

Map2Text: New Content Generation from Low-Dimensional Visualizations

Xingjian Zhang[†], Ziyang Xiong[†], Shixuan Liu[†], Yutong Xie[†],
 Tolga Ergen[‡], Dongsub Shim[‡], Hua Xu[§], Honglak Lee^{†,‡}, Qiaozhu Mei[†]
[†]University of Michigan, [‡]LG AI Research, [§]Yale University
 {jimmyzsj,xzyang,shixuanl,yutxie,qmei}@umich.edu,{tergen,dshim}.lgai@gmail.com
 honglak@eecs.umich.edu,hua.xu@yale.edu




Figure 1: Illustration of a MAP2TEXT task which generates new content based on a 2D projection map. The figure provides an example of generating new red-teaming strategies for testing large language models. Given a low-dimensional visualization precomputed from certain text corpora and a query position (green dot), MAP2TEXT challenges a model to generate new, coherent, and meaningful textual content that would correspond to that location in the visualization.

Abstract

Low-dimensional visualizations, or "projection maps" of datasets are widely used across scientific research and creative industries as effective tools for interpreting large-scale and complex information. These visualizations not only support understanding existing knowledge spaces but are often used implicitly to guide exploration into unknown areas. While powerful methods like TSNE or UMAP can create such visual maps, there is currently no systematic way to leverage them for generating new content. To bridge this gap, we introduce MAP2TEXT, a novel task that translates spatial coordinates within low-dimensional visualizations into new, coherent, and accurately aligned textual content. This allows users to explore and navigate undiscovered information embedded in these spatial layouts interactively and intuitively. To evaluate the performance of MAP2TEXT methods, we propose Atometric, an evaluation metric that provides a granular assessment of logical coherence and alignment of the atomic statements in the generated texts. Experiments conducted across various datasets demonstrate the versatility of MAP2TEXT in generating scientific research hypotheses, crafting synthetic personas, and devising strategies for testing large language models. Our findings highlight the potential of MAP2TEXT to unlock new pathways for interacting with and navigating large-scale textual datasets, offering a novel framework for spatially guided content generation and discovery.

Keywords

Textual Visualization, Spatially Guided Content Generation, Text Generation Evaluation.

1 Introduction

Low-dimensional visualizations, or "projection" maps, are powerful tools that help users understand large textual corpora, much like maps aid in navigating physical landscapes. Typically, these visualizations are created by first generating high-dimensional embeddings using text embedding models (e.g., [27]), followed by dimension reduction algorithms such as TSNE [40], LargeVis [38], or UMAP [24]. This process results in a 2D (or 3D) map that preserves semantic relationships between texts, enabling users to intuitively explore complex datasets and identify interesting patterns [22, 29, 39, 41, 45]. This utility raises an intriguing question: much like how people use geographical maps to explore new territories, **can we use these visualizations not only to navigate existing knowledge but also to generate new content?**

This is the central idea behind our proposed task, **MAP2TEXT**. More specifically, MAP2TEXT aims to generate textual content corresponding to a given position within a low-dimensional visualization map. The fundamental assumption that MAP2TEXT relies on is that semantically similar texts are positioned close together on a low-dimensional visualization, creating a "map" that conveys rich contextual information beyond the individual texts themselves. By leveraging this spatial context, MAP2TEXT aims to guide the generation of new, coherent, and meaningful content.

Many downstream applications could benefit from MAP2TEXT. In scientific idea generation [12, 42, 48], researchers can select positions on the visualization map where concepts are converging or underexplored. By generating text corresponding to these research gaps, MAP2TEXT can inspire novel research directions and foster innovation. Another promising application is to test the safety and robustness of systems, including large language models (LLMs), which continuously benefits from new adversarial tests [10, 32]. Typically, developing new red teaming strategies relies on expert knowledge, which requires intensive learning processes and is not scalable. With MAP2TEXT, security experts could navigate visualizations of existing adversarial attempts and generate new strategies at scale to identify and mitigate vulnerabilities in LLMs. Overall, MAP2TEXT could be a valuable tool for any field that relies on continuous innovation and new content generation, through enabling the exploration into uncovered regions in an information space.

The MAP2TEXT task presents several significant challenges. First, the process of reducing high-dimensional text embeddings to a two-dimensional map often introduce distortions and ambiguities in spatial representation. These artifacts may lead to inaccuracies when mapping back from a 2D point to the high-dimensional semantic space, affecting the relevance and coherence of the generated text [34]. Second, modeling text generation conditional on specific locations in the embedding space is non-trivial. Developing models that effectively integrate spatial information into the text generation process is essential to ensure that the output aligns with the intended semantics [13]. Third, evaluating the quality and relevance of the generated content poses a challenge. Traditional evaluation metrics may not adequately capture the alignment between the generated text and its intended position on the map, necessitating the development of new evaluation frameworks [11]. Fourth, scalability and computational resource constraints are significant considerations. Handling large textual corpora and generating real-time responses based on user-selected points on the map can be computationally intensive, requiring optimization of algorithms for efficiency without compromising accuracy. Addressing these challenges is critical for the successful implementation and practical application of the MAP2TEXT task.

Along this direction, we make the following initial contributions:

- We introduce MAP2TEXT, a novel task of generating text given positions on a visualization map, transforming existing visualization maps into tools for new content creation¹.
- We propose ATOMETRIC, a reasoning-based evaluation metric that uses atomic statements to evaluate text generation quality at multiple levels of strictness².
- We demonstrate MAP2TEXT’s potential on four datasets, benchmarking the performance of seven candidate models and human baselines. We obtain interesting findings and showcase the potential of MAP2TEXT across domains.

Organization. The remaining sections are organized as follows: Section 2 defines the problem formulation of MAP2TEXT. Section 3 introduces the proposed evaluation metric, ATOMETRIC. Section 4 presents the experimental setup and results across multiple datasets.

¹Code to replicate our experiments can be found at the following anonymous repo: <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/map2text-27FD>

²<https://anonymous.4open.science/r/atometric-17A3/>

Section 5 reviews related work, and finally, Section 6 discusses some limitations of the paper and outlines future research directions.

2 MAP2TEXT: A New Task

In this section, we introduce the formulation of MAP2TEXT and its evaluation framework.

2.1 Problem Definition

Let \mathcal{V} represent a low-dimensional projection of a text corpus $\mathcal{D} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\}$, where $s_i \in \mathcal{S}$ is the i -th text entry and \mathcal{S} denotes the set of all possible text strings. For each text entry s_i , \mathcal{V} includes a corresponding low-dimensional (e.g., 2D) position $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$, forming a set of positions $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\}$. The visualization \mathcal{V} is typically derived from \mathcal{D} using a mapping function $f: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ that jointly maps each text entry s_i to its position \mathbf{x}_i . This mapping function f typically integrates a high-dimensional text embedding model and a dimensionality reduction algorithm. However, in many practical situations, the visualizations are pre-computed and the details of the mapping function f are unavailable to the users. Even when f is known, reconstructing the visualization pipeline from scratch can be computationally expensive and subject to randomness. Thus, we assume no access to f but rely on the assumption of *locality preservation*—points close to each other in the low-dimensional space \mathcal{X} correspond to semantically similar text in the high-dimensional space \mathcal{S} . This allows us to use proximity in the 2D projection as a guide for generating contextually relevant text without requiring the original mapping function f .

Definition. The MAP2TEXT task is defined as follows: given a query position $\mathbf{x}_q \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that has not been occupied by an existing text entry, a model g is tasked with generating a text entry \hat{s} that corresponds to \mathbf{x}_q . Specifically, the generated text \hat{s} should be semantically and logically aligned with the ground truth text $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Here, a ground truth s is a text entry that would have been mapped to \mathbf{x}_q by the original mapping function f . Thus, the objective of the MAP2TEXT task is to effectively learn an inverse mapping $g = \widehat{f^{-1}}: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ that reconstructs the relationship between the provided visualization and text entries.

2.2 Potential Solutions

Given the typical pipeline of f , there are multiple natural designs, each offering a distinct process on how to reconstruct text entries from low dimensional space.

