Dynamic 2.5D Treemaps using Declarative 3D on the Web
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Abstract

The 2.5D treemap represents a general purpose visualization technique to map multi-variate hierarchical data in a scalable, interactive, and consistent way used in a number of application fields. In this paper, we explore the capabilities of Declarative 3D for the web-based implementation of 2.5D treemap clients. Particularly, we investigate how X3DOM and XML3D can be used to implement clients with equivalent features that interactively display 2.5D treemaps with dynamic mapping of attributes. We also show a first step towards a glTF-based implementation. These approaches are benchmarked focusing on their interaction capabilities with respect to rendering and speed of dynamic data mapping. We discuss the results for our representative example of a complex 3D interactive, and introduce another strong visual variable, namely height, for the leaves. Thus, 2.5D treemaps allow us to independently map three attributes (size, color, height) and to visually relate these attributes in a single view. Technically, 2.5D treemaps are represented by 3D scenes and often ambiguously denoted by “3D treemaps”. A growing number of applications and systems can take advantage of 2.5D treemaps providing means to interactively explore and analyze large-scale hierarchical data. Interactivity and scalability are key to the user to gain insights, to uncover structures and patterns as well as to acquire knowledge by reasoning. Insofar, 2.5D treemaps are representative for a large number of dedicated interactive data visualization techniques. Incorporating a 2.5D treemap as a visualization component in web-based applications is faced by a number of challenges from a software engineering point of view. In particular, if implementations are based on imperative 3D graphics programming, typical problems arise related to code complexity, interoperability across platforms, integration into web-based workflows, and software maintenance. Declarative 3D provides an alternative approach (Figure 1) investigated in this paper. We present and evaluate implementations of 2.5D treemap web clients based on three different technologies X3DOM, XML3D, and glTF. We also discuss how to efficiently and dynamically map attribute data to visual variables. Our evaluation focuses on three main aspects:

- **Rendering Performance**: User interaction requires interactive frames rates and short data transmission times, taking into account that treemaps visualize up to $10^3$ – $10^7$ items.
- **Dynamic Data Mapping**: The clients need to support dynamic attribute mapping on a per-item basis, e.g., adding additional data, selecting and filtering individual items.
- **Declarative Paradigm**: The visualization clients should be fully based on declarative 3D graphics.

1 Introduction

Treemaps [Shneiderman 1992] provide effective means to display, explore, and analyze multi-variate large hierarchical data, e.g., large-scale software system data [Langelier et al. 2005; Bohnet and Döllner 2011] and business data [Vliegen et al. 2006]. Treemaps use space-restricted, recursively nested sets of rectangles, which express parent-child relationships among nodes; the rectangles’ sizes are proportional to per-node weights. Data associated with nodes, denoted by attributes, can be mapped by means of visual variables [Carpendale 2003] of treemaps, e.g., rectangle size, color, texture, and shading. 2.5D treemaps extend treemaps by using the third dimension: rectangles are extruded to 3D blocks, keeping the regular treemaps two-dimensional reference space and layout [Bladh et al. 2004]. Blocks emphasize the hierarchical nesting of inner nodes and introduce another strong visual variable, namely height, for the leaves. Thus, 2.5D treemaps allow us to independently map three attributes (size, color, height) and to visually relate these attributes

