99 | 0.77 |

d

## Multiple-level grouping

> You can group rows recursively.

| Nearest Station | Store Name | Item | Price (JPY) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hongo-Sanchome | Umite | Natsu-Ramen | 700 |
|  |  | Maze Men X | 850 |
|  | IBASA | Ramen | 700 |
| Todai-mae | Yojinmen | Cold Ramen | 650 |
|  |  | Ramen | 700 |
|  |  | 800 |  |

## Tables

$>$ Basics
> Row-oriented structure
$>$ Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Plots

$>$ Basics
> Bar chart to box plot
> Control parameter
> Misc

## Row hierarchization

> Row hierarchization = Deleting a row + Indentation
$\checkmark$ In other words, horizontally-long $\leftrightarrow$ vertically-long $>$ Row hierarchization may make a table easier to read.

| Item | Type | Price $(¥)$ | Floor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pork | Meat | 300 | 2 |
| Beef | Meat | 500 | 2 |
| Tomato | Vegetables | 100 | 3 |
| Corn | Vegetables | 200 | 3 |
| Cabbage | Vegetables | 30 | 4 |


| Item | Type | Price $(¥)$ | Floor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pork | Meat | 300 | 2 |
| Beef |  | 500 | 2 |
| Tomato | Vegetables | 100 | 3 |
| Corn |  | 200 | 3 |
| Cabbage |  | 30 | 4 |



A good table. Rows are interchangeable.

## Row hierarchization

> Row hierarchization = Deleting a row + Indentation
$\checkmark$ In other words, horizontally-long $\leftrightarrow$ vertically-long $>$ Row hierarchization may make a table easier to read.

| Item | Type | Price $(¥)$ | Floor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pork | Meat | 300 | 2 |
| Beef | Meat | 500 | 2 |
| Tomato | Vegetables | 100 | 3 |
| Corn | Vegetables | 200 | 3 |
| Cabbage | Vegetables | 30 | 4 |


| Item | Type | Price $(¥)$ | Floor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pork | Meat | 300 | 2 |
| Beef |  | 500 | 2 |
| Tomato | Vegetables | 100 | 3 |
| Corn |  | 200 | 3 |
| Cabbage |  | 30 | 4 |



Row grouping. Easier to read. Good.

## Row hierarchization

> Row hierarchization = Deleting a row + Indentation
$\checkmark$ In other words, horizontally-long $\leftrightarrow$ vertically-long
$>$ Row hierarchization may make a table easier to read.

| Item | Type | Price $(¥)$ | Floor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pork | Meat | 300 | 2 |
| Beef | Meat | 500 | 2 |
| Tomato | Vegetables | 100 | 3 |
| Corn | Vegetables | 200 | 3 |
| Cabbage | Vegetables | 30 | 4 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Item | Type | Price $(¥)$ | Floor |
| Pork | Meat | 300 | 2 |
| Beef |  |  | 2 |
| Tomato | Vegetables | 100 | 3 |
| Corn |  | 200 | 3 |
| Cabbage |  | 30 | 4 |


| Item | Price (¥) | Floor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Meat |  |  |
| Pork | 300 | 2 |
| Beef | 500 | 2 |
| Vegetables |  |  |
| Tomato | 100 | 3 |
| Corn | 200 | 3 |
| Cabbage | 30 | 4 |

## Indentation (add white spaces in TeX) <br> Row hierarchization. In this case, this one is also good.



## Indentation (add white spaces in TeX )

Row hierarchization. In this case, this one is also good.

