

How Do Observable Users Decompose D3 Code? A Qualitative Study

Melissa Lin*
mylin@andrew.cmu.edu
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, USA

Hannah Bako
hbako@umd.edu
University of Maryland
College Park, USA

Heer Patel*
Medina Lamkin
heerpate@cs.washington.edu
mlamkin@cs.washington.edu
University of Washington
Seattle, USA

Tukey Tu
Soham Raut
Leilani Battle
yuanjt2@cs.washington.edu
sohamr@cs.washington.edu
leibatt@cs.washington.edu
University of Washington
Seattle, USA

Abstract

Code templates simplify the visualization programming process, especially when using complex toolkits such as D3. While many projects emphasize template creation, few investigate why users prefer one code organization strategy over another, and whether these choices influence how users reason about corresponding visualization designs. In response, we qualitatively analyze 715 D3 programs published on Observable. We identify three distinct levels of D3 code organization—program, chart, and component—which reflect how users leverage program decomposition to reason about D3 visualizations. Furthermore, we explore how users repurpose prior examples, revealing a tendency to shift towards finer-grained code organization (e.g., from program to component) during repurposing. Interviews with D3 users corroborate our findings and clarify why they may prefer certain code organization strategies across different project contexts. Given these findings, we propose strategies for creating more intuitive D3 code recommendations based on users' preferences and outline future research opportunities for visualization code assistants.

CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing** → **Visualization theory, concepts and paradigms**; **Empirical studies in visualization**; *Visualization systems and tools*.

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

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 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 of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

Keywords

Literature Review, Human Perception, Visualization Design

ACM Reference Format:

Melissa Lin, Heer Patel, Medina Lamkin, Hannah Bako, Tukey Tu, Soham Raut, and Leilani Battle. 2024. How Do Observable Users Decompose D3 Code? A Qualitative Study. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

From designing bespoke visualizations in D3 [10] to orchestrating multi-chart interactions in Vega-Lite [37], visualization programming is considered a valuable skill among data scientists, enthusiasts, and engineers [35]. But increased customization often leads to higher toolkit complexity and in turn steeper learning curves [36]. As a result, users may struggle to write their own customized programs [4], even when adapting existing examples [7], negating the benefits of adopting more expressive toolkits like D3. One popular solution is to generate code templates [23], such as chart and interaction templates that D3 users can simply populate with their desired data variables [2, 17]. However, templates often reflect the perspectives of researchers and toolkit creators and do not necessarily reflect how D3 users themselves may reason about their own D3 code [4]. Broadly, we observe relatively few research projects investigating why users may prefer one code organization strategy over another, and whether these decisions may influence how users reason about the corresponding visualization designs.

In this paper, we explore opportunities to observe a user's comprehension of visualization code. By targeting comprehension, we can speak to what code structures these users find intuitive to understand, which provides a blueprint for explaining why certain code templates, visualization recommendations, and even visualization toolkits may align closely with users' mental models of visualization programs. We apply qualitative methods to investigate a core measurement of code comprehension from the CS education literature: code decomposition [11, 38]. Examining how users decompose

code into logical blocks allows us to *test implicit assumptions in the literature* regarding users' mental models of visualization programs [4, 30]. For example, do D3 users really organize their code according to toolkit designers' recommendations? Further, how intentional are visualization users when they copy code from outside sources? And how closely does the organization of copied code match the user's own thought process?

Inspired by previous qualitative research on D3 usage [4, 7], we contribute a qualitative analysis of D3 code decomposition strategies across 715 D3 projects covering 24 visualization types shared on Observable [28], a computational notebook environment containing the largest database of D3 examples on the web. Given that D3 users routinely copy from existing examples [7, 17, 18, 23], we also analyze how Observable users repurpose code written by others. Our analysis reveals three distinct strategies for decomposing D3 programs: segmenting code into **components** of functionality, creating reusable visualization templates for **charts**, or using one Observable cell for the entire **program**. We find that **Component-Level decomposition is the most popular decomposition strategy among the notebooks we analyzed, which held true across all 24 observed visualization types and regardless of whether the code was repurposed or not. Furthermore, we find that users' component utilization strategies align closely with the structure of the Layered Grammar of Graphics [42], filling a gap in the literature on how users' toolkit comprehension and code organization patterns compare to proposed patterns from toolkit creators.**

To connect our findings with how users think about D3 code structure, we conducted an **interview study with 7 Observable users** ranging from students to professional developers. Our interview participants report using the same decomposition strategies we observed through our notebook analysis. They also clarify why certain decomposition strategies may be preferred, such as using Component-Level decomposition to make debugging D3 programs easier or learning from the use of Chart-Level decomposition in examples from D3 co-creator Mike Bostock. Together, our analysis and study findings reveal how **D3 users are intentional about structuring their code in a semantically meaningful way**, e.g., by component/process (data transformation, visual encoding, etc.) or by output (chart type). Furthermore, our findings provide initial empirical evidence that **users deliberately choose and modify examples not only based on the visualization design choices they represent but also their code organization strategies.**

The contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- We present a robust dataset of 715 annotated Observable notebooks representing 24 distinct visualization types written using D3.
- We report on a comprehensive analysis of how Observable users organize their D3 visualization code, including code decomposition and code copying strategies.
- We annotate code cells with the visualization component they contribute to and the purpose and intent of the notebooks.

- We conduct an interview study with 7 Observable users regarding how they organize their D3 code, which corroborates our qualitative findings and clarifies user rationales for adopting different decomposition strategies.
- We discuss future implications regarding the creation of supportive learning and visualization prototyping tools for D3, including opportunities for AI code generation.

All supplementary materials are available at https://osf.io/sudb8/?view_only=302fc5c8d397412aac35c6e094ae7dd6.

2 Related Work

In this section, we review existing work on supporting D3 users and visualization language users more broadly.

2.1 Facilitating Visualization Code Reuse

Copying from existing examples is a key user strategy for creating new D3 visualizations [3, 4, 7]. For example, in their analysis of 37,815 D3-related posts on Stack Overflow, Battle et al. observe that 14% of them build on existing examples from just three sources: Observable, the D3 gallery, or Bl.ocks.org [7]. However, relevant examples can be hard to find and modify correctly [3, 7]. Hoque and Agrawala introduce a search engine that supports querying via visual encodings and data attributes [18]. However, D3 code can contain uncommon syntax and code structures, making it difficult to search [7]. Further, in-depth examples may over-complicate the visualization prototyping process [7] or even lead to design fixation [29]. We seek to understand how users intuitively structure their own D3 code, which can facilitate improvements to D3 example search and reuse features in future development environments.

Code reuse is also a common usage pattern among multiple visualization toolkits, which several projects aim to support through *code templates*. For example, Bako et al. find that D3 users implement visualizations similarly, and contribute templates to help users program common D3 visualization and interaction types [2]. Harper et al. propose techniques for converting existing D3 visualizations into templates [17]. Tools such as Ivy generalize these concepts to make it easier to create and reuse code templates [23]. However, templates are difficult to modify beyond their defined parameters, impeding user creativity and workflow [4]. Our research presents an alternative method for analyzing D3 users' coding strategies, which could lead to new methods for template design and customization.

2.2 Visualization Recommendation

Going beyond the reuse of existing examples, visualization recommendation tools generate partial or full visualizations to speed up the design process [45]. Many of these tools not only give recommendations but also apply changes for the user [16, 19]. Mirny, for example, suggests visualizations and interactions to create and also automatically generates D3 code snippets to help users implement recommended changes [4]. Our research can benefit visualization recommendation systems by highlighting key characteristics of code snippets that make them easier or harder for D3 users to understand, potentially boosting the adoption of recommended code.

2.3 Automatic Design Pattern Detection

Other automated tools concentrate on segmenting code into more readable and logical components, facilitating a better understanding of the code. MiCoDe, for example, generates empty code templates by extracting code patterns, preserving the high-level structure of programs (e.g., function headers) [22]. MiLoCo similarly allows users to identify programming rules through the use of semantic clusters, a technique that groups code with related vocabulary, and a graph mining algorithm [31]. DeMIMA and MoDeC can detect code patterns through an abstract model identification process and limiting variables values respectively [15, 26]. Many other tools have been designed to achieve similar goals with different techniques [12, 14, 27, 33, 40, 41]. With a better understanding of users' mental models of D3, we can implement analogs within automated tools, allowing them to reason about code in a manner that is more intuitive for end users of differing expertise.