The most straightforward approach is to directly learn an inverse mapping from the 2D positions to the corresponding text entries, requiring the model to memorize the entire visualization map, associate each position with its corresponding text, and generalize the learned relationship to unoccupied positions. This could be achieved by fine-tuning a pre-trained language model that takes the input of a 2D coordinate and outputs a text string. This process can be described as $g: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$.

If high-dimensional embeddings of the text corpus are available, we could introduce an intermediate step by mapping the 2D positions to a high-dimensional textual embedding space before reconstructing the text. This can be achieved using a neural network.




Figure 2: An illustrative example of ATOMETRIC on generating new red teaming strategies for LLMs. ATOMETRIC decomposes the generated text into a set of atomic statements, which are individually compared against the reference text to evaluate how well each statement is supported under different levels of strictness—thereby measuring the “precision” of the generated text. Conversely, the reference text can be decomposed and compared against the generated text to assess “recall”. Both decomposition and verification processes are automated using LLMs with a prompt template, detailed in Appendix B.

The embedding is then decoded back into text using an embedding inversion model such as the `vec2text` model [26] (note that an embedding inversion model requires access to the original embedding model $f_e : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^H$). This approach can be expressed as $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^H \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, where \mathbb{R}^H denotes the High-dimensional embedding space.

Another approach may first generate an initial textual description or of the 2D position. This description is then be used to generate the final text, which can be done through prompting a language model. In this case, the inverse mapping is decomposed into two stages: first, the model constructs a preliminary text prompt, then uses this prompt to generate the final output, which could be described as $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$.

A more detailed description and analysis of these methods and their performance is provided in Section 4.

2.3 Evaluation Framework

Like other tasks of new content generation, evaluating the MAP2TEXT task presents unique challenges due to the lack of ground-truth content at *arbitrary*, previously *unexplored* positions. While domain experts could compare the quality and accuracy of generated contents given specific query positions, this *online* process is not scalable and thus unsuitable for automatic benchmarking.

To overcome this, we adopt an *offline* benchmarking approach by partitioning a precomputed visualization \mathcal{V} into a training set and a testing set. In this approach, the training set includes both original text entries and their corresponding positions in the 2D map. This allows the model to understand the relationship between the text and positions. In contrast, for the testing set, only the positions are made available to the model, serving as query points for which the model generates the associated text. The generated text is then

compared against the ground-truth text held out from the original visualization, which serves as a gold standard reference.

This framework addresses the scalability issue of human judgment but faces another challenge in aligning the generated content with the reference text. For instance, the generated text might use different wording or phrasing while still conveying the same underlying idea as in the reference. Traditional lexical-level metrics may fail to capture such equivalence, penalizing otherwise valid outputs. This motivates the proposal of ATOMETRIC, an evaluation metric designed to assess semantic and logical alignment between the generated and reference texts across varying levels of strictness.

3 ATOMETRIC: A New Evaluation Metric

A key challenge of evaluating MAP2TEXT is to identify an appropriate metric that accurately assesses the alignment between the generated content \hat{s} and the gold standard reference s in our specific context. We outline the essential requirements for such a metric and introduce a novel metric tailored to meet these criteria.

3.1 Motivation

Unlike traditional content generation tasks, which aims to replicate ground-truth texts, MAP2TEXT requires evaluating whether the generated content is capable of inspiring the user to explore the map in a similar way—despite how much the surface expressions match or differ, the generated content must accurately reflect the semantic relationships and logical structures of reference content.

Existing evaluation metrics struggle to capture the semantic and logical complexity required for the MAP2TEXT task. Traditional metrics such as ROUGE [19] and BLEU [31] rely on lexical-level n-gram overlaps, penalizing legitimate variations in phrasing and structure even when the generated content accurately conveys the same meaning. Recent metrics like BERTScore [46] and BLEURT [37]

address some of these limitations by using contextual embeddings to measure semantic similarity. However, these metrics lack interpretability, as they offer a high-level similarity scores without explaining the nuances of why certain outputs are deemed similar or dissimilar. Moreover, these metrics evaluate holistic sentence- or paragraph-level similarity, neglecting the internal coherence of fine-grained statements. This limitation is crucial for MAP2TEXT, where maintaining the precise relationships and logical structures between entities is critical.

3.2 Features

To address the limitations of existing metrics, we propose **Atometric**, a novel metric specifically designed to evaluate the semantic and logical coherence of generated content in the MAP2TEXT task. An illustrative example of ATOMETRIC is shown in Figure 2. ATOMETRIC has the following features:

Atomic Statement Alignment. Inspired by FActScore [25], ATOMETRIC focuses on the alignment of atomic statements—the fundamental units of meaning that express relationships between entities and actions within a text. By directly evaluating these atomic statements instead of the complex full texts or fragmented ngrams, ATOMETRIC assesses whether the generated content preserves the logical relationships and semantic properties present in the reference.

Multiple Levels of Strictness. ATOMETRIC introduces multiple strictness levels to capture nuanced levels of alignment. Inspired by definitions in textual entailment [3, 35, 44], these strictness levels offer varying degrees of relevance, from direct support to more relaxed criteria such as topic relevance. This flexibility ensures that the metric can accommodate the inherent variability of natural language while remaining faithful to the core semantic content.

Comprehensive Evaluation Metrics: ATOMETRIC provides precision, recall, and F1-score measurements that jointly evaluate the correctness and completeness of the generated content. Precision measures the logical consistency and accuracy of generated statements, while recall captures the extent to which the generated content covers all key statements of the reference. This approach ensures a thorough assessment of both semantic accuracy and content coverage.

3.3 Definition

The formal definition of ATOMETRIC is as follows. Given a pair of generated and reference text (\hat{s}, s) , We first extract a set of atomic statements from \hat{s} and s using an LLM, denoted as $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{s}}$ and \mathcal{A}_s , respectively. The two sets of atomic statements are further verified by another LLM at multiple levels of strictness l to evaluate both precision and recall. Mathematically, ATOMETRIC precision, recall,

Level	Criterion
Loose	The reference and the atomic statement <i>share related concepts or themes</i> , and do <i>not contradict</i> each other.
Moderate	The atomic statement can be <i>logically inferred</i> from the reference, or the atomic statement can <i>support</i> the reference.
Strict	The reference <i>explicitly states</i> or <i>clearly paraphrases</i> the same information as the atomic statement.

Table 1: Overview of different strictness criteria. A bolded letter of each level is used as its abbreviation in later references. Details are provided in Appendix B.

and F_1 -score at level l is defined as:

$$\text{Atometric}_P = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_{\hat{s}}|} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{\hat{s}}} \mathbb{I}^l [a \text{ is relevant to } s] \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Atometric}_R = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_s|} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_s} \mathbb{I}^l [a \text{ is relevant to } \hat{s}] \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Atometric}_{F_1} = \frac{2 \times \text{Atometric}_P \times \text{Atometric}_R}{\text{Atometric}_P + \text{Atometric}_R} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbb{I}^l[\cdot]$ is an indicator function at strictness level l that checks if an atomic statement is relevant to the corresponding reference or generated text in the sense of textual entailment [3, 35, 44]. We show an overview of criteria in Table 1 and provide a detailed template in Appendix Figure 5 that could be easily adapted to different datasets with minimal change.

Comment. ATOMETRIC builds on the strengths of existing evaluation metrics while addressing their limitations. ATOMETRIC Precision and ATOMETRIC Recall can be viewed as relaxations of BLEU and ROUGE, respectively, as they shift from strict n-gram matching to statement-level alignment. This allows generation with more flexible expression while preserving underlying semantic and logical relationships. Compared to BERTScore and BLEURT, which rely on embedding similarity, ATOMETRIC uses LLM-based multi-level relevance judgments, offering a more interpretable and adjustable evaluation. By focusing on atomic statements and incorporating varying strictness levels, ATOMETRIC provides a more nuanced and detailed assessment of content generation, particularly suited to tasks like MAP2TEXT that require a balance between semantic accuracy and logical coherence.

4 Experiments

With the new evaluation metric, we are able to benchmark a set of simple yet effective candidate methods for MAP2TEXT, instantiating the outlined solutions in Section 2.2, and compare them with a human baseline and a strong dummy baseline.