## Row hierarchization

> Row hierarchization = Deleting a row + Indentation
$\checkmark$ In other words, horizontally-long $\leftrightarrow$ vertically-long
$>$ Row hierarchization may make a table easier to read.

| Item | Type | Price ( $¥$ ) | Floor | Item | Type | Price ( $¥$ ) | Floor | ItemMeat | Price (¥) | Floor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pork | Meat | 300 | 2 | Pork | Meat | 300 | 2 | Pork | 300 | 2 |
| Beef | Meat | 500 | 2 | Beef |  | 500 | 2 | Beef | 500 | 2 |
| Tomato | Vegetables | 100 | 3 | Tomato | Vegetables | 100 | 3 | Vegetables |  |  |
| Corn | Vegetables | 200 | 3 | Corn |  | 200 | 3 | Tomato | 100 | 3 |
| Cabbage | Vegetables | 30 | 4 | Cabbage |  | 30 | 4 | Corn | 200 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cabbage | 30 | 4 |

$>$ Row-grouping and row-hierarchization are just for visualization
> Semantically, one should be able to convert the table to the original "stack of rows" from easily.

## Tables

> Basics
> Row-oriented structure
$>$ Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Plots

> Basics
> Bar chart to box plot
> Control parameter
> Misc

## Column hierarchization

> Columns cannot be grouped. But can be hierarchically summarized.
$>$ Ok. But there are multiple "error"s.
$>$ Not only wordy, but also requires spaces.

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Method | Min. error | Avg. error | Max. error |
| Isomap | 0.23 | 0.44 | 0.92 |
| LLE | 0.10 | 0.73 | 1.82 |


|  |  | Error |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Column <br> hierarchization | Method | Min. | Avg. | Max. |
|  | Isomap | 0.23 | 0.44 | 0.92 |
|  | LLE | 0.10 | 0.73 | 1.82 |

$>$ Hierarchize "error".
$>$ No redundant information. Good!
$>$ Again, this is for visualization. We can always back to the original form.

## Column hierarchization



## Multiple column-hierarchization

> You can hierarchize columns multiple times.
With hierarchization, one needs to write a unit just once, making the table shorter

| Prefecture | Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  |  | Precipitation (mm) |  | Access |  | Density (persons $/ \mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max. | Avg. | Min. | August | December | By shinkansen | By plane |  |
| Ishikawa | 32 | 20 | -1 | 179.8 | 304.7 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 267 |
| Shizuoka | 27 | 23 | 5 | 250.9 | 63.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 461 |
| Okinawa | 33 | 28 | 15 | 175.4 | 104.4 |  | $\checkmark$ | 643 |

## It's ok to mix usual columns and hierarchized columns

## Multiple column-hierarchization

 Prefecture \& Max. \& Avg. \& Min. \& August \& December \& By shinkansen \& By plane \& Density (persons/\$\{km\}^2\$) $¥ \neq ¥$ midrule
Ishikawa \& 32 \& 20 \& -1 \& 179.8 \& 304.7 \& $¥$ checkmark \& $¥$ checkmark \& $267 ¥ ¥$
Ishikawa \& 32 \& 23 \& 5 \& 250.9 \& 63.0 \& $¥$ checkmark \& $¥$ checkmark \& $461 ¥ ¥$
Okinawa \& 33 \& 28 \& 15 \& 175.4 \& 104.4 \& \& $¥$ checkmark \& $643 ¥ ¥$ ¥bottomrule
¥end\{tabular\}
vVILI IIErdrcrilZaliOr, Orie rieeds lU Write a unit just once, making the table shorter

| Prefecture | Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  |  | Precipitation (mm) |  | Access |  | Density (persons $/ \mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max. | Avg. | Min. | August | December | By shinkansen | By plane |  |
| Ishikawa | 32 | 20 | -1 | 179.8 | 304.7 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 267 |
| Shizuoka | 27 | 23 | 5 | 250.9 | 63.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 461 |
| Okinawa | 33 | 28 | 15 | 175.4 | 104.4 |  | $\checkmark$ | 643 |

## It's ok to mix usual columns and hierarchized columns

## Tables

$>$ Basics
> Row-oriented structure
> Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart


## Plots

> Basics
> Bar chart to box plot
> Control parameter
$>$ Misc

## Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)

> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule) has two parameters.
$\checkmark$ Trims the ends of the line?: " 1 " (left) or " $r$ " (right) or "lr" (both)
$\checkmark$ Range (e.g., "2-4")
> By setting these params correctly, the table becomes much beautiful.


## Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)

|  |  | error |  |  |  | error |  |  |  | error |  |  |  | Error |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Method |  | Avg. | Max. ${ }^{\text {ben }}$ | Method | Min. | Avg. | Max. | Method | Min. | Avg. | Max. | Method | Min. | Avg. | Max |
| Isomap | 0.23 | 0.44 | 0.92 | Isomap | 0.23 | 0.44 | 0.92 | Isomap | 0.23 | 0.44 | 0.92 | Isomap | 0.23 | 0.44 | 0.92 |
| LLE | 0.10 | 0.73 | 1.82 | LLE | 0.10 | 0.73 | 1.82 | LLE | 0.10 | 0.73 | 1.82 | LLE | 0.10 | 0.73 | 1.82 |
| cmidrule() $\{2-4\}$ |  |  |  |  | cmidrule(1) $\{2-4\}$ |  |  |  | cmidrule(r) $\{2-4\}$ |  |  |  | cmidrule(lr) $\{2-4\}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Trim left |  |  |  | Trim right |  |  |  | Trim left and right |  |  |

Small differences... But god is in the details...

## Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)

## w/ proper params

| Prefecture | Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  |  | Precipitation (mm) |  | Access |  | Density (persons/ $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max. | Avg. | Min. | August | December | By shinkansen | By plane |  |
| Ishikawa | 32 | 20 | -1 | 179.8 | 304.7 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 267 |
| Shizuoka | 27 | 23 | 5 | 250.9 | 63.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 461 |
| Okinawa | 33 | 28 | 15 | 175.4 | 104.4 |  | $\checkmark$ | 643 |

## w/o proper params

| Prefecture | Temperature ( $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ |  |  | Precipitation (mm) |  | Access |  | Density (persons/ $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Max. | Avg. | Min. | August | December | By shinkansen | By plane |  |
| Ishikawa | 32 | 20 | -1 | 179.8 | 304.7 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 267 |
| Shizuoka | 27 | 23 | 5 | 250.9 | 63.0 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 461 |
| Okinawa | 33 | 28 | 15 | 175.4 | 104.4 |  | $\checkmark$ | 643 |

## Tables

$>$ Basics
> Row-oriented structure
> Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
$>$ Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Plots

> Basics
> Bar chart to box plot
> Control parameter
> Misc

## Column to row

> This is not recommended, but moving a column to a row often makes the table clearer. Consider the following typical table.

| Method | Dataset | Runtime (ms) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| k-means | MNIST | 10.2 |
|  | ImageNet | 45.3 |
|  | Places | 57.1 |
| Ours | MNIST | 8.3 |
|  | ImageNet | 39.1 |
|  | Places | 82.3 |

$>$ This table is good (rows are interchangeable), but... $\checkmark$ If we compare methods in the same dataset, the values are far away (e.g., on MNIST, k-means (10.2) vs Ours (8.3)).
With more methods/datasets, the table becomes more vertical.

## Column to row

> This is not recommended, but moving a column to a row often makes the table clearer. Consider the following typical table.

| Method | Dataset | Runtime (ms) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| k-means | MNIST | 10.2 |
|  | ImageNet | 45.3 |
|  | Places | 57.1 |
| Ours | MNIST | 8.3 |
|  | ImageNet | 39.1 |
|  | Places | 82.3 |

> This table is good (rows are interchangeable), but... $\checkmark$ If we compare methods in the same dataset, the values are far away (e.g., on MNIST, k-means (10.2) vs Ours (8.3)).
With more methods/datasets, the table becomes more vertical.

