


Hyperbolic Browsing

Scalable Hierarchy Browsing in Hyperbolic Space
Glatzhofer Michael

Institute of Interactive Systems and Data Science (ISDS),
Graz University of Technology, Austria



Abstract

Hyperbolic space can be used in conjunction with projections to Euclidean space as a basis for visualising and exploring large hierarchies. This work will first present a brief history and overview of hyperbolic geometry, including projections and why they are useful for hierarchy visualisation. The work will then survey existing hyperbolic browsing UI components and applications. The work will conclude with a look at d3-hypertree, a new JavaScript component which implements hyperbolic tree browsing.

Oct 2018, updates on GitHub
Demo: hyperbolic-tree-of-life.github.io
Code: glouwa.github.io/d3-hypertree
Title image: Circle Limit III, M.C. Escher 1959.

© Copyright 2018 by the author(s), except as otherwise noted.

This work is placed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence.

Contents

Contents	i
List of Figures	iii
List of Tables	v
1 Hyperbolic Geometry	1
1.1 Euclid	1
1.2 Lobachevsky Bolyai	2
1.3 Embeddings	3
1.4 Transformations, Projections and Hyperbolic Models	6
1.4.1 Coordinate Systems	7
1.4.2 Projections	7
1.4.3 Poincaré Model	8
1.4.4 Tilings	9
1.4.5 Finite Models	10
1.4.6 Infinite Models	11
1.5 Hyperbolic Space and Hierarchy Visualisation	12
2 Implementation Survey	13
2.1 Early Systems	13
2.2 H3 Implementations	15
2.2.1 H3 Viewer ^{Code}	15
2.2.2 Walrus ^{Code}	15
2.2.3 h3py ^{GitHub}	15
2.3 H2 Implementations	16
2.3.1 Inxight	16
2.3.2 HyperTree ^{Web}	17
2.3.3 Hyptree ^{Web}	17
2.3.4 HyperProf ^{Web}	17
2.3.5 Roget2000	17
2.3.6 HVS	17
2.3.7 Ontology4us ^{Web}	17
2.3.8 JIT Hypertree ^{GitHub}	17
2.3.9 TreeBolic ^{Web}	17
2.3.10 RogueVis ^{Web}	17
2.3.11 d3-hypertree	18
2.4 Implementation Comparison	20
Bibliography	23

List of Figures

1.1	Playfair's 5th axiom	1
1.2	Embedding construction rules for \mathbb{H}^2 in \mathbb{R}^3	3
1.3	Real objects approximating \mathbb{H}^2 embedded in \mathbb{R}^3	4
1.4	Surfaces with constant negative curvature.	4
1.5	Transformation and projection classes	6
1.6	Möbius and Cayley transformation. Projections relations.	6
1.7	Azimutal projections	7
1.8	$\mathbb{D}^1, \mathbb{H}^1$ embedding in \mathbb{R}^2	7
1.9	Artistic Schläfli {7,3} tiling	9
1.10	Tiling and hierarchies	12
2.1	Early systems: Hyperbolic Tree Browser and H3 Viewer	13
2.2	Common pipeline. [This ^{CC4}]	14
2.3	H3 implementations gallery	15
2.4	Inxight products gallery	16
2.5	Selected H2 implementations gallery	17
2.6	d3-hypertree scalability	18
2.7	d3-hypertree focus view	19
2.8	d3-hypertree context view	19

List of Tables

1.1	Early applications of Lobachevsky's axioms.	2
1.2	Summary of curved space	5
1.3	Selection of finite projections from \mathbb{H}^2 to \mathbb{R}^2	10
1.4	Selection of infinite projections from \mathbb{H}^2 to \mathbb{R}^2	11
2.1	Comparison of Implementations	20

Chapter 1

Hyperbolic Geometry

1.1 Euclid

Ancient greek mathematicians produced books about geometry for hundreds of years, before Euclid summarized this knowledge in his book 'Elements'. This book enabled technology to flourish, was the second most replicated book before 15th century, and a main text book until the 19th century. Its applications were numerous, but constrained to the five axioms stated by Euclid [Euclid 300BC]:

1. Any two points lie on a unique line.
2. Any straight line can be continued indefinitely in either direction.
3. You can draw a circle of any centre and any radius.
4. All right angles are equal.
5. If a straight line, crossing another two straight lines L, L' ,
makes angles α, β with L, L' on one side,
and if $\alpha + \beta < \pi$,
then L, L' if extended sufficiently far meet on that same side.

Unfortunately the 5th axioms formulation is not best suited for our considerations, we will use Playfair's version formulated and proven to be equivalent in 1795 [Playfair 1795] [fig1.1]:

5. In a plane, through a point not on a given straight line,
at most one line can be drawn that never meets the given line.




Figure 1.1: Playfair's 5th axiom shows clearly that there is only one line not crossing the given line in euclidean space. [This^{CC4}]

If this constraints could be reduced, the huge number of applications would multiply. If this constraints could be reduced, the huge number of applications would multiply. If this constraints could be reduced, the huge number of applications would multiply. If this constraints could be reduced, the huge number of applications would multiply.

