

Homework 1 (Part 3): Chart Evaluation

Chart / Image / Picture Evaluator Template

Note:

- Attempt all questions
- Each question is worth 1 point

Focus of this exercise
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This exercise encourages you to evaluate the implicit or explicit arguments, evidence, assumptions, and conclusions about key data/ information visualization issues in each chart or image (i.e. think critically about the charts, images, pictures etc)• This exercise encourages you to develop your own knowledge, comprehension and conceptual understanding and to connect, synthesize, and/or transform your ideas about the images, charts etc. into a new form (i.e. be a creative thinker and contribute your ideas and thoughts)• This exercise encourages you to connect your INFO 5602 learning to real-world issues or life experiences and consider diverse perspectives for the application of concepts we have explored in class to these real-world charts, images etc.• This exercise encourages you to reflect on what you are learning in INFO 5602• This exercise encourages you to contribute your ideas and thoughts.• Consider diverse perspectives (gender, political, ethnic, racial, etc.) when evaluating the charts, images etc.• Challenges you to develop and present your own knowledge, comprehension, and conceptual understanding when you have carefully considered each chart, image etc.

Student Name	Luna McBride
Student ID	107607144

Chart No.	<i>Great or Gross?</i>	Why do you think the chart/image/picture is <i>Great</i> or <i>Gross</i> ? List in bullet points	List (in bullet points) three things on the chart you would change to make the chart, image, picture better regardless of whether you think it is <i>Great</i> or <i>Gross</i> ?
1.	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3D elements make it difficult to read compared to the labels. • The sheer amount of color and information increases cognitive load way above the amount a reasonable person would be able to handle. • The color selection does not make good use of its 3D environment (the darkest color is in the middle and there is no gradient to speak of). • Pre-attentive attributes do not move reader's attention in any way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split this into separate graphs. The 3D version of this is unreadable. • If they really need to be on the same graph for your comparison, perhaps represent the data on a single line graph. That way, comparisons can still be made while being readable. • Utilize smarter color choices to take advantage of your medium.

2	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of color only increases cognitive load instead of comparing country wealth like is most likely intended. • What does the line mean. The label says “differences above 12% are statistically significant at a 95% confidence level”, but what does that mean in this context? What does a 12% level do for the countries on either side? • The area on the bottom explaining the age significance of the study is grayed out, thus making it more likely to be ignored despite its importance to the context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the economy level is important given some unlisted context, split this into separate graphs. Otherwise, remove the colors as it is just adding noise. • If you are going to use the line, say what it would mean to the average person. Not everyone knows this study or data as well as you do. • It seems there is more to the countries chosen than would meet the eye. Is this trying to say “the high-income countries are not necessarily healthier than the other countries?” If so , why not just say it?
3	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3D nature of the chart once again only takes away from the data by making it confusing. Any motion that could be created by the lines is muddled by the other lines. • The color choices clash with the elements that make this 3D, with the shadow/edge elements of the Vietnam and Korean lines having white shadows while the Chinese line is white, thus decreasing readability. • Black is moved to the back despite popping out more against the white background, while the white and gray lines are in the front despite fading into the background. • This graph also puts the color gray into an odd spot here, as it is both telling us to ignore it while also sticking out based on its position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send this back to 2D if they need to be on the same graph or split them up into their own graph for better readability. • Choose better colors based on the data. I understand the limitations of grayscale printing with things like textbooks, but these should not be on the same graph with hard to read colors if that limitation was properly taken into account. • Perhaps add the labels to the axes. Even with the caption, it is still hard to conceptualize what it means.

4	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The January on each date means nothing. • The graph does not start at 0. • The information given is not enough for the average reader to know what it means for them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fix the X axis. Not only should the January be removed off each of the years, but you could list every 5 years or so to reduce cognitive load. • This graph makes sense not to start at 0, but perhaps little dashes could be used to denotate that difference. • Include a caption with some context pertinent to the expected viewer. Without some of those indicators, the default assumption would be the general public.
5	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The axis does not start at 0. • Why is the 8.6% at the end level with the 9.0% next to it? • Black background combined with the drop shadow of the gold numbers just creates a terrible experience when considering the grid lines behind them. • The 3D oval shape of the points just adds to cognitive load without any benefit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fix the data. The 8.6% on the right being level with the 9.0% is very misleading. • Remove either the grid lines or the points with numbers. The color of them specifically is explainable given brand colors, but the combination of both brings the effectiveness of each of them down. • Starting at 0 would have been more honest. It also would have helped the political cause better, as it would have shown constant high unemployment without the need to fudge the graph. This is not to say the political motive is important, but rather to say that the change also messed up the only feasible motive to make that change.

