

AltChart: Enhancing VLM-based Chart Summarization Through Multi-Pretext Tasks

Omar Moured^{1,2}, Jiaming Zhang^{1,2,*}, M. Saquib Sarfraz¹, and Rainer Stiefelhagen^{1,2}

¹ CV:HCI lab, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany.

² ACCESS@KIT, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany.

{firstname.lastname}@kit.edu

<https://cvhci.anthropomatik.kit.edu/>

Abstract. Chart summarization is a crucial task for blind and visually impaired individuals as it is their primary means of accessing and interpreting graphical data. Crafting high-quality descriptions is challenging because it requires precise communication of essential details within the chart without vision perception. Many chart analysis methods, however, produce brief, unstructured responses that may contain significant hallucinations, affecting their reliability for blind people. To address these challenges, this work presents three key contributions: (1) We introduce the AltChart dataset, comprising 10,000 real chart images, each paired with a comprehensive summary that features long-context, and semantically rich annotations. (2) We propose a new method for pretraining Vision-Language Models (VLMs) to learn fine-grained chart representations through training with multiple pretext tasks, yielding a performance gain with $\sim 2.5\%$. (3) We conduct extensive evaluations of four leading chart summarization models, analyzing how accessible their descriptions are. Our dataset and codes are publicly available on our project page: <https://github.com/moured/AltChart>.

Keywords: Alternative Text · Text Semantics · Pretext Tasks

1 Introduction

We can find charts everywhere in newspapers, in scientific documents, and in many applications that track personal data. Charts provide compact and coherent information visualization and are often used to obtain significant insights from complex data. Given the importance and diverse use cases for charts, it's essential to guarantee equal access for a broad audience. This includes the 253 million Blind and Visually Impaired (BVI) individuals [1], who are often given no choice in understanding charts [22].

Visualizations are accessible to individuals with blindness through two methods: tactile modality, where data is rendered on printed materials with varied elevations [38,39,37]. However, the primary means by which they use is via textual

* corresponding author

summaries, commonly known as **alternative (alt) text** [55]. These summaries are embedded as hidden tags within documents’ web pages. A study [10] revealed that over 80% of these do not adhere to accessibility best practices, often neglecting to include alt text. Furthermore, even when they are available, they often don’t comply with recommended guidelines (e.g. WCAG [54], Diagram Center’s [13]) and standards (e.g. W3C [52]). Recent studies have highlighted significant deficiencies in summaries found within publications [2,9].

Chart summaries are typically derived from two sources: they are either manually created by humans or generated (semi-)automatically by AI systems. While human-generated descriptions tend to be accurate, they are often overly simplified or too complex, lacking the necessary balance for effective communication [31]. **A high-quality chart summary should clearly convey the essential details of the visualization, meeting diverse user preferences. This includes providing not only the necessary contextual information but also visual aspects** [31] (e.g., chart type, data encodings, color schemes, etc.) to accommodate different interaction styles. Authoring a high-quality chart summary is a non-trivial task [32] in both document AI and document accessibility domains.

Generated descriptions through Vision-Language (VL) models, unlike deterministic systems, are faster to obtain and require no expertise, but are highly susceptible to hallucinations [28]. Recent advancements in large VL models have significantly improved chart analysis field, enabling tasks like chart2text [23], chart2table [8], and chart2code [35], among others. However, **these models are often trained on synthetically generated datasets or existing real chart corpus, which are either limited in size or do not meet accessibility guidelines**. This limitation can result in semantically weak summaries that are brief and potentially inaccurate. To address this, our work introduces AltChart, a dataset particularly suitable for VL models with 10,000 real chart images with human-authored chart summarize, adhering to accessibility guidelines and semantically rich.

VL models have shown improvement in overall performance when scaling the pretraining corpus [53,18]. The increased sample size enables these models to learn fine-grained representations. However, the use of synthetically generated data raises concerns about model robustness and biases towards certain visualization styles [5,3]. To address these limitations, we investigate whether vision encoders could develop better representations through different training means.

Pretext tasks are among the methods that have shown promising performance in preparing models for complex tasks [45]. They challenge models to resolve smaller image-level tasks as a preliminary step before the mainstream one. Consequently, we have conducted experiments with multi-pretext tasks and found that it can achieve state-of-the-art performance on widely recognised chart summarization benchmarks. We also find that other available annotation types in datasets (e.g., bounding boxes, segmentation masks, key points, etc..) could be made useful for vision language models with pretext tasks as they can be defined accordingly.

To foster further research on chart summarization, we will make the dataset, and codes publicly available to the community. The key findings and contributions of this paper can be summarized as:

- We introduce pretext tasks to train VL models, aiming to reduce hallucinations and develop fine-grained chart representation. Our model *AltChart* achieves state-of-the-art performance in popular chart summarization benchmarks.
- We collect and publicly release the AltChart dataset serving as a benchmark for semantically rich and long-context chart descriptions. The dataset features 10,000 real chart images sourced from HCI publications, spanning 8 categories and 10 key semantics.
- We conducted extensive evaluations of 4 leading chart summarization models, analyzing the impact of structured and lengthy summaries on their performance. Our findings highlight the effectiveness of our approach in learning better visual chart representations. However, further improvements are needed in specific areas, such as panel and multivariate charts, as well as for low-resolution data.