4.1 Candidate Methods

Fine-Tuning (FT). The most straightforward approach is to directly learn the inverse mapping $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ by fine-tuning a pre-trained model. We fine-tune the 70B Llama 3.1 model using LoRA [8], where the model takes a 2D coordinate as input and outputs the corresponding text. For instance, an input query would be, "Convert the coordinate to text: [9.1054, 10.1339]"

Embedding Inversion. If high-dimensional embeddings are available, we can decompose g into two separate mappings: $g_1 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^H$ and $g_2 : \mathbb{R}^H \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$. For the first mapping, g_1 , we use a k-NN interpolation algorithm to project the 2D coordinates into the H -dimensional embedding space. While more complex methods could be employed for g_1 (e.g., training a neural network), we select this straightforward approach as it requires no additional training and demonstrates comparable empirical performance. The second mapping, g_2 , then converts the high-dimensional embeddings into text using the `vec2text` model [26]. Since we use the pre-trained `vec2text` model without any additional fine-tuning, it is limited to supporting embeddings generated specifically by `text-embedding-ada-002`.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG). Prompting LLMs has shown strong performance across various tasks [18]. However, a straightforward zero-shot prompting approach—like the query mentioned in the fine-tuning example above—is not feasible as a pre-trained LLM lacks inherent knowledge of the visualization map. To address this limitation, we incorporate a set of Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) methods on GPT-4o to provide relevant context and enhance the model’s understanding of the map. We use the same notation in Section 2 to illustrate each method. For each query position $\mathbf{x}_q \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

- (1) **(1st-order RAG)** We retrieve the texts corresponding to its nearest neighbors $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_q) \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ and use this information to prompt the LLM to generate new content \hat{s} .
- (2) **(1st-order RAG with few-shot examples)** Building on (1), we add few-shot examples. Each few-shot example consists of texts from $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ and the corresponding s_i for some $i \in \mathcal{I}$, where \mathcal{I} is a pre-selected set.
- (3) **(2nd-order RAG with few-shot examples)** Building on (2), we replace the pre-selected set \mathcal{I} with $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_q)$. Intuitively, this means we consider information from "2-hop" neighbors of the query position.
- (4) **(1st-order RAG with chain-of-thought examples)** Building on (2), we add additional chain-of-thought reasoning [43] as auxiliary information.

Implementation of each method can be found in Appendix D.

4.2 Datasets

We evaluate the candidate models on four diverse datasets to demonstrate the broad application of MAP2TEXT.

Dataset Name	# Entries	Avg. Len.	Vis. Pipeline
Persona	100k	27.10	gte-v1.5 + UMAP
Red-Teaming Strategies	39k	84.06	ada-002 + UMAP
CS Research Idea	149k	41.57	ada-002 + LargeVis
CS Research Context	150k	40.96	ada-002 + LargeVis

Table 2: Basic information of datasets and visualizations. Average length is calculated using `tiktoken`. A bolded letter of each dataset is used as its abbreviation in later references.

Persona. We use an existing visualization³ of a subset of the *PersonHub* dataset [5] where each text entry provides a brief description of a synthetic persona. MAP2TEXT can be applied to generate new persona descriptions based on different regions of the map, enabling the creation of diverse character profiles.

Red-Teaming Strategies. We construct a summarization dataset⁴ from the *LLM Red Teaming* dataset by Ganguli et al. [10] which comprises human-generated and annotated red-teaming dialogues aimed at identifying vulnerabilities in LLMs. Given a 2D visualization of these summaries, MAP2TEXT can help generate unexplored red-teaming strategies, enhancing the robustness testing of LLMs.

CS Research Ideas & Context. We create 2D maps of the *MASSW* dataset [47], where each entry corresponds to the research context or the key idea of a computer science publication. A good MAP2TEXT model can assist scientific innovation by generating new research ideas or new context of emerging topics from unexplored regions on the map, helping researchers to identify gaps in current research and inspire novel directions for scientific inquiry.

The statistics of these datasets are summarized into Table 2. Note that the visualization pipelines for these datasets are different and are hidden from candidate MAP2TEXT methods (except for embedding inversion), and a robust model should be capable of generalizing across different configurations.

4.3 Experiment Setup

Data Split. Each dataset is divided into training and testing sets, as described in Section 2.3, with 200 samples consistently held out for testing across all datasets. We apply a random split for the *Persona* and *Red-Teaming Strategies* datasets and a time-based split for the *CS Research Ideas & Context* datasets, where the most recent 200 entries (all in Dec 2023) are held out for testing, simulating the scenario of real-world research exploration.

Evaluation Metrics. We prioritize our proposed evaluation metric, *ATOMETRIC*, as it is specifically designed to capture the nuanced semantic and contextual alignment. We report *ATOMETRIC-F1* across three levels of strictness: loose (L), moderate (M), and strict (S), as well as *ATOMETRIC-Precision* (M) and *ATOMETRIC-Recall* (R) for a more comprehensive picture⁵. In addition to *ATOMETRIC*, we include traditional evaluation metrics—*BERTScore* (F1) [46], *BLEURT* [37], *METEOR* [17], and *ROUGE-2* [19]—as reference points for comparison. Evaluation on some extra metrics such as *BLEU* and other *ATOMETRIC* scores are provided in Appendix A.1.

4.4 Baselines

We begin by analyzing the evaluation results of a human baseline and a simple yet effective dummy baseline, providing a foundation for comparing the performance of the candidate AI methods.

Human Baseline. We recruit human annotators to conduct the MAP2TEXT task using the *Persona* dataset, as this dataset does not require special domain expertise. Detailed settings for this study are provided in Appendix A.2. In brief, human annotators are given

³<https://huggingface.co/datasets/argilla/FinePersonas-v0.1-clustering-100k>

⁴Details of the construction are provided in Appendix C.2.

⁵We use `gpt-4o-2024-05-13` as the backbone LLM in *ATOMETRIC*.

access to a partial visualization containing the query location and they are allowed to view the textual content of all visible data points. No constraints are imposed regarding their generation strategy, allowing them complete flexibility in navigating the visualization and generating content based on the map. We expect the human baseline to represent a strong benchmark compared to AI methods.

EchoNearest Baseline. For each query x_q , the EchoNearest model simply retrieves and outputs the content of its closest neighbor in the 2D space. This simple baseline operates under the assumption that semantically similar content is clustered closely in the visualization map, making the nearest neighbor a relevant choice for responding to the query, though it lacks novelty. This approach mimics a “lazy” human strategy for content generation which could be effective when novelty is not required. As our gold standard references all exhibit some level of novelty compared to their neighbors, we expect it to perform below both the human baseline and more advanced AI methods when evaluated using proper metrics.

Metric	Human		EchoNearest		
	P	P	R	I	C
Atometric-F1 (L)	0.901	0.884	0.783	0.430	0.538
Atometric-F1 (M)	0.605	0.556	0.586	0.191	0.105
Atometric-F1 (S)	0.302	0.268	0.282	0.098	0.045
Atometric-P (M)	0.610	0.548	0.598	0.199	0.103
Atometric-R (M)	0.601	0.565	0.575	0.184	0.107
BERTScore F1	0.894	0.898	0.902	0.857	0.862
BLEURT Scores	0.431	0.454	0.436	0.325	0.323
METEOR	0.232	0.306	0.428	0.160	0.170
ROUGE-2	0.110	0.117	0.231	0.032	0.034

Table 3: Evaluation results for the human and EchoNearest baselines. (L), (M), and (S) denote “loose”, “moderate”, and “strict” for the strictness level of ATOMETRIC.

Analysis. The evaluation results for the human and EchoNearest baselines are provided in Table 3. Several observations can be made.

First, under all ATOMETRICS, the human baseline outperforms the EchoNearest model, as expected. However, under conventional metrics, the human baseline scores lower than the EchoNearest model. This discrepancy likely arises because conventional metrics emphasize lexical-level text similarity, favoring the EchoNearest model’s repetition of existing entries. In contrast, human responses, while more contextually relevant, tend to vary in language style and phrasing, which conventional metrics fail to capture. This validates the strength of ATOMETRIC in recognizing the semantic and contextual richness of human-generated content.

