

1 **Dossier: visualizing/ understanding decision choices in data analysis via**
2 **decision similarity**
3

4 **ANONYMOUS AUTHOR(S)**
5

6 In data analysis, analysts are expected to clearly communicate the decisions they make, as these choices inform how results are
7 interpreted and compared across studies. Such decisions – for example, selecting the degree of freedom for a smoothing spline – are
8 often not systematically studied, since once an analysis is published, it is done seldom revisited or replicated with alternative choices.
9 In this work, we focus on a body of data analysis studies on the effect of particulate matter on mortality, conducted by researchers
10 worldwide, which naturally provide alternative analyses of the same question. We automatically extract analytic decisions from the
11 published literature into structured data using Large Language Models (Claude and Gemini). We then proposed a pipeline to calculate
12 paper similarity based on the semantic similarity of these extracted decisions and their reasons, and visualize the results through
13 clustering algorithms. This approach offers an efficient way to study decision-making practices than traditional interviews. We also
14 provide insights into the use of LLMs for text extraction tasks and the communication of analytic choices in data analysis practice.
15

16 CCS Concepts: • **Applied computing** → *Document analysis*; • **Human-centered computing** → *HCI theory, concepts and models*.
17

18 Additional Key Words and Phrases: Large language models
19

20 **ACM Reference Format:**
21

22 Anonymous Author(s). 2025. Dossier: visualizing/ understanding decision choices in data analysis via decision similarity. In *Proceedings*
23 of CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI'26). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 18 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX>.
24 XXXXXXXX
25

- 26 • Something about “analysis review” - Roger thinks it’s a better to have a new word for this.
27 • demonstrate - analytically homogeneous - the table won’t look like that
28

29 **1 Introduction**
30

31 Decisions are everywhere in data analysis, from the initial data collection, data pre-processing to the modelling
32 choices. These decisions will impact the final output of the data analysis, which may lead to different conclusions
33 and policy recommendations. When such flexibility can be misused—through practices such as p-hacking, selective
34 reporting, or unjustified analytical adjustments—it can inflate effect sizes or produce misleading results that meet
35 conventional thresholds for statistical significance. They have been demonstrated through many-analysts experiments,
36 where independent teams analyzing the same dataset to answer a pre-defined research question often arrive at markedly
37 different conclusions. These practices not only compromise the validity of individual studies but also threaten the
38 broader credibility of statistical analysis and scientific research as a whole.
39

40 Multiple recommendations have been proposed to improve data analysis practices, such as pre-registration and
41 multiverse analysis. Bayesian methods also offer a different paradigm to p-value driven inference for interpreting
42 statistical evidence. Most empirical studies of data analysis practices focus on specially designed and simplified analysis
43

44 Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not
45 made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components
46 of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to
47 redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
48

49 © 2025 ACM.
50

51 Manuscript submitted to ACM
52

53 Manuscript submitted to ACM

53 scenarios. While informative, these setups may not adequately capture the complexity of the data analysis with
 54 significant policy implications. [In practice, studying the data analysis decisions with actual applications is challenging.]
 55 Analysts may no longer be available for interviews due to job changes, and even when they are, recalling the full set
 56 of decisions and thinking process made during the analysis is often infeasible. Moreover, only until the last decades,
 57 analysis scripts and reproducible materials were not commonly required by journals for publishing. [As a result, it
 58 remains challenging to study how analytical decisions are made.]
 59

60 In this work, we focus on a specific class of air pollution modelling studies that estimate the effect size of particulate
 61 matter (PM2.5 or PM10) on mortality, typically using Poisson regression or generalized additive models (GAMs).
 62 While individual modelling choices vary, these studies often share a common structure: they adjust for meteorological
 63 covariates such as temperature and humidity, apply temporal or spatial treatments, like including lagged variables and
 64 may estimate the effect by city or region before combining results. Because these studies investigate similar scientific
 65 questions using a shared modelling framework, they form a natural many-analyst setting. This allows us to examine, in
 66 a real-world context, the range of analytical decisions made by different researchers addressing the same underlying
 67 question.
 68

69 In this work, we develop a structured tabular format to record the analytical decisions made by researchers in the air
 70 pollution modelling literature. Using large language models (LLMs), we automate the extraction of these decisions from
 71 published papers. This allows us to treat decisions as data – allowing us to track them over time, compare methodology
 72 across papers, and query commonly used approaches. We further introduce a workflow to cluster studies based on
 73 decision similarity, revealing three distinct groups of papers that reflect the modelling strategies differ in the European
 74 and U.S. studies, which offers a new way to visualize the field in the air pollution mortality modelling.
 75

76 The contribution of this work includes:

- 77 • A new approach to study data analysis decision choices through automatic extraction of decisions from scientific
 78 literature using LLMs,
- 79 • A dataset compiled from 62 papers to study decision-making in air pollution mortality modelling,
- 80 • A pipeline to construct similarities between papers based on decision similarities, and
- 81 • Issues we found from existing data analysis reporting

82 The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the background on data analysis decisions.
 83 Section 3 describes the data structure for recording decisions, the use of large language models to process research
 84 papers, and the validation of LLM outputs. In Section 4, we present the method for calculating paper similarity based
 85 on decision similarities. Section 5 reports the finding of our analysis, including the clustering of papers according to
 86 similarity scores and sensitivity analyses related to LLM providers, prompt engineering, and LLM parameters. Finally,
 87 Section 7 discusses the implications of our study.
 88

90 2 Related work

91 2.1 Decision-making in data analysis

92 A data analysis is a process of making choices at each step, from the initial data collection to model specification, and
 93 post-processing. Each decision represents a branching point where analysts choose a specific path to follow, and the
 94 vast number of possible choices analysts can take forms what Gelman and Loken [18] describe as the “garden of forking
 95 paths”. While researchers may hope their inferential results are robust to the specific path taken through the garden,
 96 in practice, different choices can lead to substantially different conclusions. This has been empirically demonstrated
 97

105 through “many analyst experiments”, where independent research groups analyze the same dataset to the same answer
106 using their chosen analytic approach. A classic example is Silberzahn et al. [41], where researchers reported an odds
107 ratio from 0.89 to 2.93 for the effect of soccer players’ skin tone on the number of red cards awarded by referees. Similar
108 variability has been observed in structural equation modeling [39], applied microeconomics [22], neuroimaging [8],
109 and ecology and evolutionary biology [19].

110 Examples above have rendered decision-making in data analysis as a subject to study in data science. To collect
111 data on how analysts making decisions during data analysis, researchers have conducted interviews with analysts and
112 researchers on data analysis practices [2, 24, 29], visualization of the decision process through the analytic decision
113 graphics (ADG) [30]. Recently, Simson et al. [42] describes a participatory approach to decisions choices in fairness ML
114 algorithms. Software tools have also developed to incorporate potential alternatives in the analysis workflow, including
115 the DeclareDesign package [7] and the multiverse package [38]. The DeclareDesign package [7] introduces the
116 MIDA framework for researchers to declare, diagnose, and redesign their analyses to produce a distribution of the
117 statistic of interest, which has been applied in the randomized controlled trial study [6]. The multiverse package [38]
118 provides a framework for researchers to systematically explore how different choices affect results and to report the
119 range of plausible outcomes that arise from alternative analytic paths. Other systems have been developed to visualize
120 multiverse analysis [31].

126 2.2 Visualization on scientific literature

127 Much of the work on IEEE visualizing scientific literature focuses on helping researchers stay aware of relevant
128 publications, given the rapidly growing volume of scientific output and the difficulty of navigating it. Systems have
129 been developed to support the discovery of relevant papers, where relevance is typically determined by keywords [23],
130 citation information (e.g. citation list, co-citation) [13], or combinations with other relevant paper metadata (e.g. author,
131 title) [5, 14, 17, 20]. More recent approaches incorporate text-based information from the abstract or sections of the
132 paper to [obtain a better similar metric]. This includes using topic modelling [1], argumentation-based information
133 retrieval [43], and text embedding [36]. While these metadata information and high level text-based information are
134 valuable for discovering relevant papers, for data analysis, researchers need tools that help them *make sense* of the
135 literature rather than simply *finding* it. Capturing the decisions and reasoning expressed during analyses within a
136 similar theme can reveal common practices in the field and guide decisions choices in new applications. With recent
137 advances in Large Language Models (LLMs), it has become possible to automatically extract structured information from
138 unstructured text through prompting. This allows scientific literature to be clustered and visualized using information
139 about the underlying decisions and reasoning made during analysis, providing a basis for studying analysts’ decision
140 choices.