2.4 Code Decomposition and Visualization Grammars

Code decomposition is a useful measure of programming comprehension in CS education [38]. For example, Charitsis et al. find that intro CS students who decompose their code into modular functions tend to have better assignment outcomes [11]. Decomposition has also been studied in computational notebook environments [34]. For example, Raghunandan et al. observe that Jupyter-based data science notebooks often separate code by functionality, such as placing visualization code in separate cells [32]. Titov et al. take it one step further by directly restructuring the cells and reordering the notebook for the user to help increase clarity [39]. We seek to understand whether decomposition methods from CS education and data science broadly may translate to visualization programming and D3 specifically.

Although established theories guide the structure and interpretation of many visualization grammars (e.g., the Grammar of Graphics [44] and Layered Grammar of Graphics [42]), *it is unclear whether the reasoning of toolkit and grammar designers aligns with the reasoning of end users*. One approach to investigating this problem is to analyze how end users organize their own code into logical units and compare those suggested by prevailing theories [30]. We take a similar approach in this work but we focus on D3, given observed challenges for D3 users in making sense of and debugging D3 code [7].

2.5 Computing Education and Large Language Models

The goal of programming courses is to not only expose students to a specific programming language but also to *help students develop independent problem-solving skills* [24]. Decomposition strategies play a critical role in problem-solving. For example, Charitsis et al. found that introductory programming students decompose their programming assignments to add functionality, restructure code, and remove duplicated code [11]. They also found that adopting decomposition strategies early led to better assignment outcomes. Although large language models (LLMs) can aid in this process by helping students to triage and generate code [8], they may also rob students of opportunities to develop problem-solving skills and

even encourage overreliance on AI code assistance [1, 8, 25]. Further, these models are notorious for hallucinating false information and providing nonsensical rationales for generated answers, which students are not equipped to assess [5, 20, 21]. By developing complementary knowledge regarding how people reason about and structure D3 code, we can develop additional inputs to LLMs and other AI solutions to improve their outputs for educational use.

2.6 Why Analyze Observable Notebooks?

We selected the Observable notebook platform [28] as the focus of our study as it is now the largest source of D3 examples following the deprecation of Bl.ocks.org [9]. Furthermore, Observable's notebook environment contains a cellular structure, which allows users to separate code into modular cells that can be split, joined, or reordered according to user preferences. This enables us to *objectively* analyze what code was placed into distinct cells, compared to other file formats where we must *subjectively* interpret white space characters (e.g., raw JavaScript or HTML files). Furthermore, users often apply different white space patterns depending on which stage of the analysis process they are in [32], making it difficult to systematically code notebooks using this method. We therefore adopt a more conservative analysis approach by focusing on code cells, which provide a clearer indicator of code structuring.

3 Data Collection & Preparation

To understand how users organize their D3 code, we collected 715 D3 visualization notebooks covering 24 visualization types from Observable [28]. In this section, we provide an overview of our data collection methods and key terms used in the rest of the paper.

3.1 Building the Corpus of Observable Notebooks

To facilitate a rigorous qualitative analysis, we collected a diverse range of examples (see subsection 3.2) spanning 24 visualization types identified in previous work [6]. We followed a search strategy and screening process to curate our example corpus.

Search by Visualization Type: Full-text keyword searches were performed on Observable for each visualization type identified in Battle et al.'s taxonomy [6]. These include terms such as "*area chart*", "*stacked area chart*", and "*graph*". A list of complete keywords has been provided in supplementary materials¹.

Filter for Quality and Uniqueness: We reviewed the retrieved search results in order of relevance until at least ten unique visualizations (distinct code that renders distinct visualizations) per visualization type were found. To ensure the quality of curated notebooks, we only selected notebooks that rendered visualizations with no compile or runtime errors. This selection process yielded a total of 240 examples.

Track Relevant Duplicates: Similar to prior work [2, 3, 7], we also observe that many Observable notebooks are *duplicates* that copy code from older examples and make minor revisions such as importing a different dataset. Given the importance of code copying in creating new D3 programs (see section 2), we accounted for this behavior in our analysis. Thus, we also collected observed

¹Supplementary Materials

duplicates for each of our initial 240 examples which expanded our dataset to 715 total notebooks.

Although we collected a total of 715 examples, for the rest of the paper, we focus on the set of 240 unique examples from our corpus. Note that since 475 of 715 examples are duplicates, one can extrapolate our results to the broader corpus.

3.2 Term Definitions

To aid understanding, we define the following terms used in this paper:

- **Decompose:** refers to how users separate code within a single Observable notebook using cells. We use this definition as an overarching term to describe how users "organize," "structure," and "break down" code [12].
- **Modularity:** refers to the extent to which users decompose their code into separate pieces, i.e., modules [7]. An example of a module would be an Observable code cell.
- **Sources:** are D3 programs that inspire or provide code for other programs. A source could be a notebook shared on Observable like in the D3 Gallery² or a D3 program shared on an external platform such as GitHub Gist³.
- **An Example:** refers to a single Observable notebook.

4 Analysis Overview

The objective of this paper is to understand how Observable users decompose their D3 programs and how this might influence the way they reason about D3 visualizations. Consequently, our analysis focuses on three research questions:

RQ1: How do D3 users decompose their own code?

RQ2: How do D3 users copy code from existing examples?

RQ3: How do users draw decomposition strategies from existing D3 examples?

4.1 Analysis Process

To answer these research questions, we perform a mixed methods evaluation of the examples in our corpus (see section 3) to **examine** the structure and organization of code cells and identify the decomposition strategies applied in each example (R1). Then, we **inspect** to what extent examples repurposed code from their sources (R2). Finally, we **compare** the decomposition strategies within examples to those in their sources to gauge the influence of existing examples on observed decomposition strategies within our corpus (R3).

Examine notebook structure. To understand how D3 users decompose their code, we examined each example from our corpus and noted different choices made regarding the **use of code cells** such as the number of code cells used in the program. Subsequently, we grouped repeated patterns of code cell structures into high-level *decomposition strategies*. Using this information, we qualitatively coded each example by the decomposition strategy used, what visualization component each code cell was contributing to, and variable dependencies between code cells, enabling us to answer our first research question in section 5.

Inspect example sources. To better understand how deliberate users' coding decisions may be, we inspect how examples draw from existing sources such as through manual copying and the use of Observable forks. We rely on our observations to classify whether examples did or did not copy code from sources, answering our second research question in section 6.

Compare decomposition strategies. To understand how inheriting code may influence decomposition strategies, we compare the coded decomposition strategy for each example to the strategies used by its sources. For example, we consider whether decomposition strategies tend to match those of their sources when code is copied and what decomposition strategies are prevalent for original examples without known sources, answering our third research question (section 7).

Scoping Program Decomposition for Our Analysis. We acknowledge that prior to Observable, D3 users did not have access to code cells and used other strategies to decompose their code such as writing helper functions. Thus, Observable users could employ function calls and cell decomposition to further organize their D3 programs. To determine what decomposition information helper functions may provide beyond Observable code cells, we qualitatively analyzed 100 Bl.ocks.org examples from Bako et al.'s D3 dataset [2] to compare. Functions were used in the following ways (counts in parentheses):

- Building entire visualizations (5/100).
- Creating part of a visualization (18/100).
- Data processing (43/100).
- Adding interactions (74/100).

Overall, we find that *helper functions in Github Gists from Bl.ocks.org are used similarly to Observable code cells, but code cells are more comprehensive*. Thus, we focus on analyzing code cells in this paper. Further, we reiterate that white space is a more subjective measure of decomposition that may evolve as users iterate on their notebooks [32].

4.2 Annotating Collected Examples

To develop our codebook for our analyses, a random sample of 15 unique examples from the six most popular D3 visualization types reported in the literature [2, 6, 7] were surveyed using the search procedure described in subsection 3.1. These 15 examples were distinct from the 715 examples in the main dataset and were selected specifically for codebook development purposes. The lead authors independently examined and annotated these examples (provided in supplementary materials⁴, after which the entire author team met to discuss and refine the initial codebook. Following this discussion, the lead authors re-examined and annotated the 15 examples again, achieving a Cohen's Kappa inter-rater reliability score [13] of 0.941. After refining the codebook based on this exercise, the lead authors manually analyzed the 240 unique notebooks collected from the exercise described in subsection 3.1 over the course of 15 weeks. Weekly meetings were held to discuss any discrepancies in coding, which were resolved through consensus discussions.