Figure 1: Interactive 2.5D treemap clients (with dynamic attribute mapping) based on X3DOM, XML3D, and glTF developed in our study.
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papers inside the HTML `<canvas>` element, it is based on a low-
level imperative API. The use of such APIs, however, can be con-
sidered to be orthogonal to most existing web technologies, which
include contents in web documents and get modified via DOM API.
The “Declarative 3D for the Web Architecture W3C Community
Group” provides platforms to embed 3D graphics within the HTML
DOM [Jankowski et al. 2013]: X3DOM [Behr et al. 2009] and
XML3D [Sons et al. 2010]. X3DOM implements a subset of the
nodes specified by X3D, an existing ISO standard [Web3D Consor-
tium 2008], for the web. In contrast to X3DOM, which brings an
existing format into the web, XML3D provides a minimal set of ele-
ments as an extension to HTML5. Thereby, XML3D seamlessly in-
tegrates with the web technology stack and leverages HTML, CSS,
and JavaScript events. The Kronos Group released the OpenGL
Transmission Format glTF [Kronos Group 2015], which will al-
low applications to receive and process standard format 3D assets
and, thereby, to reuse the ecosystem of asset pipeline tools. glTF
supports extensions, e.g., external and binary assets. Compared to
X3DOM and XML3D, glTF is only a transmission format, not
intended to be directly renderable, as it has to be converted into
renderer-specific scene descriptions. As a consequence, it is diffi-
cult to directly modify the 3D scene at a high level of abstraction.

Since browser vendors stated that native support of declarative 3D
is not their priority [Jankowski et al. 2013], supplementary support
by means of WebGL-based Polyfill implementations [Sons et al.
2013] are provided. In terms of glTF, we take advantage of a ren-
derer based on three.js\(^1\).

3 2.5D Treemaps using X3DOM

X3D documents typically contain a `<scene>`, a `<viewpoint>`, and
various `<transform>` and `<shape>` tags. We have applied three differ-
ent approaches for encoding the geometry of 2.5D treemaps: (1)
multiple `<box>` tags, (2) a single unit cube specified by a single
`<indexedfaceset>` that is reused, and (3) a pre-baked buffer via a
single `<indexedfaceset>` tag. Attribute mapping to the visual vari-
able heights, color, and ground size is explicitly resolved and, thus,
directly specified in X3D properties. In practice, the attribute map-
ing to the cuboids’ ground size is often fixed to a single attribute,
that is, it does not change for various map themes. X3DOM provides
a special “turntable” navigation that allows users to control azimuth
and altitude. The latter can be further constrained by lower and up-
per angles to restrict the camera position to the upper hemisphere,
which is preferred for 2.5D treemaps. For picking of individual data
elements, e.g., to provide selection and filtering mechanics as well
as additional node information, we leverage DOM event handlers
and process the desired element’s attributes appropriately. This de-
sign allows us to declaratively specify a 2.5D treemap depicting
several thousand data elements via X3DOM.

Boxes. This approach uses the `<box>` tag as base geometry for
each node of the treemap. The base tag of a treemap node is a
`<transform>` for the position and size transform of the shared
base geometry. `<appearance>` and `<material>` tags define a node’s
color, specifically the `diffuseColor` attribute is used. A `<shape>`
with the `<box>` as child reuses the base geometry. Updating tree-
map nodes is restricted to changes to `<transform>` attributes for
height and `<material>` attributes for the color. Similarly, we use
`emissiveColor` of `<material>` for highlighting.

Shared Geometry. A 2.5D treemap is mainly composed of boxes
and typically viewed from the top hemisphere. Hence, the bottom
faces can be omitted to optimize the geometric representation.
The `<indexedfaceset>` tag is used to define five faces for each node.
The normals are defined for each face; setting its `normalPerVertex`
attribute to `false`. This shape is then reused for all treemap nodes
using the `def` and `use` attributes. The usage in the X3DOM hierar-
chy and the updates are similar to the boxes approach.

4 2.5D Treemaps using XML3D

With respect to data handling XML3D is flexible due to its inte-
gration of Xflow [Klein et al. 2013]. However, every renderable
object in an XML3D scene is represented using a `<mesh>` element to
achieve individual interaction (i.e., event handler). Each mesh
is fed with geometry data, material properties, and a scene graph
transformation. In the following, approaches using basic meshes,
assets, and pre-baked buffers are discussed.

