

# A Novel JupyterLab User Experience for Interactive Data Visualization<sup>1</sup>

Peter K. G. Williams<sup>1,2</sup>

Jonathan Carifio<sup>1</sup>

Henrik Norman<sup>3</sup>

A. David Weigel<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, Cambridge, MA, USA;  
pwilliams@cfa.harvard.edu*

<sup>2</sup>*American Astronomical Society, Washington, DC, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Winter Way AB, Lerum, Västergötland, Sweden*

<sup>4</sup>*US Space & Rocket Center, Huntsville, AL, USA*

**Abstract.** In the Jupyter ecosystem, data visualization is usually done with “widgets” created as notebook cell outputs. While this mechanism works well in some circumstances, it is not well-suited to presenting interfaces that are long-lived, interactive, and visually rich. Unlike the traditional Jupyter notebook system, the newer JupyterLab application provides a sophisticated extension infrastructure that raises new design possibilities. Here we present a novel user experience (UX) for interactive data visualization in JupyterLab that is based on an “app” that runs *alongside* the user’s notebooks, rather than widgets that are bound *inside* them. We have implemented this UX for the AAS WorldWide Telescope (WWT) visualization tool. JupyterLab’s messaging APIs allow the app to smoothly exchange data with multiple computational kernels, allowing users to accomplish tasks that are not possible using the widget framework. A new Jupyter server extension allows the frontend to request data from kernels asynchronously over HTTP, enabling interactive exploration of gigapixel-scale imagery in WWT. While we have developed this UX for WWT, the overall design and the server extension are portable to other applications and have the potential to unlock a variety of new user activities that aren’t currently possible in “science platform” interfaces.<sup>1</sup>

## 1. Introduction

Many astronomical organizations are building, or have already built, “science platforms”: online environments exposing both data and computation to allow researchers to make use of major data sets from afar. Examples include SciServer (Raddick et al.

---

<sup>1</sup>This submission also includes material corresponding to tutorial T04, “Interactive Visualization in the Age of the Science Platform: Huge FITS Images in JupyterLab with AAS WorldWide Telescope”.

2017), NOIRLab’s Astro Data Lab (Fitzpatrick et al. 2016), ESA Datalabs (Arviset et al. 2021), and the Rubin Science Platform (O’Mullane et al. 2021). The motivation for the creation of these platforms is well-understood: modern astronomical datasets are so big that it is impractical for researchers to simply “download the data” and analyze them. Instead, the researchers must bring their analysis *to* the data.

Paired with this motivation are the factors that make the creation of science platforms possible: perhaps most importantly, the immense sophistication of the modern web development platform. Current web browsers are sophisticated tools for building interactive, multimedia applications, and there exists a rich ecosystem of software tools for implementing web applications. Among astronomers and other scientists, the Jupyter system is particularly important. While one important aspect of the now-established Jupyter notebook system (Kluyver et al. 2016) is the design of the “notebook” user experience (UX) paradigm, just as important is the fact that Jupyter was built as a web application, targeting HTML and JavaScript rather than Windows or macOS.

The move to web-based scientific data analysis presents both opportunities and challenges. Regarding data visualization, especially interactive data visualization, one major challenge is simply achieving feature parity with the status quo. While some kinds of software are easily translated from existing platforms to the web platform, that is *not* the case for visualization applications, which are generally interactive and have complex I/O patterns. The associated opportunity is that newer web-based UX paradigms and workflows have the potential to be superior to existing ones. While it remains to be seen to what extent this potential can be realized in practice, the network-native nature of the web enables workflows that achieve unprecedented levels of openness, collaborativity, and decentralization.