²<https://observablehq.com/@d3/gallery>

³<https://gist.github.com/>

⁴Supplementary Materials

Component Type	Definition	Example
DATA AND AESTHETIC MAPPINGS	Datasets and specifications of which variables are mapped to which aesthetics	Importing datasets, mapping height to y position, picking variables/columns from a dataset
STATISTICAL TRANSFORMATION	Transforming the data, typically by summarizing them in some manner	Binning, boxplot statistics, summarizing
GEOMETRIC OBJECT	Controlling the type of plot that is made, or rendering the visualization in an SVG cell	Chart rendering cells, adding planes/areas/lines to charts
SCALE	A function mapping from data to aesthetic attributes	Color gradients, x scale, y scale
COORDINATE SYSTEM	Altering the coordinate system of the visualization, such as cartesian versus polar	Arcs
DATA TRANSFORMATION	Operations over the input dataset	Sorting, filtering, grouping, etc.
LAYOUT	Altering the positioning of objects, such as absolute versus relative	Graphs, trees, circle-packing layouts
PARAMETERIZATION	Setting values that are then inputted into other parts of the program	Width, margin, padding, radius
RENDERING (SCALE/COORDINATES)	Parts of the plot that correspond to scale/coordinates and ultimately the image that is rendered	Legends, axes
INTERACTION	Parts of the plot or visuals which can be altered through user input	Tooltips, buttons
ANIMATION	Parts of the plot or visuals which change over time, without user input	Moving points, shifting colors

Table 1: Definitions of components. The top section refers to components in the Layered Grammar of Graphics. The bottom section refers to additional components we found in D3 programs.

5 Analysis 1: How do D3 Users Decompose Their Own Code?

To answer our first research question, we examined the examples in each corpus to identify the number and functionality of code cells and the relationships between cells, such as variable and function dependencies. We then clustered examples with similar code organization, which revealed three high-level code decomposition methods: **Component-Level**, **Chart-Level**, and **Program-Level**, illustrated in Figure 1. In this section, we detail the patterns and prevalence of each decomposition strategy, compare our findings across different visualization types and notebook purposes and intents, and discuss potential relationships to existing theory on visualization grammars (e.g., the Layered Grammar of Graphics [42]).

5.1 Component-Level Decomposition

The most common strategy observed in our analysis was Component-Level decomposition, appearing in 201 of 240 examples (83.8%). In Component-Level decomposition, users create each code cell as a distinct *component*. Each component builds upon previously defined components to implement a single example. For instance, in Figure 1, the xScale component builds on the width component, the svg component builds on the xScale component, and so on.⁵ Individual components also tend to fall under one step of the visualization process, such as importing the dataset to be visualized (data in Figure 1), defining parameters of the target image (height and width), specifying visual encodings (xScale and yScale), and rendering the final image (svg).

5.1.1 Component Types. To improve our understanding of how users choose to modularize components, we analyzed each code cell in our corpus of 240 unique examples and labeled the specific aspect of the visualization design process that each cell addressed. We utilized the components defined in Wickham’s Layered Grammar of Graphics [42]: Data and Aesthetic Mappings, Statistical Transformation, Geometric Object, Scale, and Coordinate System to label the components in each code cell. However, our analysis revealed components that were not covered in the LGoG, such as code cells dedicated to implementing interactions or performing data manipulation. As such, we included 6 additional components to our codebook: Data Transformation, Layout, Parameterization, Rendering (Scale/Coordinates), Interaction, and Animation to account for additional support that comes with toolkits like Vega-Lite and D3 [10, 37]. This brought the total number of component labels to 11. We provide the definitions of these components in Table 1.

We analyzed a total of 3430 code cells. 84.7% were represented by the 11 components detailed above. The other 15.3% were imports and formatting. We find that chart types on average contain 45.9% (ranging from 32.9% to 63.3%) components from the Layered Grammar of Graphics, with more esoteric chart types like heatmap (32.9%) and word cloud (38.2%) containing fewer than standard chart types like graph (55.60%) and pie chart (63.3%) (see Appendix for details). Of the four most widely used components, three (Data and Aesthetic Mappings, Geometric Object, and Scale) are from the Layered Grammar of Graphics, as shown in Figure 2. The fourth universal component is Parameterization. Users can create more adaptable components by parameterizing parts of the code, highlighting how customizable D3 is. Although the number of components varied across notebooks, the functionality they served remained consistent. These included data loading, data manipulation, visual encoding, interaction encoding, and SVG rendering.

Additionally, we recorded dependencies for each cell (i.e. when a component from cell A is used in cell B) to examine key patterns present in how D3 users utilize variable dependencies. This also included self-dependencies, i.e. multiple cells for one component type that build upon each other. We found that the component type with the highest level of dependency with other component types was *Geometric Object* (see Figure 3). This indicates that users tend to separate foundational components of a D3 program (e.g. data

⁵We include relevant examples as footnotes, e.g., <https://observablehq.com/@uvizlab/d3-tutorial-4-bar-chart-with-transition>




Figure 1: In the center are three abstracted notebooks with different colors representing the following four visualization layers: data, geometric positional layers, functions, and scales. Program-Level has all four layers in one code cell. Chart-Level has a function code cell, a function building code cell, and a data code cell. Lastly, Component-Level has all four layers in different code cells. To the left, there is a sample of a Chart-Level Decomposition notebook with Observable formatting. To the right is an example of a Component-Level Decomposition notebook.




Figure 2: Stacked Bar Chart displaying percentages of components across visualization types. Red hues correspond to Layered Grammar of Graphics Components and blue hues correspond to additional components as in Table 1. The 4 most common components are Data and Aesthetic Mappings, Geometric Object, Scale, and Parameterization.

and aesthetic mappings, scales, parameterization) and reuse them to build the overall geometric object.

5.1.2 Use of Interactions within components. As mentioned in subsection 5.1.1, the Layered Grammar of Graphics is useful for

reasoning about visual components, but it fails to account for interactive components, which we frequently observed in our corpus (112 of 240 notebooks or 46.7%). In their analysis of D3 projects on GitHub, Bl.ocks.org, and Observable, Bako et al. observed six different interaction types (brush, hover, click, visualize, zoom & pan, and




Figure 3: Condensed Heatmap displaying percentages of dependencies present with components, including self-dependencies across all corpus examples (read from left to right). Demonstrates the highest levels of dependencies of components with the Geometric Object component. The top 5 components correspond to the Layered Grammar of Graphics and the bottom 6 correspond to additional components, as in Table 1.

drag), which we adopted to label the interactions in our corpus. We find the following distribution of interaction types in our corpus: drag (47.3%), hover (29.5%), visualize (18.8%), click (17.9%), zoom & pan (8%), and brush (7.1%)⁶.

We evaluated how Observable users organized D3 code for interactions into components. 49 of the 112 interactive examples (43.8%) separated the interactive elements into multiple cells, often giving each interaction type its own cell. These results suggest that these users treat interactions as an additional component type, similar to scales or statistical transformations. However, 40 of the 112 interaction notebooks (35.7%) incorporated the interactive code directly into the SVG rendering cell, similar to applying Program-Level decomposition (see subsection 5.3) at the scope of interactions. The remaining 23 of the 112 examples (20.5%) had interactive elements in the SVG rendering cell as well as in separate cells. 83.7% of Visualize and Drag interactions were placed into separate cells, while

the other four interactions were commonly integrated into the SVG-rendering cell.

To summarize, some users put all interaction code into a single interaction cell (i.e., interaction as a component of the visualization); some decompose interactions further into multiple cells, similar to component visualization (i.e., Component-Level interaction); others integrate interaction code into existing cells (i.e., do not separate interaction from existing components); and still others use a mix of these strategies. These findings suggest that **users' mental models of D3 interactions vary significantly**. Given that interactions are known to be challenging to implement in D3 [4, 7], we may be observing **some D3 users struggling to apply Component-Level decomposition to D3 interactions**, providing opportunities for future support tools to ease the coding process.