Basic Meshes Since 2.5D treemaps are exclusively composed of
blocks a single base geometry per `<mesh>` element can be reused to
minimize the memory footprint. This is done by referring to the
same `<data>` element via document id in the `src` attribute. The
material is shared by all blocks as well; it is attached once to the
surrounding `<group>` element and derived by its children. For each
mesh the material is configured by overriding the `diffuseColor` to
customize its appearance. To highlight map elements either the ma-
terial properties are changed or a different material is applied. For
it, the `material` attribute is set, causing the material de-
derived from the surrounding group to be overridden. Finally, a scene
graph transformation is used to put each block in place and shape it
accordingly. For that purpose, XML3D usually takes advantage of
CSS 3D Transforms [Sons et al. 2013]. However, XML3D also of-
ers the `<transform>` element for convenience and improved perfor-
ance in interactive applications. Rather than frequently updating a
mesh’s style attribute, each mesh refers to its dedicated transform,
which is updated in turn. As a consequence, it doubles the number of
required DOM elements but also enables dataflow processing for
the block transformations.

Assets With the introduction of configurable models by Klein et.
al [2014], XML3D was extended by asset instancing. Hence, we

\(^1\)http://threejs.org/examples/webgl_loader_gltf.html
can wrap the block geometry into an `<assetmesh>` within a `<asset>` element. For each instance, we create a `<model>` element and configure it with child elements that are fed into the dataflow of the asset. Since the material is applied as before and derived from the surrounding group, we just set the `diffuseColor` as before. To put each block in place, we have exactly the same options as before-hand. Even though it is desirable to configure the transform via the asset interface as well, meshes and assetmeshes can refer to `<transform>` elements only by document ids, whereas their global scope prohibits this approach.

### Pre-Baked Buffer

In contrast to the previous approaches where the same block was transformed several times into its final place at runtime, in this approach we pre-compute the full geometry of the 2.5D treemap. For it, we duplicate the block and store its transformed geometry into a (large) buffer. We can take advantage of domain-specific dataflow operators to perform the block's transformation based on raw input data to be visualized. We could use a single `<mesh>` element for the treemap due to the baked transform, however this breaks individual interaction. Instead, we maintain one mesh per block, all referring to the same `<data>` element, but using indices to draw just the relevant subset of the buffer. These indices are in turn computed based on the id of the block to be represented. The material is applied as before and derived from the surrounding group. We can also just set the `diffuseColor` as before but this approach also allows for baking colors of the blocks into their vertices since the data is duplicated anyway.

### 5.2.5D Treemaps using glTF

To effectively encode 2.5D treemaps with glTF we rely on the static scene description functionality, i.e., no animations and skins have been used. The treemap and its rendering can be fully described using accessors, buffer views, buffers, materials, meshes, nodes, programs, scenes, shaders, and techniques. Although several different approaches to encode the treemap scene exist, the one with acceptable characteristics regarding loading time and rendering performance was chosen: a single mesh representing the whole 2.5D treemap. One disadvantage is the implementation of picking, for which we have to render an explicit id buffer and then perform texture lookups while picking. The resulting glTF description uses buffers containing the positions, normals, and additional attributes of a list of blocks. The used additional attributes are the color of the treemap node and its id, primarily used for picking. Buffer views and accessors for each buffer makes the vertices accessible to the rendering system. The scene contains one single mesh representing all treemap nodes as its primitives. It uses one material that provides the used technique and no additional values. The rendering of the whole scene uses one technique, which results in one vertex shader, one fragment shader and one program.

Due to the lack of a prevalent or official web-based glTF viewer, the effort to use glTF becomes comparable to a dedicated WebGL-based renderer and, therefore, we dropped it for evaluation in the light of declarative 3D.

