Charts & Tables
Some Issues

- Size
- Resolution
- Colors
- Labels
- Units
- Chart junk
- Continuous vs. discrete data
- Significant figures and error bars
Contexts

Formats
- Paper
- Book
- Poster
- Presentation

Features
- Color
- Detail
- Labeling
- Captions/Headings
- Tags
Microbenchmark Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Microbenchmark</th>
<th>Original Classes</th>
<th>Modified Classes</th>
<th>Modified Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empty Loop</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td>1.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Field Operation</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Invocation</td>
<td>2.849, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Empty Loop
- Loop Field Operation
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Legend:
- Original Classes
- Modified Classes
- Modified Optimized
Figure 4. Runtimes for each version on each microbenchmark, normalized by the runtime of the original version. The modified classes required at least twice as much time. Optimizing the modified classes only gave a significant benefit on the Loop Method Invocation microbenchmark.
Cell Density (cell/cm²) vs. Time (hr)

- Untreated Cells
- TC Treated Cells
- FN Treated Cells
Population (2002 est.)

- Germany 17%
- France 13%
- U.K. 13%
- Italy 12%
- Spain 9%
- Poland 8%
- Romania 4%
- Netherlands 3%
- Belgium 2%
- Portugal 2%
- Austria 2%
- Slovakia 1%
- Czech Republic 2%
- Hungary 2%
- Sweden 2%
- Denmark 1%
- Lithuania 1%
- Latvia 0%
- Slovenia 0%
- Cyprus 0%
- Malta 0%
- Estonia 0%
- Luxembourg 0%
- Bulgaria 2%
- Finland 1%
More Examples

Figure Bestiary

Common Problems Interpreting and Graphing Data