## Column to row

> This is not recommended, but moving a column to a row often makes the table clearer. Consider the following typical table.

| Method | Dataset | Runtime (ms) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| k-means | MNIST | 10.2 |
|  | ImageNet | 45.3 |
|  | Places | 57.1 |
| Ours | MNIST | 8.3 |
|  | ImageNet | 39.1 |
|  | Places | 82.3 |

$>$ This table is good (rows are interchangeable), but...
$\checkmark$ If we compare methods in the same dataset, the values are far away (e.g., on MNIST, k-means (10.2) vs Ours (8.3)).
$\checkmark$ With more methods/datasets, the table becomes more vertical.

## Column to row



## Column to row



## Column to row


> Seems clear. But there's no descriptions for "Dataset"
> This approach works only if it's acceptable not to show "Dataset"

## Column to row


> Seems perfect? But there's no description for "Runtime".
> You need to write "This table reports runtime (ms)" in the caption.
$>$ If a table consists of only one type of value, you may clarify the table by removing the type in the header and explaining the type in the caption.

## Column to row


> Seems perfect? But there's no description for "Runtime".
$>$ You need to write "This table reports runtime (ms)" in the caption.
$>$ If a table consists of only one type of value, you may clarify the table by removing the type in the header and explaining the type in the caption.

## Column to row


$>$ The original cause is that there are two factors to focus (Method and Dataset).
$>$ If there are two factors to focus, the table would be "matrix-like".
$>$ In this case, plotting may be better (you can further improve this by box-plot!).

## Tables

$>$ Basics
> Row-oriented structure
$>$ Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Plots

> Basics
> Bar chart to box plot
> Control parameter
$>$ Misc

## Flowchart

> When you have trouble creating tables, then...

1. Break up the table until it becomes the "good" table (e.g., satisfying stack-of-rows principal). It is OK if it is very vertically long.
2. Repeat the "row grouping" for the most important column. Do "row hierarchization" as needed.
3. Perform "column grouping" as necessary.
4. If it still does not fit, do "move a column to a row" and then do "row hierarchization". Delete redundant descriptions.
5. If it still does not fit well, consider using a plot.

## Tables

$>$ Basics
> Row-oriented structure
> Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Plots

> Bar chart to box plot
$>$ Control parameter
> Misc

## Basics

$>$ Three basic plots; line chart, box plot (bar chart), and scatter plot
$>$ Try these basic plots first. In many cases, that will suffice.
> Avoid using overly complex/sophisticated plots, as reviewers may have difficulty understanding them.


Line chart


Box plot


Scatter plot


## Basics

> Three basic plots; line chart, box plot (bar chart), and scatter plot
$>$ There exist discrete labels. (x-axis)
$>$ For each label, several observations. (y-axis) es, that will suffice.
ted plot $>$ Several 2D instances
mave uniticuily uliuerso


Line chart

IETI.


Box plot


Scatter plot
> One control parameter (a continuous value, not discrete labels).
$>$ Compare several functions (lines) of the parameter.

## Basics



The font size should be large! Ideally, the same size as the main text.

## Tables

$>$ Basics
> Row-oriented structure
> Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Plots

> Basics
> Bar chart to box plot > Control parameter
$>$ Misc

## Bar chart to box plot

$>$ A bar chart is the first choice, however, $\checkmark$ A bar chart with error bars is basically better.
$\checkmark$ A box plot is further better.
$>$ Considering the following observations.
Accuracy of AlexNet
$\left[\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllll}0.14 & 0.06 & 0.05 & 0.11 & 0.14 & 0.08 & 0.2 & 0.14 & 0.1 & 0.08 & 0.07 & 0.15 & 0.09 & 0.01 & 0.08 & 0.15 & 0.04 & 0.04 \\ 0.11 & 0.11\end{array}\right]$
Accuracy of VGG

```
[0.06 0.08 0.07 0.06 0.07 0.03 0.04 0.02 0.03 0.06 0.01 0.04 0.04 0.05 0.04 0.03 0.04 0.09 0.09 0.05]
```