146 3 Methods

148 3.1 Decisions in data analysis

149 Decisions occur throughout the entire data analysis process – from the selection of variables and data source, to
150 pre-processing steps to prepare the data for modelling, to the model specification and variable inclusion. In this work,
151 we focus specifically on modelling decisions in the air pollution mortality modelling literature. These include the
152 choice of modelling approach, covariate inclusion and smoothing, and specifications of spatial and temporal structure.
153 Consider the following excerpt from Ostro et al. [37]:

157 Based on previous findings reported in the literature (e.g., Samet et al. 2000), the basic model included a
 158 smoothing spline for time with 7 degrees of freedom (df) per year of data. This number of degrees of
 159 freedom controls well for seasonal patterns in mortality and reduces and often eliminates autocorrelation.
 160

161 This sentence encode the following components of a decision:

- 162 • **variable**: time
- 163 • **method**: smoothing spline
- 164 • **parameter**: degree of freedom (df)
- 165 • **reason**: Based on previous findings reported in the literature (e.g., Samet et al. 2000); This number of degrees of
 166 freedom controls well for seasonal patterns in mortality and reduces and often eliminates autocorrelation.
- 167 • **decision**: 7 degrees of freedom (df) per year of data

168 The decision above is regarding a certain parameter in the statistical method, we categorize this as a “parameter”
 169 type decisions. Other types of decisions - such as spatial modelling structure or the inclusion of temporal lags - may
 170 not include an explicit method or parameter, but still reference a variable and rationale, which we will provide further
 171 examples below.

172 To record these decisions, we follow the tidy data principle [45], where each variable should be in a column, each
 173 observation in a row. In our context, each row represents a decision made by the authors of a paper and an analysis
 174 often include multiple decisions. To retain the original context of the decision, we extract the original text in the paper,
 175 without paraphrase or summarization, from the paper. Below we present an example of how to structure the decisions
 176 made in a paper, using the paper by Ostro et al. [37]:

| Paper | ID | Model | variable | method | parameter | type | reason | decision |
|-------|----|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------|--|---|
| ostro | 1 | Poisson regression | temperature | smoothing spline | degree of freedom | parameter | NA | 3 degree of freedom |
| ostro | 2 | Poisson regression | temperature | smoothing spline | degree of freedom | temporal | NA | 1-day lag |
| ostro | 3 | Poisson regression | relative humidity | LOESS | smoothing parameter | parameter | to minimize Akaike's Information Criterion | NA |
| ostro | 4 | Poisson regression | model | NA | NA | spatial | to account for variation among cities | separate regression models fit in each city |

209 Most decisions in the published papers are not explicitly stated, this could due to the coherence and conciseness of
210 the writing or authors' decision to include only necessary details. Here, we identify a few common anomalies where
211 decisions may be combined or omit certain fields:

- 212 1. **Authors may combine multiple decisions into a single sentence** for coherence and conciseness of the
213 writing. Consider the following excerpt from Ostro et al. [37]:

214 Other covariates, such as day of the week and smoothing splines of 1-day lags of average temperature
215 and humidity (each with 3 df), were also included in the model because they may be associated with
216 daily mortality and are likely to vary over time in concert with air pollution levels.

217 This sentence contains four decisions: two for temperature (the temporal lag and the smoothing spline parameter)
218 and two for humidity. These decisions should be structured as separate entries.

- 219 2. **The justification does not directly address the decision choice.** In the example above, the stated rationale
220 ("and are likely to vary over time in concert with air pollution levels") supports the general inclusion of temporal
221 lags but does not justify the specific choice of 1-day lag over alternatives, such as 2-day average of lags 0 and 1
222 (lag01) and single-day lag of 2 days (lag2). As such, the reason field should be recorded as NA.

- 223 3. **Some decisions may be omitted because they are data-driven.** For instance, Katsouyanni et al. [26] states:
224 The inclusion of lagged weather variables and the choice of smoothing parameters for all of the weather
225 variables were done by minimizing Akaike's information criterion.

226 In this case, while the method of selection (minimizing AIC) is specified, the actual degree of freedom used is not.
227 Such data-driven decisions may be recorded with "NA" in the decision field, but the reason field should still be recorded
228 as "by minimizing Akaike's information criterion"

- 229 4. **Information required to interpret the decision may be distributed across multiple sections.** In the
230 previous example, "weather variables" refers to mean temperature and relative humidity, as defined earlier in
231 the text. This requires cross-referencing across sections to identify the correct variables associated with each
232 modeling choice.

233 3.2 Automatic reading of literature with LLMs

234 **TODO:** Prompt engineering: these models may paraphrase or hallucinate unless explicitly told not to since it is
235 generative in nature based on the predicted probability of the next word from the text and the instruction

236 **TODO:** The Prompt Report: A Systematic Survey of Prompt Engineering Techniques <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2406.06608.pdf>
237 While decisions can be extracted manually from the literature, this process is labor-intensive and time-consuming.
238 Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated potential for automating the extraction of
239 structured information from unstructured text [ref]. In this work, we use LLMs to automatically identify decisions
240 made by authors during their data analysis processes.

241 Text recognition from PDF document relies on Optical Character Recognition (OCR) to convert scanned images into
242 machine-readable text – capability currently offered by Anthropic Claude and Google Gemini. We instruct the LLM
243 to generate a markdown file containing a JSON block that records extracted decisions, which can then be read into
244 statistical software for further analysis. The exact prompt feed to the LLM is provided in the Appendix. The `ellmer`
245 package [46] in R is used to connect to the Gemini and Claude API, providing the PDF attachment and the prompt in a
246 markdown file as inputs.

261 3.3 Review the LLM output

- 262 • TODO something about result validation of LLM output: We also observe data quality with the extraction:
 263 for example in Lee et al. [28], the variable recorded is “smoothing parameter”. Authors are unclear about the
 264 delivery Specify how much of validation and review has been done.
 265


266 The shiny app is designed to provide users a visual interface to review and edit the decisions extracted by the LLM
 267 from the literature. The app allows three actions from the users: 1) *overwrite* – modify the content of a particular
 268 cell, equivalently `dplyr::mutate(xxx = ifelse(CONDITION, "yyy" , xxx))`, 2) *delete* – remove a particular cell,
 269 `dplyr::filter(!(CONDITION))`, and 3) *add* – manually enter a decision, `dplyr::bind_rows()`. Figure 1 illustrates
 270 the *overwrite* action in the Shiny application, where users interactively filter the data and preview the rows affected by
 271 their edits—in this case, changing the model entry from “generalized additive Poisson time series regression” to the
 272 less verbose “Poisson regression”. Upon confirmation, the corresponding tidyverse code is generated, and users can
 273 download the edited table and incorporate the code into their R script.
 274

| paper | id | model | variable | method | parameter | type | reason | decision |
|------------------|----|---|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------------|---|
| anderson2008size | 1 | generalized additive Poisson time series regression | temperature | smoothing spline | degrees of freedom | parameter NA | 4 or 5 | |
| anderson2008size | 2 | generalized additive Poisson time series regression | deev-point temperature | smoothing spline | degrees of freedom | parameter NA | 4 or 5 | |
| anderson2008size | 3 | generalized additive Poisson time series regression | calendar time | smoothing spline | degrees of freedom per year | parameter NA | 3, 4 or 5 | |
| anderson2008size | 4 | generalized additive Poisson time series regression | polynomial concentrations | NA | NA | temporal | NA | log 0-5 days |
| barnett2004air | 1 | cose-crossover model | model | NA | NA | temporal | NA | use fixed 28-day temporal trend, seasonal changes, and random effects by design |
| barnett2004air | 2 | cose-crossover model | temperature | NA | NA | temporal | NA | to control for weather extremes of hot and cold, and previous day's temperature |
| barnett2004air | 3 | cose-crossover model | temperature extreme | percentile | 1st and 99th percentile | NA | NA | to control for extremes of hot and cold, and previous day's temperature |
| barnett2004air | 4 | random effects meta-analysis | model | NA | NA | spatial | NA | to estimate average effect for all cities using random effects meta-analysis |
| barnett2004air | 5 | cose-crossover model | air pollutants | NA | NA | temporal | NA | use average of previous day's temperature and previous day's exposure |
| lee2003seasonal | 1 | 2-stage Bayesian hierarchical model | temperature | natural cubic spline | 6 degrees of freedom | parameter NA | 6 degrees of freedom | |
| lee2003seasonal | 2 | 2-stage Bayesian hierarchical model | deev-point temperature | natural cubic spline | 3 degrees of freedom | parameter NA | 3 degrees of freedom | |