2 Background

High-quality alternative text is characterized by its semantic richness. Semantics could be words, phrases, or sentences grouped to define the theme of the overall text. Each semantic element helps further streamline the interpretation of the described content. For example, see Figure 1. Defining and extracting these textual semantics guides the model to form a representation of the patterns that an accessible description could embody. In this work, we use the term ‘semantic’ to refer to the textual keywords as shown in the aforementioned figure.

We build on the work of Lundgard, A., et al. [23], who conducted a thorough examination of visualizations, focusing specifically on the semantic depth of effective chart descriptions. They expanded the summarization guidelines framework with a more general conceptual model covering four levels of semantic content:

- L1: Chart construction properties (e.g., axes, encodings, title).
- L2: Statistical concepts and relations (e.g., outliers, correlations, statistics).
- L3: Perceptual and cognitive phenomena (e.g., trends, patterns).
- L4: Domain-specific insights (e.g., context relevant to the data).

The study suggests two key points: Firstly, it indicates that captions should communicate key trends and statistics, while also considering the preferences of the reader. Secondly, it highlights the importance of using existing accessibility guidelines as a foundation to enrich chart summarization research.

3 Related Work

Recent attention on VL models has accelerated the development of chart summarization tasks [50,9]. In this section, we start by discussing the top related

benchmarks for this task and then explore how VL models are trained to tackle this challenge.

3.1 Existing Datasets

Table 1 lists the top five related datasets for chart summarization task. The Chart-to-Text dataset [23] compiles descriptions for charts from Pew³ and Statista⁴, covering line, bar, pie, and area charts. ChartSumm [44] expands on this by nearly doubling the dataset size and including longer summaries. However, our analysis shows that both datasets focus mainly on Statistical and Perceptual (L2L3) sentences, with 91% and 94% of their content, respectively, missing foundational visual sentences (L1). AutoChart [58], while offering a balanced mix of sentence levels through synthesized charts and template-based captions, suffers from limited variation. These datasets fall short on accessibility standards. In contrast, our dataset uses real charts and summaries collected from accessible venues, doubling the chart categories to include new challenging types like Compose and Panel charts

More recently, datasets like HCI Alt Text [9] and VisText [50] have been developed to specifically address chart summarization for BVI individuals. Both datasets are rich with L1 and L2L3 semantics. VisText creates synthetic chart images using the Vega-Lite visualization tool, then used crowdsourcing for L2L3 summarize, while machine learning models are employed for L1 captions. In contrast, HCI Alt Text compiles figures from accessibility venues, filtering for those with alternative text. However, this dataset, intended primarily for analysis, comprises only 511 chart images. This limited size makes it challenging to train effective data-driven methods. To overcome these constraints, we adopted a similar methodology to HCI Alt Text, but expanded our collection to 10,000 chart images and manually annotated them with 10 text semantics.

Table 1. Overview of the five most related datasets. Our AltChart dataset includes real-charts and real-summarize, with a broader range of categories and semantics.

Name	Data Type		Categories	Semantics	Image Count
	Images	Descriptions			
Chart-to-Text [23]	real	real	4	✗	44,085
HCI Alt Text [9]	real	real	2	2	511
ChartSumm [44]	real	mixed	3	✗	84,363
AutoChart [58]	synthetic	synthetic	3	✗	23,543
Vistext [50]	synthetic	mixed	3	2	8,822
AltChart (Ours)	real	real	8	10	10,000

³ <https://www.pewresearch.org/>

⁴ <https://www.statista.com/>

3.2 Multimodal Foundation Models

Building a pretrained multimodal foundation model typically involves two steps. First, textual inputs are encoded using a language model such as T5 [43], BERT [12], or recent architectures like Llama 2.0 [51]. Second, a vision encoder processes the input image, which may focus on parts of images [7], by using FastRCNN [46], or use recent, larger transformers (e.g, ViT [14]) that encode the entire image [26]. These models are initially trained on extensive web content for comprehension tasks such as text-to-text [16] and image-to-text [42] are mainly trained with natural images. To adapt these models for specific domain tasks, a second fine-tuning iteration is often necessary to ensure that the model develops a meaningful latent space for the targeted task. For instance, Donut [24] introduced an OCR-free Transformer, trained end-to-end for document understanding. Subsequently, Nougat [4] fine-tuned Donut, making it effective for converting academic documents into markdown language. Charts, however, present a unique challenge compared to natural images or textual documents. The complexity of user questions often involves sophisticated mathematical calculations. As a result, multimodal foundation models often struggle when addressing tasks related to charts [15].

3.3 Chart-specific Vision-language Pretraining

Recent works have addressed chart-related tasks using various techniques. Some approaches involve modifying the architecture by developing adapters to interpret charts, while others introduce more comprehensive benchmarks for fine-tuning. Matcha [27] builds upon Pix2Struct [25], incorporating numerical reasoning knowledge into the image-to-text model by learning from textual math datasets. UniChart [34] employs a visual instruction tuning approach [30] and fine-tunes the Donut base model with real charts for multiple low-level tasks (e.g., extracting table data) and high-level tasks (e.g., generating summaries). Unlike UniChart, a recent model named ChartLlama [18], based on LLaVA-1.5 [29], proposes an extensive chart-related benchmark leveraging GPT-4. This benchmark is synthetically created with multiple steps to ensure high quality.