Accuracy of ResNet
$\left[\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllll}0.32 & 0.06 & 0.16 & 0.22 & 0.45 & 0.13 & 0.25 & 0.51 & 0.27 & 0.32 & 0.06 & 0.43 & 0.31 & 0.28 & 0.18 & 0.16 & 0.22 & 0.35\end{array} 0.46 \quad 0.27\right]$
Accuracy of DenseNet
$\left[\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllll}0.42 & 0.36 & 0.39 & 0.43 & 0.55 & 0 & 0.49 & 0.12 & 0.08 & 0.35 & 0.01 & 0.58 & 0.39 & 0.46 & -0.05 & 0.37 & 0.34 & 0.06 & 0.05\end{array} 0.44\right]$
Accuracy of EfficientNet
$\left[\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllll}0.1 & 0.21 & 0.17 & 0.12 & 0.28 & 0.25 & 0.11 & 0.01 & 0.09 & 0.12 & 0.21 & 0.3 & 0.11 & 0.23 & 0.18 & 0.21 & 0.05 & 0.12 & 0.07 & 0.1\end{array}\right]$

## Bar chart to box plot

$>$ A bar chart is the first choice, however, $\checkmark$ A bar chart with error bars is basically better.
$\checkmark$ A box plot is further better.
$>$ Considering the following observations.
Accuracy of AlexNet
$\left[\begin{array}{llllll}0.14 & 0.06 & 0.05 & 0.11 & 0.14 & 0.2\end{array}\right.$
Accuracy of VGG $\left[\begin{array}{lllllll}0.06 & 0.08 & 0.07 & 0.06 & 0.07 & 0.03 & 0.04\end{array}\right.$
$>$ Comparison over the discrete labels (methods). So we don't use a line chart.
$>$ Let's consider a bar chart first.
Accuracy of ResNet $\left[\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllll}0.32 & 0.06 & 0.16 & 0.22 & 0.45 & 0.13 & 0.25 & 0.51 & 0.27 & 0.32 & 0.06 & 0.43 & 0.31 & 0.28 & 0.18 & 0.16 & 0.22 & 0.35\end{array} 0.46 \quad 0.27\right]$

Accuracy of DenseNet
$\left[\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllll}0.42 & 0.36 & 0.39 & 0.43 & 0.55 & 0 & 0.49 & 0.12 & 0.08 & 0.35 & 0.01 & 0.58 & 0.39 & 0.46 & -0.05 & 0.37 & 0.34 & 0.06 \\ 0.05 & 0.44]\end{array}\right.$
Accuracy of EfficientNet
$\left[\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllll}0.1 & 0.21 & 0.17 & 0.12 & 0.28 & 0.25 & 0.11 & 0.01 & 0.09 & 0.12 & 0.21 & 0.3 & 0.11 & 0.23 & 0.18 & 0.21 & 0.05 & 0.12 & 0.07 & 0.1\end{array}\right]$

## Bar chart to box plot

Comparison of the average values. That's it. Not so much informative.

## $>$ By a box plot, we can see more information with the same space!





> > With error bars, we can see the variation of values.
> > More informative with the same space (area)

## Bar chart to box plot

Comparison of the average values. That's it. Not so much informative.

## By a box plot, we can see more information with the same space!




$>$ With error bars, we can see the variation of values.
$>$ More informative with the same space (area)

## Bar chart to box plot

Comparison of the average values. That's it. Not so much informative.
> By a box plot, we can see more information with the same space!



$>$ With error bars, we can see the variation of values.
> More informative with the same space (area)

## Box plot



## Box plot


M. Streit and N. Gehlenborg, "Bar charts and box plots", Nature Methods, 2014. https://www.nature.com/articles/nmeth. 2807

## Violin plot?

Can be found in the seaborn package

$\Rightarrow$ A violin plot is considered as a more sophisticated visualization.
$>$ We can visualize the distribution itself.
$>$ I personally don't recommend a violin plot much.