305 Fig. 1. The Shiny application interface for editting Large Language Model (LLM)-generated decisions (overwrite, delete, and add). (1)
 306 the default interface after loading the input CSV file. (2) The table view will update interactively upon the user-defined filter condition
 307 – expressed using `dplyr::filter()` syntax (e.g., `paper == anderson2008size`), (3) The user edits the model column to “Poisson
 308 regression” and applies the change by clicking the Apply changes button. The table view updates to reflect the changes (4) After
 309 clicking the Confirm button, the corresponding tidyverse code is generated, and the table view returns to its original unfiltered view.
 310 The edited data can be downloaded by clicking the Download CSV button.
 311

313 4 Calculating paper similarity

314 Once the decisions have been extracted and validated, this opens up a structured data for analyzing these information.
 315 For example, we can compare whether author's choices at different times changes, or across decisions varies at different
 316 regions. In this section, we present a method to calculate paper similarity based on the decisions shared in the paper
 317 pairs. The goal is to construct a distance metric based on similarity of the decision choice among papers that could
 318 be further used for clustering paper based on choices made by different authors in the literature. An overview of the
 319 method is illustrated in Figure 2.



350 Fig. 2. Workflow for calculating paper similarity based on decision choices: (1) standardize variable names, (2) identify most frequent
 351 variable-type decisions across all papers, (3) identify papers with at least x identified decisions, (4) calculate decisions similarity
 352 score on the *decision* and *reason* fields using transformer language models, e.g. BERT, (5) calculate paper similarity score based on
 353 aggregating decision similarity scores.

- 355 • TODO some discussion on what it means by for two papers to be similar based on decisions.

356 The calculation of paper similarity is based on the similarity of decisions shared by each paper pair. A decision
 357 comparable in two papers are the ones that share the same variable and type, e.g. temperature and parameter (a decisions
 358 on the choosing the statistical method *parameter* for the *temperature* variable), or humidity and temporal (any *temporal*
 359 treatment, e.g. choice of lag value for the *humidity* variable). While many decisions share a similar variable, different
 360 authors may refer to them with slightly different names, such as “mean temperature” and “average temperature”, hence
 361 variable names are first standardized to a common set of variable names. For example, “mean temperature” and “average
 362

365 Table 2. Missingness of decision and reason fields in the Gemini-extracted decisions. Most decisions report the choice (35.5 + 57.1 =
 366 92%), but 57.1% lacks a stated reason.

| Reason | Decision | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Non-missing | Missing |
| Non-missing | 97 (35.5%) | 16 (5.9%) |
| Missing | 156 (57.1%) | 4 (1.5%) |

373 temperature” are both standardized to “temperature”. Notice that “dewpoint temperature” is standardized into “humidity”
 374 since it is a proxy of temperature to achieve a relative humidity (RH) of 100%. For literature with a common theme,
 375 there is usually a set of variables that shared by most papers and additional variables are justified in individual research.
 376 For our air pollution mortality modelling literature, we standardize the following variable names:

- **temperature**: “mean temperature”, “average temperature”, “temperature”, “air temperature”, “ambient temperature”
- **humidity**: “dewpoint temperature” and its hyphenated variants, relative humidity”, “humidity”
- **PM**: “pollutant”, “pollution”, “particulate matter”, “particulate”, “PM10”, “PM2.5”
- **time**: “date”, “time”, “trends”, “trend”

386 Depending on the specific pairs, papers have varied number of decisions that can be compared and aggregated. While
 387 paper similarities can be computed for all paper pairs, using the similarity of one or two pair of decisions to represent
 388 paper similarity is less ideal. Hence, before calculating the text similarity of decisions, we also include two optional
 389 steps to identify and subset the most frequent decisions across papers, and to retain only papers that report more than
 390 a certain number of frequent decisions. Research questions in different fields may have different levels of homogeneity,
 391 depending on the maturity of the field and for air pollution mortality modelling, it is helpful to focus on decisions and
 392 papers that share a substantial number of decisions.

394 To assign numerical value for the similarity of reason, we use a transformer language model, such as BERT, to
 395 measure the semantic text similarity between the decision itself and its justification. The decision similarity is calculated
 396 by comparing the *decision* and *reason* fields of the decisions in each paper pair. To obtain paper similarity, we average
 397 the decision similarities across all decisions in each paper pair and other method can be customized for aggregation.
 398 The resulting paper similarity score can be used as a distance matrix to cluster papers based on their decision choices to
 399 understand the common practices in the investigated literature.

402 5 Results

404 From the 57 studies examining the effect of particulate matters (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) on mortality, we focus on the baseline
 405 model reported in each paper, excluding secondary models (e.g. lag-distributed models) and sensitivity analysis. We also
 406 exclude decisions on other pollutants, such as nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). This yields 273 decisions extracted using Gemini,
 407 averaging approximately 5 decisions per paper. Table 2 summarizes the missingness of the decisions and reason. While
 408 most papers report their decision choices (e.g. use of five degree of freedom), 57% of decisions lack a stated rationale
 409 for the choice. Table 3 lists the eight most frequently reported decision: parameter and temporal choice for time, PM,
 410 temperature, and humidity.

Table 3. Count of variable-type decisions in the Gemini-extracted decisions. The most commonly reported decision are the parameter choices and temporal lags for time, PM, temperature, and humidity.

| Variable | Type | Count |
|-------------|-----------|-------|
| PM | temporal | 56 |
| time | parameter | 45 |
| temperature | parameter | 37 |
| humidity | parameter | 26 |
| temperature | temporal | 25 |
| humidity | temporal | 20 |
| PM | parameter | 8 |
| mortality | temporal | 4 |

Table 4 reports the parameter-related decisions captured in the literature. They refer to the number of knots or degree of freedom for spline methods (natural and smoothing spline) applied to variable time, humidity and temperature. For consistency, all values have been converted to a *per year* scale. The selection of knot for natural spline has less variation than the degree of freedom choices for smoothing spline. Choices for temperature and humidity tend to be close, given they are both weather related variables, while the choices for time are more varied inherently. This tabulation offers a reference set for potential options for future studies and help to identify anomalies and special treatment in practice. Notable example includes the use of 7.7 degree of freedom in Castillejos et al. [12], and highly flexible choices of 30 and 100 in Moolgavkar [34] and Moolgavkar [35], respectively. While most papers choice to report the smoothing parameter as a constant value, Schwartz [40] specifies it as a proportion of the data (“5% of the data” and “5% of the data”).

For temporal decisions, after an initial review, we observed that decisions are still highly varied. The decisions can be divided into two groups: multi-day lags include expressions such as “6-day average”, “3-d moving average”, “mean of lags 0+1”, and “cumulative lags, mean 0+1+2”, and single-day lags include “lagged exposure up to 6 days”, “lag days from 0 to 5” among others. To standardize these entries, we applied a secondary LLM process (claude-3-7-sonnet-latest) and converted them into a consistent format: multi-day: lag [start]-[end] and single-day: lag [start], . . . lag [end]. Table 5 summarizes the temporal lag choices for PM, temperature, and humidity. Both single and multiple day lags are generally considered up to five days prior (lag 5). [TODO: check multi-day starts from one].