## 2. Jupyter and Widgets

Since its first public release, the Jupyter environment has provided a UX paradigm for web-based data visualization: the notebook widget, as implemented in the `ipywidgets` package<sup>2</sup>. The mental model underlying widgets is intuitive: while the output of an executed notebook cell is generally textual, it can actually consist of a variety of forms, such as images, audio, or arbitrary embedded HTML. Interactive Jupyter widgets use Jupyter’s “comms” system to communicate changes between the underlying computational kernel (often, but not necessarily, running Python) and the user’s web browser (implementing the widget display in JavaScript). The widget system is based on a model/view/controller (MVC) framework in which there can be multiple HTML views of the same JavaScript model, and the latter is what is synchronized with the kernel.

Although Jupyter widgets can be used to achieve complex effects, there are some limitations inherent to the system’s design. A somewhat banal but salient issue is that since widgets are tied to cells, as one works in a notebook, they tend to scroll off the screen, requiring scrolling back and forth to keep using them. There are workarounds to avoid this issue such as `jupyterlab-sidecar`<sup>3</sup>, but these require the user to take additional steps to activate them. In the case of `jupyterlab-sidecar` this includes modifications to

---

<sup>2</sup><https://ipywidgets.readthedocs.io/>

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/jupyter-widgets/jupyterlab-sidecar>

notebook code that have to be duplicated or removed depending on whether or not the sidebar can and should be used.

Furthermore, widgets must be launched in code, by a running kernel. In many cases this is not a significant limitation, but it does preclude or hamper certain workflows. For instance, in a science platform environment, one might wish to simply select a dataset in a file browser and open it for visualization. To accomplish this using a widget requires a relatively involved set of steps: in general one will have to create a notebook, load the appropriate Python modules, copy the file’s name into the session, and finally run the necessary code to display it.

Finally, widgets are tied to a single running kernel through Jupyter’s comms system. Although widgets can have their state serialized and restored through kernel restarts, this is only practical for small state sizes, not (e.g.) large images loaded for interactive visualization. Because widgets are tied to individual kernels, data from multiple notebooks cannot be combined into the same visualization, and in the JupyterLab environment (see next section), application components besides notebooks cannot interact with widgets.

### 3. The JupyterLab Computational Environment

The release of the JupyterLab software stack — to be distinguished from the “classical” Jupyter notebook — marked a major expansion in possibilities for interactive data visualization on the web. While the project’s branding may not distinguish it substantially from previous Jupyter products, the JupyterLab system represents a much more ambitious and sophisticated vision than what came before.

The web frontend of the classical Jupyter system was designed to run notebooks, although it did gain additional related functionality over time. In contrast, JupyterLab is designed to be a modular, extensible, web-based environment for computation. While it supports notebooks as a part of that functionality, the complete system is much more flexible. Superficially, this can be seen in the JupyterLab UI (Figure 1), which adds a tabs-and-frames system for managing different tools such as notebooks, terminals, and code editors. Under the hood, nearly every component of JupyterLab is built using its extension mechanism, which can be used to add new launcher buttons, menu commands, frame types, and more.

While JupyterLab supports classical Jupyter widgets with the assistance of the `jupyterlab-manager` extension provided by `ipywidgets`, the extensibility of the JupyterLab environment makes it possible to implement new visualization UX paradigms that go beyond the widget paradigm.

### 4. The JupyterLab “App” User Experience Paradigm

AAS WorldWide Telescope (WWT; Rosenfield et al. 2018) is an application for interactive astronomical data visualization that specializes in the combination of multiple datasets on the sky, including both images and catalogs of arbitrary size. While WWT has provided a Jupyter widget since 2017 via the `pywwt` package<sup>4</sup>, the constraints of

---

<sup>4</sup><https://pywwt.readthedocs.io/>




Figure 1. Screenshot of a representative JupyterLab environment. Unlike the classical Jupyter web UI, multiple notebooks may be opened and arranged in the main view area. The sidebar and menu bars provide access to a variety of associated features not available in the classical app. Notebook widgets are supported with the help of a standard extension.

the widget UX have not been a good match for the style of use that WWT encourages. Motivated by this mismatch and the new capabilities of JupyterLab, the WWT team has implemented a new UX design in the extension [@wwtelescope/jupyterlab](https://github.com/WorldWideTelescope/jupyterlab)<sup>5</sup>. This implementation is an instance of a new JupyterLab UX design pattern that we refer to as the “app” model (Figure 2). It can be tried online using the MyBinder service<sup>6</sup> (Project Jupyter et al. 2018).

