GitHub Link: https://github.com/anti-integral/ECAI-Paper-Supplementary-Info

Supplementary Visuals



This bar chart compares the percentage of papers that mention each characteristic across four different models: GPT-3.5 Full, GPT-3.5 Chunk, GPT-4 Full, and GPT-4 Chunk. Each bar represents the proportion of documents (expressed as a percentage) that reference a specific characteristic within the dataset corresponding to each model in all trials.



Similar to the top chart but focusing exclusively on the GPT-4 Full and GPT-4 Chunk models. This visualization allows for a direct comparison between two closely related model versions, highlighting differences in the emphasis on various characteristics between the full model and its chunked counterpart.



The heatmap displays the differences in the mean values of various characteristics between the GPT-4 Full and GPT-4 Chunk models. Positive values indicate characteristics more prevalent in GPT-4 Full, whereas negative values show those more common in GPT-4 Chunk. This visualization highlights the disparities and potential focuses of each model variation.



This correlation matrix visualizes the relationship between different characteristics within the data. Values close to 1 or -1 indicate strong positive or negative correlations, respectively, helping identify which characteristics tend to co-occur or vary inversely within the dataset.

References – Scanned Papers

[1]

M. Bernard, “Using Digital Twins to Improve Pumping and Distribution System Operations,” Journal AWWA, vol. 116, no. 1, pp. 6–15, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1002/awwa.2211.

[2]

P. Brahmbhatt, A. Maheshwari, and R. D. Gudi, “Digital twin assisted decision support system for quality regulation and leak localization task in large-scale water distribution networks,” Digital Chemical Engineering, vol. 9, p. 100127, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.dche.2023.100127.

[3]

P. Conejos Fuertes, F. Martínez Alzamora, M. Hervás Carot, and J. C. Alonso Campos, “Building and exploiting a Digital Twin for the management of drinking water distribution networks,” Urban Water Journal, vol. 17, no. 8, pp. 704–713, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1080/1573062X.2020.1771382.

[4]

A. R. Corriveau, T. B. Wagner, and V. Srinivasan, “Embrace Digital Tools to Enhance Water Utility Operations,” Opflow, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 18–21, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1002/opfl.1911.

[5]

J. E. Pesantez, F. Alghamdi, S. Sabu, G. Mahinthakumar, and E. Z. Berglund, “Using a digital twin to explore water infrastructure impacts during the COVID-19 pandemic,” Sustainable Cities and Society, vol. 77, p. 103520, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.scs.2021.103520.

[6]

V. Qiuchen Lu, A. K. Parlikad, P. Woodall, G. D. Ranasinghe, and J. Heaton, “Developing a Dynamic Digital Twin at a Building Level: using Cambridge Campus as Case Study,” in International Conference on Smart Infrastructure and Construction 2019 (ICSIC), Cambridge, UK: ICE Publishing, Jan. 2019, pp. 67–75. doi: 10.1680/icsic.64669.067.

[7]

S. Tripathi, M. Mack, A. Byland, L. Chamberlain, and C. Shumate, “Houston Public Works’ Journey Toward a Digital Twin,” Journal AWWA, vol. 113, no. 8, pp. 80–84, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.1002/awwa.1793.

[8]

B. Valverde-Pérez, “Operational digital twins in the urban water sector: case studies,” case studies.

[9]

F. Van Rooij, P. Scarf, and P. Do, “Planning the restoration of membranes in RO desalination using a digital twin,” Desalination, vol. 519, p. 115214, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.desal.2021.115214.

[10]

S.-W. Zhou et al., “Digital Twin-Based Pump Station Dynamic Scheduling for Energy-Saving Optimization in Water Supply System,” Water Resour Manage, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1007/s11269-024-03791-2.