Table 4. Options captured for parameter choices for time, humidity, and temperature variables in the Gemini-extracted decisions. The choices for natural spline knots are generally less varied than the degree of freedom choices for smoothing spline. Choices for temperature and humidity tend to be close, given they are both weather related variables, while the choices for time are more varied inherently.

| Method | Variable | Decision |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| natural spline | humidity | 3, 4 |
| natural spline | temperature | 3, 4, 6 |
| natural spline | time | 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12 |
| smoothing spline | humidity | 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 50% of the data |
| smoothing spline | temperature | 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 50% of the data |

469 Table 4. Options captured for parameter choices for time, humidity, and temperature variables in the Gemini-extracted decisions.
 470 The choices for natural spline knots are generally less varied than the degree of freedom choices for smoothing spline. Choices for
 471 temperature and humidity tend to be close, given they are both weather related variables, while the choices for time are more varied
 472 inherently.

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

| Method | Variable | Decision |
|------------------|----------|--|
| smoothing spline | time | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7.7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 30, 100, NA, 5% of the data |

479 Table 5. Options captured for temporal lag choices for PM, temperature, and humidity variables in the Gemini-extracted decisions.
 480 Both single-day lags and multi-day average lags are commonly used, generally considering up to five days prior (lag 5).

481

482

483

| Lag type | Variable | Decision |
|-------------------|-------------|--|
| multi-day average | PM | 0-1, 0-2, 0-3, 0-4, 0-5, 0-7, 1-0, 1-5 |
| multi-day average | humidity | 0-1, 0-2, 0-3, 0-5, 1-3, 1-5 |
| multi-day average | temperature | 0-1, 0-2, 0-3, 0-5, 0-7, 1-3 |
| single-day lag | PM | lag 0, lag 1, lag 2, lag 3, lag 4, lag 5 |
| single-day lag | humidity | lag 0, lag 1, lag 2, lag 3, lag 4, lag 5, lag 6, lag 7 |
| single-day lag | temperature | lag 0, lag 1, lag 2, lag 3, lag 4, lag 5 |

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515


516

517

518

519

520



516 Fig. 3. The dendrogram (left) and multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) (right) based on paper similarity distance for 62 air pollution
 517 mortality modelling literature. The papers are colored by the most common smoothing method used. The MDS reveals the three
 518 distinct groups of papers. This grouping corresponds to the modelling strategies differ in the European and U.S. studies, documented
 519 in ALPHENA.

521 For computing the decision similarity score, we include the first 6 most common variable-type decisions as suggested
 522 in Table 3. Figure 3 shows the clustering of the 50 papers based on the decision similarity scores. The dendrogram is
 523 generated using hierarchical clustering, and the labels are colored according to the most common smoothing method
 524 used in each paper. The clustering reveals three distinct groups of papers, which reflect the modelling strategies differ
 525 in the European (LOESS) and U.S. (...) studies [more on the APHENA].
 526

527 6 Sensitivity analysis

528 In this section, we examine the reproducibility for using LLMs for text extraction tasks in Section 6.1, discrepancies
 529 between different LLM models: Gemini (gemini-2.0-flash) and Claude (claude-3-7-sonnet-latest) in Section 6.2,
 530 and the sensitivity of our paper similarity calculation pipeline to the choice of text model used for computing decision
 531 similarity scores in Section 6.3.
 532

533 6.1 LLM reproducibility

534 For our text extraction task, we test the reproducibility of Gemini (gemini-2.0-flash) by repeating the text extraction
 535 task 5 times for each of the 62 papers. For each of the 31 papers, five runs yield $5 \times 4/2 = 10$ pairwise comparisons per
 536 field and including both the “reason” and “decision” fields results in a total of $31 \times 10 \times 2 = 620$ pairs. We exclude the
 537 pairs that have different number of decisions since it would require manually align the decision to compare and this left
 538 us with 449 out of 620 (72%) pairwise comparisons. Table 6 shows an example of such comparison in Andersen et al. [3],
 539 where all the four reasons are identical among the two runs, hence a zero number of difference.
 540

541 Table 6. An example of comparing the text extraction in decisions in Andersen 2008.
 542

| 543 Variable | Run1 | Run2 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 544 NCtot | 6day average (lag 05) | 6day average (lag 05) |
| 545 calendar time | 3 4 or 5 dfyear | 3 4 or 5 dfyear |
| 546 dew-point temperature | 4 or 5 df | 4 or 5 df |
| 547 temperature | 4 or 5 df | 4 or 5 df |

548 Table 7 summarizes the number of differences observed in each pairwise comparison. Among all comparisons, 80%
 549 produce the identical text in reason and decision. The discrepancies come from the following reasons:
 550

- 551 • Gemini extracted different length for the same decision, e.g. in Kan et al. [25], some runs may extract “singleday
 552 lag models underestimate the cumulative effect of pollutants on mortality 2day moving average **of current**
 553 **and previous day concentrations** (lag=01), while others extract “singleday lag models underestimate the
 554 cumulative effect of pollutants on mortality 2day moving average (lag=01)”. Similarly, for decisions, some runs
 555 may yield “10 df for total mortality”, while other runs yield “10 df”. Similar extraction appears in Breitner et al.
 556 [9].
- 557 • Gemini fails to extract reasons in some runs but not others, e.g. in Burnett et al. [10], the first run generates
 558 NAs in the reasons, but the remaining four runs are identical. In Ueda et al. [44] and Castillejos et al. [12], runs
 559 1 and 5 fail to extract the reasons and produce the same incomplete version, whereas runs 2, 3, and 4 produce
 560 accurate versions with reasons populated.

573 Table 7. Number of differences in the reason and decision fields across Gemini runs for papers with consistent number of decisions
 574 across runs.

| 576 | Num. of difference | Count | Proportion (%) |
|-----|--------------------|-------|----------------|
| 577 | 0 | 358 | 79.73 |
| 578 | 1 | 12 | 2.67 |
| 579 | 2 | 8 | 1.78 |
| 580 | 3 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 581 | 4 | 24 | 5.35 |
| 582 | 5 | 12 | 2.67 |
| 583 | 6 | 3 | 0.67 |
| 584 | 7 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 585 | 8 | 10 | 2.23 |
| 586 | 9 | 6 | 1.34 |
| 587 | 10 | 10 | 2.23 |
| 588 | 11 | 6 | 1.34 |
| 589 | Total | 449 | 100.00 |

596 6.2 LLM models

597
 598 Reading text from PDF document requires Optical Character Recognition (OCR) to convert images into machine-
 599 readable text, which currently is only supported by Anthropic Claude (claude-3-7-sonnet-latest) and Google Gemini
 600 (gemini-2.0-flash).

601 We compare the number of decisions extracted by Claude and Gemini across all 62 papers in ?@fig-claude-gemini.
 602 Each point represents a paper, with the x- and y-axes showing the number of decisions extracted by Claude and Gemini,
 603 respectively. The dashed 1:1 line marks where both models extract the same number of decisions. Most points fall below
 604 this line, indicating that Claude extracts more decisions – often from data pre-processing or secondary data analysis
 605 steps requiring more manual validation – whereas Gemini focuses more on modelling choices relevant to our analysis.
 606 Some of these decisions captured by Claude are

- 607 • the definition of “cold day” and “hot day” indicators in Dockery et al. [16] (“defined at the 5th/ 95th percentile”),
- 608 • the choice to summarize NO₂, O₃, and SO₂ using a “24 hr average on variable” in Huang et al. [21], and
- 609 • the definition of black smoke and in Katsouyanni et al. [26] for secondary analysis (“restrict to days with BS
 610 concentrations below 150 µg/m²”).

611 Gemini sometimes also include irrelevant decisions, such as in Mar et al. [33], where secondary analysis choices like
 612 “0-4 lag days” for air pollution exposure variables (CO, EC, K_S, NO₂, O₃, OC, Pb, S, SO₂, TC, Zn) are captured. However,
 613 these cases are less frequent, resulting in outputs with less noise overall.