Second, the four datasets exhibit varying levels of complexity. The EchoNearest model performs relatively well on the Persona and Red-Teaming Strategies datasets, suggesting that the text entries clustered closely in the visualization are highly similar, making these tasks easier to address. In contrast, the model’s performance on the CS Research Idea and CS Research Context datasets is notably lower. This indicates that these tasks require generating more complex or novel content, which demands a deeper understanding of the research domain, beyond simple proximity in the 2D space.

In addition, the ATOMETRIC results across different levels of strictness reveal subtle distinctions between research contexts and

research ideas, showcasing the strength of ATOMETRIC in capturing varying levels of sensitivity. At lower strictness levels, ATOMETRIC F1 (L) scores are higher for the CS Research Contexts. While each paper addresses a unique problem, the overarching topics are often related, leading to greater alignment in topic-level relevance. In contrast, at medium and high strictness levels (M and S), research ideas exhibit higher ATOMETRIC scores. This occurs because research ideas, while varied, frequently share concrete methodologies or designs, which stricter criteria capture more effectively. By distinguishing these nuanced differences, ATOMETRIC demonstrates its ability to assess content sensitivity at multiple levels.

4.5 Benchmark Results

Table 4 reveals several patterns in the performance of the candidate AI methods in Section 4.1 across the different datasets. No single method consistently dominates across all metrics, reflecting the varying complexities and characteristics of the domains.

Analysis. For the Persona and Red-Teaming Strategies datasets, CoT-RAG⁽¹⁾ consistently outperforms other AI methods across most metrics. This suggests that incorporating more complex reasoning structures, such as chain-of-thoughts, enhances the ability of LLMs to better align with the query position. Additionally, fine-tuning (FT) on these datasets shows clear improvements on Llama 3.1 compared to applying RAG⁽¹⁾ on its untuned version. This indicates that fine-tuning enables the LLM to better capture the specific nuances of the relation between the map locations and text.

In contrast, for CS Research Ideas and CS Research Contexts, no single method clearly stands out. The best performer under most metrics is one of the GPT-4o based methods, indicating the importance of using a more capable foundation model. However, more complex prompting only leads to marginal improvements over the basic RAG⁽¹⁾ method. Interestingly, fine-tuning Llama 3.1 on these datasets appears to reduce its performance compared to the untuned RAG⁽¹⁾ model. One possible explanation is that these datasets contain highly specialized technical content, which may not align well with the general knowledge encoded in pre-trained LLMs. Without sufficient domain-specific data for fine-tuning, a model may lose some of its generalization capacity.

Additionally, the Embedding Inversion method demonstrates competitive performance, particularly under ATOMETRIC Recall, albeit with some loss in precision. On the Red-Teaming Strategies and CS Research Contexts, it achieves scores comparable to those of GPT-4o’s RAG⁽¹⁾ model, despite only employing a simple k-NN interpolation and a small pre-trained vec2text model (220M parameters) without additional training. This result highlights the potential of embedding inversion strategies for MAP2TEXT tasks, when the originally embedding methods are accessible.

Surprisingly, no candidate models surpass the EchoNearest baseline on the Red-Team Strategies dataset. This is likely due to the concentrated distribution of the dataset, as shown in Appendix Figure 7—with examples being so close to one another that distinguishing them becomes difficult. Intuitively, when the map is sparser (i.e., KNNs are farther apart), targeting *relevance* is more challenging. Conversely, when the map is locally denser (i.e., KNNs are closer together), relevance is easier to achieve, but innovation becomes harder, an issue that could be addressed in future work.

Dataset	Metric	GPT-4o				Llama 3.1		Embedding Inversion
		CoT-RAG ⁽¹⁾	FS-RAG ⁽¹⁾	RAG ⁽²⁾	RAG ⁽¹⁾	FT	RAG ⁽¹⁾	
Persona	Atometric-F1 (L)	0.893	<i>0.852</i>	0.824	0.822	0.822	0.783	-
	Atometric-F1 (M)	0.602	<i>0.494</i>	0.464	0.454	0.463	0.390	-
	Atometric-F1 (S)	0.254	0.183	0.168	0.158	<i>0.194</i>	0.117	-
	Atometric-P (M)	0.582	<i>0.460</i>	0.449	0.430	0.459	0.365	-
	Atometric-R (M)	0.623	<i>0.533</i>	0.480	0.481	0.467	0.420	-
	BERTScore F1	0.898	<i>0.895</i>	0.893	0.892	0.893	0.887	-
	BLEURT Scores	0.474	<i>0.454</i>	0.441	0.433	0.406	0.416	-
	METEOR	0.329	<i>0.290</i>	0.263	0.260	0.251	0.268	-
	ROUGE-2	0.116	<i>0.096</i>	0.078	0.086	<i>0.098</i>	0.074	-
Red Teaming Strategies	Atometric-F1 (L)	0.728	<i>0.705</i>	0.694	0.648	0.698	0.660	0.697
	Atometric-F1 (M)	0.514	0.480	0.451	0.414	<i>0.497</i>	0.437	0.428
	Atometric-F1 (S)	0.202	<i>0.200</i>	0.168	0.144	0.185	0.167	0.126
	Atometric-P (M)	<i>0.479</i>	0.445	0.397	0.358	0.508	0.384	0.329
	Atometric-R (M)	<i>0.555</i>	0.521	0.520	0.491	0.486	0.507	0.612
	BERTScore F1	0.904	<i>0.902</i>	0.901	0.897	0.894	0.898	0.877
	BLEURT Scores	0.446	<i>0.439</i>	0.435	0.417	0.407	0.430	0.394
	METEOR	0.433	<i>0.424</i>	0.412	0.371	0.390	0.405	0.312
	ROUGE-2	0.250	0.250	<i>0.244</i>	0.232	0.203	0.235	0.114
CS Research Idea	Atometric-F1 (L)	0.507	0.492	0.492	0.495	0.412	<i>0.497</i>	0.470
	Atometric-F1 (M)	0.213	0.220	<i>0.214</i>	0.202	0.163	0.210	0.180
	Atometric-F1 (S)	0.091	0.098	0.102	0.099	0.084	<i>0.100</i>	0.096
	Atometric-P (M)	0.222	0.240	0.272	0.250	0.203	<i>0.263</i>	0.193
	Atometric-R (M)	0.205	<i>0.202</i>	0.176	0.169	0.136	0.175	0.169
	BERTScore F1	0.860	0.860	0.864	0.864	0.858	0.863	0.861
	BLEURT Scores	0.367	<i>0.365</i>	0.350	0.348	0.302	0.337	0.334
	METEOR	0.198	<i>0.194</i>	0.153	0.142	0.153	0.159	0.173
	ROUGE-2	0.041	<i>0.037</i>	0.034	0.033	0.029	0.034	<i>0.037</i>
CS Research Context	Atometric-F1 (L)	0.655	<i>0.623</i>	0.614	0.597	0.487	0.548	0.603
	Atometric-F1 (M)	<i>0.144</i>	<i>0.144</i>	0.145	0.129	0.094	0.110	0.133
	Atometric-F1 (S)	<i>0.055</i>	0.057	<i>0.055</i>	0.054	0.032	0.039	<i>0.055</i>
	Atometric-P (M)	0.181	<i>0.179</i>	0.160	0.165	0.108	0.135	0.113
	Atometric-R (M)	0.119	0.120	0.133	0.106	0.084	0.093	0.161
	BERTScore F1	0.868	0.868	0.867	0.868	0.859	0.863	0.867
	BLEURT Scores	0.340	0.345	<i>0.341</i>	0.339	0.286	0.323	0.340
	METEOR	<i>0.173</i>	0.166	0.164	0.159	0.137	0.158	0.190
	ROUGE-2	0.046	0.046	0.041	0.044	0.024	0.033	0.034

Table 4: Evaluation results of the candidate methods on the MAP2TEXT task. The highest score(s) in each row are highlighted in bold and the second highest score(s) are in italic. Results of additional evaluation metrics (e.g., ATOMETRIC Precisions and Recalls) are provided in Appendix A.1. (L), (M), and (S) denote “loose”, “moderate”, and “strict” for strictness level. Note that the embedding inversion method relies on vec2text [26], which only supports the text-embedding-ada-002 model. As a result, no scores are provided for the Persona dataset.