⁶Note that the percentages do not sum to 100% since interaction types are not mutually exclusive.

5.2 Chart-Level Decomposition

Chart-Level decomposition was present in 17 of 240 examples (7.1%). As illustrated in Figure 1, Chart-Level decomposition generally splits code according to the target output (i.e., an entire visualization) instead of visualization steps (data manipulation, rendering, etc.). To do this, users who adopted Chart-Level decomposition would create a *helper function cell* that generates the target visualization type (see Figure 1). Then, users would call this helper function in another cell to render the final visualization. While some examples occasionally extracted a small number of components into separate cells, Chart-Level code is typically segmented at a coarser scope compared to Component-Level decomposition. Although this decomposition strategy is uncommon, it **can aid the creation of reusable visualization templates** to speed up future projects [2, 4, 17]. We revisit this idea in our interview with D3 users detailed in section 8.

5.3 Program-Level Decomposition

Another strategy we observed is to *not* decompose the code. In this case, users place all of their code within a single Observable cell⁷ (see Figure 1). We call this Program-Level decomposition, which was present in only 15 of 240 examples (6.3%). Similar to Chart-Level decomposition, there was not a strong preference for Program-Level decomposition. Although we acknowledge that users could be using white space to segment their code (see section 2 and section 4), **the low prevalence of this strategy compared to Component-Level decomposition suggests that users are choosing to forego Program-Level decomposition**. We interview users about their decision-making strategies when organizing their D3 code in section 8.

5.4 Mixed Decomposition Strategies

The Component-Level, Chart-Level, and Program-Level decomposition strategies are not mutually exclusive. We observed rare examples using a mix of strategies. Examples displaying both Component-Level and Chart-Level decomposition were observed in 7 of 240 examples (2.9%), combining the idea of calling helper functions and having components with modular code cells. For example, this notebook⁸ has separate code cells for chart properties such as x-scale, y-scale, and margins, exemplifying Component-Level decomposition. Additionally, they make use of separate cells for builder functions which are called within another code cell with the desired parameters passed in, similar to Chart-Level decomposition.

As Program-Level is defined in relation to the others (i.e., as a *lack* of decomposition), mixing Program-Level with Component-Level or Chart-Level decomposition does not make sense. Hence, we did not observe any mixed strategies that include Program-Level decomposition.

5.5 Notebook Purpose and Intent

Studying decomposition strategies across different *purposes* and *intents* of examples can help us identify whether or not certain decomposition strategies are more suited for certain tasks, e.g., teaching or publishing notebooks. To this end, we examined the

purpose and intent of the 240 notebooks we collected. The purpose of a notebook refers to the general reason for which the notebook exists based on its primary use case. We categorize purpose into three broad groups:

- **Personal:** Used for individual exploration or experimentation.
- **Education:** Created for learning, teaching, or instructional purposes.
- **Work:** Designed to fulfill professional tasks, such as data analysis or reporting.

To capture the specific action or motivation behind a notebook, we also label the intent of each notebook broken into five broad categories: *practice*, *tutorial*, *template creation*, *template use*, or *publishing* (see Table 2). Using these labels, we performed a comparison of decomposition strategies across notebook purpose (Table 3) and intent (Table 4)⁹.

Our findings show that Observable users create notebooks for personal practice and not necessarily polished tutorials or templates, as shown in Table 3 and Table 4. We also find that Observable users adopt a wider variety of decomposition strategies for practicing and personal use compared to other intents/purposes. This suggests that users may experiment with different decomposition levels, but prefer Component-Level decomposition outside of this experimentation. Outside of practicing, our results show that many users begin their D3 designs by copying an existing template, reinforcing prior research (e.g., [2, 7]), and we analyze code reuse further in section 6. Finally, we observe that virtually none of the tutorial and template use/creation examples adopt Program-Level or mixed decomposition, suggesting that they are not the preferred choice for facilitating comprehension among users/learners.

Intent	Definition
TUTORIAL	Notebooks where a specific technique or visualization type is being taught. Stand alone, with text.
PRACTICE	An individual trying out a new visualization type. They tend to sometimes be incomplete and not have a lot of text.
PUBLISHING (PUBLIC or DOMAIN COMMUNICATION)	Visualizations that are polished and meant for newspapers/journals/websites/etc. Public communication is meant for a general audience whereas domain communication is meant for a specific audience in a niche topic.
TEMPLATE CREATION	Notebooks that publish a template specifically for reuse purposes. They don't necessarily have text. Includes demonstrations.
TEMPLATE USE	Notebooks that reuse a published template. They will often have a reference to the original template somewhere in the text.

Table 2: Definitions of notebook intents.

⁷<https://observablehq.com/@crazyjackel/stacked-area-chart>

⁸<https://observablehq.com/@randomfractals/nlp-word-cloud>

⁹Purposes are not mutually exclusive; we found Template Use + Tutorial and Template Use + Publishing (Public Domain) to have 2 examples each, with all displaying Component-Level decomposition.

Decomposition Strategy	Personal	Education	Work
Component	165	26	10
Chart	15	0	0
Program	15	1	1
Chart + Component	5	1	1

Table 3: Distribution of Decomposition strategies present in across example purposes. Highlights the Component-Level decomposition accounts for the majority across all intents.

Decomposition Strategy	Practice	Tutorial	Template Creation	Template Use	Republish (Do-main)	Publish (Public)
Component	102	16	6	49	4	20
Chart	5	0	1	7	0	2
Program	13	1	0	0	0	3
Component + Chart	5	1	0	0	0	1

Table 4: Distribution of decomposition strategies present in across example intents.

6 Analysis 2: How do D3 Users Copy Code From Existing Examples?

In our analysis of code decomposition strategies, we identified instances of code reuse among the examples. To better understand how users reuse code within the Observable environment, we analyzed our set of 240 examples. Specifically, we examined whether code was copied from existing D3 examples and whether the copied code was reused from within the Observable platform or sourced externally.

We identified four distinct code-copying strategies, two of which involve no direct code reuse: “*original creation*”, where users built examples from scratch, and “*orthogonal code forking*”, where users forked a notebook but did not reuse any of the original code. The remaining two strategies involve actual code copying: “*Observable sourced*”, where code was reused from another Observable notebook, and “*outside sourced*”, where code was copied from external platforms, such as GitHub.

In general, our analysis of code inheritance among the Observable notebooks in our corpus found that 141/240 (58.8%) of corpus examples did not inherit code from other D3 examples. However, code copying occurred in 99 of the 240 examples (41.2%), with users reusing code either from other Observable notebooks or external sources. These examples varied in their approach, with some copying entire code blocks with minimal modification while others selectively copied portions of code. A summary of these strategies is shown in Figure 4, and we describe each in more detail in the following sections.

Original Creation Examples with no observed code inheritance did not copy code from any sources as shown in Figure 4. Examples that fall under this strategy had no forks of other notebooks (i.e., a blank notebook was created) and were not found to have any

indirect sources. Original examples likely do not have copied code from elsewhere. 136/240 examples (56.7%) were Original.

Orthogonal Forking. Orthogonal forking occurs when examples are forked for reasons other than code reuse. We observed two instances where the source and the forked example do not share any code cells and produce entirely unrelated visualizations. We also encountered users who forked their own examples to either (a) build off of previous work or (b) conveniently couple examples through the fork links. 5/240 examples (2.1%) displayed Orthogonal forking.

Observable Sourced Code Reuse Observable Sourced examples shared code similarities with another Observable example. We labeled 86/240 (35.8%) examples as Observable Sourced, making it the most common code inheritance strategy. We observe that the majority of these examples (61.6%) are near-identical copies of their fork source, but some merely copy one cell or mention taking inspiration from a different user and contain code portions copied over from the “inspiring” example.

Outside Sourced Code Reuse We found 13/240 (5.4%) examples that share code with a source outside the Observable platform (i.e., outside-sourced code copying). Our investigation into these examples revealed that 12 of the examples were observed to have copied code from GitHub Gist projects, and the remaining one took code from a blog website.