614 For both Claude and Gemini, we find they fail to link the general term “weather variables” to the specific weather
 615 variables. For example Gemini misses this link in Dockery et al. [16] and Burnett et al. [11], while Claude does so in
 616 Dockery et al. [16] and Katsouyanni et al. [26]. Although our prompt specified that some decisions may require linking
 617 information across sentences and paragraphs to identify the correct variable, this instruction doesn’t appear to be
 618 applied consistently.

625 6.3 Text model

626 We have conducted sensitivity analysis on the text model for obtaining the decision similarity score from the Gemini
 627 outputs. The tested language models tested include

- 629 1) BERT by Google [15],
- 630 2) RoBERTa by Facebook AI [32], trained on a larger dataset (160GB v.s. BERT's 15GB),
- 631 3) XLNet by Google Brain [47], and
- 633 two domain-trained BERT models:
- 634 4) sciBERT [4], trained on scientific literature, and
- 635 5) bioBERT [27], trained on PubMed and PMC data.

636 Figure 4 presents the distribution of the decision similarity (left) and paper similarity (right) for each text model.
 637 At decision level, the BERT model produces the widest variation across all five models, while the similarity scores
 638 from XLNet are all close to 1. These scores are not comparable across models since the difference of the underlying
 639 transformer architecture. However, the paper similarity scores from each model are comparable and ?@fig-text-mds
 640 shows the multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) of the paper similarity scores from each text model: all showing a similar
 641 clustering pattern of the three main smoothing methods.
 642



671 Fig. 4. Distribution of decision similarity (left) and paper similarity (right) scores for five different text models (BERT, BioBERT,
 672 RoBERTa, SciBERT, and XLNet). The default language model, BERT, produces the widest variation across the five models, while
 673 the similarity scores form XLNet are all close to 1. The model BioBERT, RoBERTa, and SciBERT yield decision similar scores mostly
 674 between 0.7 to 1.

677 7 Discussion

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

the nature of the task: Our task involve a reasoning component in that it requires causal reasoning to identify the decisions made by the authors, and its justification/ rationale, rather than purely summarizing the text through pattern-matching.

- some decisions are more varied than others and can be reported by different ways. e.g. the most common way to report the smoothing parameter for time is the number of knots/ degree of freedom per year. While authors may report this number in different ways, i.e. “every 30 days”. A secondary processing with LLM may be useful to align the raw text into the same reporting units.
- the variation of parameters people use can help to identify parameter that needs a separate sensitivity analysis

703 References

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

- [1] Eric Alexander, Joe Kohlmann, Robin Valenza, Michael Witmore, and Michael Gleicher. 2014 ieee conference on visual analytics science and technology (vast). pages 173–182, 10 2014. doi: 10.1109/VAST.2014.7042493. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7042493>.
- [2] Sara Alspaugh, Nava Zokaei, Andrea Liu, Cindy Jin, and Marti A. Hearst. Futzng and moseyng: Interviews with professional data analysts on exploration practices. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 25(1):22–31, 01 2019. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2018.2865040. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8440815>.
- [3] Z. J. Andersen, P. Wahlin, O. Raaschou-Nielsen, M. Ketzel, T. Scheike, and S. Loft. Size distribution and total number concentration of ultrafine and accumulation mode particles and hospital admissions in children and the elderly in copenhagen, denmark. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 65(7):458–466, 07 2008. doi: 10.1136/oem.2007.033290. URL <https://oem.bmjjournals.com/content/65/7/458>. Publisher: BMJ Publishing Group Ltd Section: Original article PMID: 17989204.
- [4] Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (emnlp-ijcnlp). pages 3613–3618, Hong Kong, China, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1371. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D19-1371>.
- [5] Steven Bethard and Dan Jurafsky. Cikm ’10: International conference on information and knowledge management. pages 609–618, Toronto ON Canada, 10 2010. ACM. doi: 10.1145/1871437.1871517. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/1871437.1871517>.
- [6] Dorothy V. M. Bishop and Charles Hulme. When alternative analyses of the same data come to different conclusions: A tutorial using declaredesign with a worked real-world example. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 7(3):25152459241267904, 07 2024. doi: 10.1177/25152459241267904. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459241267904>. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- [7] Graeme Blair, Jasper Cooper, Alexander Coppock, and Macartan Humphreys. Declaring and diagnosing research designs. *American Political Science Review*, 113(3):838–859, 08 2019. doi: 10.1017/S0003055419000194. URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055419000194/type/journal_article.
- [8] Rotem Botvinik-Nezer, Felix Holzmeister, Colin F. Camerer, Anna Dreber, Juergen Huber, Magnus Johannesson, Michael Kirchler, Roni Iwanir, Jeanette A. Mumford, R. Alison Adcock, Paolo Avesani, Blazej M. Baczkowski, Aahana Bajracharya, Leah Bakst, Sheryl Ball, Marco Barilaro, Nadège Bault, Derek Beaton, Julia Beitner, Roland G. Benoit, Ruud M. W. J. Berkers, Jamil P. Bhanji, Bharat B. Biswal, Sebastian Bobadilla-Suarez, Tiago Bortolini, Katherine L. Bottenhorn, Alexander Bowring, Senne Braem, Hayley R. Brooks, Emily G. Brudner, Cristian B. Calderon, Julia A. Camilleri, Jaime J. Castrellon, Luca Cecchetti, Edna C. Cieslik, Zachary J. Cole, Olivier Collignon, Robert W. Cox, William A. Cunningham, Stefan Czoschke,