Although these models generate generally appealing outputs for sighted individuals, they raise significant concerns regarding accessibility. It is important to remember that **while a summary accessible to blind individuals is also accessible to sighted individuals, the reverse is not necessarily true.** J. Tang and Bogust et al. [50] were the first to experiment with the abilities of VLMs to generate accessible summaries, but only with synthetically generated charts. In contrast, our proposal, AltChart, ensures that our pretraining corpus comprises real charts from accessible resources, which are semantically rich for everyone.

The aforementioned state-of-the-art approaches mainly follow a similar strategy, extending the size of the pretraining corpus, which leads to higher performance on specific benchmarks but also tends to suffer from catastrophic forgetting [6,56] and lacks consistent summary structure among similar visual inputs.

We instead question whether “less can be more.” We demonstrate in our work how pretraining vision encoders with multiple pretext tasks such as, classification and colorization, can achieve state-of-the-art performance. Pretext tasks have already shown promising performance with vision models in previous studies [21,49]. Furthermore, Pretext tasks could enable the use of other annotations format that were previously not possible to train with VLMs, such as segmentation masks. We also believe that pretext tasks could help us address challenging samples (e.g., those with high loss values) with simpler substream tasks.

4 AltChart Dataset

We analyzed five current benchmarks and developed our dataset, designed to bridge some of the identified gaps in current research. Our dataset specifically targets L1 and combines L2 and L3 to simplify the annotation process. We decided to exclude L4 from our current dataset due to the domain knowledge required beyond input chart images, such as document-level topics. With the interest to explore this level in future research.

4.1 Dataset Construction

Considering the existing limitations in available data, such as the lack of semantically rich descriptions, short descriptions, or adherence to accessibility guidelines, we dedicated efforts to creating the AltChart dataset. We began by crawling HCI publications from five ACM⁵ conferences (CHI, ASSETS, DIS, UIST, W4A) spanning 2015 to 2023. Our focus was on papers containing alt-text tags. This process yielded 8,000 PDFs and 43,510 images.

To capture high-quality images with alt-text in our corpus, we undertook three steps: (1) We fine-tuned a BERT-based classifier [12] on the HCI Alt Text dataset to determine whether the alt text corresponded to a chart and for sentence-level classification (L1/L2L3). The model achieved an F1 score of 93% on the test set. (2) We reviewed the predictions and filtered out the false positives. (3) Throughout the annotating phase, we further eliminated images lacking L1/L2L3 descriptions, those shorter than three sentences, or not adhering to alt-text guidelines (e.g., presenting incorrect information), ultimately retaining 10,000 images. These steps ensured that our corpus was semantically rich and included longer author-written descriptions. A comparison analysis was conducted to verify this, as illustrated in Table 2. We randomly split our dataset into training, validation, and test sets using chart IDs to prevent data leakage across sets, resulting in an approximate 80:10:10 ratio. Next, we discuss our dataset annotation process.

4.2 Data Annotations and Properties

For each image, we recorded the paper’s DOI, the figure number, and both the image caption and its alt-text. To annotate descriptions, we followed the

⁵ <https://dl.acm.org/conferences/>

Table 2. Comparison of three leading datasets in terms of comprehensive summarization. *AltChart* stands out with significantly higher average sentence and word counts—nearly double those of the others—and showcases the most balanced L1 to L2/L3 sentence ratio.

Dataset	Avg. Summ.		L1:L2L3 Ratio
	Sentence Count	Word Count	
ChartSumm	2.0	45.44	1.17 : 98.83
Vistext	2.26	42.6	56.2 : 43.8
HCI Alt Text	3.66	77.0	74.2 : 25.8
AltChart	5.67	136.35	44.9 : 55.1

protocol outlined by Lundgard, A., et al [31]. In a given batch of 300 images, each description was semantically tagged using 10 attributes keys as seen in Figure 1. GPT-4.0⁶ was then employed to tag the remaining descriptions. Each tagged result underwent verification by our annotators. While our primary aim in using these semantic tags was to facilitate our pretext tasks, the annotations can also be useful for analyzing the data structure and enhancing accessibility by identifying missing attributes. The AltChart dataset encompasses a range of eight chart types: line, bar, area, scatter, multivariate, panel, pie, and box charts. For clarification, multivariate and panel charts represent two new categories not previously addressed in earlier benchmarks. Multivariate charts refer to those displaying more than one data type (e.g., combining lines and bars), while panel charts (Figure 1-b) are a collection of multiple charts within a single figure sharing common elements, such as a unified legend or axis.

5 Method

Although larger datasets may improve performance, as demonstrated by several SOTA works, the critical factor is how effectively the model learns from this synthetic data. The capability of these models to handle the variations and complexities of real-world charts remains a challenging issue. With this in mind, we pose a question: **Can we improve the vision encoder hidden representations to a degree that minimizes our reliance on synthetic data?** To address this, our approach leverages pretext tasks to guide the vision encoder in capturing essential covariant and invariant chart features, thereby reducing hallucinations in descriptions. Next, we discuss the details of our pretext task implementations, as outlined in Figure 2.