The hallmark of the “app” paradigm is that the visualization application is chiefly implemented inside its own JupyterLab extension, rather than through the `ipywidgets` framework. It is straightforward to extend the JupyterLab shell so that such an app can easily be opened through a button in the JupyterLab launcher, the command bar, or by selecting appropriate files in the file explorer. This makes it possible to launch the app without requiring a kernel, and also allows JupyterLab’s tab manager to be used to set up custom views, such as placing the app and a notebook in a side-by-side configuration.

Rather than launching the app *from* a notebook kernel, instead kernels are viewed as connecting *to* the app. Multiple notebooks can connect to the same app, allowing different data sources to be combined. JupyterLab’s communications framework allows bidirectional messaging between an app and kernels, allowing data to flow both from a kernel to the app (e.g., “display this small catalog”) and the other way around (e.g., “retrieve the coordinates of the current view center”).

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/WorldWideTelescope/jupyterlab>

<sup>6</sup><https://bit.ly/pywwt-notebooks>




Figure 2. Screenshot of the WWT JupyterLab app. The main WWT interface is contained within its own tab frame, and so can be repositioned and resized by the user. A button in the “Launcher” view (top-middle) makes opening WWT a one-click operation. Connecting a Python kernel to the app requires two lines of code (bottom-middle). However, because the app itself has a well-developed user interface (right), many actions can be performed without an active kernel connection.

Because of this bidirectional communication, apps may rely on notebooks to provide computational support to accomplish effects that would be difficult to achieve in a freestanding web application. For instance, in the case of WWT, there are many opportunities for data discovery and retrieval through Virtual Observatory (VO; Djorgovski & Williams 2005) protocols. However, to the best of our knowledge there are limited, if any, VO protocol implementations available in JavaScript, so that it would be expensive to provide VO support inside the WWT application per se. Meanwhile there are many VO implementations available in Python, such as `pyvo`<sup>7</sup>. A pragmatic approach would be to allow the app to use a connected kernel to make VO requests and parse the responses, minimizing the amount of new logic required in the web app. This approach can address some, but not all, of the costs associated with porting existing visualization apps to the web platform.

Not explored in the current WWT implementation is the possibility of an app providing even stronger notebook integration by generating code for the user to run. For instance, on startup the app could offer to copy/paste the generic two lines of code needed to connect a kernel to itself, or it could emit code that recreated the current viewer location to create notebooks that reliably reproduce the results of an interactive session. Apps offering such features should be designed to recognize the fact that not all Jupyter kernels are Python-based.

<sup>7</sup><https://pyvo.readthedocs.io/>

Communications between apps and kernels use Jupyter’s messaging system. In the generic “science platform” case, this involves relaying JSON messages from a kernel, likely running in a remote data center, to the user’s browser, via the Jupyter web server, which may run at some intermediate location. While Jupyter’s infrastructure masks much of the complexity underlying this setup, messages do arrive asynchronously and unreliably, necessitating careful protocol design. Message-based control systems are well-suited to this environment and are well-established in astronomy with protocols such as SAMP (Taylor et al. 2015).

In the particular case of WWT, the app is a singleton: only one WWT frame can be open in a JupyterLab session at once. This is a UX design choice; there is no technical limitation preventing multiple frames of the same app from being opened.

## 5. Visualizing Big Data in the App Paradigm

The app paradigm is well-suited to applications that involve exploratory visualization of large datasets. In the case of WWT, an application of particular interest is the display of large (gigapixel-scale) images.