6	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The enclosure of the border box is not only unnecessary, but nullifies the use of the bubbles as it bisects the electrification and renewables bubble. • The use of gray for the labels just makes it fade into the background, thus needing more effort to consciously see the label before being able to read it. • I honestly really like the bubble idea to represent investment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While I do like the gradient of blue used to exemplify adoption rate, I would personally flip it. The light colors command more attention, so it would make more sense to have the aspects with attention have a lighter color. • Remove the enclosure on the right side. It is not needed. • Make the labels clearer. Gray makes the reader want to ignore them.
7	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The circular shape is difficult to understand as we humans have a difficult time gauging angles. • All of the different colors unnecessary, and having the concepts represented on different levels of the circle also just makes them redundant. • Was this entire graph even necessary when only Virginia is highlighted? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more angles. Even something like a table or heatmap would be infinitely more readable. • The chart is entirely unnecessary given the only comparisons used are the national averages and Virginia. I do not need to know where everyone stands if only Virginia is being highlighted. • The use of multiple levels makes the colors obsolete. It just makes it a Boolean category, which makes the colors simply noise for the sake of noise.

8	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The blues used do not make a proper gradient, thus confusing the message. • The stacked bar charts actually do a good job showing the proportionality of each subset despite the color flaw, especially since it specifically comes to a total of 100%. • At least they are not using a pie chart. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the bar chart horizontal. That would make it easier to read. • Change the colors to make a gradient, with darker meaning bad and lighter meaning good. This not only reduces cognitive load by playing into the culture, but also imparts the message before we read anything. • Perhaps just clean up the design of the chart a little more. The line between bars varies in thickness and the color of the text changes in a weird way, thus creating minor cognitive dissonance that increases cognitive load.
9	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pie chart and angles used. • The actual splits are grayed out in favor of this meshing beach color scheme underneath, which adds nothing and disincentivizes the actual data being presented. • There is no title or other context, so what does it mean? • The beach underneath is also 3D, making it even harder to understand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a title and additional context. It currently means nothing. • Remove the 3D beach underneath and actually emphasize the data you are trying to show. • Use a different method besides a pie chart. It would still be hard to read even if the actual data was not grayed out.

10	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lighter blues look like gray, thus making them less of a focus. • The combination of both points and grid lines distracts from the line graph. • The close proximity of all of the lines makes it a mess to look at. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the color scheme. The light blues look a lot like gray, and thus become disincentivized by the eye. • Split this into more graphs. Right now, since the values are all the same, the lines are fighting each other for the spotlight. • Choose either points with values or the grid lines. Both together like this look messy.
11	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of red and blue puts the blue in the background a minute amount, but not enough to convey intention. • The lack of context makes the graph difficult to read. • This is still a great chart despite this due to the context of Google. Someone had to seek this out and at least have some idea to seek it out. This context is simply removed by putting it in a PowerPoint like this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An option to gray out one of the lines would have been nice here, thus making the tool more powerful for visualization. • Perhaps an added portion explaining the growth would have been nice. • Context to why May 3rd specifically was selected would also be nice. This and the previous comment, however, come more to the person who pulled the graph out of context and not the tool itself.

12	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This waterfall layout is amazing to show how carbon could go down. • The use of dark colors for the bad carbon and light colors for good energy efficiency helps build on the message. • Some of the numbers are off, however. • The enclosure is also not as effective in gray. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rounding of the lowered percentage takes away some of the punch of that possible 63%. This could be changed from a range to “as much as 63%!” or something similar to make it really pop. • The enclosure created by the top arrow could be adding unnecessary noise, but it also used to show the percent change. This could be changed to only a line from top to bottom to show the difference in height if necessary. • If this factor is necessary, it should not be gray as that only puts it a bit further into the background.
13	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pie chart angles are even worse here since there are so many entries. • What do the colors mean? Does the repetition mean something specific? • What is the context? What do the numbers mean? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This needs to be bucketized. There is no reason I could think of where every single label here needs to be listed like this. • After it is bucketized, turn it into a line chart, a bar chart, or whatever else fits with the data based on how it is aggregated. • Please add context. I cannot even comment on the colors while I cannot even figure out what the labels mean.