- 729 Kamalaker Dadi, Charles P. Davis, Alberto De Luca, Mauricio R. Delgado, Lysia Demetriou, Jeffrey B. Dennison, Xin Di, Erin W. Dickie, Ekaterina
 730 Dobryakova, Claire L. Donnat, Juergen Dukart, Niall W. Duncan, Joke Durnez, Amr Eed, Simon B. Eickhoff, Andrew Erhart, Laura Fontanesi,
 731 G. Matthew Fricke, Shiguang Fu, Adriana Galván, Remi Gau, Sarah Genon, Tristan Glatard, Enrico Glerean, Jelle J. Goeman, Sergej A. E. Golowin,
 732 Carlos González-García, Krzysztof J. Gorgolewski, Cheryl L. Grady, Mikella A. Green, João F. Guassi Moreira, Olivia Guest, Shabnam Hakimi,
 733 J. Paul Hamilton, Roeland Hancock, Giacomo Handjelas, Bronson B. Harry, Colin Hawco, Peer Herholz, Gabrielle Herman, Stephan Heunis, Felix
 734 Hoffstaedter, Jeremy Hogewege, Susan Holmes, Chuan-Peng Hu, Scott A. Huettel, Matthew E. Hughes, Vittorio Iacobella, Alexandru D. Iordan,
 735 Peder M. Isager, Ayse I. Isik, Andrew Jahn, Matthew R. Johnson, Tom Johnstone, Michael J. E. Joseph, Anthony C. Juliano, Joseph W. Kable, Michalis
 736 Kassinopoulos, Cemal Koba, Xiang-Zhen Kong, Timothy R. Koscik, Nuri Erkut Kucukboyaci, Brice A. Kuhl, Sebastian Kupek, Angela R. Laird,
 737 Claus Lamm, Robert Langner, Nina Lauharatanahirun, Hongmi Lee, Sangil Lee, Alexander Leemans, Andrea Leo, Elise Lesage, Flora Li, Monica
 738 Y. C. Li, Phui Cheng Lim, Evan N. Lintz, Schuyler W. Liphardt, Annabel B. Losecaat Vermeer, Bradley C. Love, Michael L. Mack, Norberto Malpica,
 739 Theo Marins, Camille Maunet, Kelsey McDonald, Joseph T. McGuire, Helena Melero, Adriana S. Méndez Leal, Benjamin Meyer, Kristin N. Meyer,
 740 Glad Mihai, Georgios D. Mitsis, Jorge Moll, Dylan M. Nelson, Gustav Nilsson, Michael P. Notter, Emanuele Olivetti, Adrian I. Onicas, Paolo
 741 Papale, Kaustubh R. Patil, Jonathan E. Peelle, Alexandre Pérez, Doris Pischedda, Jean-Baptiste Poline, Yanina Prystauka, Shruti Ray, Patricia A.
 742 Reuter-Lorenz, Richard C. Reynolds, Emiliano Ricciardi, Jenny R. Rieck, Anais M. Rodriguez-Thompson, Anthony Romyn, Taylor Salo, Gregory R.
 743 Samanez-Larkin, Emilio Sanz-Morales, Margaret L. Schlichting, Douglas H. Schultz, Qiang Shen, Margaret A. Sheridan, Jennifer A. Silvers, Kenny
 744 Skagerlund, Alec Smith, David V. Smith, Peter Sokol-Hessner, Simon R. Steinkamp, Sarah M. Tashjian, Bertrand Thirion, John N. Thorp, Gustav
 745 Tinghög, Loreen Tisdall, Steven H. Tompson, Claudio Toro-Serey, Juan Jesus Torre Tresols, Leonardo Tozzi, Vuong Truong, Luca Turella, Anna E.
 746 van 't Veer, Tom Verguts, Jean M. Vettel, Sagana Vijayarajah, Khoi Vo, Matthew B. Wall, Wouter D. Weeda, Susanne Weis, David J. White, David
 747 Wisniewski, Alba Xifra-Porras, Emily A. Yearling, Sangsuk Yoon, Rui Yuan, Kenneth S. L. Yuen, Lei Zhang, Xu Zhang, Joshua E. Zosky, Thomas E.
 748 Nichols, Russell A. Poldrack, and Tom Schonberg. Variability in the analysis of a single neuroimaging dataset by many teams. *Nature*, 582(7810):
 749 84–88, 06 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2314-9. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2314-9>. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [9] Susanne Breitner, Matthias Stölzel, Josef Cyrys, Mike Pitz, Gabriele Wölke, Wolfgang Kreyling, Helmut Küchenhoff, Joachim Heinrich, H.-Erich
 750 Wichmann, and Annette Peters. Short-term mortality rates during a decade of improved air quality in erfurt, germany. *Environmental Health
 Perspectives*, 117(3):448–454, 03 2009. doi: 10.1289/ehp.11711. URL <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/10.1289/ehp.11711>. Publisher: Environmental
 751 Health Perspectives.
- [10] Richard T. Burnett, Sabit Cakmak, Mark E. Raizenne, David Stieb, Renaud Vincent, Daniel Krewski, Jeffrey R. Brook, Owen Philips, and Haluk
 752 Ozkaynak. The association between ambient carbon monoxide levels and daily mortality in toronto, canada. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management
 Association*, 48(8):689–700, 08 1998. doi: 10.1080/10473289.1998.10463718. URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10473289.1998.10463718>.
- [11] Richard T. Burnett, Stieb , Brook Jeffrey R. , Cakmak ,Sabit , Dales ,Robert , Raizenne ,Mark , Vincent ,Renaud , , and Tom Dann. Asso-
 753 ciations between short-term changes in nitrogen dioxide and mortality in canadian cities. *Archives of Environmental Health: An International
 Journal*, 59(5):228–236, 05 2004. doi: 10.3200/AEOH.59.5.228-236. URL <https://doi.org/10.3200/AEOH.59.5.228-236>. Publisher: Routledge _eprint:
 754 <https://doi.org/10.3200/AEOH.59.5.228-236> PMID: 16201668.
- [12] Margarita Castillejos, Borja-Aburto, Victor H. , Dockery ,Douglas W. , Gold ,Diane R. , , and Dana. Loomis. Airborne coarse particles and mortality.
 755 *Inhalation Toxicology*, 12(sup1):61–72, 01 2000. doi: 10.1080/0895-8378.1987.11463182. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/0895-8378.1987.11463182>.
 756 Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0895-8378.1987.11463182>.
- [13] Chaomei Chen. Citospace ii: Detecting and visualizing emerging trends and transient patterns in scientific literature. *Journal of the American Society
 757 for Information Science and Technology*, 57(3):359–377, 2006. doi: 10.1002/asi.20317. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/asi.20317>.
 758 _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/asi.20317>.
- [14] J. K. Chou and C. K. Yang. Papervis: Literature review made easy. *Computer Graphics Forum*, 30(3):721–730, 2011. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8659.2011.01921.x.
 759 URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-8659.2011.01921.x>. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1467-8659.2011.01921.x>.
- [15] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Naacl-hlt 2019. page 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 06 2019. Association
 760 for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1423. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423>.
- [16] Douglas W. Dockery, Joel Schwartz, and John D. Spengler. Air pollution and daily mortality: Associations with particulates and acid aerosols.
 761 *Environmental Research*, 59(2):362–373, 12 1992. doi: 10.1016/S0013-9351(05)80042-8. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0013935105800428>.
- [17] Marian Dörk, Nathalie Henry Riche, Gonzalo Ramos, and Susan Dumais. Pivotpaths: Strolling through faceted information spaces. *IEEE Transactions
 762 on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 18(12):2709–2718, 12 2012. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2012.252. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6327277>.
- [18] Andrew Gelman and Eric Loken. The statistical crisis in science. *American Scientist*, 102(6):460–465, 12 2014. URL <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1616141998/abstract/5E050DCE82414037PQ/1>. Num Pages: 6 Place: Research Triangle Park, United States Publisher: Sigma XI-The Scientific
 763 Research Society.
- [19] Elliot Gould, Hannah S. Fraser, Timothy H. Parker, Shinichi Nakagawa, Simon C. Griffith, Peter A. Veski, Fiona Fidler, Daniel G. Hamilton, Robin N.
 764 Abbey-Lee, Jessica K. Abbott, Luis A. Aguirre, Carles Alcaraz, Irith Aloni, Drew Altschul, Kunal Arekar, Jeff W. Atkins, Joe Atkinson, Christopher M.
 765 Baker, Meghan Barrett, Kristian Bell, Suleiman Kehinde Bello, Iván Beltrán, Bernd J. Berauer, Michael Grant Bertram, Peter D. Billman, Charlie K.
 766