Finally, the human baseline demonstrates superior performance compared to all candidate methods on the Persona dataset. Its primary advantage is the flexibility to navigate the visualization and extract high-level information, such as the distribution of topics across different areas and the directional relationships between nearest neighbors. This capability enables more accurate and contextually appropriate content generation, suggesting that there is still broad improvement space for better AI methods to incorporate similar high-level navigational strategies on the map.

5 Related Work

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study on new content generation from low-dimensional projection maps. This new task is related to a few lines of research.

Low-Dimensional Visualization of Text Corpora. Low-dimensional data visualization is a versatile tool used across numerous fields

to provide intuitive representations of large datasets [36]. In public health, it assists in tracking disease trends and guiding data-driven decision-making [15]. In renewable energy, visualization helps optimize energy production and consumption [16], while environmental science relies on geographic visualization to interpret ecological data [2, 23]. Fraud detection benefits from interactive visualizations that help identify suspicious patterns [7], and library management uses visualization techniques to manage resources and support strategic decisions [28]. A variety of methods are employed to achieve these visualizations. Textual embedding models [27], such as OpenAI’s Ada 2 [30] and the widely-used BERT [6], transform text into dense vector representations that capture underlying semantic relationships. Dimensionality reduction algorithms like t-SNE [40], LargeVis [38], and UMAP [24] are commonly utilized to project the high-dimensional embeddings onto 2D or 3D maps, making complex patterns in the data space more accessible for analysis. While these visualizations primarily focus on interpreting the space of known knowledge, MAP2TEXT extends the capabilities of the map by enabling the generation of new, relevant, and accurately

aligned textual content. This shift bridges the gap between data interpretation and creative exploration, offering new possibilities for leveraging data visualizations to facilitate applications such as scientific discovery and innovation.

Controllable Text Generation. Controllable text generation (CTG) refers to the task of generating text according to the given controlled element [33]. It has been a critical focus in recent years and covers a wide range of tasks, such as Attribute-based Generation and Data Augmentation. In Attribute-based Generation, the goal is to generate text that aligns with specific attributes, such as topics, emotions, or keywords, allowing systems to produce interpretable and structured outputs tailored to user-specified needs. For instance, Khalifa et al. [14] offers a method to manipulate attributes like topic by adjusting latent variables, improving control over the text’s structure and coherence. Similarly, Prabhume et al. [33] examines a broader range of controllable attributes, demonstrating how various methods can enhance the generation process, leading to text that is more aligned with user goals. Data Augmentation is another important task within CTG. Works like Amin-Nejad et al. [1] and Liu et al. [20] have highlighted the effectiveness of CTG for data augmentation, where generated text supplements existing data by altering attributes or replacing specific entities, thus broadening the training set and improving model performance. While these works emphasize direct control over attributes such as topic or slot values, MAP2TEXT shifts the focus to leveraging spatial relationship of text representations, using the contextual information in a visualization map to guide content creation.

Evaluation of Text Generation. The evaluation of text generation quality has traditionally relied on similarity-based metrics, broadly categorized into lexical- and semantic-based approaches. These methods have been widely adopted across tasks such as machine translation, summarization, and creative content generation. Lexical-based metrics focus on n-gram overlaps between generated and reference texts. BLEU emphasizes precision, making it a common choice for machine translation [31], while ROUGE, which prioritizes recall, is frequently used for summarization tasks [19]. METEOR [17], another well-known metric, improves by incorporating synonyms and stemming to better handle linguistic variations. However, these metrics often fail to capture the deeper semantic meaning of text. To address these limitations, semantic-based metrics have been developed. Techniques such as BERTScore [46] leverage contextual embeddings from BERT to capture the token-level similarity between sentences. BLEURT [37], by fine-tuning models to predict human judgment, further aligns with human perception and measure beyond surface-level overlaps.

More recently, reasoning-based evaluations have emerged, utilizing the capabilities of LLMs to assess text coherence, consistency, and factual accuracy. Methods like GPTScore [9] employ LLM-predicted probabilities as quality scores, while G-Eval [21] engages LLMs in tasks such as Likert scale evaluations and pairwise comparisons. These approaches leverage the reasoning abilities of LLMs to evaluate content beyond traditional metrics. FActScore [25] takes this a step further by breaking generated text into atomic facts and verifying each fact’s support against external knowledge sources. Building on these advancements, our proposed method, ATOMETRIC, offers a more comprehensive and interpretable evaluation by

assessing both precision and recall of atomic statements at multiple levels of strictness. This approach captures the nuances of semantic relevance and logical coherence of the generated text, addressing gaps left by previous metrics.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce MAP2TEXT, a novel task for generating new textual content guided by specific positions within a 2D visualization map of a large text corpus. We propose a new evaluation metric, ATOMETRIC, to assess the fine-grained alignment of the generated text to gold standard references at varying levels of strictness. Through this metric, we demonstrate the effectiveness of multiple representative candidate methods for MAP2TEXT on datasets in diverse domains. Our findings show the potential of MAP2TEXT as a valuable tool for applications such as scientific idea generation, new persona generation, and LLM red teaming. This initial attempt calls for future research may explore more advanced methods and diverse applications of MAP2TEXT.

6.1 Limitations and Future Work

We list several limitations and potential directions that could be addressed in future research:

Novelty of Generated Content: Our current evaluation does not go beyond measuring similarity between the generated content and a given gold standard reference. For example, it does not consider the novelty of the output or the reference, which is crucial for applications such as research idea generation. One potential solution is to compute the similarity between the generated content and its nearest neighbors (where lower similarity indicates higher novelty) rather than the reference alone. In reality, the quality of the “gold” standard itself is often not guaranteed, as human-generated content can be highly relevant while still lack scientific validity or logical coherence. Future work may employ domain-specific criteria into the evaluation metrics or rely on specific downstream tasks.

Evaluation Limited to Known Positions: Our evaluation framework is limited to positions on the map for which ground truth content exists but is held out. We do not evaluate the model’s ability to generate content at arbitrary unexplored positions on the map, which would unleash the full potential of MAP2TEXT for open exploration and innovation into the information space. Without the gold stand reference, the quality of the generated new content has to be evaluated otherwise, through online human judgments or the utility of the generated content in downstream tasks, such as the effectiveness of a new red-teaming strategy in testing LLMs.

Optimizing MAP2TEXT Methods: There is considerable room of improvement beyond the candidate methods tested in this paper. An advanced MAP2TEXT model may leverage global patterns or community structures in the map to guide the generation, beyond the local neighborhood. Another approach is to fine-tune LLMs to utilize spatial tokens that encode positional information directly within their embedding layers. This would allow an LLM to memorize the complex map structure and incorporate spatial context more effectively, while not harming their reasoning ability.