14	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do the colors mean? • Murder rates are the factor listed here. The Brandy Scale is brought up in the captions here to emphasize the point, but they are not what is listed on the charts. • Angles. • The caption's messages also makes the first line of charts seem disingenuous, as no notes are made as to why blue states make up 2/5 of the states in the worst list. • Of course these numbers are bound to be different now since the captions bring up an Obama election, but its captions still do not support the charts given. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove some bias from the captions. • Keep everything consistent. If you are using murder rate only in the graphs, no need to bring in the Brandy Scale. • The colors do not mean anything, and the legislations they are supposed to represent goes unexplained. This is something that needs to be fixed.
15	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice and simple. • Some context is missing, but age and frequency have their own logic. • How are the ages bucketized? Is this good in context for the bars not to be above their labels? • Perhaps not necessarily great, but not actively bad like the gross ones, so more like not gross. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a title for explanation. • Add some context on the bins, as it is a bit odd to not have the labels under the bars. • Perhaps some of the numbers could be removed to reduce load.

16	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice use of emphasis and motion with Will Smith. • Nice and simple, though perhaps a bit wordy. Though, including the word “just” does add some good emphasis on the point. • The white background does not create the enclosure some images do, making for a seamless transition into Twitter’s (X’s) UI. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The seamless comment would not hold for a dark mode user, so this image relies on the user being in light mode. Given the website surrounding it, the enclosure is likely load that cannot be completely removed. • There is no data used, so the image can only be used in limited contexts as a call to action rather than any other part of the story. • While the context is known in this case, the use could fit in many other contexts (historical wars, Olympics, etc.) This is a power that memes can have, but it is something to keep in mind for when someone tries to use it later in a worse context.
17	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very nice and simple. • A nice, bold number to prove the point. • Corners used to create closure, but is not completely necessary. • Having the gray dots only around the terabyte is a little odd, though. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stay consistent. The gray dots only existing around the terabyte is odd. • The corners to make closure is not necessary. In fact, keeping them there make it fit worse into online web advertisement slots like on Reddit. • Move the “and companies keep making more of it” toward the bottom. The image only supports the “Data is expensive to store.” point in the title, so the other section packs more of a punch once we are shown <i>how</i> expensive it is.

18	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Axis is not at 0. • The gradient on the bars themselves is entirely unnecessary. • The graph does not need both the numbers on the bars and the grid lines. • The background does not need to be black, but once again, brand colors so it can be ignored. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the axis 0. • Possibly change this into a line graph. Both this and the axis change would have made their point a whole lot better. These errors specifically take from their point and make them seem disingenuous. • The gradient on the bars only adds noise. Just choose one color. • The numbers on the bars make the grid lines become noise that should be removed.
19	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The grid lines muddle the gray bars. • The multiple gray bars muddle the message. A single bar would be enclosure with a place to look, but the many just causes confusion. • "... as the economy cools" and "Businesses are cutting workers' hours in a warning sign for the economy" send a conflicting message. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choose one gray bar to use as enclosure. • Remove the grid lines, as the bold 3.0 does plenty. • Get everyone on the same page, as the title and "More Coverage" send conflicting messages.
20	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice use of a lighter/grayed-out line to reduce attention. • Only having two gray recession bars does not muddle the message like in the previous example. • The title is clear and succinct. There would have been confusion if it was either not there or tried to do more explaining. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps remove the 1998 on the x axis. It only adds noise. • Remove the grid lines. The gray recession lines already does plenty in this respect. • Perhaps a little more context could be added for those who do not know about the bonds.

21	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text placement and alignment makes it feel more burdensome. • The numbers are on the bars. I can do the math on the difference myself if I choose to. The bars themselves should be the ones doing the talking, however. • The color usage goes against the typical cultural “dark bad, light good,” which muddles the message and makes the woman managers’ success rates seem bad. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flip the graph. Make it a horizontal bar chart. It will make the text seem less like a blob. • Flip the colors. Once again, there is a cultural idea of “dark bad, light good” that originates from the night being dangerous early in human history. • Remove the bar differences. Let the bars do the talking.
22	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title and caption make it clear why we should care, and are on the left so they are read before looking at the graph. • The graph starts at 0 and does not have points besides the one of focus at the end. • The nice orange makes the graph pop, drawing attention beyond the title. • The title in the graph makes it stay aligned with the article title. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the grid lines. The highlighted 7.09% point already does plenty in that regard. • Reduce the number of years and remove the “20-“ from the front. It is fair to assume that ‘04 is 2004 in this day and age. • Perhaps make the caption under the title a little less gray, as it is important context that should not be ignored.

