

Do LLMs Work on Charts? Designing Few-Shot Prompts for Chart Question Answering and Summarization

Xuan Long Do¹, Mohammad Hassanpour², Ahmed Masry², Parsa Kavehzadeh²,
Enamul Hoque², Shafiq Joty^{3,4*}

¹National University of Singapore, ²York University, Canada,

³Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, ⁴Salesforce Research
xuanlong.do@u.nus.edu, {mhpour, parsaka, enamulh}@yorku.ca,
srjoty@ntu.edu.sg, ahmed.elmasry24653@gmail.com

Abstract

A variety of tasks have been proposed recently to facilitate exploration and analysis of charts such as chart QA and summarization. The dominant paradigm to solve these tasks has been to fine-tune a pretrained model on the task data. However, this approach is not only expensive but also not generalizable to unseen tasks. On the other hand, large language models (LLMs) have shown impressive generalization capabilities to unseen tasks with zero- or few-shot prompting. However, their application to chart-related tasks is not trivial as these tasks typically involve considering not only the underlying data but also the visual features in the chart image. We propose PROMPTCHART, a multimodal few-shot prompting framework with LLMs for chart-related applications. By analyzing the tasks carefully, we have come up with a set of prompting guidelines for each task to elicit the best few-shot performance from LLMs. We further propose a strategy to inject visual information into the prompts. Our experiments on three different chart-related information consumption tasks show that with properly designed prompts LLMs can excel on the benchmarks, achieving state-of-the-art.

1 Introduction

Data visualizations such as bar charts and line charts are frequently used for analyzing data, to derive important insights and make informed decisions (Hoque et al., 2022). However, comprehending important patterns and trends from charts and answering complex questions about them can be cognitively demanding (Whitaker and Jacobbe, 2017; del Puy Pérez-Echeverría et al., 2018). To support users in analyzing charts, various downstream tasks have been proposed such as chart question answering or ChartQA (Masry et al., 2022; Kantharaj et al., 2022a; Lee et al., 2022) and chart summarization (Kantharaj et al., 2022b).

To date, the dominant strategy to tackle these downstream tasks is to fine-tune a pre-trained language model or vision-language model on each task. While this strategy generally yields good performance, it requires a large amount of labeled data for each downstream task as well as computational resources to train. Furthermore, recent studies have shown that even after fine-tuning, these models still struggle with queries that involve logical and arithmetic reasoning (Liu et al., 2022b; Masry et al., 2022; Kantharaj et al., 2022a; Cheng et al., 2023).

Meanwhile, large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive generalization capabilities to unseen tasks through *in-context learning* and/or *instructional tuning*. With in-context learning, LLMs can perform a new task only by looking at few examples without making any gradient update on the task data (Brown et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2023a), while instructional tuning aims to enhance the model’s instruction following capability by explicitly finetuning an LLM on large amount of multi-task instructional data (Wei et al., 2022a; Ouyang et al., 2022). Such generalization ability of LLMs is game changing compared to the predominant finetuning paradigm with two key advantages. First, it eliminates the need to train the model on each downstream task, which is highly resource consuming for LLMs. Second, such ability makes LM-as-a-service possible (Sun et al., 2022), powering wide range of real world applications. Thus, there are emergent studies focusing on few-shot prompting for vision-language tasks (Alayrac et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2022; Najdenkoska et al., 2023).

Despite these recent advances, there has not been any comprehensive work on how few-shot prompting can be effectively applied to chart comprehension and reasoning tasks. Liu et al. (2022a) present a one-shot method for ChartQA, which consists of two main steps: (i) extracting the data table from an input chart; (ii) constructing one-shot prompt to infer the output from an LLM. Nonetheless, this

*Work done when the author was on leave from NTU




Figure 1: An overview of our proposed PROMPTCHART prompting framework. The *Visual Data Table Generator* module is omitted for the tasks of Long-form Chart Question Answering and Chart Summarization.

work only focuses on the one-shot setting and only one type of downstream task (i.e., factoid chart question answering). Moreover, it only uses the extracted data table to answer tasks without using visual features (e.g., colors, positions, and shapes of graphical marks) from the chart, which limits the model’s ability to perform visual reasoning. To our knowledge, there has not been any work that explores few-shot prompting for a diverse range of chart comprehension and reasoning tasks.