Through $P \notin L$ there is **one** line not meeting L (1.1)

1.2 Lobachevsky Bolyai

Although euclidean geometry was widely used and understood for more than 2000 years, its non euclidean derivations were not discovered before 1823. This is reasonable because the theory of complex numbers is necessary to formulate this kind of mathematics. Lobachevsky and Bolyai discovered independently that a slight modification of the 5th axiom has no influence of the correctness of all 28 theorems. The modifications of the 5th axiom are [Lobachevsky 1823] [Bolyai 1823]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Through } P \notin L \in \mathbb{S} \text{ there is } & \text{no line not meeting } L \\ \text{Through } P \notin L \in \mathbb{H} \text{ there are } & \text{infinitely many lines not meeting } L \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

This axioms can not be fulfilled in euclidean \mathbb{R}^2 or \mathbb{R}^3 , but we can find a surface embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 fulfilling them. This embedding was found early on for spherical geometry, and 1955 for hyperbolic geometry. Table [tab1.1] shows possible explanations how to fulfill the modified axioms. But one of them is a embedding and one a projection. Embeddings are conform to a sheet of paper in reality, a \mathbb{R}^2 embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 . This is the most intuitive way to approach such a geometry. Projections and models will be discussed later in section [1.4], to get a basic understanding, i suggest to answer the question how a hyperbolic plane can be embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 first.



	Spherical geometry	Hyperbolic geometry
5th axiom	Through $P \notin L$ there is no line not meeting L	Through $P \notin L$ there are infinitely many lines not meeting L
Embeddings	The surface of a sphere is an isometric embedding of \mathbb{S}^2 in \mathbb{R}^3 . Great circles always intersect.  [Peter Mercator <small>Public Dom.</small>]	We do not know yet how to embed a \mathbb{H}^2 in \mathbb{R}^3 .
Projections	$\mathbb{S}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2$ map projections are an application of spherical geometry.  [Michael Glatzhofer <small>Obs</small>]	A projection from $\mathbb{H}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2$ shows that the 5th axiom is fulfilled. Hyperbolic projections will be discussed in section 1.4.  [Trevorgoodchild <small>Public Dom.</small>]

Table 1.1: Early applications of Lobachevsky's axioms.

1.3 Embeddings

Embeddings are the ideas of placing a space within a space, like a sheet of paper in reality. Each space has its own coordinates system, which can have a different number of dimensions, and each point of the embedding can be described by both coordinate systems. To map coordinates from one space to the other is called embedding. Note that a sheet of paper has one dimension less than its containing space. The paper is considered infinitely thin, to adopt correctly to the fact that a point on the paper is given by only two coordinates. We can also imagine such a embedded plane as surface of a sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . The embedding of a \mathbb{S}^2 in \mathbb{R}^3 in fulfillment of the 5th axiom is easy to find, all great circles on the sphere cross each other at least once. Using a sphere instead of a sheet of paper, and accepting great circles are lines, shows that this kind of geometry fulfills all axiom. This intuitive handling was maybe the reason why spherical geometry did get more attention first, and lead to improvements in mathematics of spherical projections like map projections. But wait, circles are considered to be a lines? (Flat earth alarm?)

Euclid's axioms use the term straight lines, but as visible in table [tab1.1] these lines are not straight. So what is a straight line? Mathematicians answered this question for spherical, and hyperbolic geometry. A line^{Wiki} needs to be only locally straight, that means in the coordinate system of the embedded space, to be a line in terms of euclid's axioms. On earth, the shortest line between two points on the surface is always a part of a great circle. For spherical geometry that means a line which is locally straight like one of the great circles on a sphere is sufficient. A straight line in hyperbolic space must be locally straight and orthogonal to the edge of the plane. This was mathematically proven by lobachevsky. But this knowledge is still not enough to find an embedding of the hyperbolic plane in \mathbb{R}^3 . [Weeks 1985]

Hyperbolic geometry was not widely recognised, since no known embedding limits its applications. A problem which remained until 1955. Hilbert showed 1899 that it is not possible to place a full hyperbolic plane in \mathbb{R}^3 [Hilbert 1899], and finally 1955, Kuiper showed that there is a C^1 isometric embedding for \mathbb{H}^2 in \mathbb{R}^3 [Kuiper 1955]. This lead to a theory describing how to construct a hyperbolic plane \mathbb{H}^n embedded \mathbb{R}^{n+1} [fig1.2]. One way to construct a \mathbb{H}^2 embedding in \mathbb{R}^3 is to put together 7 triangles at every vertex, this is called the polyhedral model, or schlafly $\{7, 3\}$ tiling [Taimina 2009] [1.4.4]. By adding additional space in comparison to a flat $\{3, 6\}$ tiling the plane gets 'curly', and all postulated metrics of hyperbolic geometry can be measured using the given line definition.




Figure 1.2: Embedding construction rules for \mathbb{H}^2 in \mathbb{R}^3 , and handcrafted models.

[Jeffrey R. Weeks^{Book}] [Frank Sottile^{CC3}] [Daina Taimina^{web}]

With this knowledge it is possible for humans to analyse hyperbolic planes in an intuitive way, by using paper models. But such a hyperbolic paper plane is fragile in handling and not suited for measurements. Using knitted planes is an improvement by damia introduced in 2001, and regonicsed as an important tool for mathematicians. It allows to identify straight lines by simply stretching the crochet, if it folds properly, the line between the handle points is straight. Also measurements can be taken of this line [Henderson and Taimina 2001].

Now we have seen how a hyperbolic plane looks like and are able to identify objects in reality to which this kind of mathematic can be applied. Note, Kuiper showed it is only possible to embed parts of \mathbb{H}^n in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Embeddings as visualisations are therefore possible for \mathbb{H}^2 and \mathbb{H}^1 , for humans and other 3-dimensional beings. \mathbb{H}^2 embeddings occur in nature, but are not relevant for our purposes.