Web-based, interactive visualization of such datasets requires that they be processed into a format that allows the client to display something without needing to download the entire dataset in advance. In WWT, images that span a substantial solid angle must be converted into the TOAST (McGlynn et al. 2019) or HiPS (Fernique et al. 2015) formats, both of which involve breaking the image data into tiles that are then hierarchically downsampled to lower resolutions. Images that contain a large number of pixels but do not span a large area can be represented using a gnomonic (WCS TAN) projection with a similar hierarchical tiling scheme. The software package *toasty*<sup>8</sup> can generate these formats from typical astronomical datasets. In other application domains, the precise data formats may vary but processes analogous to the tiling and downsampling steps will inevitably apply.

For large, public datasets, it makes sense to precompute these visualization-friendly outputs and serve them from a well-known location. For browser-based display the natural service mechanism is HTTP, and indeed the WWT app has a sophisticated HTTP-based I/O subsystem for retrieving tile data on-the-fly as the user navigates an image. (Here and elsewhere, “HTTP” should be read to mean “HTTP or HTTPS”).

In the “science platform” use case, it is also likely that users will obtain or generate new datasets that they wish to visualize in the app. In the Jupyter architecture these datasets will be “kernel-backed”: the kernel process is the one that has direct access to the data. These data need to be made available to the app frontend. Presuming that the frontend has an HTTP-based I/O subsystem, it would be desirable to make such data available over HTTP — but this is not actually possible in the stock Jupyter architecture. Frontend code can only communicate with the Jupyter *server* using HTTP, and the server and kernels may be running in different environments (Figure 3).

While it may be possible to avoid this problem by implementing a comms-based I/O subsystem, this is not a feasible solution for WWT. We therefore implemented a small Jupyter server extension, `wwt_kernel_data_relay`<sup>9</sup> (KDR), that allows kernels to

---

<sup>8</sup><https://toasty.readthedocs.io/>

<sup>9</sup><https://wwt-kernel-data-relay.readthedocs.io/>




Figure 3. Schematic of messaging in the Jupyter architecture. The Jupyter(Lab) frontend runs in the user’s browser and communicates with the server over HTTP. The server communicates with the kernels (only one shown here for clarity), which may be running on a separate network, using ZeroMQ. The frontend can communicate with kernels indirectly using “comms”, which tunnel ZeroMQ messages to the browser using WebSockets. The WWT Kernel Data Relay adds a mechanism to, in effect, tunnel HTTP requests to one or more kernels using ZeroMQ.

register themselves as handling certain HTTP requests and provides server hooks to relay those requests and their responses over the Jupyter ZeroMQ messaging system. The protocol is designed to be as minimal as possible and should be applicable to other scenarios where a Jupyter frontend needs to obtain data from a kernel over HTTP.

A further difficulty is that the default `ipykernel`<sup>10</sup> Python kernel implementation only processes most ZeroMQ messages while it is executing a code cell. If an app like WWT is being used to explore a large kernel-backed dataset, this means that data requests will pile up until the user happens to run code in the right kernel, leading to an unacceptable UX. The `pywwt` implementation of the KDR protocol patches the `ipykernel` message handler to allow “expedited” handling of specially-marked messages. The KDR server extension uses such markers to avoid this problem. An un-patched message handler will simply be oblivious to the requests for expedited handling.

## 6. Discussion

It would be inappropriate to describe the app UX paradigm as flatly “better” or “worse” than the widget paradigm. Each approach has strengths and weaknesses for various use cases. For long-lived, interactive applications, we believe that the app design has many advantages, including easy launch, a reliable and intuitive way to set up a side-by-side view of code and data, and the ability to combine data from multiple kernels. On the other hand, unlike a widget, an app cannot be serialized into a saved notebook, and

<sup>10</sup><https://github.com/ipython/ipykernel>

its UI is not visually connected with the specific lines of code that created it. Finally, widgets are probably somewhat easier to implement, although we hope that the open-source nature of the WWT JupyterLab app and new tools such as the KDR make it easier for future implementers to create apps based on WWT's example.