- 781 Blake, Shannon Blake, Louis Bliard, Andrea Bonisoli-Alquati, Timothée Bonnet, Camille Nina Marion Bordes, Aneesh P. H. Bose, Thomas Botterill-
 782 James, Melissa Anna Boyd, Sarah A. Boyle, Tom Bradfer-Lawrence, Jennifer Bradham, Jack A. Brand, Martin I. Brengdahl, Martin Bulla, Luc Bussière,
 783 Ettore Camerlenghi, Sara E. Campbell, Leonardo L. F. Campos, Anthony Caravaggi, Pedro Cardoso, Charles J. W. Carroll, Therese A. Catanach,
 784 Xuan Chen, Heung Ying Janet Chik, Emily Sarah Choy, Alec Philip Christie, Angela Chuang, Amanda J. Chunco, Bethany L. Clark, Andrea Contina,
 785 Garth A. Covernton, Murray P. Cox, Kimberly A. Cressman, Marco Crotti, Connor Davidson Crouch, Pietro B. D'Amelio, Alexandra Allison
 786 de Sousa, Timm Fabian Döbert, Ralph Dobler, Adam J. Dobson, Tim S. Doherty, Szymon Marian Drobniak, Alexandra Grace Duffy, Alison B. Duncan,
 787 Robert P. Dunn, Jamie Dunning, Trishna Dutta, Luke Eberhart-Hertel, Jared Alan Elmore, Mahmoud Medhat Elsherif, Holly M. English, David C.
 788 Ensminger, Ulrich Rainer Ernst, Stephen M. Ferguson, Esteban Fernandez-Juricic, Thalita Ferreira-Arruda, John Fieberg, Elizabeth A. Finch, Evan A.
 789 Fiorenza, David N. Fisher, Amélie Fontaine, Wolfgang Forstmeier, Yoan Fourcade, Graham S. Frank, Cathryn A. Freund, Eduardo Fuentes-Lillo,
 790 Sara L. Gandy, Dustin G. Gannon, Ana I. Garcia-Cervigón, Alexis C. Garretson, Xuezen Ge, William L. Geary, Charly Géron, Marc Gilles, Antje
 791 Girndt, Daniel Glikzman, Garrison B. Goldspiel, Dylan G. E. Gomes, Megan Kate Good, Sarah C. Goslee, J. Stephen Gosnell, Eliza M. Grames, Paolo
 792 Gratton, Nicholas M. Grebe, Skye M. Greenler, Maaike Griffioen, Daniel M. Griffith, Frances J. Griffith, Jake J. Grossman, Ali Güncan, Stef Haesen,
 793 James G. Hagan, Heather A. Hager, Jonathan Philo Harris, Natasha Dean Harrison, Sarah Syedin Hasnain, Justin Chase Havird, Andrew J. Heaton,
 794 María Laura Herrera-Chautre, Tanner J. Howard, Bin-Yan Hsu, Fabiola Iannarilli, Esperanza C. Iranzo, Erik N. K. Iverson, Saheed Olade Jimoh,
 795 Douglas H. Johnson, Martin Johnsson, Jesse Jorna, Tommaso Jucker, Martin Jung, Ineta Kačergytė, Oliver Kaltz, Alison Ke, Clint D. Kelly, Katharine
 796 Keoghan, Friedrich Wolfgang Keppeler, Alexander K. Killion, Dongmin Kim, David P. Kochan, Peter Korsten, Shan Kothari, Jonas Kuppler, Jillian M.
 797 Kusch, Małgorzata Lagisz, Kristen Marianne Lalla, Daniel J. Larkin, Courtney L. Larson, Katherine S. Lauck, M. Elise Lauterbur, Alan Law, Don-Jean
 798 Léandri-Breton, Jonas J. Lembrechts, Kiara L'Herpiniere, Eva J. P. Lievens, Daniela Oliveira de Lima, Shane Lindsay, Martin Luquet, Ross MacLeod,
 799 Kirsty H. Macphie, Kit Magellan, Magdalena M. Mair, Lisa E. Malm, Stefano Mammola, Caitlin P. Mandeville, Michael Manhart, Laura Milena
 800 Manrique-Garzon, Elina Mäntylä, Philippe Marchand, Benjamin Michael Marshall, Charles A. Martin, Dominic Andreas Martin, Jake Mitchell
 801 Martin, April Robin Martinig, Erin S. McCallum, Mark McCauley, Sabrina M. McNew, Scott J. Meiners, Thomas Merkling, Marcus Michelangeli,
 802 Maria Moiron, Bruno Moreira, Jennifer Mortensen, Benjamin Mos, Taofeek Olatunbosun Muraina, Penelope Wrenn Murphy, Luca Nelli, Petri
 803 Niemelä, Josh Nightingale, Gustav Nilsonne, Sergio Nolazco, Sabine S. Nooten, Jessie Lanterman Novotny, Agnes Birgitta Olin, Chris L. Organ,
 804 Kate L. Ostevik, Facundo Xavier Palacio, Matthieu Paquet, Darren James Parker, David J. Pascall, Valerie J. Pasquarella, John Harold Paterson, Ana
 805 Payo-Payo, Karen Marie Pedersen, Grégoire Perez, Kayla I. Perry, Patrice Pottier, Michael J. Proulx, Raphaël Proulx, Jessica L. Pruitt, Veronarindra
 806 Ramananjato, Finaritra Tolotra Randimbiarison, Onja H. Razafindratsima, Diana J. Rennison, Federico Riva, Sepand Riyahi, Michael James Roast,
 807 Felipe Pereira Rocha, Dominique G. Roche, Cristian Román-Palacios, Michael S. Rosenberg, Jessica Ross, Freya E. Rowland, Deusdedith Rugemalila,
 808 Avery L. Russell, Suvi Ruuskamen, Patrick Saccone, Asaf Sadeh, Stephen M. Salazar, Kris Sales, Pablo Salmón, Alfredo Sánchez-Tójar, Leticia Pereira
 809 Santos, Francesca Santostefano, Hayden T. Schilling, Marcus Schmidt, Tim Schmoll, Adam C. Schneider, Allie E. Schroeder, Nicolas
 810 Schtickzelle, Nick L. Schultz, Drew A. Scott, Michael Peter Scroggie, Julie Teresa Shapiro, Nitika Sharma, Caroline L. Shearer, Diego Simón, Michael I.
 811 Sitvarin, Fabrício Luiz Skupien, Heather Lea Slinn, Grania Polly Smith, Jeremy A. Smith, Rahel Sollmann, Kaitlin Stack Whitney, Shannon Michael
 812 Still, Erica F. Stuber, Guy F. Sutton, Ben Swallow, Conor Claverie Taff, Elina Takola, Andrew J. Tanentzap, Rocío Tarjuelo, Richard J. Telford,
 813 Christopher J. Thawley, Hugo Thierry, Jacqueline Thomson, Svenja Tidau, Emily M. Tompkins, Claire Marie Tortorelli, Andrew Trlica, Biz R.
 814 Turnell, Lara Urban, Stijn Van de Vondel, Jessica Eva Megan van der Wal, Jens Van Eeckhoven, Francis van Oordt, K. Michelle Vanderwel, Mark C.
 815 Vanderwel, Karen J. Vanderwolf, Juliana Vélez, Diana Carolina Vergara-Florez, Brian C. Verrelli, Marcus Vinícius Vieira, Nora Villamil, Valerio
 816 Vitali, Julien Vollering, Jeffrey Walker, Xanthe J. Walker, Jonathan A. Walter, Paweł Waryszak, Ryan J. Weaver, Ronja E. M. Wedegärtner, Daniel L.
 817 Weller, and Shannon Whelan. Same data, different analysts: variation in effect sizes due to analytical decisions in ecology and evolutionary biology.
BMC Biology, 23(1):35, 02 2025. doi: 10.1186/s12915-024-02101-x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-024-02101-x>.
- [20] Florian Heimerl, Qi Han, Steffen Koch, and Thomas Ertl. Citerivers: Visual analytics of citation patterns. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 22(1):190–199, 01 2016. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2015.2467621. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7192685/authors>.
- [21] Wei Huang, Jianguo Tan, Haidong Kan, Ni Zhao, Weimin Song, Guixiang Song, Guohai Chen, Lili Jiang, Cheng Jiang, Renjie Chen, and Bingheng Chen. Visibility, air quality and daily mortality in shanghai, china. *Science of The Total Environment*, 407(10):3295–3300, 05 2009. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.02.019. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S004896970900165X>.
- [22] Nick Huntington-Klein, Andreu Arenas, Emily Beam, Marco Bertoni, Jeffrey R. Bloem, Pralhad Burli, Naibin Chen, Paul Grieco, Godwin Ekpe, Todd Pugatch, Martin Saavedra, and Yaniv Stopnitzky. The influence of hidden researcher decisions in applied microeconomics. *Economic Inquiry*, 59(3):944–960, 2021. doi: 10.1111/ecin.12992. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ecin.12992>. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/ecin.12992>.
- [23] Petra Isenberg, Tobias Isenberg, Michael Sedlmair, Jian Chen, and Torsten Möller. Visualization as seen through its research paper keywords. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 23(1):771–780, 01 2017. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2016.2598827. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7539364>.
- [24] Alex Kale, Matthew Kay, and Jessica Hullman. Decision-making under uncertainty in research synthesis: Designing for the garden of forking paths. *CHI '19*, page 1–14, New York, NY, USA, 05 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. doi: 10.1145/3290605.3300432. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3290605.3300432>.
- [25] Haidong Kan, Stephanie J. London, Guohai Chen, Yunhui Zhang, Guixiang Song, Naiqing Zhao, Lili Jiang, and Bingheng Chen. Differentiating the effects of fine and coarse particles on daily mortality in shanghai, china. *Environment International*, 33(3):376–384, 04 2007. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2006.12.001. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160412006002108>.