Figure 1.3: Real objects approximating \mathbb{H}^2 embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 .

Each of these objects in [fig1.3] is only a part of a hyperbolic plane, according to Hilbert's theorem. If we would apply our construction rules further on, we would have to continue the construction at the border of the planes. 'Curls' would get smaller and smaller, until they need more space than available in \mathbb{R}^3 . Does this hemisphere really converge to a sphere? Hilbert really? [Hilbert 1899]

The walnut plane in [fig1.3d] stops extending after less iterations, thus has a different appearance. This is related to curvature and curvature adopted layouts. The objects are just approximations of the hyperbolic plane, this is also visible at the thickness of the walnut, which is not considered at all.




Figure 1.4: Surfaces with constant negative curvature.

[C.T.J. Dodson^{web}] [David Dumas^{web}] [Wiki^{CC0}] [Wiki^{CC4}]

The images in [fig1.3] do not show all surfaces to which hyperbolic geometry can be applied. In fact it can be applied to all surfaces with constant negative curvature. [fig2.8] shows a selection of surfaces with this property. [fig1.3a] is the mathematical equivalent of the images in [fig1.3], note that also this surface is just a part of \mathbb{H}^2 , and when extended it will get more 'curls' and result in a lettuce-like surface. [Cannon et al. 1997] [Series 2008]







	Spherical	Euclidean	Hyperbolic
Parallels	through $P \notin L$ there is no line not meeting L	through $P \notin L$ there is one line not meeting L	through $P \notin L$ there are infinitely many lines not meeting L
Curvature	> 0	0	< 0
Model	\mathbb{S}	\mathbb{E}	\mathbb{D} or \mathbb{H}
Lines	arcs of great circles	euclidean lines	arcs orthogonal to boundary
Applicable to	 also sphere, ellipsoid... Wiki [Ag2gaeh^{CC4}]	 also plane, cylinder... Wiki [Ag2gaeh^{CC4}]	 also hyperboloid... Wiki [Ag2gaeh^{CC4}]
Angle sum of Δ	$> \pi$	π	$< \pi$
Circumference of \circ	$2\pi \sin(r)$	$2\pi r$	$2\pi \sinh(r)$
Area of \circ	$4\pi \sin^2(r/2)$	πr^2	$4\pi \sinh^2(r/2)$
Embedding [1.3]	 Schläfli $\{5, 3\}$ tiling [Tomruen ^{PublicDom.}]	 Schläfli $\{6, 3\}$ tiling [Lasunncy ^{CC4}]	 Schläfli $\{x, y\}$ tiling [Serfass ^{shinyapps}]
Projection [1.4.5]	 Spherical Lagrange projection. [Michael Glatzhofer ^{Obs}]	transformation	 Schläfli $\{7, 3\}$ tiling on poincaré disk [Parsly Taxel ^{PublicDom.}]

Table 1.2: Summary of curved space [Series 2008] [Cannon et al. 1997]. For details on tilings see [1.4.4].

1.4 Transformations, Projections and Hyperbolic Models




Figure 1.5: Transformation and projection classes. [Robert FERREOL *PublicDom.*]

Transformations^{Wiki}, coordinatesystems^{Wiki}, projections^{Wiki} and tilings [1.4.4] are the base knowlege to compare hyperbolic models [1.4.5]. Projections map a Point from one space to another, they were the first applications of hyperbolic geometry in physics in late 1800. Tilings are helpfull tools to discuss layout properties.

$$\text{Transformation: } \mathbb{A}^n \mapsto \mathbb{A}^n \quad (1.3)$$

Transformations map a point to a point in the same space, but projections can do that too and are in this case comparable to transformations. Möbis Transformations map from a riemann sphere to it self. They are inversion transformations and the mathematical foundation of the poincaré model. The following components of a möbius transformation are valid möbius tranformations it self: inversion $f(z) = 1/z$, translation $f(z) = z+b$, rotation $f(z) = az$, $|a| = 1$. All möbius transformations have a defined inverse, and are in general cool. Calay transformations map the upper half plane to the unit disk, this is usefull to switch between poincare disk and ponacare half plane model [Lamping et al. 2001]^{Pat}.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Caylay: } f(z) &= \frac{z-i}{z+i} \\ \text{Möbius: } f(z) &= \frac{az+b}{cz+d}, \quad a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}, \quad ad - bc \neq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$




Figure 1.6: Some new transformations and projections. [Chrislb^{CC3}] [KSmrq^{CC3}]

Next step will be to take a brief look on available coordinate systems and on the poincare model [1.4.3]. It serves us as example of a model to get a better understanding of what a model differs from a projection. With the help of tilings we will finally compare the main models of hyperbolic geometry from 1800 physics [1.4.5] [1.4.6], and show how they can be applied for hierarchy visualisation [1.5].

1.4.1 Coordinate Systems

There are many hyperbolic coordinate systems^{Wiki}, Polar, Axial and Cartesian-style coordinate system, Lobachevsky, Horocycle-based and Quadrant coordinate systems, and model based coordinate systems. Interesting for hierarchy visualisation is the horocycle^{Wiki} based system, i suppose it is usefull to implement schläfli tiling^{Wiki} like layouts. Model based system like Beltrami, Weierstrass, Poincaré coordinate systems are actually not used in the according model, but representing it, like a reduced version of the model.