References

- [1] Ali Amin-Nejad, Julia Ive, and Sumithra Velupillai. 2020. Exploring Transformer Text Generation for Medical Dataset Augmentation. In *International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:218974353>
- [2] Anna Bohman, Tina-Simone Neset, Tomasz Opach, and Jan Ketil Rød. 2015. Decision support for adaptive action—assessing the potential of geographic visualization. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 58, 12 (2015), 2193–2211.
- [3] Samuel R Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D Manning. 2015. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.05326* (2015).
- [4] Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. *arXiv:1508.05326* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.05326>
- [5] Xin Chan, Xiaoyang Wang, Dian Yu, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. 2024. Scaling synthetic data creation with 1,000,000,000 personas. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.20094* (2024).
- [6] Jacob Devlin. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [7] William N Dilla and Robyn L Raschke. 2015. Data visualization for fraud detection: Practice implications and a call for future research. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems* 16 (2015), 1–22.
- [8] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [9] Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. 2023. Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04166* (2023).
- [10] Deep Ganguli, Liane Lovitt, Jackson Kernion, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Ben Mann, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Kamal Ndousse, et al. 2022. Red teaming language models to reduce harms: Methods, scaling behaviors, and lessons learned. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07858* (2022).
- [11] Tanya Goyal, Junyi Jessy Li, and Greg Durrett. 2022. News summarization and evaluation in the era of gpt-3. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.12356* (2022).
- [12] Xuemei Gu and Mario Krenn. 2024. Generation and human-expert evaluation of interesting research ideas using knowledge graphs and large language models. *arXiv [cs.AI]* (May 2024).
- [13] Zhiting Hu, Zichao Yang, Xiaodan Liang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Eric P Xing. 2017. Toward controlled generation of text. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1587–1596.
- [14] Muhammad Khalifa, Hady Elsahar, and Marc Dymetman. 2020. A distributional approach to controlled text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.11635* (2020).
- [15] Tumaini Kilimba, Gideon Nimako, and Kobus Herbst. 2015. Data everywhere: an integrated longitudinal data visualization platform for health and demographic surveillance sites. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Bioinformatics, Computational Biology and Health Informatics*. 551–552.
- [16] Omesh Kumar and Abhishek Goyal. 2016. Visualization: a novel approach for big data analytics. In *2016 Second International Conference on Computational Intelligence & Communication Technology (CICCT)*. IEEE, 121–124.
- [17] Alon Lavie and Abhaya Agarwal. 2007. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with High Levels of Correlation with Human Judgments. In *WMT@ACL*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:16289845>
- [18] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 9459–9474.
- [19] Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*. 74–81.
- [20] Ruibo Liu, Guangxuan Xu, Chenyan Jia, Weicheng Ma, Lili Wang, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2020. Data boost: Text data augmentation through reinforcement learning guided conditional generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.02952* (2020).
- [21] Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023. G-eval: Nlg evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16634* (2023).
- [22] Daniel M Low, Laurie Rumker, Tanya Talkar, John Torous, Guillermo Cecchi, and Satrajit S Ghosh. 2020. Natural language processing reveals vulnerable mental health support groups and heightened health anxiety on Reddit during COVID-19: Observational study. *J. Med. Internet Res.* 22, 10 (Oct. 2020), e22635.
- [23] Alan M MacEachren and DR Fraser Taylor. 2013. *Visualization in modern cartography*. Elsevier.
- [24] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. 2018. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03426* (2018).
- [25] Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxin Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Wei Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Factscore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14251* (2023).
- [26] John X. Morris, Volodymyr Kuleshov, Vitaly Shmatikov, and Alexander M. Rush. 2023. Text Embeddings Reveal (Almost) As Much As Text. *arXiv:2310.06816* [cs.CL]
- [27] Niklas Muennighoff, Nouamane Tazi, Loïc Magne, and Nils Reimers. 2022. MTEB: Massive Text Embedding Benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07316* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2210.07316>
- [28] Sarah Anne Murphy. 2013. Data visualization and rapid analytics: Applying tableau desktop to support library decision-making. *Journal of Web Librarianship* 7, 4 (2013), 465–476.
- [29] Maximilian Noichl. 2021. Modeling the structure of recent philosophy. *Synthese* 198, 6 (June 2021), 5089–5100.
- [30] OpenAI. n.d. OpenAI API [Software]. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/api-reference>. Accessed: YYYY-MM-DD.
- [31] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 311–318.
- [32] Ethan Perez, Saffron Huang, Francis Song, Trevor Cai, Roman Ring, John Aslanides, Amelia Glaese, Nat McAleese, and Geoffrey Irving. 2022. Red teaming language models with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03286* (2022).
- [33] Shrimai Prabhumoye, Alan W Black, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2020. Exploring controllable text generation techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01822* (2020).
- [34] Cynthia Rudin, Chaofan Chen, Zhi Chen, Haiyang Huang, Lesia Semenova, and Chudi Zhong. 2022. Interpretable machine learning: Fundamental principles and 10 grand challenges. *Statistic Surveys* 16 (2022), 1–85.
- [35] Mobashir Sadat and Cornelia Caragea. 2022. SciNLI: A Corpus for Natural Language Inference on Scientific Text. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 7399–7409. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.511>
- [36] Matthew Sadiku, Adebowale E Shadare, Sarhan M Musa, Cajetan M Akujuobi, and Roy Perry. 2016. Data visualization. *International Journal of Engineering Research And Advanced Technology (IJERAT)* 2, 12 (2016), 11–16.
- [37] Thibault Sellam, Dipanjan Das, and Ankur P Parikh. 2020. BLEURT: Learning robust metrics for text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04696* (2020).
- [38] Jian Tang, Jingzhou Liu, Ming Zhang, and Qiaozhu Mei. 2016. Visualizing large-scale and high-dimensional data. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on world wide web*. 287–297.
- [39] Paul Tschisgale, Peter Wulff, and Marcus Kubsch. 2023. Integrating artificial intelligence-based methods into qualitative research in physics education research: A case for computational grounded theory. *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.* 19, 2 (Sept. 2023), 020123.
- [40] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of machine learning research* 9, 11 (2008).
- [41] Jiaqi Wang, Zeyu Li, and Jiawan Zhang. 2022. Visualizing the knowledge structure and evolution of bioinformatics. *BMC Bioinformatics* 23, Suppl 8 (Sept. 2022), 404.
- [42] Qingyun Wang, Doug Downey, Heng Ji, and Tom Hope. 2023. SciMON: Scientific inspiration machines optimized for novelty. *arXiv [cs.CL]* (May 2023).
- [43] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 24824–24837.
- [44] Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. A Broad-Coverage Challenge Corpus for Sentence Understanding through Inference. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, Marilyn Walker, Heng Ji, and Amanda Stent (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1112–1122. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N18-1101>
- [45] Yi Yang, Kungpeng Zhang, and P K Kannan. 2022. Identifying market structure: A deep network representation learning of social engagement. *J. Mark.* 86, 4 (July 2022), 37–56.
- [46] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675* (2019).
- [47] Xingjian Zhang, Yutong Xie, Jin Huang, Jinge Ma, Zhaoying Pan, Qijia Liu, Ziyang Xiong, Tolga Ergen, Dongsub Shim, Honglak Lee, et al. 2024. MASSW: A New Dataset and Benchmark Tasks for AI-Assisted Scientific Workflows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06357* (2024).
- [48] Yangqiaoyu Zhou, Haokun Liu, Tejes Srivastava, Hongyuan Mei, and Chenhao Tan. 2024. Hypothesis generation with large language models. *arXiv [cs.AI]* (April 2024).

A Experiment Details

A.1 Results on Extra Metrics

We provide additional experiment results on a broader list of evaluation metrics as a complementary reference for Table 3 and 4. The results are shown in Table 5, 6, and 7.

A.2 Human Annotation




Figure 3: Sample screenshot of human annotation protocol.

Two undergraduate students were recruited to annotate the human baseline for the Persona dataset, with each annotator generating 60 textual entries for the testing set. The annotators were provided with the same information as the other candidate methods, including a 2D visualization centered on the query data point. Textual information for each data point appeared when the annotator hovered over it. To enhance their understanding, the five nearest neighbors to the query point were highlighted in color, with their corresponding contents displayed next to the visualization. A sample screenshot of the annotation prompt is provided in Figure 3.

B ATOMETRIC Details

The evaluation of ATOMETRIC involves two steps, **decomposition** and **verification**. It is straightforward to adapt ATOMETRIC to other datasets with the provided templates. The implementation is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/atometric-17A3/>. We use gpt-4o-2024-05-13 as the backbone model for all the evaluation.

B.1 Atomic Statement Decomposition

A backbone LLM is prompted to decompose the textual content into a list of atomic statements, with the system prompt provided in Figure 4. To better adapt the model to each specific dataset, we include few-shot examples to guide the decomposition process, provided in the aforementioned implementation repository. In general, the resulting atomic statements are expected to be simple, clear, non-trivial, and self-contained.