To bridge this gap, we take the first step to study few-shot prompting for chart-related tasks. We design PROMPTCHART, a multimodal prompting framework consisting of three modules as shown in Fig. 1. Our main contribution is the *Prompt Constructor* module, which aims to construct effective few-shot prompts. For each task, we focus on analyzing carefully its subcategories and experiment with different few-shot prompting setups to verify the necessity and effectiveness of each demonstration. We then define a set of attributes for each task to guide the prompt constructions. To effectively encode the visual information into the few-shot prompts, we propose *Visual Data Table Generator* (VDTG) module to generate the *visual data table* - a data table that includes visual information such as colors and positions of the chart’s labels.

We evaluate PROMPTCHART on three different benchmarks: (1) Factoid QA with charts where the answer to a question is a short phrase; (2) Long-form Chart QA or LCQA where the answer is an explanatory text; (3) Chart summarization where the

output is a summary of the chart. Compared with existing strong baselines, our framework achieves significant improvements in automatic metrics and human preferences across all downstream tasks, achieving state-of-the-art performance.

2 Related Work

Our work is mainly related to two lines of prior studies that we briefly describe here. An extended related work can be found in Appendix A.1.

2.1 Chart QA and Summarization

Recently, there has been growing interest in solving various chart-related downstream tasks. For example, the chart question answering (CQA) problem takes a question about a chart as input and produces the answer as output (Hoque et al., 2022). Methani et al. (2020) and Masry et al. (2022) propose chart question answering benchmarks targeting factoid questions that require visual and arithmetic reasoning. Meanwhile, long-form chart question answering task (or open-ended CQA) (Kantharaj et al., 2022a) requires an explanatory answer for each question by reasoning over the chart image. In addition, chart summarization task (Kantharaj et al., 2022b) focuses on having a chart image as input and generating a natural language summary covering key insights from the chart. In this work, we verify the effectiveness of our proposed framework on the above three chart question answering and summarization tasks. We study these tasks because they require interactions between textual queries

Datasets	Type	#Charts/#QA pairs
ChartQA	Factoid CQA	21.1K/32.7K
OpenCQA	Long-form CQA	7.7K/7.7K
Chart-to-Text	Chart Summarization	44K/44K

Table 1: Statistics of the downstream benchmarks.

and chart images and also because there are adequate publicly available datasets for them.

2.2 Prompting

With the scaling of model sizes (Devlin et al., 2019; Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020; Chowdhery et al., 2022), large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated strong capabilities in solving multiple NLP downstream tasks only by conditioning on the input prompt which contains a few demonstrations (a.k.a., few-shot prompting). Such paradigms of prompting LLMs are called prompt-based learning or in-context learning (Liu et al., 2023a; Beltagy et al., 2022). This line of research has attracted great attention from the research community to solve downstream tasks including vision-language tasks (Alayrac et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2022; Najdenkoska et al., 2023). However, exploring how chart-related downstream tasks could benefit from the above techniques has received limited attention. Recently, Liu et al. (2022a) propose the first one-shot reasoning framework for chart question answering based on PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2022). Nonetheless, this framework suffers from several limitations as discussed in §1. On the contrary, our study framework PROMPTCHART overcomes these limitations.

3 Problem Formulation

- Problem Definition** We focus on three chart-related tasks: factoid chart QA (FCQA), long-form chart QA (LCQA) and chart summarization (CS). A sample in FCQA can be expressed as (C, D, Q, A) , where C , D , Q and A stand for the corresponding chart image, data table, input question and answer, respectively. Similarly, a sample in LCQA can be expressed as (C, T, O, Q, A) , where T and O respectively represent the chart title and its OCR (optical character recognition) output; other symbols are similarly defined as in FCQA. Similarly, a sample in CS can be expressed as (C, T, O, A) , where A represents the chart summary. The LLM can utilize all the data except A as input, and is expected to produce A as output.