7 Analysis 3: How Do Users Draw Decomposition Strategies From Existing D3 Examples?

To investigate if decomposition strategies are a reflection of users’ personal preferences or inherited from sources they copy from, we examine how frequently decomposition strategies were changed from source examples. By analyzing shifts in decomposition strategies, we identify which decomposition strategy appears to be most intuitive to Observable users. Our evaluation of code copying in section 6 shows our corpus contains examples with a diverse set of code inheritance strategies. It can also provide insight into how users decompose their code both when using and not using code from a source. To this end, we examined each of the examples where we identified instances of code copying and compared the decomposition strategies used in the example to those used in the source example.

7.1 Inheritance Strategies within Notebooks with Observable-Sourced Code Copying

Observable Sourced examples made up the majority of examples that demonstrated code copying (see section 6). We observe two key patterns when comparing decomposition strategies between notebooks and the source example they copied code from. First we find that users prefer to keep Component-Level decomposition when already present in the source. However, when users opt to change decomposition methods, they only change to a more modular method, i.e. Component-Level.

7.1.1 Status Quo Inheritance. *Status Quo* implies that users defaulted to the decomposition strategy of their source. This was




Figure 4: A directly duplicated example exemplifying code copying (left) and an instance of copied and altered code (center) versus original creation (right).




Figure 5: Flow of decomposition strategies of sources compared to their corresponding Observable Sourced corpus examples. Illustrates a preference for keeping Component-Level decomposition in sources or changing to Component-Level decomposition.

present in 42/240 (17.5%) Observable Sourced examples. Of those, 32/42 (76.2%) examples used Component-Level decomposition, suggesting user satisfaction with a component-based approach. We note the popularity of the Component-Level decomposition strategy in source examples (47.8%) may explain this behavior. The remaining 10/42 (23.8%) examples demonstrated Chart-Level, Component + Chart-Level, and Program-Level decomposition, as illustrated in Figure 5.

7.1.2 Modular Inheritance. In our analysis, we observed 25 instances where users made a shift towards more modular decomposition strategies when inheriting code from observable-sourced examples. 17/86 (19.8%) Observable-sourced examples changed the source's *Chart-Level decomposition to Component-Level decomposition*, and 8/86 (9.3%) Observable-sourced examples changed *Program-Level decomposition to Component-Level decomposition*. We

find that no examples shifted from Component-Level decomposition to either Chart- or Program-Level decomposition (see Figure 5). These results suggest that **Observable users have a desire for Component-Level code, even if users are inheriting code from non-Component-Level sources.**

Additionally, when we examine the intents and purpose of the 25 examples that changed to Component-Level decomposition, we find that users shift to Component-Level decomposition for various reasons. All three categories of purpose are represented with 22 personal, 2 education, and 1 work. The majority of intents are present as well; there are 10 practice, 8 template use, 5 publishing, 1 tutorial, 1 template use + publishing, and 0 template creation examples.

Decomposition Strategies of No Decomposition Inheritance and Unobservable Decomposition Inheritance Examples




Figure 6: Distribution of Decomposition strategies of examples with No Decomposition Inheritance and Unobservable Decomposition Inheritance. Demonstrates a preference for Layered decomposition of Original Creation, Orthogonal Forking, and Outside Sourced Code Reuse examples.

7.2 Inheritance Strategies within Notebooks with Outside-Sourced Code Copying

The 13 Outside-Sourced notebooks were not sourced from a cellular environment like Observable. As a result, decomposition inheritance was *Unobservable* for these examples. However, we found that 11 out of 13 examples employed Component-Level decomposition, as illustrated in Figure 6. Although we are unable to categorize the decomposition strategies used in the source examples, a manual review of these programs shows that users utilized the whitespace to partition their code once it was copied into Observable. This suggests that **Component-Level decomposition is not simply a byproduct of Observable’s cellular environment but more likely reflects users’ preferred way of organizing D3 code.** However, further research is needed to validate this hypothesis.

7.3 Other Inheritance Strategies

7.3.1 No Decomposition Inheritance. For a decomposition strategy to be inherited, code must be copied from a source example. Hence, the 141 Original and Orthogonal examples were coded with *No Decomposition Inheritance*, as they had no copied code. 114/141 (80.9%) of these examples used Component-Level decomposition, 14/141 (9.9%) used Program-Level decomposition, 8/141 (5.7%) used Chart-Level decomposition, and 5/141 (3.5%) used Component + Chart-Level decomposition. This finding aligns with the trend of 84.4% **users preferring Component-Level decomposition, even if they do not inherit any code.**

7.3.2 Missing Decomposition Inheritance. There were Observable Sourced examples that were forks of inaccessible deprecated D3 Gallery examples, so we code 19/240 (7.9%) of corpus examples with *Missing Decomposition Inheritance* as we cannot be sure of their source’s decomposition strategy. All 19 of these examples displayed Component-Level decomposition, as shown in Figure 5.

7.4 Section Summary

In summary, we sought to understand how code inheritance influences decomposition strategies used by Observable users. Our findings reveal that **users seemed to prefer more modular code decomposition when copying code regardless of the decomposition strategy used in source examples.** This suggests they Observable users intuitively think about D3 code in a component-wise and modular manner. Codings for each analyzed example is available in supplementary materials ¹⁰.

8 How Do People Think About Organizing D3 Code?

Through our analysis of Observable notebooks, we found that people tend to prefer using Component-Level decomposition over Chart-Level and Program-Level decomposition. However, this analysis alone does not give us insight into whether people are intentional about how they organize their D3 code, why people choose one decomposition method over other methods, and what benefits they perceive from organizing their code in a specific way. To explore how the decomposition strategies we observed relate to users’ mental models (i.e. how people think about their code), we interviewed seven D3 users on how they organize their code on Observable. Participants were recruited through our professional networks and through the Observable platform directly. Our institutional IRB approved the study design. We view this study as an *initial exploration* into users’ thought processes to form hypotheses that can be validated by future research.

8.1 Participant Backgrounds

Our participants represent a wide range of age groups (18-54), educational backgrounds (high school to PhD), and occupations (e.g., researcher, analyst, Observable employee). Participant demographics are detailed in the Appendix.

8.2 Interview Protocol

Participants were given an overview of the study and asked to sign a consent form. Participants also completed an optional demographics and background survey regarding their age, gender, race and ethnicity, and occupation as well as their experience with statistics, making data visualization, and using Observable.

The interviews were conducted on Zoom, lasting an average of 34 minutes each, and were structured into two parts. First, participants were asked to screenshare an Observable D3 notebook and explain its purpose and functionality. During this overview, participants were prompted to discuss how they have organized the code, how they debug their D3 code on Observable, etc. Next, participants were asked questions about using D3 and Observable, including how they were influenced by past programming experience and whether they used other examples to build their visualizations. A full list of possible questions can be found in the supplementary materials.

¹⁰Supplementary Materials

8.3 Emerging Themes from the Interviews

We determined participants' decomposition strategies based on the notebooks shared with us as well as by asking them about their code organization strategies, including the use of functions and Observable code cells; our inferred decomposition strategies were *not* explained to participants. We observed a breadth of decomposition preferences through our interviews (participants are labeled as **P1**, **P2**, **P3**, etc.): **P1** uses Program-Level decomposition, **P2**, **P3**, and **P5** use Component-Level decomposition, and **P4**, **P6**, and **P7** use Chart-Level decomposition. From these interviews, three common themes emerged on how people think about their D3 code.

8.3.1 These D3 Users are Intentional About Code Structure. All participants shared specific reasons why they chose to organize their code in certain ways. For example, 3/7 participants discussed how functions facilitate the reuse of data visualizations. **P4** and **P6** talked about building functions to reuse charts and showed us several examples. **P5**, who primarily uses Component-Level decomposition, showed us a visualization dashboard in which he used function calls for previously built charts to keep his dashboard neat. Participants also discuss *thoughtful deviations* from their usual strategies. For example, **P4** mentioned that he will sometimes put all the code into a single cell instead of a function if he is testing new ideas or he isn't planning to reuse the visualization. Similarly, **P7** uses multiple new cells when he is playing with a new idea. Then, he streamlines the code into a single function later.