We will use polar coordinate systems for our discussion. A model is a theory of the relations of two spaces, therefore models define a coordinate system for both. Many models use complex numbers, the poincaré model allows only values on the complex unit disk, in both spaces [1.4]. The origin is located in center of embeddings, like in all azimuthal projections as the poincare disk model.

1.4.2 Projections




Figure 1.7: In azimuthal projections geodesics cross in origin. Stereographic projections are conformal and kreistreu. Gnomonic projections are isometric. [Cmglee^{CC3+}]

$$\text{Projection: } \mathbb{A}^n \mapsto \mathbb{B}^m \quad (1.5)$$

what is it. we will consider 2dimensional surfaces embedded in the same \mathbb{R}^3 . may has a inverse, and other properties.

projection classes: azimuthal = straigt lines though the center

gnomonic = from the center point of the sphere (line=line), produces always infinite images

sterographic projections = from a point on the sphere (conformal, circles)

orthographic proj = inf away

finite infinite coordinate space of image.

each model has a assoziated projection. relations of hyperbolic modesl shown in fig. as 1dim, but work also for higher dimensions. each hyperbolic model has a spherical twin.




Figure 1.8: \mathbb{D}^1 , \mathbb{H}^1 and other models embedded in \mathbb{R}^2 .
[Selfstudier^{PublicDom.}]

1.4.3 Poincaré Model

The poincaré model might be considered famouse, or at least its applications like Eschers art and Einsteins relativity. This and the fact that [Lamping and Rao 1996] used it for their work is the reason why it is the first model we discuss. Polar coordiantes are used, projecting the hole hyperbolic to the euclidean unit disk, making it a finite model [1.4.5].

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hyperbolic Coordinate } z_h &\in \mathbb{C} \cup \mathbb{H} \quad |z_h| < 1 \\ \text{Euclidean coordinate } z_e &\in \mathbb{C} \cup \mathbb{E} \quad |z_e| < 1 \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

The poincaré model is a azimuthal and stereographic projection, and therefore conformal and great circles intersect in the origin. Geodesics^{Wiki} are arcs in the image, the poincaré disk, and intersecting the unitcircle perpendicular [fig1.1]. Circles stay circles, althoug the center of the circle in the euclidean image is not in the center of the euclidean circle. Parameter P defines the hyperbolic point maped to the center of the image, we will call it 'focus point' in context of hierarchy visualisation. θ is automatically set at some implementations for rotation compensation. The inverse is given as möbius inverse [1.4].

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rotation: } \theta &\in \mathbb{C} \quad |\theta| = 1 \\ \text{Translation: } P &\in \mathbb{C} \quad |P| < 1 \\ \text{Transformation: } \langle P, \theta \rangle & \\ z_e &= \frac{\theta z_h + P}{1 + \bar{P}\theta z_h} \\ \text{Inverse: } \langle -\bar{\theta}P, \bar{\theta} \rangle & \\ z_h &= \frac{\bar{\theta}z_e - \bar{\theta}P}{1 + -\bar{\theta}P\bar{\theta}z_e} \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

Vector based systems like SVG are using arcs or polylines to draw the potentially distorted image of a geodesic. Geo projection systems need to solve this problem too, and did, d3-geo^{Web} uses adaptive sampling to interpolate a polyline. The poincaré model provides a analytical solution to calculate the circle center of the arc segment of a given line \overline{AB} , $A, B \in \mathbb{C} \in \mathbb{E}$.

$$\begin{aligned} d &= \Re(A)\Im(B) - \Re(B)\Im(A) \\ \text{Arc center } c_e &= \frac{i}{2} \frac{A(1 + |B|^2) - B(1 + |A|^2)}{d} \\ \text{Orientaion} &= \begin{cases} \text{clockwise,} & \text{if } d > 0 \\ \text{counterclockwise,} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$


For mouse interactions like panning and pinching as well as animations the composition operator can be derived from the möbius transformation property. When implementing a hyperbolic browser, always keep in mind that a transformation $\langle -z_h, 1 \rangle$ will place the point z_h in center of the projection image. θ can be used for möbius homothety, but they tend to cause motion sickness.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Composition: } \langle P_1, \theta_1 \rangle \circ \langle P_2, \theta_2 \rangle &= \left\langle \frac{\theta_2 P_1 + P_2}{\theta_2 P_1 \bar{P}_2 + 1}, \frac{\theta_1 \theta_2 + \theta_1 \bar{P}_1 P_2}{\theta_2 P_1 \bar{P}_2 + 1} \right\rangle \\ \text{Identity transforamtion: } \langle 0, 1 \rangle & \\ \text{Focusing } z_h : \langle -z_h, 1 \rangle & \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$


1.4.4 Tilings

Tiling a.k.a. tessellations split a plane in one or more shapes without gaps or overlaps. They will help us to compare projections, and are closely related to most \mathbb{H}^2 layouts [1.5]. We will only use regular tilings, this means only one shape is used to fill the plane. This implies that tiles, the instances of this shapes have all the same area in hyperbolic space, but not necessarily in projection images. Isometric embeddings are an intuitive way to visualize hyperbolic planes, they preserve area, length, straightness, angles and circles, at least if viewed from the correct perspective.

We already know schläfli^{Wiki} tilings from the plane construction [1.3]. The most simple tilings are: {5, 3}, {6, 3}, {7, 3}, respectively for spherical, euclidean and hyperbolic plane [tab1.2]. We will use the {7, 3} tiling if possible for comparison. Projecting a tiling shows in my opinion the properties of a projection even better than a Tissot's indicatrix^{Wiki}.



