
Discussion Notes

1. Main point of the paper as the authors sees it – Ealaf Selim
   - The paper proposes a new system which combines Information Visualization with Collaborative data analysis.
   - Integrating a representation of the information visualization pipeline into the shared workspace
   - Requirements of coordinated multiple view systems:
     - Map actions on objects in one visualization to actions in another
     - Meet the challenge for multiple users by extending the concept to support concurrent asynchronous interactions
   - Primary Goals of Lark:
     - Support team members in switching between tightly and loosely coupled work
     - Keep concurrent interaction individually scoped (to visually specify which other views their interactions will affect)
     - Provide concurrent interaction with no specific temporal flow of activities
     - Incorporate information views that can be individually placed, scaled, and organized so that team members can change their locations easily and establish their own work areas
   - Solution proposed: Setting the data-visualization within a meta visualization.

Class notes:
   - The application has covered several important topics:
     - Allows users to work concurrently on the same data;
     - Proposes a new system for collaboration in a big table;
     - Explores new interaction styles;
     - Support to multiple users on the same data, seeing what each others are doing (group space awareness)
     - Proposes an interesting separation of personal space and group space
     - Uses meta visualization, derived from the visualization pipeline
   - One of the goals of the system is supporting a fluent transition between tightly coupled and loosely coupled collaboration styles.
2. Main point of the paper as you as a reader see it – S. M. Sohan

*Class notes:*
- The fact that users found the system intuitive and useful, gives confidence and supports the idea of this project.
- In his opinion, there was some confusion concerning the question ‘how to best support collaboration’. Paper should have included some comparisons on other systems, and show why Lark is better.
- You need to know what types of filtering are being used in the visualization. He sees is no way to view that info. Ex. Clones: what am I cloning?
- On future work section, limitations were not very explicit outlined; people said it was useful, but this is not a well grounded statement.
- This paper discusses a tabletop application used in a ‘real’ scenario, with positive feedback from ‘real people’. That denotes a characteristic of usefulness of tabletops for a serious application, not a ‘silly’ application as a game.
- Do people need to understand the pipeline in order to use the system?
- *Comments made by Sheelagh after Sohan’s reader’s point of view*
  - When biologist were using the tree, they couldn’t see the tree at all, because it was small;
  - When Lark was used (for 2-3 hours), the observers didn't have a formula for a usability study;
  - The system was loaded with real data from a group of biologists. When this group was working with the application, they ended up focused on their data, instead of focusing on the experiment. That is a sign of engagement.
  - There is probably no similar system that does what Lark does, so it is hard to establish comparisons.

3. How this paper applies to moving this research forward and to our research? – Jamie Starke

*Class notes:*
- The idea of the visualization pipeline is good: links the views. It could be useful, but was it useful? Did the users understand it?
- Organization of info presented on the paper is ‘problematic’, it was hard to browse, and the related work was not well described.
- - He couldn’t find what the ‘new and different’ of the paper would be, so it was difficult to see what possible future work it could suggest.
- *Comments made by Sheelagh after Jamie’s inquiries on ‘what’s new and different’*
  - *Scoped interaction*, that allows the users to choose a limited impact of their actions on the group space, is probably the most relevant contribution.
  - PDH was cited as a good example of messy group interaction, because it changes the whole group space info if one user does an action. It could be more useful if the user had more control of where alterations should actually be reflected.
4. General discussion:

- The biologists (users) were so excited about the project that they didn’t care about the shortcomings. That might have blinded them to the system’s problems and possible improvement.
- Comments on the structure of the paper: It is ok not to specify related work if there is no related work available, what usually happens when you have a new idea/concept. But the ‘it is new’ should be clearly stated.
- The nodes tree is really small, and it was hard for the users to see it. And that was cited as an issue.
- Nodes don’t move, it would be good to have the chance of reorganizing them if needed.

5. Three Main Points:

- The existence of scoped interaction;
- ‘Information Visualization + Collaboration’ has been somewhat explored, but is a considerably new field;
- Nodes display in the meta-visualization.