Using a certain decomposition style also helps participants *achieve specific goals*, such as understanding their code, keeping a notebook neat, improving integration into an external web application, and enabling interaction. For example, **P2** presented a notebook that was part of a team project with the goal of importing it into a web application. **P2** mentioned his team found that using a component approach to organizing the code, instead of using a single cell, led to better visualization rendering in their web application. He described this process of deciding to use Component-Level decomposition, saying, "... We felt that separating each component would be easier for our web app, that way we can integrate text and components of the Observable notebook onto the web app". **P3**, who also used Component-Level decomposition, explained how building up a visualization step by step helped him understand the code better. While **P5** used Chart-Level decomposition for neatness in his presented visualization dashboard, most of the other notebooks he shared were individual charts decomposed into components. **P5** navigated to a forked source visualization he used for inspiration when explaining his examples. The source example used Chart-Level decomposition; however, **P5** was unable to recall why he reorganized the code given how long ago he created it. Lastly, **P1** used new cells to enable interactions with his visualizations.

Together, these findings suggest that **many users are intentional about how they structure D3 code and how code structure can be changed to suit their design goals**. Our participants organize their code in ways that best serve them and sometimes deviate from the primary decomposition strategy we observed if a different strategy aligns better with their long-term project goals.

8.3.2 Decomposition Strategies Can Make Debugging Easier. Participants often mentioned debugging D3 code being a significant

challenge (4 out of 7 participants), due in part to JavaScript's silent failures [7]. To simplify the debugging process, **P2** and **P3** **pointed to splitting code into distinct cells (i.e., Component-Level decomposition) as being helpful for isolating problems and identifying issues**. **P3** described how his code organization supports debugging, *"If you display a visualization in a sequential process from top to bottom [referring to his use of Component-Level decomposition], you can go back up until where the problem disappears."*

Other participants who do not typically use Component-Level decomposition also created new cells to identify issues. For example, **P1** mentioned that he sometimes moves code to new cells instead of commenting it out. **P7** also uses new cells for debugging by creating JavaScript mutables. These findings seem to align with recent work in CS education which finds that Component-Level decomposition strategies can make introductory programming assignments easier to debug and faster to complete [11].

8.3.3 Examples Inspire Code Organization as Well as Visualization Best Practices. Lastly, participants shared how they rely on examples for inspiration. In some cases, people use examples for inspiration on what data visualizations to create. Then, they **fork the example and update the code structure to suit their needs**. For example, **P5** changed the decomposition strategy of the original source to suit his preferences.

Other participants discussed how they **learned to structure their code from examples**. **P3**, who exclusively uses Component-Level code, pointed to how he was taught and the examples he learned from as the main reason he chooses to program in a Component-Level manner. The Observable D3 Gallery was also a significant source of inspiration for participants. For example, **P4** mentioned that he changed the way he wrote functions after seeing D3 examples from Mike Bostock and thinking their code organization was clearer. Similarly, **P6** discussed how he learns from other notebooks, *"It's easy to learn [using Observable]. I can go open anybody's notebook [and see] this is how they have written it... I can say that I learn from other people's code."* Additionally, **P6** mentioned that his code structure looks very similar to examples in the Observable D3 Gallery as he frequently relies on it for inspiration.

9 Discussion

In this paper, we attempt to infer users' mental models of D3 code by analyzing how they structure their own D3 programs in the Observable notebook environment. We analyzed a corpus of 715 examples that represented 24 visualization types. Our findings reveal three decomposition strategies representing a progression from modular code organization (Component) to semantically meaningful code chunking (Chart) to no (cell) organization (Program). We also find that when code is copied from existing D3 examples, users tend to shift towards a more modular decomposition strategy, suggesting that Component-Level decomposition closely matches how users reason about D3 code. Our interview study with Observable users also corroborates these findings and reveals users' rationales for these strategies, such as easing the debugging process, facilitating code reuse across projects, or following best practices demonstrated by D3 experts. In this section, we summarize our main findings, their implications and limitations, and opportunities for future research.

9.1 Key Analysis Findings and Implications

Code decomposition strategies can be used to enhance flexibility in the design of visualization languages. Observing Component-Level decomposition in D3 code is unsurprising given coding conventions taught in computer science courses [11, 38]. However, what is interesting is that D3 users seem to decompose their code, at least in part, according to visualization design principles. Specifically, our findings suggest that users' mental models of D3 code (i.e., preferred component types) seem to align with the model proposed in Wickham's Layered Grammar of Graphics [42] (section 5). These findings indicate that languages, tools, and support documentation (including example programs/notebooks) can be enhanced by integrating intuitive code organization strategies (e.g., Component-Level decomposition) that match the target visualization design principles; for example, using the components of the Grammar of Graphics [43] to organize examples in relevant visualization galleries, or designing the language structure of a new toolkit to enable decomposition according to common component types (e.g., data and aesthetic mappings, geometric objects, etc.). That being said, users also proposed valid reasons for alternative organization strategies, such as chunking code together to facilitate Chart-Level code reuse. Visualization languages must be flexible enough to accommodate different usage scenarios and a menu of abstractions may be needed to cater to different mental models of visualization code. Recent work in studying ggplot2 usage suggests that it may not necessarily offer this type of flexibility [30], revealing a gap for new toolkits/grammars to fill. These principles also extend to support tools and documentation. For example, our findings show how examples from the Observable D3 gallery can influence the way Observable users organize their own D3 programs. Broadly, *we encourage the visualization community to consider users' programming strategies as a complementary model for studying user reasoning and visualization design.*

Analyzing D3 usage enables us to assess existing theory. To the best of our knowledge, our findings provide the first (qualitative) analysis of overlap between D3 code examples and Grammar of Graphics components [43]. Our findings suggest that D3's code structure has a high overlap with the Layered Grammar of Graphics [42] for simpler chart types such as bar and pie charts. While some complex chart types seem to break the GoG mold (e.g., word clouds and Sankey diagrams), we find others that align well with it (e.g., radial charts and geographic maps), suggesting that chart type complexity alone does not fully predict expressiveness. Further, identifying multiple examples that diverge from the underlying theory could provide useful feedback for redesigning a language or designing a new visualization language to address the discrepancies. Our analysis of transitions between components also suggests possible flow structures that can inform language design; for example, to ensure that commonly connected components (e.g., geometric objects and coordinate systems) are expressed sequentially in the target language/toolkit to make a language easier and more intuitive to use.

It is also helpful to understand which components of D3 are not covered by the Grammar of Graphics [43]. For example, our findings suggest that the customization features that increase D3's appeal are omitted from the Grammar of Graphics such as layouts

and parameterization. Further, seemingly standard components such as data transformations, animations, and interactions also fall outside the Grammar of Graphics (as also observed in prior work [30, 37]). As a general-purpose theory, we acknowledge that it does not make sense for the Grammar of Graphics to cover every language/toolkit use case. However, we argue it could be useful to revisit *why* these components are excluded to ensure it still makes sense and to determine whether sister theories are needed to fill the gap (e.g., as Vega-Lite does for interactions [37]). *Our analysis approach makes this reflection process not only feasible but also more systematic, and could lead to a new design space of future improvements in visualization language and toolkit design.*

Code decomposition strategies can be leveraged to improve code understanding in visualization education. Our interview study with Observable users highlights that users choose decomposition strategies to improve their current and future visualization programming workflows, such as making debugging easier, improving code understanding, and facilitating code reuse (section 8). Furthermore, users make deliberate decisions regarding which visualization designs *and* coding strategies they choose to adopt when copying from existing D3 examples (section 8).

Educators can leverage our findings in various ways. For example, they can modularize created tutorials and examples for their courses, maximizing the likelihood that students will comprehend and successfully repurpose them in subsequent projects. As another example, educators can provide students with code using Program-Level decomposition and observe how students repurpose the code as an informal assessment. Observing students re-organizing the code (e.g., to Component-Level decomposition) could be a useful indicator that they are engaging with the material in a meaningful way, which could be scaled up to larger course sizes.

9.2 Future Research Opportunities

Automation to Improve Language Understanding. Large language models (LLMs)—and AI solutions in general—can be powerful tools for generating output matching an expressed visualization intent [4, 21, 45]. However, there are no guarantees regarding the quality and interpretability of AI-generated code. This is particularly challenging in scenarios where the code may not throw obvious errors (e.g., silent JavaScript errors in D3 programs [7]) and the target users lack the knowledge and skills to debug the code [8, 25].