- 833 [26] Klea Katsouyanni, Giota Touloumi, Evangelia Samoli, Alexandros Gryparis, Alain Le Tertre, Yannis Monopolis, Giuseppe Rossi, Denis Zmirou,
 834 Ferran Ballester, Azedine Boumghar, Hugh Ross Anderson, Bogdan Wojtyniak, Anna Paldy, Rony Braunstein, Juha Pekkanen, Christian Schindler,
 835 and Joel Schwartz. Confounding and effect modification in the short-term effects of ambient particles on total mortality: Results from 29 european
 836 cities within the aphea2 project. *Epidemiology*, 12(5):521, 09 2001. URL https://journals.lww.com/epidem/fulltext/2001/09000/confounding_and_effect_modification_in_the_11.aspx.
- 837 [27] Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. Biobert: a pre-trained biomedical
 838 language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics*, 36(4):1234–1240, 02 2020. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btz682. URL
 839 <https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/36/4/1234/5566506>.
- 840 [28] S. L. Lee, W. H. S. Wong, and Y. L. Lau. Association between air pollution and asthma admission among children in hong kong. *Clinical & Experimental
 841 Allergy*, 36(9):1138–1146, 2006. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2222.2006.02555.x. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1365-2222.2006.02555.x>.
 842 _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1365-2222.2006.02555.x>.
- 843 [29] Jiali Liu, Nadia Boukhelifa, and James R. Eagan. Understanding the Role of Alternatives in Data Analysis Practices. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization
 844 and Computer Graphics*, 26(1):66–76, January 2020. ISSN 1941-0506. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2019.2934593. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8805460/>.
- 845 [30] Yang Liu, Tim Althoff, and Jeffrey Heer. Paths explored, paths omitted, paths obscured: Decision points & selective reporting in end-to-end
 846 data analysis. CHI '20, page 1–14, New York, NY, USA, 04 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376533. URL
 847 <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3313831.3376533>.
- 848 [31] Yang Liu, Alex Kale, Tim Althoff, and Jeffrey Heer. Boba: Authoring and visualizing multiverse analyses. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and
 849 Computer Graphics*, 27(2):1753–1763, 02 2021. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2020.3028985. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9216579/>.
- 850 [32] Yinhan Liu, Myla Ott, Namarn Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov.
 851 Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1907.11692.
- 852 [33] T F Mar, G A Norris, J Q Koenig, and T V Larson. Associations between air pollution and mortality in phoenix, 1995–1997. *Environmental
 853 Health Perspectives*, 108(4):347–353, 04 2000. doi: 10.1289/ehp.00108347. URL <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/abs/10.1289/ehp.00108347>. Publisher:
 854 Environmental Health Perspectives.
- 855 [34] Suresh H. Moolgavkar. Air pollution and hospital admissions for diseases of the circulatory system in three u.s. metropolitan areas. *Journal of the Air &
 856 Waste Management Association*, 50(7):1199–1206, 07 2000. doi: 10.1080/10473289.2000.10464162. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/10473289.2000.10464162>.
 857 Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- 858 [35] Suresh H. Moolgavkar. Air pollution and daily mortality in two u.s. counties: Season-specific analyses and exposure-response relationships.
 859 *Inhalation Toxicology*, 15(9):877–907, 01 2003. doi: 10.1080/08958370390215767. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/08958370390215767>. Publisher: Taylor &
 860 Francis.
- 861 [36] Arpit Narechania, Alireza Karduni, Ryan Wesslen, and Emily Wall. Vitality: Promoting serendipitous discovery of academic literature with
 862 transformers & visual analytics. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 28(1):486–496, 01 2022. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2021.3114820.
 863 URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9552447/>.
- 864 [37] Bart Ostro, Rachel Broadwin, Shelley Green, Wen-Ying Feng, and Michael Lipsett. Fine particulate air pollution and mortality in nine california
 865 counties: Results from calfine. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 114(1):29–33, 01 2006. doi: 10.1289/ehp.8335. URL <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/10.1289/ehp.8335>. Publisher: Environmental Health Perspectives.
- 866 [38] Abhraneel Sarma, Alex Kale, Michael Moon, Nathan Taback, Fanny Chevalier, Jessica Hullman, and Matthew Kay. multiverse: Multiplexing
 867 alternative data analyses in r notebooks (version 0.6.2). *OSF Preprints*, 2021. URL <https://github.com/MUCollective/multiverse>.
- 868 [39] Marko Sarstedt, Susanne J. Adler, Christian M. Ringle, Gyeongcheol Cho, Adamantios Diamantopoulos, Heungsun Hwang, and Benjamin D.
 869 Lienggaard. Same model, same data, but different outcomes: Evaluating the impact of method choices in structural equation modeling. *Journal of
 870 Product Innovation Management*, 41(6):1100–1117, 2024. doi: 10.1111/jpim.12738. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jpim.12738>.
 871 _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/jpim.12738>.
- 872 [40] Joel Schwartz. The distributed lag between air pollution and daily deaths. *Epidemiology*, 11(3):320–326, 2000. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3703220>. Publisher: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- 873 [41] R. Silberzahn, E. L. Uhlmann, D. P. Martin, P. Anselmi, F. Aust, E. Awtrey, Š. Bahnik, F. Bai, C. Bannard, E. Bonnier, R. Carlsson, F. Cheung,
 874 G. Christensen, R. Clay, M. A. Craig, A. Dalla Rosa, L. Dam, M. H. Evans, I. Flores Cervantes, N. Fong, M. Gamez-Djokic, A. Glenz, S. Gordon-McKeon,
 875 T. J. Heaton, K. Hederos, M. Heene, A. J. Hofelich Mohr, F. Högden, K. Hui, M. Johannesson, J. Kalodimos, E. Kaszubowski, D. M. Kennedy, R. Lei,
 876 T. A. Lindsay, S. Liverani, C. R. Madan, D. Molden, E. Molleman, R. D. Morey, L. B. Mulder, B. R. Nijstad, N. G. Pope, B. Pope, J. M. Prenoveau, F. Rink,
 877 E. Robusto, H. Roderique, A. Sandberg, E. Schlüter, F. D. Schönbrodt, M. F. Sherman, S. A. Sommer, K. Sotak, S. Spain, C. Spörlein, T. Stafford,
 878 L. Stefanutti, S. Tauber, J. Ullrich, M. Vianello, E.-J. Wagenamakers, M. Witkowiak, S. Yoon, and B. A. Nosek. Many analysts, one data set: Making
 879 transparent how variations in analytic choices affect results. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1(3):337–356, 09 2018. doi:
 880 10.1177/2515245917747646. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245917747646>. Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- 881 [42] Jan Simson, Fiona Draxler, Samuel Mehr, and Christoph Kern. Preventing harmful data practices by using participatory input to navigate the
 882 machine learning multiverse. CHI '25, page 1–30, New York, NY, USA, 04 2025. Association for Computing Machinery. doi: 10.1145/3706598.3713482.
 883 URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3706598.3713482>.

- 885 [43] Imad Tbahriti, Christine Chichester, Frédérique Lisacek, and Patrick Ruch. Using argumentation to retrieve articles with similar citations: An
886 inquiry into improving related articles search in the medline digital library. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 75(6):488–495, 06 2006. doi:
887 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2005.06.007. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1386505605000894>.
- 888 [44] Kayo Ueda, Nitta ,Hiroshi ,Ono ,Masaji , , and Ayano Takeuchi. Estimating mortality effects of fine particulate matter in japan: A comparison of time-
889 series and case-crossover analyses. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association*, 59(10):1212–1218, 10 2009. doi: 10.3155/1047-3289.59.10.1212.
890 URL <https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-3289.59.10.1212>. Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-3289.59.10.1212>.
- 891 [45] Hadley Wickham. Tidy data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 59:1–23, 09 2014. doi: 10.18637/jss.v059.i10. URL <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v059.i10>.
- 892 [46] Hadley Wickham, Joe Cheng, and Aaron Jacobs. *ellmer: Chat with Large Language Models*, 2025. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ellmer>.
R package version 0.1.1.
- 893 [47] Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for
894 language understanding. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1906.08237.
- 895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936