## Violin plot: bad points

$>$ A violin plot automatically generates (interpolates) the distribution.
$>$ It is dangerous, especially when \#data is not enough.

## Data: [1.0, 2.0]


> The reviewers may not understand the violin plot anyway.

## Violin plot: good points

> If the data is bi-modal or multi-modal, a violin plot is the only option. Data: [10.1, 9.9, 10.1, 9.8, 10.2, 10.0, 20.1, 20.2, 20.0, 19.9, 20.1]



## Tables

$>$ Basics
> Row-oriented structure
> Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
$>$ Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Plots

$>$ Basics
> Bar chart to box plot > Control parameter
> Misc

## Control parameter

> It often happens that we would like to show the two line-plots with the same control parameter.



## Control parameter

> It often happens that we would like to show the two line-plots with the same control parameter.
Inverse of runtime. Higher is better.

> HNSW seems more accurate but slower.
$>$ Can we know more information from these?

## Control parameter




## Control parameter

$>$ Informative plot with a less space!
$>$ Trade-off between the two curves.




Depending on the context, one may evaluate the curve by AUC (area under the curve)

Runtime of NSG suddenly drops around R@1=0.7

## Control parameter

$>$ Informative plot with a less space!
> Trade-off between the two curves.


for $x, y, c t r l$ in zip(xs, ys, ctrls):
plt.annotate(text=f"T=\{ctrl\}", $x y=(x, y)$, xytext=(x, $y+5)$ )


Depending on the context, one may evaluate the curve by AUC (area under the curve)

Runtime of NSG suddenly drops around R@1=0.7

## Precision-recall curve has the same structure



## Tables

$>$ Basics
> Row-oriented structure
$>$ Row grouping
> Row hierarchization
> Column hierarchization
> Partial horizontal line (cmidrule)
> Column to row
> Flowchart

## Plots

$>$ Basics
$>$ Bar chart to box plot
> Control parameter
> Misc

## Put the grid on a logarithmic graph



## Legend

> The order of the methods in the legend should match the lines as much as possible.



## Don't use dangerous charts



Pie charts


Radar charts


3D bar charts

■ north
■ south
■ east

- west


## Continuous parameter or discrete labels

> Don't draw a line for data of discrete labels.


## What should we do to improve our paper?

$>$ Do good research
$\checkmark \bigodot$ Yes, of course! But we know it takes time.
> Improve a writing skill.
$\checkmark$ Y Yes, of course! But we know it takes time.
> Improve English (if you're a non-native English speaker).
$\checkmark \fallingdotseq$ Yes, of course! But we know it takes time.
> Improve equations/tables/plots.
$\checkmark$ This won't take much time - study for a few days and you'll master it. So go ahead and do it!

## Schedule

| Date (2024) | Contents | Presented by |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1, Apr 10 | Introduction. Review of fundamental concepts | Yusuke, Koya, Yuki, Jun |
| Week 2, Apr 17 | Equations and pseudo-codes | Yusuke Matsui |
| Week 3, Apr 24 | Presentation | Koya Narumi |
| Week 4, May 1 | Fables and plots | Yusuke Matsui |
| Week 5, May 8 | Figures | Koya Narumi |
| Week 6, May 22 | Videos | Koya Narumi |
| Week 7, May 29 | Invited Talk 1 | Dr. Yoshiaki Bando (AIST) |
| Week 8, June 5 | Invited Talk 2 | Prof. Katie Seaborn (Tokyo Tech) |
| Week 9, June 12 | GitHub in depth | Yusuke Matsui |
| Week 10, June 19 | Automation of research and research dissemination (Web, Cloud, CI/CD) | Jun Kato (\%) |
| Week 11, June 26 | Research community | Jun Kato ( |
| Week 12, July 3 | 3DCG illustrations | Yuki Koyama |
| Week 13, July 10 | Final presentations | - |
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