5.1 Chart Pretext Tasks

An effective feature extraction process should include both covariant and invariant features [36]. Covariant features, which adapt to transformations such

⁶ <https://openai.com/gpt-4>




Fig. 1. Two chart samples from *AltChart* with their annotated summaries. Semantics are indicated by a color code, where `<semantic-name>` marks the beginning and `</semantic-name>` marks the end of the semantic segment.

as scaling or rotation (e.g., vertical axis labels, font sizes), enhance vision encoders' ability to recognize objects despite spatial changes. Meanwhile, invariant features maintain consistency by capturing key characteristics that remain constant across various scenarios (e.g., multi-line charts often include legends). This duality is crucial to ensure a comprehensive and reliable interpretation of chart images. These features, covariant and invariant, are developed through pretext tasks using both self-supervised and supervised training methods, respectively.

Self-Supervised Tasks is to learn image representations directly from pixels, without relying on predefined semantic annotations. This process typically involves applying transformations to input images and training sub-models to predict the properties of the transformation. In this work, we have chosen three traditional tasks, namely:

1. **Rotation Prediction [17]:** rotating chart images by various degrees and having a sub-model to predict the angle of rotation. This helps in learning the orientation and geometry of chart components.
2. **Jigsaw Puzzle Solving [40]:** scrambling charts to multiple segments and training a sub-model to reorder them correctly. This teaches the model about the spatial relationships within chart elements.




Fig. 2. Overview of our vision encoder’s training approach, starting from the top-left with tasks including puzzle solving, colorization, rotation, and classification. Sample outputs for each corresponding task are shown on the bottom-right of the figure.

3. **Colorization [57]:** feeding grayscale chart images into a sub-model for colorization. This helps in developing features that distinguish between chart components (e.g., different pies in a pie chart).

Supervised Tasks defined as the utilization of a small amount of labelled data to capture consistent representations. Given the chart analysis topic, different datasets provide varying types of annotations. For example, AltChart and Vistext lack pixel-level semantic annotations, while the Chart-to-Text benchmark offers bounding box annotations for text. To ensure applicability across all benchmarks, we leverage the classification of chart categories task. However, one may explore additional approaches, such as masked element identification, when segmentations or bounding boxes are available.

5.2 Implementation Details

All pretext tasks need to be evaluated against quantitative metrics to ensure their effectiveness. To facilitate this evaluation, we employ a shallow backbone network complemented by a task-specific head. In the following sections, we will detail the transformation functions, sub-models, and our formation of the loss function.

Transformation Functions. Given an image I , we apply the transformation functions $g(\cdot)$, $f(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$ to generate a transformed image and corresponding ground-truth labels for rotation, puzzle solving, and colorization tasks, respectively.

For rotation, the image undergoes one of four rotational levels: 0° , 90° , 180° , and 270° . This process follows the methodology described in [17], where the network is tasked with identifying the correct rotation angle. In the puzzle-solving

task, the image is divided into a 3x3 grid, resulting in nine 64x64 pixel patches. To avoid overfitting, each patch’s location is randomly jittered by up to seven pixels, in line with the approach of N. Mehdi et al. [40], thus creating nine distinct 64x64 pixel tiles. We define 100 possible permutations (puzzle configurations), each associated with a unique index. The function $f(\cdot)$ outputs the nine image tiles along with the index of the corresponding permutation, serving as the ground-truth label. The model’s objective is to accurately classify the correct permutation index. For the colorization operation, the image is transformed into a grayscale image using the formula $\frac{R+G+B}{3}$ as in [11], and the sub-model is trained to predict the a and b color channels in the CIE Lab color space. The development of the loss function for these operations is discussed in the following section.

Loss Function. three pretexts and one supervised task are present in our formulations. three of which; rotation, puzzle solving, and the supervised tasks end with a softmax activation layer hence we utilized the traditional Cross-Entropy Loss $\mathcal{L}_{rotation}$, \mathcal{L}_{puzzle} and \mathcal{L}_{categ} respectively to output probability values between 0 and 1. For the colorization we utilized the conditional GAN loss \mathcal{L}_{cGAN} with regression mean absolute error loss \mathcal{L}_{L1} as proposed in Pix2Pix [20]. Given N images in a batch, The colorization loss \mathcal{L}_{color} is then computed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cGAN}(G, D) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log D(I_g^i, I_{ab}^i) + \log (1 - D(I_g^i, G(I_g^i, z))) \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{L1}(G) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |I_{ab}^i - G(I_g^i, z)| \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{color} = \mathcal{L}_{cGAN}(G, D) + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{L1}(G) \quad (3)$$

In Equation 1, the generator, G , takes a grayscale image I_g^i and produces a 2-channel image I_{ab} . The discriminator, D , concatenates both images to decide whether they are fake or real. It’s important to note that both models are conditioned on the grayscale image, meaning the noise vector is omitted [20]. The mean absolute error $\mathcal{L}_{L1}(G)$ in Equation 2 aims for pixel-wise comparison between the generated image and the ground truth to introduce a form of self-supervision. Since $L1$ has been shown to produce contrastive results , the parameter α is introduced to balance its overall impact. Our final loss \mathcal{L}_{total} is formed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{total} = \gamma_1 \mathcal{L}_{color} + \gamma_2 \mathcal{L}_{rotation} + \gamma_3 \mathcal{L}_{puzzle} + \gamma_4 \mathcal{L}_{categ} \quad (4)$$

In calculating the total loss, we sum each one with its respective gamma parameter γ_{1-4} , allowing us to fine-tune their contributions.

