### Paul Rosen

paul.rosen@utah.edu @paulrosenphd https://cspaul.com

# Visualization for Data Science DS-4630 / CS-5630 / CS-5630 / CS-6630

### Visualizing Multivariate Networks

Based on an IEEE VIS Tutorial held by Carolina Notre, Marc Streit, and Alexander Lex



THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH





## Multivariate Network

- Network Topology + Node and Edge Attributes
- Visualization is a tradeoff between Topology and Attributes
  - Choosing efficient encodings for one aspect often interferes with the ability to effectively visualize the other.



#### d Attributes terferes with the ability to



#### The State of the Art in Visualizing Multivariate Networks



Figure 1: A typology of operations and layouts used in multivariate network visualization. Layouts describe the fundamental choices for encoding multivariate networks. View Operations capture how topology and attribute focused visualizations can be combined. Layout Operations are applied to basic layouts to create specific visualization techniques. Data Operations are used to transform a network or derive attributes before visualizations. The colors reflect node attributes (orange), edge attributes (purple), and topology (grey).

#### Abstract

Multivariate networks are made up of nodes and their relationships (links), but also data about those nodes and links as attributes. Most real-world networks are associated with several attributes, and many analysis tasks depend on analyzing both, relationships and attributes. Visualization of multivariate networks, however, is challenging, especially when both the topology of the network and the attributes need to be considered concurrently. In this state-of-the-art report, we analyze current practices and classify techniques along four axes: layouts, view operations, layout operations, and data operations. We also provide an analysis of tasks specific to multivariate networks and give recommendations for which technique to use in which scenario. Finally, we survey application areas and evaluation methodologies.



Volume 38 (2019), Number 3 STAR - State of The Art Report

Implicit Tree Layouts



Leaf-Centric

Converting Attributes/Edge to Nodes













Inner Nodes + Leaves

Leaf-Centric



Querying and Filtering



Converting Attributes/Edge to Nodes



## Multivariate Network Tasks



# How is a multivariate network task different than a regular graph task?

• Rely on both the topology of the network and the attributes of the nodes and edges





C. Nobre









How many of my collaborators are from the oceanography field?











What is an efficient way I can complete all my errands?





- How many of my collaborators are in the oceanography field?
- Which cluster has the highest number of collaborations?
- What is the fastest route to get all my errands done?

# Tasks that rely on the **topology** of the network and the **attributes** of the nodes and edges



eanography field? llaborations? ds done?

# structures









# Network and Attribute Characteristics













Name: Maya Age: 23 Nationality: Brazilian GPA: 3.8

FRIENDS: 3 years







Name: Maya Age: 23 Nationality: Brazilian GPA: 3.8 Degree: 4

FRIENDS: 3 years













### Network Size







# Small <100

# Medium 100-1000



# Large >1000





## Network Types











Implicit Tree Layouts





Leaf-Centric

Querying and Filtering

Converting Attributes/Edge to Nodes



SCIA













Inner Nodes + Leaves

Leaf-Centric



Converting Attributes/Edge to Nodes





**Topology and Attributes** 

Multiple layouts for Topology or Attributes









Inner Nodes + Leaves

Leaf-Centric



Querying and Filtering



Converting Attributes/Edge to Nodes







#### Implicit Tree Layouts -





Inner Nodes + Leaves

Leaf-Centric



Querying and Filtering



Converting Attributes/Edge to Nodes



## Node-Link Layouts











### **Topology Driven Layout**





#### On-Node / On-Edge Encoding

Attribute-Driven Faceting



### **Attribute Driven Layouts**

#### Attribute-Driven Positioning



## On-Node / On-Edge Encoding













# On-Node / On-Edge Encoding





#### Gehlenborg et al. 2010



















Nielsen, 2009













Is easily understood by most users Works well for all types of networks





Scalability. Node size leaves little space to encode attributes.

Recommended for small networks when only a few (usually under five) attributes on the nodes are shown, or in combination with a zooming/filtering strategy





#### On-Node / On-Edge Encoding



## Attribute-Driven Faceting










## Semantic Substrates





	×
6	
me	

Shneiderman and Aris, 2006









extracellular

plasma membrane

cytoplasm

nucleus

transcriptionally regulated genes

Barskey et al. 2008



Well suited for networks with different node types or with an important categorical or set-like attribute.





Less scalable with respect to the number of nodes and network density than node-link layouts.

Neighborhoods, paths, and clusters are not easily visible if they span different facets.