23	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So, the younger age groups are red and you want us to focus on them. Why? • The title is neutral in discussing use of digital wallets, but the color choice emphasizes the young while deemphasizing the old. Why? • Though nice use of having percentages above the bars while also having no grid lines. • When you say “over the past 12 months,” does this mean throughout or within? What rules were used in that regard? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please give context to why the specified groups are emphasized or deemphasized. • If the intent was not to emphasize, choose other colors. The current ones make it seem like you are hinting at something here. • There should be an additional caption for context. This is not just due to the color issue, but the “over” issue.
24	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The double y axis is hard to read. • Not everyone knows what EBITDA means in terms of times. Additional context is needed. • The use of gray for the line deemphasizes it, thus adding cognitive load to even perceive it on top of trying to comprehend it with the double y axis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split this in two with one y axis each. • Change the color of the line and remove the unnecessary points. • Explain what “times” means for EBITDA in this case.
25	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pie chart and angles. • What is the context? What is an RMW? • The use of many colors just adds to cognitive load. • The removed slices make it even harder to judge angles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change this to a horizontal bar chart. • Give context. • Make smarter use of color. • Perhaps find a higher quality image to use.

26	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice use of enclosure and color gradient. • What is bad and good in this context? If the low procurement score is bad, then the social sector should be at the bottom. • The construction measure should be at the top since it is the topic of interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move construction to the top. It is considered the lowest, so a simple flip would do the trick. • Change the chart to horizontal stacked bar charts since the values all add to 100. At least it appears to be proportions. • Add more context to what makes a good and bad score. Once again, a 58 on the bottom tier seems better than a 72.
27	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I cannot read this at all, whether zoomed out or full screen. • There are so many colors. It is way too much. • What is the context? • Both the left side and the colors appear to be acronyms. What do those acronyms mean? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up the quality so it can be read. • Add context for the acronyms, or do not use acronyms if this is not possible. • Find a better chart to use. I do not have any suggestions because I cannot read it at all, but use something else. • Reduce the amount of colors. Make them mean more.
28	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which line should be focused on? The colors could have either one trying to pop. • The double axis adds nothing. • The points on the lines only add noise. • The months at the front of each of the years add nothing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send the less important line to the background. • Remove the points from the lines. • Remove the months from the x axis. • Remove the second y axis.

29	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usually I would say the rest of the gray is unnecessary, but I feel like the emphasis on it meaning unbanked people and the fact that it is being sent to the background by being gray actually does a good job at emphasizing that these people exist. • The least to most structure better shows the Philippines' place on the hierarchy while putting it more toward the top. It is also bolded to show that it is the country of interest. • The blue used for the banked could have been a slightly lighter blue to show it being good, however. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighten the blue to emphasize it as the good outcome. • Remove the bold on the title's caption. It does not need to be bold. • Perhaps use simpler language in the title to make it more readable to more people.
30	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of color and order of items could have been used more effectively. • The title is wordy and fumbles the meaning. • While the use of a horizontal stacked bar chart is good, they are not stacked in accordance to adoption or good vs bad. They are consistent, yes, but none of them have a spectrum of highest to lowest usage to set the stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pick better gradient colors, and line them up to collectively form a nice gradient. This would preferably be with darkest being worst and vice versa, but some of these are not necessarily worse than the other and the order from the next point should take precedence. • Arrange the first bar chart numerically to set the pattern. • The caption to the title does not need to be bold.

31	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of gray makes it seem like the ROE has increased 4 out of 7 percent rather than 4 to 7 percent. • The meaning of the “Relevance to book type” meaning is not very well explained. I do like the idea of the scantron-like visual to show existence, however. • The darker color choices make it seem bad to have the difference rather than good. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain the context of the scantron side better. I like the idea of that visual, but the lack of context makes it a fumble in execution. • Use a lighter color for the definite change to indicate good. • Change the gray in accordance with the other color choice. Gray means ignore, where the meaning trying to be portrayed is variability.
32	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gray enclosure is well used to focus attention. • The 2.3 times difference is very well highlighted. • Good use of light good, dark bad. • The axes could use some work, however. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither the graph title nor the x axis need to be bold. • The x axis does not need the arrows around its label. That just adds noise. • The grid lines are not necessary here, especially since the ending is well highlighted as the important part. They should be removed.