(a) Poincaré projection



(b) Embedding

Figure 1.9: Craig S. Kaplans^{Web} artistic Schläfli {7, 3} tiling on poincaré disk (a), and its projection on an embeddig by Loren Serfass^{shinyapps} (b). Tiles have the same size in hyperbolic space, get ∞ small at $r_e = 1$, $r_h = \infty$ on poincare disk, and appear to have the same size in embedding. For animation see Loren Serfass^{YouTube}

Comparing poincaré disk and embedding of a tiled plane, shows isometry and equiareality are not given in poincaré disk.[fig1.9]. Loren Serfass^{Web} has created this beautiful visualisation based on Craig S. Kaplan^{Web}'s tiling. Remember, the embedding shows only a part of the hyperbolic plane, while the poincaré model shows the hole hyperbolic plane.

1.4.5 Finite Models

Finite model show the hole hyperbolic plane in a finite image, typically on the unitdisk, or one or two half-planes. They were the first applications of hyperbolic geometry, the poincaré model is also one of them. It was used physics at the end of the 19th century. All models have a spherical twin, see table [tab1.2]. We will use hemisphere model as base since it is mathematically the most simple one.

$$\text{Hemisphere model } \mathbb{D} : x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1, z > 0 \quad (1.10)$$

The hemisphere is finite, therefore, for azimuthal projections, only the gnomonic fills a infinite plane. Half-plane and band model are not azimuthal. The half-plane model shows half of the hemisphere, thus avoiding an infinite image. The Band model shows the other half next to the first. The center horizontal line preserves length in the band model, simmilar to the mercator projection, its spherical twin.

Beltrami-Klein m. = Orthog. proj. of \mathbb{D} from $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \infty \end{pmatrix}$ onto plane $z = C$

Poincaré disk m. = Stereog. proj. of \mathbb{D} from $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}$ onto plane $z = 0$ (1.11)

Poincaré half-plane m. = Stereog. proj. of \mathbb{D} from $\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ onto plane $x = 1$

preserves 1.5				
1871 Beltrami–Klein	1873 Poincaré disk	1873 Poincaré half-plane	Band model	
Length				*
Area	✓			
Straightness				
Angle		✓	✓	✓
Circle		✓	✓	✓

Table 1.3: Selection of finite projections from \mathbb{H}^2 to \mathbb{R}^2 . Empty cells indicate 'not preserved'. *The band model preserves length only along the 'equator'. [Theon^{CC3}] [Segerman Schleimer^{YouTube}]

1.4.6 Infinite Models

ll based on Hyperboloid model, lorenz, minkovsky, bla bla wer braucht des inifte models only physics, but should have less numerical problems. [wikiminkowski^{Wiki}](#) [hyperboloid^{Wiki}](#) hat vermutlich weniger numberische probleme [Cannon et al. 1997].

- all are azimuthal
 - lambert azimuthal areae proj
 - azimuthal distance (unflag)
- special thanks to madore

$$\text{Euclidean coordinate } z_e \in \mathbb{C} \in \mathbb{E} \quad (1.12)$$

$$\text{Gans m. = Stereog. proj. of } \mathbb{D} \text{ from } \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ onto plane } z = 1 \text{ (gnomonic)} \quad (1.13)$$

but it should be also possible to use gnomi hyperboloid to get to gans:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H} : \text{Hyperboloid m.} &= \text{Stereog. proj. of } \mathbb{D} \text{ from } \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ onto surface } x^2 + y^2 - z^2 = -1, z > 0 \\ \text{Gans m.} &= \text{Stereog. proj. of } \mathbb{H} \text{ from } \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ onto plane } z = 1? \\ \text{Gans m.} &= \text{orthogonal?} \end{aligned} \quad (1.14)$$




			
preserves 1.5	1966 Gans model	Lambert azimuthal	L. azimuthal equidistant
Length Area Straightness Angle Circle		✓	*

Table 1.4: Selection of infinite projections from \mathbb{H}^2 to \mathbb{R}^2 . Empty cells indicate that the 'row label' is not preserved. *The band model preserves length only along the 'equator'. [David Madore [YouTube](#)]

1.5 Hyperbolic Space and Hierarchy Visualisation




Figure 1.10: Poincaré projections of trees and tilings. [Parcly Taxel]^{Public Dom.} [Anton Sherwood]^{Public Dom.} [This]^{CC4}

All images in [fig1.10] are poincaré projections for comparison. If a tree which nodes are placed on equal area tiles, is placed in a plane, the degree of this tree shows the growth of area of the containing plain. Mathematicians showed that area of hyperbolic space grows exponentially, a property fitting to the growth of directed acyclic graphs^{Wiki} aka trees or hierarchies [fig1.10b].

Before we proceed some terms should be defined: Each tile in [fig1.10c] is a apeirogon^{Wiki}, a apeirogon has ∞ edges. The edges of a apeirogon lie on a circle, called horocycle^{Wiki}. In a poincaré disk, all circles touching the unit circle are horocycles. We will need some other variables in the second part of this work, n will be used for the the number of nodes in a tree, and n_v will address the number of visible nodes on a poincaré disk. The poincaré disk shows the hole hyperbolic plane, 'visible' means in this case the edge occupies more than one pixel. δ and the term degree will be used for out degree, since the degree of a tree is almost constant with $\frac{n-1}{n}$ and not usefull for our considerations.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{number of nodes of hole tree: } n \\
 &\text{number 'visible' nodes: } n_v \\
 &\text{mean out degree of hole tree: } \bar{\delta} \\
 &\text{mean out degree of 'visible' tree: } \bar{\delta}_v \\
 &\text{out degree of center node: } \delta_c \\
 &\text{hyperbolic node distance: } \lambda = \lambda_h = \lambda_{c,e}
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

[fig1.10c][fig1.10d] this looks like berge layout, but root edges half double length in berge.

and correct line length anyway.

sugest a horocycle/horogons based coordinatee system for layout algo. should have less umberical problems (bended branches)

[fig1.10b] Wicht tree degree fits to the 73 tiling? which tiling do i need to embedd a d degree tree?