Our research findings can contribute to future AI-driven solutions by revealing the programming patterns and structures that different D3 user groups find intuitive to understand. For example, one could prompt or fine-tune LLMs to organize and label code by components, e.g., data manipulation, data and aesthetic mappings, interactions, etc. LLMs could even be pipelined to generate code and then organize it in a more intuitive way, depending on the inferred preferences of the D3 user who is seeking support. In this way, *our research can be used to generate code with a more intuitive structure and explanations for why it is structured the way it is.*

Exploring the Cognitive Impact of Different Decomposition Strategies. Each of the decomposition strategies identified in this work presents unique cognitive demands: Component-Level decomposition may provide more modularity and clarity but could

also overwhelm users with details, while Program-Level decomposition might simplify the structure at the cost of making individual components harder to isolate and understand. Investigating how these strategies affect users' cognitive load during tasks like debugging, code comprehension, and program modification could provide deeper insights into the trade-offs between code simplicity and modularity. Such research could also examine which decomposition strategies are most effective for different types of users (novices vs. experts) or different levels of visualization design complexity. Understanding the cognitive implications of these strategies may guide the design of programming environments, educational curricula, and tools that reduce cognitive overload, improve debugging efficiency, and ultimately enhance programming outcomes for a wide range of users.

Leveraging Decomposition Strategies to Enhance Visualization Design Through Component Reuse. A key area for further exploration is how the Component-Level decomposition strategy can be leveraged to help D3 users achieve their visualization design goals more efficiently. For instance, the Component-Level structuring could be harnessed to build mappings of common visualization components across multiple notebooks and visualization types. These mappings could serve as a resource for users, helping them identify, combine, and reuse components that align with their specific design objectives. Research efforts could focus on building interfaces that facilitate the linking of related components from various sources, allowing users to easily piece together customized visualizations without needing to start from scratch or manually search through a vast number of examples. In this way, users can explore D3 code along two levels of abstraction simultaneously: Component-Level semantics and the low-level D3 specification/syntax. This approach could also help users discover new patterns and solutions by surfacing alternative ways to decompose and reassemble visualizations. By providing a more structured, component-based pathway to visualization design, this method could facilitate faster design iteration and experimentation.

9.3 Limitations

Our corpus examples were all collected from the Observable platform, representing a subset of D3 users. Some Observable users also program their visualizations in private notebooks, which we cannot access. While we employed multiple strategies to increase the rigor of our example and source collection (see section 3), we acknowledge there are examples where we were unable to locate or analyze the source. For example, some sources may have undergone changes after they were used. Thus, decomposition inheritance may not be fully verifiable. Finally, our corpus appears relatively small when ignoring duplicate notebooks. Including duplicates allows more D3 users to be included in our analysis, but given their redundancy with our initial corpus, we do not comment on them directly in our findings.

10 Conclusion

Visualization users make deliberate choices about how they organize and structure their code. By studying the reasoning processes behind their code organization strategies, we can design visualization toolkits and support infrastructure that align with users'

programming mental models and visualization design goals. In this paper, we introduce a qualitative approach to analyzing how users decompose their D3 code in Observable notebooks and contextualize our findings through an interview study with D3/Observable users. Our analysis takes into account how users draw inspiration from existing notebooks and reorganize the code to match their own decomposition preferences and project goals. From our analyses, we find a clear preference among Observable users for Component-Level decomposition, where users separate code into distinct cells that build on one another, and each cell serves a clear purpose (data manipulation, visual encoding, SVG rendering, etc.). This pattern held across different visualization types and code reuse strategies, suggesting that a Component-Level decomposition approach aligns with users' mental models of D3 code. Furthermore, this Component-Level approach appears to align with existing visualization grammars, namely the Layered Grammar of Graphics [42]. Our interview study not only corroborates the decomposition and code reuse strategies we observed but also clarifies why certain strategies may be adopted; for example, to mirror best practices presented by D3 experts or to make D3 programs easier to debug. Our findings open up new research directions in observing the visualization programming and design processes, refining and creating visualization languages and grammars, and making AI-generated code examples more intuitive for D3 users to understand.

Supplementary Materials

All our supplementary materials are available via this anonymous OSF link: https://osf.io/sudb8/?view_only=302fc5c8d397412aac35c6e094ae7dd6. For ease of reviewing, we also provide a complete copy of all our supplementary materials as a **zip file on PCS** and a detailed README.md file that outlines its contents (also in the zip file).

References

- [1] Benjamin Bach, Mandy Keck, Fateme Rajabiyazdi, Tatiana Losev, Isabel Meirelles, Jason Dykes, Robert S. Laramée, Mashael AlKadi, Christina Stober, Samuel Huron, Charles Perin, Luiz Morais, Wolfgang Aigner, Doris Kosminsky, Magdalena Boucher, Søren Knudsen, Areti Manataki, Jan Aerts, Uta Hinrichs, Jonathan C. Roberts, and Sheelagh Carpendale. 2024. Challenges and Opportunities in Data Visualization Education: A Call to Action. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 30, 1 (2024), 649–660. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2023.3327378>
- [2] H. Bako, A. Varma, A. Faboro, M. Haider, F. Nerrise, B. Kenah, and L. Battle. 2022. Streamlining Visualization Authoring in D3 Through User-Driven Templates. In *2022 IEEE Visualization and Visual Analytics (VIS)*. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 16–20. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VIS54862.2022.00012>
- [3] Hannah K. Bako, Xinyi Liu, Leilani Battle, and Zhicheng Liu. 2023. Understanding how Designers Find and Use Data Visualization Examples. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 29, 1 (2023), 1048–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2022.3209490>
- [4] Hannah K. Bako, Alisha Varma, Anuoluwapo Faboro, Mahreen Haider, Favour Nerrise, Bissaka Kenah, John P. Dickerson, and Leilani Battle. 2023. User-Driven Support for Visualization Prototyping in D3. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces* (Sydney, NSW, Australia) (IUI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 958–972. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581641.3584041>
- [5] Yejin Bang, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Nayeon Lee, Wenliang Dai, Dan Su, Bryan Wilie, Holy Lovenia, Ziwei Ji, Tiezheng Yu, Willy Chung, Quyet V. Do, Yan Xu, and Pascale Fung. 2023. A Multitask, Multilingual, Multimodal Evaluation of ChatGPT on Reasoning, Hallucination, and Interactivity. (Nov. 2023), 675–718. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.ijcnlp-main.45>
- [6] Leilani Battle, Peitong Duan, Zachery Miranda, Dana Mukusheva, Remco Chang, and Michael Stonebraker. 2018. *Beagle: Automated Extraction and Interpretation of Visualizations from the Web*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3174168>