### 6 Results and Discussion

For performance measurements, the clients processed and rendered the same attributed data set with 2,990 nodes. The results were obtained by manual instrumentation and suggest interactive frame rates on consumer hardware for all approaches (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>DOMContent Loaded</th>
<th>First Frame Displayed</th>
<th>Continuous Rendering</th>
<th>Remapping all Colors</th>
<th>Remapping all Heights</th>
<th>Highlighting of one Leaf Node</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X3DOM</td>
<td>Boxes</td>
<td>0.48s</td>
<td>4.05s</td>
<td>15fps</td>
<td>87ms</td>
<td>152ms</td>
<td>91ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3DOM</td>
<td>Shared Geometry</td>
<td>1.37s</td>
<td>3.60s</td>
<td>15fps</td>
<td>87ms</td>
<td>124ms</td>
<td>86ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3DOM</td>
<td>Pre-baked Buffer</td>
<td>0.63s</td>
<td>1.19s</td>
<td>60fps</td>
<td>112ms</td>
<td>552ms</td>
<td>696ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML3D</td>
<td>Mesh</td>
<td>1.59s</td>
<td>2.05s</td>
<td>30fps</td>
<td>173ms</td>
<td>98ms</td>
<td>37ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML3D</td>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>2.21s</td>
<td>2.70s</td>
<td>29fps</td>
<td>97ms</td>
<td>104ms</td>
<td>40ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML3D</td>
<td>Pre-baked Buffer</td>
<td>1.46s</td>
<td>2.78s</td>
<td>28fps</td>
<td>291ms</td>
<td>293ms</td>
<td>37ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glTF</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>0.24s</td>
<td>0.29s</td>
<td>60fps</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: All measurements were captured and averaged over 1,000 iterations for the same data set of 2,990 nodes (358 parent and 2632 leaf nodes) with the same attribute mapping applied. All data was deployed on a server (http://hpicsg.github.io/web3d-treemaps/) and loaded/processed locally in Chrome (50.0.2661.87 64-bit) running on a Notebook (Intel Core-i7 6700HQ, 16GB RAM, Windows, Intel HD 530). For polyfill and DOM publicly available resources were used based on X3DOM 1.7.1, XML3D 5.1.4, and glTF 1.0 (with three.js r76).
of our approaches require custom JavaScript code to apply these manipulations throughout several `<shape>` or `<mesh>` elements in the DOM. XMLHttpRequest’s flexible data composition system can be used to reduce the number of DOM manipulations.

Because declarative 3D implementations ease development, the time to create the the 2.5D treemap visualization clients was rather low (a few days). Using standard formats for such visualization makes them more accessible on the web, which was one of the goals for this case study. Declarative 2.5D treemap visualization could be easily integrated into existing web pages or published in a cloud-based collaboration platform. In addition, using standardized, open data formats simplifies archiving of visualization and there is no need for a proprietary, self-maintained viewer application.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

All presented approaches enable the embedding of 2.5D treemaps within the existing web technology stack (with a constraint of XMLHttpRequest and X3DOM for interaction). This allows us to leverage existing web technologies such as JavaScript events for interaction handling. Features like built-in object picking, e.g., for selection and hovering of blocks, dynamic data remapping as well as basic navigation concepts components top off Declarative 3D to a full-fledged sandbox for rapid prototyping of visualization components. Hence, Declarative 3D provide a powerful alternative to dedicated renderers, realizing their limitations. Particularly, the large set of elements usually handled in data visualization points out a crucial shortcoming. Optimized approaches driven by use-cases will probably always outperform more generic approaches such as Declarative 3D. Nonetheless, these limits can be pushed much further to achieve sufficient performance. For instance, revisiting asset instances (i.e., optimize buffer usage and draw calls, geometry instancing) and a proper use of the respective shader stages (i.e., vertex displacement and color lookup tables) may offer another magnitude of performance. Once Xflow supports hassle-free parallel execution in mainstream browsers, this will become even more interesting. Last, enabling geometry instancing during rasterization would be good candidate for future work.

The open-source implementation is made available under MIT license and can be accessed via GitHub pages: https://hpicsgs.github.io/web3d-treemaps/.
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