Convolutional network. In our experiments, we utilize a ResNet-18 network [19]. Two modifications are applied: (1) The standard 3-channel convolutional layer input is adjusted to align with the vision encoder output’s shape (2) After the final FC layer, following the final FC (Fully Connected) layer, we implement average pooling and linearly project the output to match the number of classes for each specific pretext task. For the colorization task, a U-Net decoder [47] is concatenated to the vision encoder to function as the generator. The discriminator is again a ResNet-18.

Hyperparameters. For our pretext tasks, we use a default image resolution of 224×224 , unless specified otherwise. We set the parameter $\alpha = 100$ in Equation 3 and an equal impact for all losses, $\gamma_{1-4} = 0.25$ in Equation 4. Both the ResNet and the U-Net decoder are initialized with their pre-trained weights, obtained from MMpretrain⁷ and MMsegmentation⁸ respectively.

6 Experiment

In this section, we conduct both quantitative and qualitative comparisons of four SOTA methods against AltChart.

6.1 Experimental Setups

In this study, we conducted all training processes on a cluster equipped with four NVIDIA-40 GPUs. We utilized publicly available source code from GitHub for each model. Initially, all models were trained on the Chart-2-Text dataset. We then fine-tuned these pre-trained models on the other datasets listed in Table 3 (Vistext and AltChart), with the exception of our baseline model, which is described subsequently. For fine-tuning, the training epochs were set to 5, and the LoRa adapter was employed. We did not alter the input resolution for any of the approaches from their initial configurations. Each experimental run took approximately 8-10 hours to complete.

6.2 Baselines & Evaluation Metrics

We compare our model against four baselines: (1) Vistext [50], a VL-T5-based model that achieves SOTA results in generating accessible chart summaries. (2) Matcha [27], an adaptation of Pix2Struct for charts, pre-trained on mathematical reasoning and chart data extraction tasks. (3) UniChart [34], a model based on Donut [24], further pre-trained on multiple chart analysis tasks, achieving SOTA on Chart-2-Text [23] and ChartQA [33]. (4) ChartLLama [18], a fine-tuned LLaVA 1.5 [29] model trained on a large chart corpus synthetically generated with GPT-4.

⁷ <https://github.com/open-mmlab/mmpretrain>

⁸ <https://github.com/open-mmlab/msegmentation>

To conduct the comparison on our benchmarks, we first reproduced and ran inference with each of the baseline models, evaluating their summarization performance using the BLEU score [41]. Furthermore, given that the BLEU score primarily focuses on n-gram matching between the generated and reference texts, it may overlook essential aspects such as semantic similarity, informativeness, and factual correctness [48]. Hence, we also performed a qualitative evaluation and error analysis of the outputs.

6.3 Training Details

As a baseline, we utilized the Donut model, primarily chosen for its relatively low number of parameters, scaling to millions, in contrast to the LLaVA model, which scales to billions. Initially, we employed the base Donut weights, pre-trained for text reading tasks as an alternative to OCR engines. These base weights cannot comprehend chart images. We initially train the transformer encoder for 3 epochs on pretext tasks as previously described, followed by training the entire model (vision+language components) for an additional 2 epochs on summarization tasks.

Table 3. Results of state-of-the-art methods on three datasets of chart summarization. The number of training parameters reported.

Model	#Params	VisText			Chart-2-Text			AltChart		
		L1	L2/L3	avg.	Pew	Statista	avg.	L1	L2/L3	avg.
Vistext - image guided [50]	224M	9.0	2.0	5.5	14.2	44.2	29.2	-	-	-
Matcha	282M	6.0	4.0	5.0	12.2	39.4	25.8	16.5	8.0	12.2
Unichart	201M	6.3	5.2	5.75	12.4	38.2	25.3	22.7	13.9	18.3
ChartLLama - 13B	500M	35.0	6.0	20.5	14.2	40.7	27.45	35.0	14.2	24.6
Ours (AltChart)	180M	37.6	5.6	21.6	15.1	46.0	30.55	44.1	14.6	29.3

6.4 Comparison of State-of-the-Art Models

Our novel chart summarization model achieves state-of-the-art performance on diverse datasets, pushing the boundaries of both efficiency and quality. As shown in Table 3, we evaluate our method against different chart models, such as MatCha, UniChart, and ChartLlama on three datasets: VisText, Chart-2-text, and our proposed AltChart. Each dataset offers unique challenges, with VisText and AltChart testing different summarization levels and Chart-2-text utilizing data from two distinct sources: Pew and Statista. Despite having fewer trainable parameters (180M) than other text-based models, our approach boasts superior efficiency and adaptability. It readily applies to different benchmarks and swiftly trains for downstream tasks.