- Benchmarks** We choose ChartQA (Masry et al., 2022) – a benchmark which contains factoid

chart question-answer pairs with visual and logical reasoning, OpenCQA (Kantharaj et al., 2022a) – another QA benchmark where the answers are explanatory descriptions, Chart-to-Text (Kantharaj et al., 2022b) – a benchmark for chart summarization, as the FCQA, LCQA, CS benchmarks respectively to study. For Chart-to-Text, it consists of two datasets, referred to as Pew and Statista. The statistics of the benchmarks are presented in Table 1.

4 Methodology

Fig. 1 shows our prompting framework PROMPTCHART, consisting of three modules: (i) *Prompt Constructor (PC)*; (ii) *Visual Data Table Generator (VDTG)*; (iii) *InstructGPT* (Ouyang et al., 2022). In the case of FCQA, the chart image C is provided to the VDTG module to generate the *visual data table* D_v . With D_v and Q as input, the PC module then constructs the prompt, which is fed into InstructGPT to generate an answer A . For LCQA and CS tasks, the chart title T and the OCRs O are input to the PC module to construct the prompt without going through the VDTG module. We present the details of each module one by one below.

4.1 Prompt Constructor (PC)

For each task, the prompt constructor module constructs the prompts to query the LLM. Liu et al. (2022a) only use a one-shot prompt without conducting a detailed task-prompt analysis. We argue that task-prompt analysis is critical because it helps to identify the necessary demonstrations for each prompt to maximize the LLM’s performance. To achieve this, we thoroughly analyze the task and propose a set of guidelines for prompt construction.

- Factoid Chart Question Answering (FCQA)** Inspired by Chain-of-Thought (Wei et al., 2022b), we propose *chain of chart reasoning (CCR)*, a prompting strategy for FCQA. We categorize the task in FCQA into 9 subcategories outlined in Table 2 and design a CCR prompt format specifically for each. Our CCR formats satisfy two main properties. Firstly, the formats describe clearly the reasoning process step by step, leading to the final answer for each query. Secondly, the elements in the CCR (operands, operators, visual attributes) need to be well-specified with clear relationships. Here, visual attributes include colors (e.g., ‘red’, ‘green’) and positions (e.g., ‘left’, ‘right’) of marks (e.g., bars and lines). We follow these guidelines

Tasks	Specifics - Supportive Case	Chain of Chart Reasoning (CCR) Prompt Format
Retrieval	Visual Retrieval (Color & Position) - Case 1	<i>No demonstration needed</i>
	Numerical Retrieval - Case 2	<i>No demonstration needed</i>
	Compositional Retrieval - Case 3	<i>No demonstration needed</i>
	Complex Retrieval - Case 9	operands with visual attributes, operands without visual attributes, reasoning, result.
Reasoning	Add & Subtraction - Case 4	operands without visual attributes, operators, reasoning, result.
	Division & Multiplication - Case 5	operands without visual attributes, operators, reasoning, result.
	Visual Reasoning - Case 6	operands with visual attributes, operators, reasoning, result.
	Compositional Reasoning - Case 7	operands with visual attributes, operands without visual attributes, operators, reasoning, result.
	Boolean	All types of reasoning - Case 8

Table 2: Task types and prompt format for factoid chart question answering. Supportive cases are illustrated in Fig. 2. Each element in the CCR is colored uniquely.

to carefully handcraft our prompt consisting of 6 demonstrations which are samples from ChartQA (Masry et al., 2022). We show an example below:

Question: *Is the average value of Andean Latin America and Cambodia more than the value of Thailand?*

CCR: *"The value of Andean Latin America is 1.47 and the value of Cambodia is 0.77. So the average value of Andean Latin America and Cambodia is $(1.47 + 0.77) / 2 = 1.12$. The value of Thailand is 0.39. Since $1.12 > 0.39$, the average value of Andean Latin America and Cambodia is more than the value of Thailand. The answer is Yes"*

We present all 6 demonstrations in Table 6, and discuss their details in §6.1.