Apeirogonal tilings^{Wiki} show that the numberof ploygons define the degree of the resulting tree in the $\{\infty, x\}$ tiling. To avoid unused space, the number of edges of a tile can be resuced to $\log_{\bar{\delta}}(n)$

→ {number of edges on horocyle, degree} → $\{\log_{\bar{\delta}}(n), \bar{\delta}\}$ should give results with a simmilar node density like the tilings visible in [fig1.10c]

this might be simmilar to a patent

if you want to see it like this: $d=2 \iff 73$ you gat a tree like 19d, looks good.

interesting but patented [Lamping and Rao 1998]^{Pat}.

Chapter 2

Implementation Survey

2.1 Early Systems




Figure 2.1: Hyperbolic Browser^{YouTube} and H3 Viewer^{YouTube}, the first hyperbolic browsing systems.
[Keith Andrews^{??}]

The first hyperbolic browsing systems were implemented and studied in mid '90s. The Hyperbolic Browser by [Lamping et al. 1995] lays out a tree in \mathbb{H}^2 , whereas H3 Viewer by [Munzner 1997] uses \mathbb{H}^3 as layout space. The main difference of this projects is the dimension of layout space. They also use different projections, but that may be seen as a consequence of layout space dimensionality. Projectins are actually exchangeable, although all following projects inherited the projection types according to this early systems. Both projects:

- push the boundary of scalability of hierarchy visualisation.
- use projection parameters to define a focus area in hyperbolic space, and modify this parameters by mouse interaction. A concept still state of the art for spatial visualisation pipelines.
- systems suffer from a lack of ability to show high degree nodes, especially if mean degree is high. But this is a known limitation of Browsing solved by Searching.

pipeline: layout then transform is same for both variants.

architecture, pipeline: layout, transform, transform back, interaction, animation, similarity to spartial systems. Hyperbolic browsing systems are even simpler than spartial, no topo. [2.4] layout creates spartial data, from there on very similar to spartial visualisation system.

avoid relayout, but layout can be lazy,




Figure 2.2: Common pipeline. [This^{CC4}]

model: formats, hierarchy, graph + spanning tree

2 impls are editable

layout:

H2 arranged on arc, H3 on a spherical cap (surface).

many implementations, h3, h2 bergeré [Bergé and Bouthier 2003], deviations weights, lazy,

lambda, by place nodes as far outside as needed to ensure min node distance. possible to ensure equal area for each node. similar to curvature adoption.

viewmodel: spartial data

P, θ

animation,

selection,

transformation: 2d, 3d, poincare, klein, technically possible is hard so.

maybe klein is better suited to avoid hidden nodes in R3

rotation compensation,

multi focus

renderer: euclidean, even if augmented or VR.

input may be 2d or 3d

framerate stabilized:

both are selecting nodes by radius. max information density

no sign of overwie by node reduction,

degree: n_v high degree problem. \rightarrow max information density. svg is slow, but enough on desktop.

2.2 H3 Implementations

most scaleable.

graph with spanning tree.

mathemeatics complex impl, less impls. see table. what a pitty.

layout: no line but plane $S \in$ circle

additional dim gives best scalability, but also additional 3 rotatln of sphere nesesary. maybe eigenvetor. or virtualrealty/aargumented reality. stand under tthe tree.

2.2.1 H3 Viewer^{Code}

[Munzner 1997]

free project used h3 and beltrami klein. maybe less overlaps because less ball more S.

c++ impl, with hge range of fetures inkl: selection, rotation, cyclic links.

spanning tree always necessary.

degrees up to 1k are beatifully fully visualized, but selection of single elements and labels gets hard. overview ok, selecting in overview not possible anyway.

2.2.2 Walrus^{Code}

increases scalability, yeah mr. young!

implemented as non appletable java3d, running this tech nowadays is lottery.

framerate stabilized.

most are interactive, walruss shows that more nodea are percieveable, at least in h3. node selection hard, overview/orientations good.

gifs available.

2.2.3 h3py^{GitHub}

is a h3 layout python plotting tool,

uses `mathplotlib` as backend.

easy to use with pip instal h3py.

link, supported formats:




Figure 2.3: H3 implementations gallery, and icosahedral tiling in poincaré ball. [Claudio Rocchini^{CC2.5}] [Keith Andrews^{??}] [CAIDA / Young Hyun^{??}] [Songxiao Zhang^{Github}]

2.3 H2 Implementations

most used, implemented.

patent by Xerox

high degree problem worse than with h3.

h2 to r2 with poinvcare projection. no overlaps. only 1 pan necessary. uses pocare model line model to draw arcs. adaptive sampling like d3-geo would not need. perimeter culled node filter, crisp interaction with implementations in c?

rotation compensation for choosable node, mulitfocus, interpolation, animation, labels, 20k,

zoom=zieze of node area * diag(),

layout [Lamping and Rao 1994]^{Pat}

[Lamping et al. 1995]

[Lamping and Rao 1996]

2.3.1 Inxight

1997 formed inxight and took patent.

follow up in different languages java lisp

just some more patents

curvature, [Lamping and Rao 1998]^{Pat}

caching, [Lamping et al. 1998]^{Pat}

halfplane patent [Lamping et al. 2001]^{Pat}




Figure 2.4: Inxight products gallery. [Keith Andrews??]