Apart from the significant efficiency, our method has outstanding performance, yielding state-of-the-art scores on all three datasets. For instance, on

VisText, it delivers a remarkable 37.6% score on L1 test, outperforming ChartLlama by 2.6%, and achieves exceptional results on L2/L3 test. Similar success manifests in the Chart-2-text dataset, where it scores 15.1% and 46.0% across the two data sources. It shows the generalizability of the proposed method. Our proposed AltChart dataset unveils the potential of our method. In the structured summarization test, it surpasses the previous best score by 9.06% (reach 44.1% on L1) and obtains a best 14.6% on the more challenging L2/L3 test. These remarkable improvements across diverse datasets showcase the effectiveness and generalizability of our pre-training method. Our model sets a new standard for both efficiency and quality in chart summarization.

<p style="text-align: center;">Input Image</p> <p>Blacks give greater priority to criminal justice reform than whites, Hispanics</p> <p><i>% who say reforming the criminal justice system should be a top priority ...</i></p> <p>Source: Survey conducted Jan. 7-14, 2016. Whites and blacks included only those who are not Hispanic; Hispanics are of any race. (N=96 for black respondents.)</p> <p>PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	UniChart	According to a survey conducted by the Pew Research Center, blacks give greater priority to criminal justice reform than whites. Specifically, 73% of blacks prioritize criminal justice reform as a top priority, while only 44% of whites prioritize it. Hispanics prioritize criminal justice reform as a top priority, while only 48% of Hispanics prioritize it as a priority. The chart shows that the majority of blacks. The chart reveals a top priority, with only 39% of them as a top priority, where Hispanics, where Hispanics priorities, where Hispanics priorities, where Hispanics
	ChartLLama	The data indicates a significant divergence in the perception of prioritizing the reform of the criminal justice system among different racial groups. A striking 73% of blacks express the view that this should be a top priority, contrasting with 48% of Hispanics and merely 39% of whites who share the same sentiment.
	AltChart (Ours)	The image displays a horizontal bar chart from a Pew Research Center survey conducted from January 7-14, 2016. The chart, titled "Blacks give greater priority to criminal justice reform than whites, Hispanics." It shows that 73% of Black respondents view criminal justice reform as a top priority, significantly higher compared to 39% of White and 48% of Hispanic respondents. Overall, 44% of the total survey participants consider it a top priority.

Fig. 3. Qualitative analysis of chart summarization.

6.5 Qualitative Analysis

To present the qualitative results of the proposed AltChart benchmark, we conduct a visualization comparison in Fig. 3. The visualization showcases a chart summarization example from the proposed AltChart dataset, comparing our method with other models like UniChart and ChartLlama. Each case displays the input chart image followed by summaries generated by all three models. On the left side of the visualization is the same input chart image that is a horizontal bar chart, and on the right side from top to bottom are the prediction from UniChart, ChartLLama, and ours. Among them, UniChart made some wrong description about this chart, such as “44% of whites” is incorrect. UniChart struggles in this case, producing repetitive and unclear summaries. ChartLlama also falters, offering basic and incomplete descriptions that miss key details like the total value. In contrast, our method delivers accurate and detailed summaries for the input bar chart. For instance, it can correctly identify the chart type as “horizontal bar chart” and timeframe “January 7-14, 2016”. Apart from that, our method can provide insightful descriptions such as “Overall, 44% of the total survey participants consider it a top priority”. This comparative analysis

demonstrates our model’s ability to generate precise and comprehensive chart summaries, surpassing the capabilities of existing methods.

6.6 Ablation Study

To isolate the impact of our proposed pre-training tasks on chart summarization performance, we conduct an ablation study on the proposed AltChart dataset. As shown in Table 4, we divide the experiments into two groups: self-supervised and supervised training, allowing for clear comparisons between different pre-training paradigms. The reported score is the average from the L1 and L2/L3 summarizations. Self-supervised training can achieve a score of 27.9%, while supervised training alone can reach 25.3%. This 2.6% gain highlights the effectiveness of self-supervised learning in enriching the model’s understanding of charts. Pushing the boundaries further, our combined approach that leverages both self-supervised and supervised training delivered the best score of 29.35% in structured chart summarization. This significant improvement proves the effectiveness of our carefully designed prefix tasks in propelling the model towards superior performance.

Table 4. Ablation study of the prefix tasks. Accuracy measured as the ratio of correct predictions to total predictions.

Self-supervised	Supervised	Result (avg L123)
✓		27.90
	✓	25.30
✓	✓	29.35

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce AltChart, a SOTA chart summarization model that generates rich, accessible summaries. We employ pretext tasks as a pretraining technique for our model, without significant reliance on synthetic data. Our method facilitates the use of various annotation formats during the training process to acquire robust feature representations, which were absent in previous in earlier models. Additionally, we present the AltChart dataset, which is so far the largest accessibility-compliant, real chart summarization dataset with rich semantics. This dataset can be further utilized for other tasks, such as recommendation and classification systems. While our model sets a new record on the chart summarization tasks, the evaluation also suggests opportunities for further improvement.

Limitations Nonetheless, our model faces several limitations. Despite being trained with twice the number of chart categories, the model still tends to hallucinate and produce factually incorrect statements, especially with visually complex charts, such as those with many lines, bars, or 3x3 panel charts. Therefore, there is a need for more generalizable chart models that can accurately interpret the diverse range of charts found in documents. Future directions may focus on enhancing the vision encoders, as they are the first component to digest the image.