- **Long-form Chart Question Answering (LCQA)** Similar to FCQA, our goal is to build a prompt consisting of demonstrations that represent most of the available long-form chart QA pairs. We adhere to the following three principles while designing the prompt for the LCQA task: (i) Descriptive answer to each question in the prompt should be focused and informative enough, i.e., should not be too long and beyond the scope of the question or too short and unable to capture the full extent of the answer. (ii) the prompt should cover the different QA pair types. (iii) If the LLM is inferred to generate an answer for a question that is in the prompt, that generated answer must be as close as the answer given in the prompt. This property ensures that the model does not hallucinate when answering the questions that it is instructed from the demonstrations, leading towards more factually-correct generations.

We carefully select our prompt having a total of 6 demonstrations from OpenCQA (Kantharaj et al., 2022a). Among them, 2 questions are *Describe and Summary*, i.e., questions asking to describe or summarize the chart based on statistical properties

such as describing data distribution, outliers, and trends, 2 are *Comparative* i.e., questions asking to compare the specified items in the chart, and 2 are *Discover*, questions asking to derive key insights or findings from the chart. All the demonstrations are shown in Table 7 with details in §6.2.

- **Chart Summarization (CS)** Except design principle (i), the other two principles of LCQA are applicable to chart summarization. Specifically, the prompt should cover different summarization types (e.g., comparative, descriptive, reasoning) and the LLM should not hallucinate on demonstrations. We select 3 demonstrations from the Pew dataset and 3 demonstrations for the Statista dataset of Chart-to-Text (Kantharaj et al., 2022b). Table 8 presents all the demonstrations, which contains examples of three summary types: *Perceptual and Cognitive* (e.g., cause and effect, trends), *Statistical and Comparative* (e.g., min, max, higher, smaller), and *Visual Encoding* (relating to visual information such as colors and positions).

4.2 Visual Data Table Generator (VDTG)

Prior work (Liu et al., 2022a) only considers the data table without any visual information from the chart, which makes the task of chart QA lose its visual nature. To study how the visual information affects the model performance in few-shot prompting, we introduce the VDTG module to construct *visual data table*, a representation integrating the usual data table with visual attributes of the marks (Fig. 4). Given a chart image, the VDTG module is trained to generate a visual data table with two properties: (i) it has the associated colors (in natural language) of the rows/columns' labels; (ii) the rows and columns of the chart are sorted in their appearing positions in the chart.

We construct the training dataset for VDTG module from the *full version* of ChartQA at Github¹. To create the ground-truth visual data table for each chart image, we first create *sorted data table* by collecting all the texts and coordinators of the bounding boxes of the chart and sorting them by the x-axis values and y-axis values. We also collect all the colors of the charts' data marks (e.g., bars and lines) by parsing their original SVG files. Since those colors are in hexadecimal format, we convert them into natural language colors by mapping them with the name of its closest color in `webcolors`²

¹<https://github.com/vis-nlp/ChartQA>

²<https://pypi.org/project/webcolors/>

using a KDTree (Bentley, 1975). Still, we have noticed some hexadecimal codes are not present in the `webcolors` set, so we decided to manually check 300 random visual data tables and added 80 new mappings `{hex, color name}` to the set. Moreover, we remove the charts whose bounding boxes information is not fully provided. Overall, we obtain a total of 18,317 training samples and 1,056 validation samples. We fine-tune UniChart (Masry et al., 2023) on our constructed dataset, a SoTA Chart-to-Table model, to generate the visual data tables. It is worth noting that this module is chart-type agnostic. Naturally, since it is trained on ChartQA, it supports the available chart types in ChartQA, including a variety of bar charts, line charts, and pie charts. The details of our training and inference for this module are in Appendix A.2.

4.3 InstructGPT

We use the frozen InstructGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022) as our LLM, which is based on GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) and has been fine-tuned on natural human written instructions. Note that other LLMs such as ChatGPT can also be directly used.