2.3.2 HyperTree^{Web}

bioinformatics, taxonomy, protein kinase [Bingham and Sudarsanam 2000]

2.3.3 HypTree^{Web}

vermutlis aler Vladimir Bulatov link Yuezheng Zhou

2.3.4 HyperProf^{Web}

bulgatov, art, is often credited.

<http://bulatov.org/math/index.html>

2.3.5 Roget2000

thesaurus vis credits bulgatov [Baumgartner and Waugh 2002]

2.3.6 HVS

master thesis. good rotation compensation? [Nussbaumer 2005]

2.3.7 Ontology4us^{Web}

link, frauenhofer project ontologie browser.

2.3.8 JIT Hypertree^{Github}

javascript, edit, simple. link

2.3.9 TreeBolic^{Web}

comercial wordnet browser, free java component.
credits Vladimir Bulatov gpl mention

2.3.10 RogueVis^{Web}

sold as game, free for vis. links many papers.




Figure 2.5: Selected H2 implementations gallery. [Bingham and Sudarsanam 2000] [Yuezheng Zhou^{Web}] [Vladimir Bulatov^{Web}] [Baumgartner and Waugh 2002] [Keith Andrews^{??}] [Ontology4us^{Web}] [Nicolas Garcia Belmonte^{Web}] [TreeBolic^{Play}] [RogueVis^{Web}]

2.3.11 d3-hypertree

MIT, assuming html5 is no lterry for a long time. lettuce of life. d3-geo-hyperbolic.

see it like a map. overview must be available. ok with some constraints. fileformats. d3-hierarchy. d3-geo.

adaptive drawing [Hop97]

config options: layers, layouts, landmarks, labels, touch, imgs, colors, with infovis props.




Figure 2.6: Comparison of a small hierarchy $n = 200$ (a-e), and a large hierarchy with $n = 70k$ (f-j). Low λ values on the left show overview/context, high λ values on the right show details/focus. If $\lambda < .3$ weight culling is necessary. Works for weighted datasets with average degree < 5 .

detail view wrks as for other hyperbolic browsers.

examples in fig [fig??] show best case examples for $\lambda < .1$.

the following exampels show reson for a fail overview layout/filter.




Figure 2.7: $\lambda > .4 \rightarrow$ Detailview. Failes if: $\delta > 100$. [This^{CC4}]

degree problem persists also in overview.
detail view examples.




Figure 2.8: $\lambda < .2 \rightarrow$ Overview. Failes if: weight uniform $\vee (\bar{\delta} > 10 \wedge var(\delta) < e)$. [This^{CC4}]

overview fails to show nodes out to the perimeter if weights uniform distributed, but also in other cases, ie if one mega node consumes all available n_v . different culling weights like entropy, angle, or by data given weights may overcome this problem. quadratic, logarithmic weight seen in images above. also laoutout algo must be considered when searching for a culling weight.

2.4 Implementation Comparison

Layout space	\mathbb{H}^3			\mathbb{H}^2									
Max δ_v	$\sim 10^3$			$\sim 10^2$									
Projection	Beltrami–Klein			Poincaré disk									
	H3 Viewer	Walruss	pyh3	Inxight	HyperTree	Hypree	HVS	Ontology4us	JIT	HyperProf	TreeBolic	RougeVis	d3-hypertree
Pan navigation	✓			✓	✓~		✓	✗	✗			✓	
Click navigation	✓			✓	✓~	!	✓	✓	✓	!	!	✓	
Pseudo-Zoom		!		✓	✓~	!	✓	✗	✗	!	!	✓	
Pinch Pseudo-Zoom	✗					✗	✗	✗	✗			✓	
Rotation compensation	✓			✓								✓	
Layout	m	m	m	l			b					b	
Cyclic links	✓							✓	✓	✓		✗	
Multi focus				✓								✗	
Selection	1^s	1^s			N^k		1^s	1^s	1^s	1^s	1^s	N^{st}	
Editable					✓				✓			✗	
Max n	100k	500k		20k								70k	
Max n_v												70k	
Scalable if $\lambda < .1$												✓ ^w	
Webpage	→	→	→		→	→		→	→	→	→	→	→
PDF	9p	-		8p	2p	7p	-		-				
Application code	C++ \$	Java GPL2		\$	Java \$		Java			Java	Java \$		
Library code			Phyton MIT						JS \$		Java GPL3	C++ GPL2	JS MIT
First appeared	'97	'01		'95	'99	'02		'09		'96	'08		'17
Last update	'03	'05	'15	'09	'12		'05	'14	'13	'13	'17	'18	'18

Table 2.1: Empty cells indicate unknown value

[!] group not evaluated

^m Munzner \mathbb{H}^3 layout

^s single selection only

\$ commercial

~ strange behaviour in demo

^l Lamping and Rao layout

^t toggle multi selection

§ free for noncommercial use

^b Bergé layout. Similar to $\{\infty, \delta\}$

^k multiselection with keyboard

^w with given weights, see 2.3.11

Future work

- imroofe bergé layout to imitate tiling.
- measure values in prototype.
- find better (generic) culling algo.
- solve numerical problems by layout origin shift.
- iplement horocycle layout.
- implement topojson in/as viewmodel, and use d3-geo to project.
- more projectins, with d3-geo easy.
- more layers for high degree.
- ui event transformation maybe also by d3 solved?
- cleanup infovis props, css, add more renderers.
- python, jupyter, mathplotlib, R, js cmponent api.