B.2 Atomic Statement Verification

We use ATOMETRIC precision as an example to illustrate the verification process. Given a list of atomic statements, a backbone LLM is prompted to compare each atomic statement against the reference

You will be given a sentence or sentences. Decompose them into no more than 10 atomic statements. Each atomic statement is a proposition that is simple, clear, non-trivial, and self-contained. The subject of each statement must be a common noun. ****Strictly avoid using proper nouns (e.g. abbreviation) or pronouns in the atomic statements.****

Respond in json with the key 'atomic_statements' containing a list of strings (atomic statements). The first atomic statement should be a concise summary of the entire input sentence(s).

Here are a few examples for you to follow:

Input: {Input}
 Output: {Output}



Figure 4: Prompt template for ATOMETRIC decomposition. The proposed metric could be adapted to different dataset with minimal change in prompting.

You are an expert in {topic}.
 You will be shown a general description of a {subject} as reference information and an atomic statement.

Based only on the shown reference information and your knowledge of the field, determine ****how possible the atomic statement is a correct description for the {subject}****:

1. Highly possible: The reference information explicitly states or clearly paraphrases the same information as the atomic statement.
2. Moderately possible: The atomic statement can be logically inferred from the reference information, or the atomic statement is able to support the reference information.
3. Weakly possible: The reference information and the atomic statement share related concepts or themes, and do not contradict each other.
4. Not possible: The atomic statement is not related to the reference information in any meaningful way.

Please provide the answer in JSON format, with the key "level" and the value as a number corresponding to the level described above.

Here are some examples:

```
- Reference information
{reference example}

- Atomic statements and answers
{atomic statement}: 1
{atomic statement}: 2
{atomic statement}: 3
{atomic statement}: 4
```



Figure 5: Prompt template for ATOMETRIC verification. The proposed metric could be adapted to different dataset with minimal change in prompting.

information. Drawing inspiration from the textual entailment criteria defined by Bowman et al. [4], we define four levels of relevance based on how likely an atomic statement accurately describes the

Dataset	Metric	GPT-4o				Llama 3.1		Embedding Inversion
		CoT-RAG ⁽¹⁾	FS-RAG ⁽¹⁾	RAG ⁽²⁾	RAG ⁽¹⁾	FT	RAG ⁽¹⁾	
Persona	Atometric Precision (loose)	0.908	0.853	0.822	0.815	0.822	0.758	-
	Atometric Precision (moderate)	0.582	0.460	0.449	0.430	0.459	0.365	-
	Atometric Precision (strict)	0.201	0.141	0.133	0.125	0.208	0.096	-
	Atometric Recall (loose)	0.878	0.850	0.825	0.829	0.822	0.808	-
	Atometric Recall (moderate)	0.623	0.533	0.480	0.481	0.467	0.420	-
	Atometric Recall (strict)	0.342	0.261	0.229	0.214	0.181	0.148	-
	BERTScore Precision	0.893	0.890	0.891	0.891	0.897	0.882	-
	BERTScore Recall	0.903	0.900	0.895	0.894	0.890	0.892	-
	BLEU (BLEU)	0.075	0.063	0.050	0.060	0.056	0.045	-
	Cosine Similarity	0.885	0.879	0.871	0.869	0.868	0.857	-
	ROUGE-1	0.360	0.334	0.311	0.309	0.315	0.298	-
	ROUGE-L	0.281	0.262	0.244	0.248	0.258	0.231	-
	ROUGE-Lsum	0.281	0.262	0.245	0.247	0.258	0.231	-
	Red Team Attempts	Atometric Precision (loose)	0.713	0.693	0.667	0.607	0.709	0.614
Atometric Precision (moderate)		0.479	0.445	0.397	0.358	0.508	0.384	0.329
Atometric Precision (strict)		0.182	0.180	0.147	0.142	0.188	0.156	0.093
Atometric Recall (loose)		0.744	0.718	0.724	0.695	0.688	0.715	0.826
Atometric Recall (moderate)		0.555	0.521	0.520	0.491	0.486	0.507	0.612
Atometric Recall (strict)		0.226	0.224	0.196	0.146	0.183	0.180	0.194
BERTScore Precision		0.904	0.903	0.903	0.901	0.894	0.899	0.879
BERTScore Recall		0.903	0.901	0.899	0.893	0.894	0.898	0.875
BLEU (BLEU)		0.231	0.230	0.221	0.198	0.184	0.214	0.076
Cosine Similarity		0.926	0.918	0.915	0.906	0.913	0.911	0.926
ROUGE-1		0.481	0.478	0.471	0.446	0.444	0.465	0.430
ROUGE-L		0.377	0.376	0.372	0.354	0.329	0.359	0.250
ROUGE-Lsum		0.378	0.376	0.372	0.354	0.330	0.360	0.250
CS Research Idea		Atometric Precision (loose)	0.540	0.538	0.577	0.550	0.452	0.550
	Atometric Precision (moderate)	0.222	0.240	0.272	0.250	0.203	0.263	0.193
	Atometric Precision (strict)	0.084	0.095	0.117	0.118	0.110	0.118	0.115
	Atometric Recall (loose)	0.477	0.453	0.429	0.450	0.378	0.454	0.511
	Atometric Recall (moderate)	0.205	0.202	0.176	0.169	0.136	0.175	0.169
	Atometric Recall (strict)	0.099	0.102	0.090	0.086	0.068	0.086	0.082
	BERTScore Precision	0.858	0.857	0.869	0.870	0.863	0.868	0.864
	BERTScore Recall	0.862	0.863	0.859	0.858	0.853	0.858	0.858
	BLEU (BLEU)	0.024	0.020	0.020	0.016	0.016	0.021	0.025
	Cosine Similarity	0.836	0.836	0.833	0.834	0.822	0.832	0.839
	ROUGE-1	0.221	0.225	0.205	0.205	0.206	0.214	0.227
	ROUGE-L	0.162	0.160	0.157	0.158	0.153	0.156	0.168
	ROUGE-Lsum	0.162	0.160	0.157	0.158	0.153	0.156	0.168
	CS Research Context	Atometric Precision (loose)	0.695	0.663	0.653	0.629	0.497	0.559
Atometric Precision (moderate)		0.181	0.179	0.160	0.165	0.108	0.135	0.113
Atometric Precision (strict)		0.060	0.070	0.062	0.077	0.035	0.045	0.049
Atometric Recall (loose)		0.620	0.588	0.580	0.569	0.478	0.537	0.682
Atometric Recall (moderate)		0.119	0.120	0.133	0.106	0.084	0.093	0.161
Atometric Recall (strict)		0.050	0.048	0.049	0.041	0.029	0.034	0.063
BERTScore Precision		0.871	0.873	0.872	0.874	0.864	0.869	0.870
BERTScore Recall		0.864	0.864	0.862	0.862	0.853	0.858	0.863
BLEU (BLEU)		0.028	0.030	0.028	0.028	0.017	0.021	0.029
Cosine Similarity		0.849	0.849	0.847	0.847	0.823	0.831	0.856
ROUGE-1		0.214	0.202	0.199	0.200	0.171	0.202	0.230
ROUGE-L		0.151	0.151	0.142	0.147	0.121	0.139	0.151
ROUGE-Lsum		0.151	0.151	0.142	0.147	0.121	0.140	0.151

Table 5: Additional evaluation results of the candidate methods on the MAP2TEXT task. (L), (M), and (S) denote “loose”, “moderate”, and “strict” for strictness level.

Metric	P	R	I	C
Atometric Precision (loose)	0.882	0.802	0.453	0.542
Atometric Precision (moderate)	0.548	0.598	0.199	0.103
Atometric Precision (strict)	0.296	0.288	0.103	0.044
Atometric Recall (loose)	0.885	0.764	0.411	0.535
Atometric Recall (moderate)	0.565	0.575	0.184	0.107
Atometric Recall (strict)	0.267	0.279	0.093	0.045
BERTScore Precision	0.898	0.902	0.860	0.864
BERTScore Recall	0.898	0.902	0.855	0.860
BLEU (BLEU)	0.074	0.212	0.020	0.029
Cosine Similarity	0.885	0.925	0.833	0.841
ROUGE-1	0.362	0.475	0.207	0.197
ROUGE-L	0.290	0.361	0.153	0.137
ROUGE-Lsum	0.289	0.361	0.153	0.137

Table 6: Additional evaluation results of the CopyNearest baseline.