Due to the limited, time-constrained computing resources, we didn't investigate how each pretext task affects the overall model performance. Furthermore, our experimentation was limited to training a single-vision encoder using a two-step training strategy. However, future work could include pretext tasks as part of an end-to-end training cycle and explore different vision encoders, such as CLIP. Finally, we believe that undertaking a robustness benchmark is a necessary measure, particularly considering the use of these models by blind and visually impaired individuals. We aim to carry out this investigation in our forthcoming research.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank the HoreKa computing cluster at KIT for the computing resources used to conduct this research. We also thank everyone from CVHCI lab who contributed to the annotation phase.

Disclosure of Interests. The first author has received a fund grant from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant No.861166.

References

1. Ackland, P., Resnikoff, S., Bourne, R.: World blindness and visual impairment: despite many successes, the problem is growing. *Community eye health* **30**(100), 71 (2017)
2. Alam, M.Z.I., Islam, S., Hoque, E.: Seechart: Enabling accessible visualizations through interactive natural language interface for people with visual impairments. In: *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. pp. 46–64 (2023)
3. Bansal, H., Grover, A.: Leaving reality to imagination: Robust classification via generated datasets. In: *ICLR 2023 Workshop on Trustworthy and Reliable Large-Scale Machine Learning Models* (2023)
4. Blecher, L., Cucurull, G., Scialom, T., Stojnic, R.: Nougat: Neural optical understanding for academic documents. In: *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations* (2023)
5. Cascante-Bonilla, P., Shehada, K., Smith, J.S., Doveh, S., Kim, D., Panda, R., Varol, G., Oliva, A., Ordonez, V., Feris, R., et al.: Going beyond nouns with vision & language models using synthetic data. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. pp. 20155–20165 (2023)
6. Chen, S., Hou, Y., Cui, Y., Che, W., Liu, T., Yu, X.: Recall and learn: Fine-tuning deep pretrained language models with less forgetting. In: *Proceedings of the 2020*

- Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP). pp. 7870–7881 (2020)
7. Chen, Y.C., Li, L., Yu, L., El Kholy, A., Ahmed, F., Gan, Z., Cheng, Y., Liu, J.: Uniter: Universal image-text representation learning. In: European conference on computer vision. pp. 104–120. Springer (2020)
 8. Cheng, Z.Q., Dai, Q., Hauptmann, A.G.: Chartreader: A unified framework for chart derendering and comprehension without heuristic rules. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 22202–22213 (2023)
 9. Chintalapati, S.S., Bragg, J., Wang, L.L.: A dataset of alt texts from hci publications: Analyses and uses towards producing more descriptive alt texts of data visualizations in scientific papers. In: Proceedings of the 24th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility. pp. 1–12 (2022)
 10. Commission, D.R.: The web: Access and inclusion for disabled people; a formal investigation. The Stationery Office (2004)
 11. Deshpande, A., Rock, J., Forsyth, D.: Learning large-scale automatic image colorization. In: Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision. pp. 567–575 (2015)
 12. Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In: Burstein, J., Doran, C., Solorio, T. (eds.) Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers). pp. 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota (Jun 2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423>, <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423>
 13. Diagram Center: Specific guidelines – graphs. <http://diagramcenter.org/specific-guidelines-e.html> (2022)
 14. Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., et al.: An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (2020)
 15. Farahani, A.M., Adibi, P., Darvishy, A., Ehsani, M.S., Hutter, H.P.: Automatic chart understanding: a review. *IEEE Access* (2023)
 16. Floridi, L., Chiriatti, M.: Gpt-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines* **30**, 681–694 (2020)
 17. Gidaris, S., Singh, P., Komodakis, N.: Unsupervised representation learning by predicting image rotations (2018)
 18. Han, Y., Zhang, C., Chen, X., Yang, X., Wang, Z., Yu, G., Fu, B., Zhang, H.: Chartllama: A multimodal llm for chart understanding and generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16483 (2023)
 19. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Deep residual learning for image recognition. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 770–778 (2016)
 20. Isola, P., Zhu, J.Y., Zhou, T., Efros, A.A.: Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks (2018)
 21. Jaiswal, A., Babu, A.R., Zadeh, M.Z., Banerjee, D., Makedon, F.: A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning. *Technologies* **9**(1), 2 (2020)
 22. Jung, C., Mehta, S., Kulkarni, A., Zhao, Y., Kim, Y.S.: Communicating visualizations without visuals: Investigation of visualization alternative text for people with visual impairments (2021)