5 Experiments

5.1 QA and Summarization Experiments

- **Baseline Models** We compare our model with 3 streams of baselines. The *first stream* consists of *Models with fine-tuning strategies*, which can be further categorized into two subcategories: (a) models that take the chart image as input such as Pix2Struct (Lee et al., 2022) - the state-of-the-art visually-situated language model, MatCha (Liu et al., 2022b), and UniChart (Masry et al., 2023) - the state-of-the-art chart pretraining model; and (b) models that take the data table as input such as VisionTapas (Masry et al., 2022) - the original state-of-the-art vision-language model on ChartQA, VL-T5 (Cho et al., 2021) - the state-of-the-art model on OpenCQA, T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) a competitive text generation model on the chart summarization task as reported by Kantharaj et al. (2022b). The *second stream* consists of *Large language models with data tables provided*: FlanT5-xxl (Chung et al., 2022) - an instructions-fine-tuned large language model achieving impressive few-shot results on many NLP tasks, PAL (Gao et al., 2022) - the state-of-the-art few-shot code-based reasoning model on the GSM8K benchmark (Cobbe et al., 2021). The *third stream* comprises *Large language*

models without data tables provided: DePlot + FlanPaLM (Liu et al., 2022a) - the state-of-the-art factoid chart question answering model.

For the FCQA task, we select Pix2Struct, MatCha, DePlot, PAL, FlanT5-xxl as the five baselines. We adopt FlanT5-xxl and VL-T5 as the two baselines for the LCQA task. For the CS task, we compare our model with FlanT5-xxl and T5.

- **Inference** InstructGPT model is called for the inference through OpenAI API being *text-davinci-003* in April 2023. We utilize Nucleus Sampling (Holtzman et al., 2020) as our decoding strategy with a temperature value of 0.7, a `max_tokens` value of 256, and a `top_p` value of 0.9 as our decoding hyper-parameters. The `frequency_penalty` and `presence_penalty` are set to 0.

- **Automatic Evaluation & Human Preferences** For text generation tasks, prior works (Belz and Reiter, 2006; Tan et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2023b) discuss that n-gram reference-based evaluation metrics for text generation tasks such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and ROUGE (Lin, 2004) may have a relatively low correlation with human judgments and generated texts with very high scores can have a poor quality (Smith et al., 2016; Kann et al., 2018; Mathur et al., 2020). Therefore, we focus on evaluating the factual correctness of the models for LCQA and CS tasks. In particular, we use *QAFactEval* (Fabbri et al., 2022) (by averaging all its criteria), a QA-based metric that computes a factual score based on the ability of a QA model to answer questions generated from the input, given the generated text. We further follow Ouyang et al. (2022) to conduct *human preferences* to evaluate the performance of models. Specifically, for each dataset, we randomly select 300 samples. We hire three annotators who are English native speakers and collect the generated outputs of these samples from the best-performing baseline (which is not a variant of our model) and PROMPTCHART. We then ask the annotators to rate which one they prefer, or it is a tier. The annotators' agreements are measured by Krippel's alpha (Krippendorff, 2011).

- **Zero- and Few-shot Settings** For zero-shot, we follow Kojima et al. (2022) to prompt the InstructGPT model to generate the textual outputs step by step. Specifically, we use "Answer the following question step by step." as the FCQA instruction and "Answer the following question step by step

Model	Gold table?	Mode	ChartQA		
			Aug.	Human	Avg.
T5	Yes	fine-tuned	56.96	25.12	41.04
VLT5	Yes	fine-tuned	56.88	26.24	41.56
VisionTapas	Yes	fine-tuned	61.44	29.60	45.52
Pix2Struct	No	fine-tuned	81.60	30.5	56.0
MatCha	No	fine-tuned	90.2	38.02	64.2
UniChart	No	fine-tuned	88.56	43.92	66.24
FlanT5-xxl	Yes	zero-shot	63.84	27.84	45.84
PAL	Yes	zero-shot	80.88	42.77	61.83
InstructGPT	Yes	zero-shot	62.24	40.96	51.60
DePlot + Inst. + CCR	No	zero-shot	78.64	45.78	62.21
UniChart + Inst. + CCR	No	zero-shot	79.76	46.67	63.28
PROMPTCHART	No	zero-shot	79.44	47.11	63.1
DePlot + GPT-3 + CoT	No	one-shot	37.3	36.5	36.9
DePlot + FlanPaLM + CoT	No	one-shot	76.7	57.8	67.3
FlanT5-xxl	Yes	few-shot	64.56	28.56	46.56
PAL	Yes	few-shot	0.00	0.16	0.08
InstructGPT	Yes	few-shot	75.12	49.52	62.32
DePlot + Inst. + CCR	No	few-shot	80.28	60.49	70.39
UniChart + Inst. + CCR	No	few-shot	81.68	62.24	71.96
PROMPTCHART	No	few-shot	81.44	63.2	72.32