- [7] Leilani Battle, Danni Feng, and Kelli Webber. 2022. Exploring D3 Implementation Challenges on Stack Overflow. In *2022 IEEE Visualization and Visual Analytics (VIS)*. 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VIS54862.2022.00009>
- [8] Brett A. Becker, Paul Denny, James Finnie-Ansley, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, James Prather, and Eddie Antonio Santos. 2023. Programming Is Hard - Or at Least It Used to Be: Educational Opportunities and Challenges of AI Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 54th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1* (<conf-loc>, <city>Toronto ON</city>, <country>Canada</country>, </conf-loc>) (SIGCSE 2023). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 500–506. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3545945.3569759>
- [9] Michael Bostock. 2015. blocks.org. <https://github.com/mbostock/blocks.org>
- [10] Michael Bostock, Vadim Ogievetsky, and Jeffrey Heer. 2011. D3 Data-Driven Documents. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 17, 12 (Dec. 2011), 2301–2309. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2011.185>
- [11] Charis Charitsis, Chris Piech, and John C. Mitchell. 2023. Detecting the Reasons for Program Decomposition in CS1 and Evaluating Their Impact. In *Proceedings of the 54th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education V. 1* (<conf-loc>, <city>Toronto ON</city>, <country>Canada</country>, </conf-loc>) (SIGCSE 2023). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1014–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3545945.3569763>
- [12] Chen Chen, Bongshin Lee, Yunhai Wang, Yunjeong Chang, and Zhicheng Liu. 2024. Mystique: Deconstructing SVG Charts for Layout Reuse. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 30, 1 (2024), 447–457. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2023.3327354>
- [13] Jacob Cohen. 1960. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and psychological measurement* 20, 1 (1960), 37–46.
- [14] Andrea De Lucia, Vincenzo Deufemia, Carmine Gravino, and Michele Risi. 2010. An Eclipse plug-in for the detection of design pattern instances through static and dynamic analysis. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSM.2010.5609707>
- [15] Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc and Giuliano Antoniol. 2008. DeMIMA: A Multilayered Approach for Design Pattern Identification. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 34, 5 (2008), 667–684. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2008.48>
- [16] Jonathan Harper and Maneesh Agrawala. 2014. Deconstructing and Restyling D3 Visualizations. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (Honolulu, Hawaii, USA) (UIST '14). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 253–262. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2642918.2647411>
- [17] J. Harper and M. Agrawala. 2018. Converting Basic D3 Charts into Reusable Style Templates. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 24, 03 (mar 2018), 1274–1286. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2017.2659744>
- [18] Enamul Hoque and Maneesh Agrawala. 2020. Searching the Visual Style and Structure of D3 Visualizations. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 26, 1 (2020), 1236–1245. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2019.2934431>
- [19] Kevin Zeng Hu, Michiel A. Bakker, Stephen Li, Tim Kraska, and César A. Hidalgo. 2019. VizML: A Machine Learning Approach to Visualization Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Stephen A. Brewster, Geraldine Fitzpatrick, Anna L. Cox, and Vassilis Kostakos (Eds.). ACM, Glasgow, Scotland, UK, 128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300358>
- [20] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 12, Article 248 (mar 2023), 38 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730>
- [21] Nam Wook Kim, Grace Myers, and Benjamin Bach. 2023. How Good is ChatGPT in Giving Advice on Your Visualization Design? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09617* (2023).
- [22] Yun Lin, Guozhu Meng, Yinxing Xue, Zhenchang Xing, Jun Sun, Xin Peng, Yang Liu, Wenyun Zhao, and Jinsong Dong. 2017. Mining implicit design templates for actionable code reuse. In *2017 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. 394–404. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2017.8115652>
- [23] Andrew M McNutt and Ravi Chugh. 2021. Integrated Visualization Editing via Parameterized Declarative Templates. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 17, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445356>
- [24] Rodrigo Pessoa Medeiros, Geber Lisboa Ramalho, and Taciana Pontual Falcão. 2019. A Systematic Literature Review on Teaching and Learning Introductory Programming in Higher Education. *IEEE Transactions on Education* 62, 2 (2019), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TE.2018.2864133>
- [25] Arghavan Moradi Dakhel, Vahid Majdinasab, Amin Nikanjam, Foutse Khomh, Michel C. Desmarais, and Zhen Ming (Jack) Jiang. 2023. GitHub Copilot AI pair programmer: Asset or Liability? *Journal of Systems and Software* 203 (2023), 111734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2023.111734>
- [26] Janice Ka-Yee Ng, Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc, and Giuliano Antoniol. 2010. Identification of Behavioural and Creational Design Motifs through Dynamic Analysis. *J. Softw. Maint. Evol.* 22, 8 (dec 2010), 597–627. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smr.421>
- [27] J. Niere. 2002. Fuzzy logic based interactive recovery of software design. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Software Engineering. ICSE 2002*. 727–728. <https://doi.org/10.1145/581469.581473>
- [28] Observable, Inc. 2024. Observable. <https://observablehq.com>
- [29] Paul Parsons, Prakash Shukla, and Chorong Park. 2021. Fixation and Creativity in Data Visualization Design: Experiences and Perspectives of Practitioners. In *2021 IEEE Visualization Conference (VIS)*. 76–80. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VIS498.27.2021.9623297>
- [30] Xiaoying Pu and Matthew Kay. 2023. How Data Analysts Use a Visualization Grammar in Practice. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 840, 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580837>
- [31] Wenyi Qian, Xin Peng, Zhenchang Xing, Stan Jarzabek, and Wenyun Zhao. 2013. Mining Logical Clones in Software: Revealing High-Level Business and Programming Rules. In *2013 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance*. 40–49. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSM.2013.15>
- [32] Deepthi Raghunandan, Aayushi Roy, Shenzhi Shi, Niklas Elmqvist, and Leilani Battle. 2023. Code Code Evolution: Understanding How People Change Data Science Notebooks Over Time. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (<conf-loc>, <city>Hamburg</city>, <country>Germany</country>, </conf-loc>) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 863, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580997>
- [33] Simone Romano, Giuseppe Scanniello, Michele Risi, and Carmine Gravino. 2011. Clustering and lexical information support for the recovery of design pattern in source code. In *2011 27th IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM)*. 500–503. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSM.2011.6080818>
- [34] Adam Rule, Aurélien Tabard, and James D. Hollan. 2018. Exploration and Explanation in Computational Notebooks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (<conf-loc>, <city>Montreal QC</city>, <country>Canada</country>, </conf-loc>) (CHI '18). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173606>
- [35] Lindy Ryan, Deborah Silver, Robert S. Laramée, and David Ebert. 2019. Teaching Data Visualization as a Skill. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* 39, 2 (2019), 95–103. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MCG.2018.2889526>
- [36] Arvind Satyanarayan, Bongshin Lee, Donghao Ren, Jeffrey Heer, John Skasko, John Thompson, Matthew Brehmer, and Zhicheng Liu. 2020. Critical Reflections on Visualization Authoring Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 26, 1 (2020), 461–471. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2019.2934281>
- [37] A. Satyanarayan, D. Moritz, K. Wongsuphasawat, and J. Heer. 2017. Vega-Lite: A Grammar of Interactive Graphics. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 23, 1 (Jan 2017), 341–350. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2016.2599030>
- [38] Xiaodan Tang, Yue Yin, Qiao Lin, Roxana Hadad, and Xiaoming Zhai. 2020. Assessing computational thinking: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Computers & Education* 148 (2020), 103798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103798>
- [39] Sergey Titov, Yaroslav Golubev, and Timofey Bryksin. 2022. ReSplit: Improving the Structure of Jupyter Notebooks by Re-Splitting Their Cells. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. 492–496. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER53432.2022.00066>
- [40] Nikolaos Tsantalis, Alexander Chatzigeorgiou, George Stephanides, and Spyros T. Halkidis. 2006. Design Pattern Detection Using Similarity Scoring. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 32, 11 (2006), 896–909. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2006.112>
- [41] Hironori Washizaki, Kazuhiro Fukaya, Atsuto Kubo, and Yoshiaki Fukazawa. 2009. Detecting Design Patterns Using Source Code of Before Applying Design Patterns. In *2009 Eighth IEEE/ACIS International Conference on Computer and Information Science*. 933–938. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIS.2009.209>
- [42] Hadley Wickham. 2010. A layered grammar of graphics. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 19, 1 (2010), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1198/jcgs.2009.07098>
- [43] Leland Wilkinson. 2005. *The grammar of graphics*. Springer New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-28695-0>
- [44] L. Wilkinson, A. Anand, and R. Grossman. 2005. Graph-theoretic scagnostics. In *Information Visualization, IEEE Symposium on*. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 157,158,159,160,161,162,163,164. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INVIS.2005.1532142>
- [45] Zehua Zeng, Phoebe Moh, Fan Du, Jane Hoffswell, Tak Yeon Lee, Sana Malik, Eunye Koh, and Leilani Battle. 2022. An Evaluation-Focused Framework for Visualization Recommendation Algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 28, 1 (2022), 346–356. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2021.3114814>

A Appendix

ID	Age	Highest De- gree	Occupation	D3 Exp
P1	25-34	Masters	Research Assistant	3-4 years
P2	18-24	High school	Student	< 1 year
P3	18-24	Bachelors	Data Analyst	1-2 years
P4	-	-	-	5+ years
P5	25-34	Bachelors	Software Developer	3-4 years
P6	35-44	Masters	Web Designer & De- veloper	5+ years
P7	45-54	PhD	D3 Maintainer & Observable Em- ployee	5+ years

Table 5: Background of interview participants. Also, 6 participants were male, 5 identified as Asian/Pacific Islander and 1 as White/Caucasian.




Figure 7: Visualization specific bar chart displaying the percentage of cells containing Layered Grammar of Graphics Components in corpus examples. Displays lower percentages for specialized visualization types compared to standard visualization types.