23. Kantharaj, S., Leong, R.T., Lin, X., Masry, A., Thakkar, M., Hoque, E., Joty, S.: Chart-to-text: A large-scale benchmark for chart summarization. In: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 4005–4023 (2022)
24. Kim, G., Hong, T., Yim, M., Nam, J., Park, J., Yim, J., Hwang, W., Yun, S., Han, D., Park, S.: Ocr-free document understanding transformer. In: European Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 498–517 (2022)
25. Lee, K., Joshi, M., Turc, I.R., Hu, H., Liu, F., Eisenschlos, J.M., Khandelwal, U., Shaw, P., Chang, M.W., Toutanova, K.: Pix2struct: Screenshot parsing as pretraining for visual language understanding. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 18893–18912. PMLR (2023)
26. Li, J., Li, D., Xiong, C., Hoi, S.: Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 12888–12900. PMLR (2022)
27. Liu, F., Piccinno, F., Krichene, S., Pang, C., Lee, K., Joshi, M., Altun, Y., Collier, N., Eisenschlos, J.M.: Matcha: Enhancing visual language pretraining with math reasoning and chart derendering (2023)
28. Liu, H., Xue, W., Chen, Y., Chen, D., Zhao, X., Wang, K., Hou, L., Li, R., Peng, W.: A survey on hallucination in large vision-language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00253 (2024)
29. Liu, H., Li, C., Li, Y., Lee, Y.J.: Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning (2023)
30. Liu, H., Li, C., Wu, Q., Lee, Y.J.: Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **36** (2024)
31. Lundgard, A., Satyanarayan, A.: Accessible visualization via natural language descriptions: A four-level model of semantic content. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* **28**(1), 1073–1083 (2021)
32. Mack, K., Cutrell, E., Lee, B., Morris, M.R.: Designing tools for high-quality alt text authoring. In: Proceedings of the 23rd International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility. pp. 1–14 (2021)
33. Masry, A., Do, X.L., Tan, J.Q., Joty, S., Hoque, E.: Chartqa: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022. pp. 2263–2279 (2022)
34. Masry, A., Kavehzadeh, P., Do, X.L., Hoque, E., Joty, S.: Unichart: A universal vision-language pretrained model for chart comprehension and reasoning. In: Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 14662–14684 (2023)
35. Meng, F., Shao, W., Lu, Q., Gao, P., Zhang, K., Qiao, Y., Luo, P.: Chartassisstant: A universal chart multimodal language model via chart-to-table pre-training and multitask instruction tuning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02384 (2024)
36. Misra, I., Maaten, L.v.d.: Self-supervised learning of pretext-invariant representations. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 6707–6717 (2020)
37. Moured, O., Alzalabny, S., Schwarz, T., Rapp, B., Stiefelwagen, R.: Accessible document layout: An interface for 2d tactile displays. In: Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Pervasive Technologies Related to Assistive Environments. pp. 265–271 (2023)
38. Moured, O., Baumgarten-Egemole, M., Müller, K., Roitberg, A., Schwarz, T., Stiefelwagen, R.: Chart4blind: An intelligent interface for chart accessibility conversion. In: Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces. pp. 504–514 (2024)

39. Moured, O., Zhang, J., Roitberg, A., Schwarz, T., Stiefelhagen, R.: Line graphics digitization: A step towards full automation. In: International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition. pp. 438–453. Springer (2023)
40. Noroozi, M., Favaro, P.: Unsupervised learning of visual representations by solving jigsaw puzzles (2017)
41. Post, M.: A call for clarity in reporting bleu scores. In: Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers. pp. 186–191 (2018)
42. Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., et al.: Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In: International conference on machine learning. pp. 8748–8763. PMLR (2021)
43. Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., Liu, P.J.: Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **21**(1), 5485–5551 (2020)
44. Rahman, R., Hasan, R., Farhad, A.A.: ChartSumm: A large scale benchmark for Chart to Text Summarization. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE), Islamic University of . . . (2022)
45. Rani, V., Nabi, S.T., Kumar, M., Mittal, A., Kumar, K.: Self-supervised learning: A succinct review. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering* **30**(4), 2761–2775 (2023)
46. Ren, S., He, K., Girshick, R., Sun, J.: Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **28** (2015)
47. Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., Brox, T.: U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation (2015)
48. Sai, A.B., Mohankumar, A.K., Khapra, M.M.: A survey of evaluation metrics used for nlg systems. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* **55**(2), 1–39 (2022)
49. Schiappa, M.C., Rawat, Y.S., Shah, M.: Self-supervised learning for videos: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys* **55**(13s), 1–37 (2023)
50. Tang, B., Boggust, A., Satyanarayan, A.: Vistext: A benchmark for semantically rich chart captioning. In: Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 7268–7298 (2023)
51. Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al.: Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023)
52. W3C: Standards. <https://www.w3.org/standards/> (2022)
53. Wang, Z., Li, J., Hong, Y., Wang, Y., Wu, Q., Bansal, M., Gould, S., Tan, H., Qiao, Y.: Scaling data generation in vision-and-language navigation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 12009–12020 (2023)
54. Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG): Complex images. <https://www.w3.org/WAI/tutorials/images/complex/> (2022)
55. WebAIM: Screen reader user survey 9 results. <https://webaim.org/projects/screenreadersurvey9/> (2021)
56. Xu, Y., Zhong, X., Yepes, A.J.J., Lau, J.H.: Forget me not: Reducing catastrophic forgetting for domain adaptation in reading comprehension. In: 2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN). pp. 1–8. IEEE (2020)
57. Zhang, R., Isola, P., Efros, A.A.: Colorful image colorization (2016)
58. Zhu, J., Ran, J., Lee, R.K.W., Li, Z., Choo, K.: Autochart: A dataset for chart-to-text generation task. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing (RANLP 2021). pp. 1636–1644 (2021)