Recommended for networks where nodes can be separated into groups easily and where these groups are central to the analysis





### Attribute-Driven Faceting

### Attribute-Driven Positioning

















Bezerianos et al. 2010









### Dork et al. 2011



### Well suited for quantitative attributes





Recommended for smaller, sparse networks where relationships between node attributes are paramount to the analysis task, and topological features only provide context





### Attribute-Driven Positioning



## Tabular Layouts





Adjacency Matrix

Quilts





BioFabric





























				state	OR	MA	MA	OR	MA
+	degre	e city	state	airport	PDX	SEA	GEG	EUG	PSC
	1.00 1	.04k		airport					
		Minneapolis	MN	MSP					
		Des Moines	IA	DSM					
	•	T Fargo	ND	FAR			13	8 p	ath
	•	Sioux Falls	SD	FSD			6 r	mid	dle
	•	Bismarck/Ma	ND	BIS			30	carr	rier
	•	Duluth	MN	DLH					
	•	Williston	ND	ISN					
	•	Hibbing	MN	HIB					
	•	Aberdeen	SD	ABR					
	•	Brainerd	MN	BRD					
	•	Bemidji	MN	BJI					
	•	Dickinson	ND	DIK					
	•	Grand Forks	ND	GFK					
	•	Devils Lake	ND	DVL					
		Cedar Rapids	IA	CID					
	-	Jamestown	ND	JMS					
	•	Minot	ND	MOT					
	•	Rapid City	SD	RAP					

+

city

Portland Seattle Spokane Eugene Pasco/Kenne

### node-to-node path count

			1			
1	4	20	95	438	2008	9194











(s)



Kerzner et al, 2017



**Attribute similarity (nodes)** 



Structure (edges)





### **Attribute values (nodes)**

Berger et al, 2019



Ideal for dense and completely connected networks





number of nodes.

Complexity of choosing the right reordering algorithm

Recommended for smaller, complex and dense networks with rich node and/or edge attributes, for all tasks except for those involving paths





### Requires quadratic space with respect to the



## Quilts



















U











Links between nonconsecutive layers can be problematic to integrate and non-intuitive

Recommended for layered or k-partite networks with limited skiplinks.





### BioFabric







U





Beverage	Day 1
Beer	1
Coke	0
Port	4
Coke	5
Beer	2
Port	3



### BioFabric







Longabaugh, 2012

Can be used to visualize rich edge attributes and node attributes at the same time





More difficult to discover neighbors and clusters in Biofabric compared to matrices.

Recommended for small, sparse networks with many nodes and rich edge attributes







### View Operations







### Overloaded



## Juxtaposed





U





Name	Beverage	Day 1	
Mark	Beer	1	
Sue	Coke	0	
Cole	Port	4	
Jon	Coke	5	
Tom	Beer	2	
Abby	Port	3	



## VIGOR







Pienta et al. 2018



## **Graph Dice**







Bezerianos et al. 2010



Independent views can optimize for topology and attribute independently.





Recommended for large networks and/or very large numbers or heterogeneous types of node and link attributes





### Juxtaposed

# Not great for tasks on topological structures beyond a single node or edge.

## Integrated







U

	Name	Beverage	Day 1
	Mark	Beer	1
S	Sue	Coke	0
	Cole	Port	4
	Jon	Coke	5
	Tom	Beer	2
	Abby	Port	3







## Juniper



- 🖅 Clash of kings
- Dance with dragons
- Feast for crows
- Game of thrones
- 🟆 Noble
- 😃 Stark
- Storm of swords
- O northmen







Nobre et al. 2018









### Meyer et al. 2010



### Circos







Krzywinski et al. 2009


good at integrating attributes with topology, if the topology can be represented in a linear layout.





Not suitable for networks that can not be sensibly linearized.

Recommended for networks with several, heterogenous, node attributes and well suited for tasks on single nodes, neighbors, and paths





Integrated

## Overloaded









# GMaps







She & amp Him **Freelance Whales** Metric Snow Patrol The Shins Empire of the Sun **Beach House** Animal Collective The Album Leaf Efterklang

Gansner et al. 2010



### Bubble Sets









#### Collins et al. 2009



### LineSets







#### Alper et al. 2011



#### good at displaying sets and clusters





Recommended for recommend overloading for the particular use case of visualizing set-memberships or clusters on top of node-link diagrams







### Layout Operations





#### **Small Multiples**







### Peakspotting







#### https://truth-and-beauty.net/projects/peakspotting



### Small Multiples







Bach et al. 2014



Common layout facilitates attribute comparisons in specific topological features



Recommended for small networks where the tasks are focused on attribute comparison





#### **Small Multiples**



# More at <a href="http://vdl.sci.utah.edu/mvnv/">http://vdl.sci.utah.edu/mvnv/</a>