Table 3: Factoid Chart QA experimental results. PROMPTCHART is equivalent to InstructGPT + CCR + Visual Information. All the metrics are measured in percentage.

by a single paragraph." as the LCQA instruction. For the CS task, the instruction is "Summarize the trends in the chart step by step and write the summary.". The full sets of few-shot demonstrations for FCQA, LCQA, CS tasks are provided in Table 6, Table 7, Table 8 respectively.

5.2 Main Results

- **VDTG Results** To evaluate our visual data table generation model, we follow recent relevant works in the Chart-to-Table domain and evaluate our model using the Relative Number Set Similarity (RNSS) (Masry et al., 2022) and Relative Mapping Similarity (RMS) (Liu et al., 2022a) metrics. Our model exhibits an impressive RNSS of 94.29% and RMS of 89.55%, highlighting its strong capability to extract data from images. This successful visual data table extraction process has significantly contributed to the overall performance of PROMPTCHART.

- **FCQA, LCQA, CS Results** Our main experimental results for FCQA task on ChartQA are outlined in Table 3. We derive three main observations. Firstly, compared to zero-shot, one-shot, and fine-tuned baselines, PROMPTCHART (few-shot) outperforms them by large margins, especially on the *human* test set. These improvements verify the effectiveness of our proposed FCQA prompt. Secondly, our experiments on *augmented* test set reveal that the PROMPTCHART gains minor improve-

Model	Mode	OpenCQA		Chart-to-Text			
		QAFactEval	HumP	QAFactEval-P	HumP-P	QAFactEval-S	HumP-S
T5	fine-tuned	21.39	-	18.57	-	53.69	2.34
VLT5	fine-tuned	22.65	10.34	-	-	-	-
MatCha	fine-tuned	-	-	13.03	-	35.50	-
FlanT5-xxl	zero-shot	13.97	-	19.36	4	23.98	-
InstructGPT	zero-shot	23.16	-	18.13	-	24.72	-
PROMPTCHART	zero-shot	25.85	-	18.44	-	25.31	-
FlanT5-xxl	few-shot	5.61	-	18.29	-	34.05	-
InstructGPT	few-shot	24.23	-	29.17	-	38.02	-
PROMPTCHART	few-shot	27.19	81.67	31.17	94.34	49.88	94.23

Table 4: Long-form chart question answering and chart summarization experimental results. Metrics are measured in percentage.

ments when conditioning on the few-shot prompt instead of the instruction only (i.e., the zero-shot setting). We attribute this to the nature of the questions from *augmented* test set since they are mostly retrieval and not reasoning questions, which makes them less challenging for LLMs such as InstructGPT. Thirdly, the results of PROMPTCHART and its variant *UniChart + InstructGPT + CCR* indicate that although the visual data tables slightly worsen the performance of the model on visually-irrelevant questions, they boost the performance of the models on visually-related questions, leading to overall improvements. We further provide additional analysis for the visual data table representation in Appendix A.8. Exemplary cases are in Table 15.

Our evaluations in Table 4 for LCQA and CS tasks on OpenCQA and Chart-to-Text benchmarks illustrate a number of noteworthy findings. Firstly, with the carefully-designed prompts that we propose, PROMPTCHART significantly improves the factuality scores on OpenCQA and Chart-to-Text Pew datasets, surpassing the performance of all fine-tuned baselines. Secondly, the model also exhibits superior human preferences in comparison to these fine-tuned methods. Finally, we observe that PROMPTCHART generally performs better in the few-shot setting compared to the zero-shot setting. This highlights the importance of good demonstrations in determining its performance. Our annotators achieve strong agreements with an average Kripp’s alpha values of 0.86 (0.79 for OpenCQA, 0.91 for Chart-to-Text-Pew, and 0.88 for Chart-to-Text-Statista).