Bibliography

- Baumgartner, Jason and Tim A Waugh [2002]. “Roget2000: a 2D hyperbolic tree visualization of Roget’s Thesaurus”. In: *Visualization and Data Analysis 2002*. Volume 4665. International Society for Optics and Photonics. 2002, pages 339–347. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0a2c/0dd1b6ea250d3e8202b5dac559fc8702af38.pdf> (cited on page 17).
- Bergé, Benjamin and Christophe Bouthier [2003]. “Mathematics and algorithms for the hyperbolic tree visualization” [2003] (cited on page 14).
- Bingham, Jonathan and Sucha Sudarsanam [2000]. “Visualizing large hierarchical clusters in hyperbolic space”. *Bioinformatics* 16.7 [2000], pages 660–661. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/16.7.660. eprint: /oup/backfile/content_public/journal/bioinformatics/16/7/10.1093/bioinformatics/16.7.660/2/160660.pdf. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/16.7.660> (cited on page 17).
- Bolyai [1823]. 1823 (cited on page 2).
- Cannon, James W, William J Floyd, Richard Kenyon, Walter R Parry et al. [1997]. “Hyperbolic geometry”. *Flavors of geometry* 31 [1997], pages 59–115. <http://library.msri.org/books/Book31/files/cannon.pdf> (cited on pages 4–5, 11).
- Euclid [300BC]. *Elements*. Ancient Greece, 300BC. <http://farside.ph.utexas.edu/Books/Euclid/Elements.pdf> (cited on page 1).
- Henderson, David W and Daina Taimina [2001]. “Crocheting the hyperbolic plane”. *The Mathematical Intelligencer* 23.2 [2001], pages 17–28. <http://pi.math.cornell.edu/~dwh/papers/crochet/crochet.html> (cited on page 3).
- Hilbert, David [1899]. 1899 (cited on pages 3–4).
- Kuiper, Nicolas [1955]. “On c1-isometric embeddings II”. *Proc. Ser. A* [1955], pages 683–689 (cited on page 3).
- Lamping, John and Ramana Rao [1994]. “Layout Of Node-link Structures In Space With Negative Curvature”. Patent US5590250A (US). 1994. <https://patents.google.com/patent/US5590250A/en> (cited on page 16).
- Lamping, John and Ramana Rao [1996]. “The hyperbolic browser: A focus+ context technique for visualizing large hierarchies”. *Journal of Visual Languages & Computing* 7.1 [1996], pages 33–55. <http://www.cs.kent.edu/~jmaletic/cs63903/papers/Lamping96.pdf> (cited on pages 8, 16).
- Lamping, John and Ramana Rao [1998]. “Local relative layout of node-link structures in space with negative curvature”. Patent US20020085002A1 (US). 1998. <https://patents.google.com/patent/US20020085002A1/en> (cited on pages 12, 16).
- Lamping, John, Ramana Rao and Yozo Hida [2001]. “Tree Visualization System And Method Based Upon A Compressed Half-plane Model Of Hyperbolic Geometry”. Patent US6901555B2 (US). 2001. <https://patents.google.com/patent/US6901555B2/en> (cited on pages 6, 16).

- Lamping, John, Ramana Rao and Peter Pirolli [1995]. “A focus+ context technique based on hyperbolic geometry for visualizing large hierarchies”. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. 1995, pages 401–408. <http://www.idav.ucdavis.edu/~asharf/shrek/Projects/HypBrowser/startree-chi95.pdf> (cited on pages 13, 16).
- Lamping, John, Ramana Rao and Tenev Tichomir [1998]. “Controlling which part of data defining a node-link structure is in memory”. Patent US6654761B2 (US). 1998. <https://patents.google.com/patent/US6654761B2/en> (cited on page 16).
- Lobachevsky [1823]. 1823 (cited on page 2).
- Munzner, Tamara [1997]. “H3: Laying Out Large Directed Graphs in 3D Hyperbolic Space” [1997]. <http://www.cs.ubc.ca/~tmm/talks/iv09/nestedmodel-4x4.pdf> (cited on pages 13, 15).
- Nussbaumer, Alexander [2005]. “Hierarchy Browsers: Integrating Four Graph-Based Hierarchy Browsers into the Hierarchical Visualisation System (HVS)”. Advisor: Ao.Univ.-Prof. Dr. Keith Andrews. Master’s Thesis. A-8010 Graz, Austria: Graz University of Technology: Institute for Information Systems and Computer Media (IICM), 2005 (cited on page 17).
- Playfair, John [1795]. *Elements of Geometry*. 1795 (cited on page 1).
- Series, Caroline [2008]. *Hyperbolic geometry MA 448*. 2008. <https://homepages.warwick.ac.uk/~masbb/Papers/MA448.pdf> (cited on pages 4–5).
- Taimina, Daina [2009]. *Crocheting adventures with hyperbolic planes*. AK Peters/CRC Press, 2009 (cited on page 3).
- Weeks, Jeffrey R. [1985]. *The shape of Space*. Marcel Dekker, 1985 (cited on page 3).