33	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The angles do not come as a problem since they are not being used for proportionality. • The use of the plate-like visual calls back to some of the designs for the nutrition plates, which is very topical given the meaning it gives to public spending. • None of the colors are flashy and actually lend themselves well to the meaning. • There is an overuse of bold, however. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave only the fossil fuels and renewable energy bold while removing the bold from the subcategories like traditional renewables. • Perhaps a “dollars in billions” note plus removing all of the billions from the actual items could clean it up a bit. • Perhaps a single color could have been used for each core and tax exemption arc for standardization, but the colors are faded enough to where it does not cause much of a problem.
34	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The donuts are unnecessary. The numbers already tell enough of a story. • Lines add a bit too much load. • There is a major overuse of green. This may just be company colors and would be willing to overlook that if it is, but it diminishes the highlighting power of it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the donuts. The numbers are plenty. • If everything is green to be highlighted, then nothing is being highlighted. Use it in the numbers to emphasize your point. Though, if this is done for corporate color reasons, this criticism could be ignored. • Remove the lines around the Top Two Levers section, as the spacing plus the bold on the categories already does plenty to set them apart as a slightly separate but related idea.

35	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a very crusty image. Image quality is very important. • Pie chart with angles. • Separated slices make it even harder to comprehend than just having the angles. • The 3D adds nothing. • There is too much color. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change this to not a pie chart. • Up the image quality. • Make smarter use of color. I know the chosen colors are nice because they represent the flavors well, but it is too much.
36	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrible image quality. • There are too many colors and shapes. • The points are way too frequent and add noise. • There is no context for the labels. • The full date is not necessary. • There is no y axis or title to tell me what is going on. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add context. • Remove the colors and points. Separate into separate graphs if all are equally important to highlight. • Up the image quality. It is hard to read small, let alone as a presentation on the big screen. • Fix the dates. They all appear to be January of 2004, so only the days are necessary on most of them.
37	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Image quality makes it hard to read. • 3D usage makes it hard to read. • There is too much data represented here. • The banana backgrounds may be funny, but they are unnecessary. • There is too much color that amounts to nothing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split this graph up. It likely could be a time series line graph for each country, or separate ones for each country. • Make more efficient color choices. • Remove the background bananas. • Up the image quality.

38	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of green, but it is most likely a company color. • Simple and direct. • Misaligned bubbles make it seem more fun and adds some motion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not everything has to be green. Black text can be your friend. • Perhaps order the bubbles by percentage. • Perhaps create a gradient based on percentage to make more effective use of the motion. Though, the abnormal structure does add to the fun aesthetic.
39	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vertical stacked bar charts are harder to read. • There are too many colors. • The bubbles around the values changing sizes does not add much. • Which of the insurances are exchanges? This crucial context being missing makes the bar charts lose their meaning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group the exchanges into one bucket to show off your point. • Remove the bubbles around the exchange numbers and let the numbers do the talking. • Flip the bar chart horizontal, as horizontal stacked bar charts make better use of the Z structure us English readers take advantage of. • Fix the colors, but only after the bins are fixed.

40	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very hard to read. • What does it mean by constellation? Not knowing this concept makes this exceptionally hard to read. • The vertical bars are hard to read, but making them horizontal would ruin the long caption for each bar. • More random color choice add confusion rather than meaning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split this into multiple graphs, likely between bad and good outcomes. Right now, having everything all together does not impart this important context. • Perhaps add a short explanation on what is meant by “constellation.” • Make better use of color to create a gradient, grouping bad and good outcomes.
41	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A nice gradient is created on the color, with gray being used for “don’t know” since that should be ignored. • “Significantly” being dark blue imparts negativity, but the title has more neutrality on the subject. As such, intent could be being skewed. Though, I like the interpretation of negativity caused by this, so I will call this good. • Excellent of the horizontal bar charts, as it is easier to read like a progress bar. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the title’s intent match with the color a little better. • Un-bold the chart’s title, as I was initially confused thinking it was the title and flat out did not see the actual title. • Perhaps change some of the language to make it easier to understand.
42	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The added shadows add nothing. • The color choices do not make sense. A gradient would have been even better here to represent increasing knowledge. • The watermarks, while I understand the necessity, add noise due to placement. The one next to the Python logo specifically took a minute for my brain to process as separate entities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the colors more of a gradient. A dark to light gradient could be interesting to signify coming out of the dark by learning, based on the phrase “I am in the dark on this.” • Make smarter watermark placements. • Remove the shadows.