6 Discussion


6.1 Demonstration Selection for FCQA

We discuss the necessity of each demonstration in our proposed six-shot prompt for FCQA task. Fig. 2 presents our supportive cases and the InstructGPT’s answers in the *zero-shot* setting. By examining these cases, we derive several observa-

Entity	Good influence (Green)	No influence (Grey)	Bad influence (Blue)
Morality	45	5	13
Politics	52	10	16
Personal	62	8	22
The economy	63	12	27
Education	79	11	39

Sub-Saharan African publics largely see growing internet connectivity as a positive

Generally, do you think the increasing use of the internet has had a good influence, a bad influence or no influence at all on ___ in our country?



Note: Percentages are six-country medians based on total sample in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa and Tanzania.
Source: Spring 2017 Global Attitudes Survey, Q74e-e.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER

Case	Question	Correct Answer	InstructGPT's Answer
1	What is the highest value of green bars?	79	79 (Education)
2	What is the second lowest value of No influence?	8	8
3	What is the lowest value of the right-most bars?	13	13
4	How much value increase in No influence from Politics to The economy?	2	12
5	How many times does No influence in Politics bigger than The economy?	10:12	10 times
6	What is the sum of the highest blue bar and grey bar?	51	39 + 11 = 50
7	What is the sum of the two highest blue bars and lowest Bad influence?	111 (39 + 27 + 45)	85 (63 + 22 + 11)
8	Is the sum of the two highest No influence more than all values of Bad influence?	No	No, the sum of the two highest No influence values is 18, which is less than the sum of all the Bad influence values which is 76.
9	How many bars have values of less than 10?	2	3

Figure 2: Supportive cases for our ChartQA prompt construction. Green answers are correct answers, and red ones are errors.

tions. Firstly, InstructGPT model can do *Visual Retrieval*, *Numerical Retrieval*, and *Compositional Retrieval* without any demonstration (i.e., in zero-shot setting), which are proven by Case 1, 2, 3 respectively. Secondly, without any demonstration, the model seems to fluctuate in getting correct answers for arithmetic reasoning types including *Add & Subtraction* and *Division* (Case 4, 5, 6, 7). Thirdly, for more complex reasoning types such as *Compositional Reasoning*, the model performs poorly (Case 9) even in the reasoning steps (Case 8). Based on these observations, we propose the prompt consisting of 6 demonstrations for the types of queries in which the model makes mistakes. We also conduct an experiment in which we select 6 random samples in the ChartQA validation set as demonstrations, PROMPTCHART achieves an overall accuracy of 68.92% (56.95% in the human set, and 80.88% in the augmented set), which is far lower from our proposed prompt, suggesting that our prompt is generalizable to other variations of questions within the benchmark. Note that, for a new benchmark, our current selection of demonstrations may not be sufficient, however, our methodology of selecting demonstrations can be adapted to improve generalizability.

6.2 Best Number of Demonstrations for LCQA and CS Task

We conduct experiments to select the best number of demonstrations in the prompts fed to the model for the tasks of LCQA and CS. Specifically, we select a subset containing 300 random samples from




Figure 3: Performance of our PROMPTCHART with different numbers of demonstrations in the prompt on 300 random samples of each benchmark.

the validation splits of Chart-to-Text (Pew dataset and Statista dataset) and OpenCQA as our mini-test sets. We then compare the performance of our model at different numbers of carefully-selected demonstrations (1, 3, 6, 9) and report the corresponding QAFactEval scores (Fabbri et al., 2022). We select the demonstrations thoroughly, following the proposed properties in §4. After obtaining the best number of demonstrations on each mini-test set, we randomly select the same number of demonstrations to test the effectiveness of our proposed properties. The results are presented in Fig. 3. We derive two main observations. Firstly, as we add more demonstrations to the prompt, the model may tend to generate more factually incorrect texts compared to using the previous number of demonstrations. Secondly, our careful sets of demonstrations

Model	OpenCQA	Pew	Statista
LCQA w/o (ii)	25.87	-	-
LCQA w/o (iii)	27.01	-	-
PROMPTCHART	27.19	-	-
CS w/o (ii)	-	29.11	47.61
CS w/o (iii)	-	30.79	48.16
PROMPTCHART	-	31.17	49.88

Table 5: Effects of proposed properties. We select the same number of demonstrations with our proposed number for each task as in §4.

boost the performance of the model significantly compared to random selections, which illustrates the effectiveness of our proposed properties.

