

CS 5630 / 6630 Project Peer Feedback

The purpose of this exercise is to elicit feedback from your peers on your projects and to ultimately improve your project. This exercise is synchronized with the first project milestone and will be graded as part of it. Attendance is mandatory.

Reviewing the Yu sung and Kailing Fu group project

By Hyojoon Park and Seyoun Byun

General Questions

- Are the objectives interesting to the target audience?

Yes, they will use the national centers for Environmental information to show where the earthquake happens in the timeline. They will show damages in the economy, live losses, list of future earthquake countries, and forecast of the earthquake locations.

- Is the scope of the project appropriate? If not, suggest improvements.

We think the scope of the project is appropriate. Yu Sung and Kailing Fu group will use the Flag Tsunami features, date, earthquake location, Focal depth, magnitude, modified Mercalli Intensity, and effects (Descriptions) with the following ID the earthquake.

- Is the split between optional and must-have features appropriate? Why?

We think some of the optional features need to be the must-have features. Optional features are built for the storytelling. They focused on the scaling and brushing as optional features. However, the general damage from each earthquake and the history seems to connect to the project objection.

- Is the visualization innovative? Creative? Why?

We think this visualization is innovative because you can see the map on the top with the detailed mouseover description. Also, the year and magnitude are interactively shown on the map. We like that the group will visualize the bar charts. Then, this will be clearer with the data.

- Does the visualization scale to the used dataset? Could it handle larger but similar datasets?

The repository has 5,700 earthquakes from 2150 BC to the present. The group scaled-down the dataset to 1700-2020. Using the scale of the term between 10 years may handle even larger data. However, 320 years of total data would work to make any prediction written on the object.

- Is the project plan detailed enough? Is a path to the final project clear?

We think the project plan was detailed and precise. We were able to understand the motivation, object, data, data-processing, and visualization plan.

- Is an interesting story told?

We think that the forecasting of the place (countries and the areas) of the earthquake is told. Also, they told the motivation that there is not symmetry visualization for this database. We think this will help users to understand the earthquake in general.

Visual Encoding

- Does the visualization follow the principles used in class?

Yes, the group follows the principles used in class. They will display information of the top countries by sorting methods. (Only thing that concerned us is that they will choose the top 20 countries, and using 20 different colors would not be helpful for categorical color). The circle and the slider bar's size seem inspired by homework four, and we think they followed the materials in class well.

- What is the primary visual encoding? Does it match the most important aspect of the data?

We believe the groups' primary visual encoding is the global map with the sorting table and the main bubble chart. Those give the most information on the project objective. We like the idea that they will use the scaling method (zoom in and out) on the map to focus on the country's area. Also, they have extra information about the Tsunami, and we think this will be a very interesting encoding since the Tsunami and earthquake have lots of associations. The money loss and people loss section may be confused since three plots are horizontal in the people's loss, but three plots are not all horizontal in the money loss. This might be better if they put the line between the section on the people's loss and money loss.

- What other visual variables are used? Are they effective?

We think the visual variables may be useful when they use more color hue and color value. The group used the size variable and the color hue only.

- Is color sensibly used? If not, suggest improvements.

We do not think they used the color sensibly. First, the year bar and the magnitude bar have the same color. The sorting countries will do have the same color as well as the bubble. This can be improved by the dashed in the bar chart with the continuous color. Also, it might be better with the size description of the bubble. Second, all bar charts have the same color. We think this can be improved with the different categorical color by each feature. We like the highlighting color on the map with the earthquake.

Interaction and Animation

- Is the interaction meaningful? If not, suggest improvements.

We think the interaction is meaningful. We do like the idea of zooming in/out on the map. Also, the slider bars of the magnitude and year bar would be meaningful. Also, showing detailed info box on mouse hovering helps the user easily access the details. However, this may be improved by clicking on the countries sorting with the ranking by year.

- If multiple views, are they coordinated? If not, would it be meaningful?

They have one screen in the visualization. We understand that all these data are connected. We think their project is similar to one that we did in the exam (<https://www.oecdregionalwellbeing.org/US49.html>). They put all the data into one screen. However, all the data was interactively visualized.

We think this is meaningful because if there are two screens, it would be hard to understand the prediction of the forecasting the countries and places of future earthquakes.

- Is there any animation planned? Is it clear? Is it intuitive?

Interactions with the map may be seen as animations since the image of the map changes with smooth transitions. This visualization would be intuitive to understand the project objection.