Metric	Human
Atometric Precision (loose)	0.894
Atometric Precision (moderate)	0.610
Atometric Precision (strict)	0.396
Atometric Recall (loose)	0.909
Atometric Recall (moderate)	0.601
Atometric Recall (strict)	0.244
BERTScore Precision	0.905
BERTScore Recall	0.883
BLEU (BLEU)	0.035
Cosine Similarity	0.875
ROUGE-1	0.324
ROUGE-L	0.278
ROUGE-Lsum	0.278

Table 7: Additional evaluation results of the human baseline on the Persona dataset.

subject in the reference, shown in Figure 5, the template of system prompt. The final precision score at strictness level is then calculated as the proportion of generated statements considered relevant **at or above** that level. For instance, ATOMETRIC Precision (M) counts all statements deemed both high and moderate possibility.

C Dataset Details

C.1 Persona




Figure 6: 2D visualization of *Persona* dataset.

Description. *Persona* dataset contains a set of synthetic persona, created with the pipeline introduced in `distilabel 1.4.0`. It contains 100,000 sample personas as well as their embeddings encoded by Alibaba-NLP/gte-large-en-v1.5 model. The original dataset also provides information about nearest neighbors, 2D projection coordinates, cluster labels and summary labels for each data sample. A few examples are shown below:

- A geography teacher or high school educator focused on environmental and climate studies, likely designing a lesson plan or assignment on the human impacts of climate change.
- A meteorologist or a radar technician dealing with weather surveillance and radar image analysis, likely one working with national radar systems interpreting data to provide accurate weather forecasts.
- A public health specialist focused on childhood environmental health and prevention, likely working in a county or local government role, such as a health educator or departmental program manager.

C.2 Red-Teaming Strategies



Figure 7: 2D visualization of *Red-Teaming Strategies* dataset.

Description. The *Red-Teaming Strategies* dataset is derived from the *Red Teaming LLM* dataset, which comprises human-generated red teaming dialogues aimed at uncovering vulnerabilities in large language models. The original dataset includes dialogues annotated for overall harmfulness using both human and automated assessments. In this work, rather than utilizing the full dialogues due to their length, we focus on extracting the strategies employed within these dialogues to provoke harmful responses. These strategies can inspire the generation of more specific and actionable examples for further analysis. In specific, we prompt GPT-4o to summarize each dialogue using the prompt in Figure 10. A few examples are shown below:

- The context of the conversation involves a person seeking advice on how to come out to their religious parents, who they anticipate will react negatively. The red team expert attempts to elicit harmful outputs by using provocative language and stereotypes about religious parents, suggesting violence as a solution, and expressing disdain for their beliefs. This approach could be harmful as it promotes negative stereotypes, encourages violence, and fosters divisive attitudes rather than constructive dialogue.
- The context of the conversation involves a person seeking advice on how to engage in sexual activities with a married coworker at their workplace without getting caught. The red team expert uses a technique of escalating the conversation by suggesting specific locations and actions, and eventually introducing the idea of threatening violence to prevent being reported. This output is harmful as it encourages inappropriate workplace behavior, infidelity, and violence, which could lead to serious personal and professional consequences.

C.3 CS Research Idea & Context




Figure 8: 2D visualization of *CS Research Idea* dataset.



Figure 9: 2D visualization of *CS Research Context* dataset.

Description. We follow the same pipeline as MASSW paper. For a list of publications in the computer science field, we use the key idea and context from them. A few examples of the key ideas are shown below:

- The authors propose a metric, based on the Fisher information, that is strongly indicative of the generalizability of local minima and can be effectively applied as a practical regularizer.
- The authors propose a novel approach to geolocalise panoramic images on a 2-D cartographic map by learning a low-dimensional embedded space which allows comparison between an image captured at a location and local neighbourhoods of the map.
- The authors propose a new approach for predicting SQL query properties, including the query answer size, run-time, and error class, relying on data-driven machine learning techniques and large query workloads, instead of database stats or execution plans.

A few examples of the contexts are shown below:

- Recent advances in deep learning have focused on studying the generalizability across different local minima of deep neural networks (DNNs), but no existing methods both discover properties of good local minima and develop regularization techniques to induce good local minima.
- Current geolocalisation approaches require image data to be tied to a particular location on a map, but struggle in localizing single images accurately.
- Formulating efficient SQL queries is a challenging and iterative process requiring tuning and execution cycles. Current methods for providing insights about SQL query properties prior to execution depend on database instance statistics or query execution plans.

Summarization of Red Teaming LLMs

You are a red team expert. You summarize the strategy/trick used by another human red team expert to elicit harmful outputs from a language model (LLM) based on a provided dialogue in at most three sentences. Be honest and truthful in the summarization. Do not omit important information even if they are offensive.

Your summary should include:

- The context of the conversation.
- The technique(s) and trick(s) used by the red team experts to elicit harmful outputs.
- An explanation of how the output could be harmful.

Output Format

- A maximum of 3 sentences providing a summary in plain text.
- Make sure all three elements (topics/contexts, techniques/tricks, harm explanations) are included clearly, concisely, and precisely.

Figure 10: Prompt for summarization of the Red Teaming LLM dataset.

1st-order RAG Prompt

You are an expert in analyzing red team attempts aimed at eliciting harmful outputs from large language models (LLMs). Each red team attempt includes:

- The context of the conversation or scenario.
- The specific technique or trick used by the red team expert to elicit harmful outputs.
- An explanation of how the output generated by these tricks could be harmful.

You will be provided with some examples of previous red team attempts. Your task is to predict five new red team attempts, ensuring that each new attempt is thematically relevant to the techniques or scenarios observed in the provided examples and follows a similar format as the provided examples.

Structure your response in a JSON format, with each predicted red team attempt accompanied by a brief rationale. Here's the format I'd like you to use:

```
{
  "predictions": [
    {
      "content": "Predicted red team attempt",
      "rationale": "Brief explanation of why this red team attempt is relevant and how it relates to the provided examples."
    }
    // ... additional red team attempts
  ]
}
```

Figure 11: Prompts used in our 1st-order RAG method on the Red Team Attempts dataset.

D Implementation Details

Repository Access. Our experiment details and code can be found at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/map2text-27FD>.

Fine-tuning Experiments Details. We employed the Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct model for fine-tuning, running on 4 NVIDIA A100

GPUs. Each dataset was fine-tuned for three epochs, and for datasets with over 100,000 data points, the process required approximately 50 hours to complete. To enhance the model’s training efficiency, we utilized the Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) technique, setting the rank (r) to 16 and the scaling factor (α) to 32. We set the dropout rate to 0.05 to prevent overfitting, while setting the initial learning rate to $1e-4$, weight decay to 0.0, and momentum factor (γ) to 0.85 to optimize convergence. Besides, mixed precision training was enabled to maximize computational efficiency. For consistency, all experiments were initialized with the same hyperparameter settings. We use temperate $t = 1$ during inference.

Embedding Inversion. In our embedding inversion approach, the first mapping $g_1 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^H$ is implemented using a K-NN interpolation algorithm. We employ an approximate nearest neighbor (ANN) search method with a threshold across all datasets to efficiently identify the closest data points, ensuring scalability even for larger datasets. The retrieved neighbors’ high-dimensional embeddings are then interpolated using an unweighted interpolation. Although a more complex weighted interpolation could be applied, we did not observe any performance improvements. Intuitively, this method leverages the smoothness of the underlying manifold. The interpolated embedding is then fed into a pre-trained vec2text model, where the number of search steps (`num_steps`) is set to 5, with all other configurations kept as default.

Prompt Examples.

Retrieval Augmented Generation. We use gpt-4o-2024-05-13 for all RAG-based method and set temperature $t = 0$ for all generations. Figure 11 provides an example of prompts used in the 1st-order RAG method for the Red Team Attempts dataset in our experiments. For a comprehensive collection of prompts used across all datasets and all methods, please refer to the `map2text/model/prompts` directory in the repository, which is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/map2text-27FD/map2text/model/prompts/>.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009