43	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extended gray bars mean nothing in this case. • The two graphs with gray bars mean something entirely different from one another, making it seem like they are trying to connect them by color and placement when they should not. • There is too much bold usage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the color of the second plot on the aerospace company side, as they should not seem like equivalents. • Remove the extended gray bars on the second plot of each section. • Remove the bold on everything besides the title and the company titles.
44	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corners are making unnecessary closure. • “grow to” should not be bold, as it removes some of the focus that should go to the 175 Billion Terabytes. • The title clearly appears to be a connecting component between this visualization and one of the previous ones. The “data is expensive to store” part this time is unnecessary, as this part discusses more of the “and companies keep making more of it” part of the title. • The blockier earth is a little harder to look at, as it does not properly retain the shape of the continents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the corners. • Un-bold the “grow to” part of the bolded text. • Make the visual better represent the shapes of the continents. • Perhaps implement a paradigm of bolding some parts of the title and not bolding others to better connect the parts of the presentations to the specific part of the title that is being focused on. This is not necessary per se, but it would reduce cognitive load and look cool.

45	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When you say detrended, do you mean normalized? It would be better if that was better emphasized. • The graph is simple, and the x axis is well spaced out to reduce load. • The y axis could be better established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better context would be nice. • Fixing the y axis to say “sales (magnitude)” or “sales (normalized)” to emphasize the transformation would clear up some confusion. • Perhaps the upper and right edges could be removed since the enclosure is not entirely necessary. This looks like an exploratory data analysis graph from something like Matplotlib, however, so this likely was not meant to be presented and, thus, did not necessarily need that extra effort.
46	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a great infographic, but that means it has different expectations from a data visualization and should be treated as such. • It is very colorful, but none can be taken away since the colors are on the food or the flag of origin. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps the second half of the peach and the extra part of the fish could have been used like the onion to make better use of white space. • Perhaps the line between the largest exporters title and the fruit section could be removed, since the other lines are more used to point to the items rather than segment. • It is odd that lamb is chosen specifically rather than meat in general. That swap may be more impactful for the image.

47	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is clearly an older image, but the use of different terms across political lines was already present. The use of different terms reduces understandability across multiple audiences, especially with terms that decline in usage as time goes on. • The context of this post has been lost to time. • 30% does not say how many and which states, which is once again lost context due to time. 30% also does not mean much in America, given the spread of people in the nation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps use a number of states rather than a percentage. • Add some context for the sake of preservability. • Use a common term to increase understandability.
48	Great	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice use of gray/reduced alpha to deemphasize necessary context data. • Nice use of bold to highlight the current point in time. • Nice x axis, utilizing '05 instead of 2005 to reduce cognitive load. • Nice job prioritizing chart alignment with the article's title by putting the chart's title in the graph. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the grid lines, since they are not necessary in this case. • Change the alignment on the chart's caption. It seems a bit odd to have it center aligned when everything else is left aligned. • Perhaps remove the top bar next time when pulling the article out of its initial context. The top bar works for the website, but only adds noise when pulled out of that context.

49	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The blue and purple titles do not work well on a blue and purple background. Some of them are hard to read. • Is there a point to having the background be these colors? Is there context I am missing to why this was a good idea? • The images are gray, telling us to ignore them while they are the factors that are meant to represent their lenders/borrowers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the background to make it more readable. • Change the color of the images, possibly to better represent the lender versus borrower pattern established. • Perhaps change the bullet points, as the double arrows adds more load than they are worth,
50	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gray in the background ironically puts more emphasis on it when it does not need it. It also does not appear to be a company color, so it is unnecessary. • All of the possible responses do not need to be included here. • Responses also do not appear to be related or add to be 100%, making this long bar chart format unnecessary. • If the 3 capability development answers need to be highlighted as a single group, why are they not a single bar? • The colors do not add any meaning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the colors. The background should be a white (or I would accept a company adjacent color if need be) and the bars have no reason to be different colored (unless there is a specific one to highlight). • Group the emphasized segment of bars into a single bar. • Turn the bars horizontal to better account for the longer answers on that axis. • Cut the number of bars down.