**Acknowledgments.** This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. OAC-2004840. Work on the AAS WorldWide Telescope project has been funded by the American Astronomical Society, the NSF, Space Telescope Science Institute, and other supporters.

## References

- Arviset, C., Navarro, V., Basso, D., Alvarez, R., Basso, D., del Rio, S., Diego, M. A., Lopez-Caniego, M., Lousa Marques, A., Marinic, F., Pereira, A., Ramons, N., & Zlobin, V. 2021, in 5th Planetary Data Workshop & Planetary Science Informatics & Analytics, vol. 2549 of LPI Contributions, 7014. URL <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2021LPICo2549.7014A>
- Djorgovski, S. G., & Williams, R. 2005, in From Clark Lake to the Long Wavelength Array: Bill Erickson's Radio Science, edited by N. Kassim, M. Perez, W. Junor, & P. Henning, vol. 345 of ASP Conf. Ser., 517. URL <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2005ASPC...345..517D>
- Fernique, P., Allen, M. G., Boch, T., Oberto, A., Pineau, F.-X., Durand, D., Bot, C., Cambr  s, L., Derriere, S., Genova, F., & Bonnarel, F. 2015, A&A, 578, A114+. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201526075>
- Fitzpatrick, M. J., Graham, M. J., Mighell, K. J., Olsen, K., Norris, P., Ridgway, S. T., Stobie, E. B., Bolton, A. S., Saha, A., & Huang, L. W. 2016, in Software and Cyberinfrastructure for Astronomy IV, edited by G. Chiozzi, & J. C. Guzman, vol. 9913 of SPIE Conference Series, 99130L. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1117/12.2233791>
- Kluyver, T., Ragan-Kelley, B., P  rez, F., Granger, B., Bussonnier, M., Frederic, J., Kelley, K., Hamrick, J., Grout, J., Corlay, S., Ivanov, P., Avila, D., Abdalla, S., Willing, C., & Jupyter Development Team 2016, in Positioning and Power in Academic Publishing: Players, Agents and Agendas, edited by F. Loizides, & B. Schmidt (IOS Press), 87–90. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-649-1-87>
- McGlynn, T., Fay, J., Wong, C., & Rosenfield, P. 2019, ApJS, 240, 22+. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aaf79e>
- O'Mullane, W., Economou, F., Huang, F., Speck, D., Chiang, H.-F., Graham, M. L., Allbery, R., Banek, C., Sick, J., Thornton, A. J., Masciarelli, J., Lim, K.-T., Mueller, F., Padolski, S., Jenness, T., Krughoff, K. S., Gower, M., Guy, L. P., & Dubois-Felsmann, G. P. 2021, in ADASS XXXI, edited by O. Smirnov (San Francisco: ASP), vol. TBD of ASP Conf. Ser., TBD. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2111.15030>
- Project Jupyter, Bussonnier, M., Forde, J., Freeman, J., Granger, B., Head, T., Holdgraf, C., Kelley, K., Nalvarte, G., Osheroff, A., Pacer, M., Panda, Y., Perez, F., Ragan-Kelley, B., & Willing, C. 2018, in Proceedings of the 17th Python in Science Conference, edited by F. Akici, D. Lippa, D. Niederhut, & M. Pacer, 113–120. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.25080/Majora-4af1f417-011>
- Raddick, J., Souter, B., Lemson, G., & Taghizadeh-Popp, M. 2017, in American Astronomical Society Meeting Abstracts #229, vol. 229, 236.15. URL <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2017AAS...22923615R>
- Rosenfield, P., Fay, J., Gilchrist, R. K., Cui, C., Weigel, A. D., Robitaille, T., Otor, O. J., & Goodman, A. 2018, ApJS, 236, 22+. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aab776>
- Taylor, M. B., Boch, T., & Taylor, J. 2015, Astronomy and Computing, 11, 81. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ascom.2014.12.007>