6.3 Dive Deeper into the Proposed Properties

To verify the necessity of our proposed properties for guiding the prompt construction in §4, we conduct experiments by removing the properties one by one, resulting in 4 experiments. Our illustrative cases are presented in Appendix A.9:

- **LCQA - w/o prop. (ii)** Our prompt for LCQA task only contains 6 *Describe and Summary* question-answer pairs. This experiment is to show that without *Comparative* and *Discoverer* QA pairs in the prompt, the model achieved lower performance.

- **LCQA - w/o prop. (iii)** We select 6 other samples in OpenCQA dataset as demonstrations such that the model hallucinates on demonstrations, showing that it is better to ensure this property.

- **CS - w/o prop. (ii)** Our prompt in the CS task only contains 6 *Statistical and Comparative* summaries. This experiment is to verify that without any *Perceptual and Cognitive* summary in the demonstrations, the model might output numbers or texts that do not exist in the input.

- **CS - w/o prop. (iii)** We select 6 other summaries in the dataset as demonstrations such that there exists at least one of them which the model hallucinates on, showing that it is better to ensure property (iii).

Our experimental results are outlined in Table 5. We observe that removing any proposed property results in decreased performance of the model, which enforces our proposed properties.

6.4 Error Analysis

Despite achieving promising performance, our proposed framework still falls into several categories

of errors. We discuss them below and all the case studies are introduced in Table 16.

- **Factoid Chart Question Answering** To understand the challenges of FCQA task and promising future directions, we manually investigate 100 FCQA questions that the model failed to output the correct answers and realize the following issues:

- (1) **Logical and mathematical reasoning** is a common error that LLMs such as InstructGPT often make (Gao et al., 2022). Case 1 provides an illustration of this phenomenon, where the model correctly identifies the required operands and operators, but still produces incorrect computational output. The model also frequently makes logical errors, as demonstrated in Case 2, where despite correctly calculating the average percentage of three bars as 6.75%, which is greater than 6%, the model fails to conclude the correct answer.

- (2) **Visual data table generation challenge** Although directly fine-tuning UniChart (Masry et al., 2023) to generate visual data tables with correct positions gives us some minor improvements, we observe that UniChart sometimes generates wrong names of the colors. Table 9 illustrates some of such cases. Given a huge room for future research as discussed in Appendix A.8, future works can focus on improving this module.

- **Long-form Chart Question Answering & Chart Summarization** Our human evaluation on PROMPTCHART reveal several key challenges:

- (1) **Hallucinations & factual errors** are observed from the generated answers of our PROMPTCHART. These errors are well-known LLMs issues, and have been studied extensively by prior works (Fabbri et al., 2022; Ji et al., 2023). For LCQA, one example of such errors is Case 5 in which the model generates unwanted numbers (highlighted in red color) that are not in the chat image. Similarly for CS, in Case 6, the red passage could not be found in the chart image and input information, but the model generates it confidently.

- (2) **Logical & mathematical reasoning errors** also appear during generating long-form answers and summaries. Case 4 is an example of LCQA task, in which "decreased by 10 percentage points" should be from "88 % to 78 %" instead of "78 % to 88 %" as generated. Additionally, Case 3 illustrates a CS example, in which the model, despite correctly retrieving 8269.54 kg in 2019, a number being much bigger than 6348.43 in 2011, still concludes

that 6348.43 in 2011 is the largest amount.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we take the first step to study few-shot prompting with large language models for chart question answering and summarization tasks. We propose PROMPTCHART, a multimodal few-shot prompting framework with LLMs. Through meticulous task analysis, we have developed a comprehensive set of prompting guidelines that are specifically tailored to each downstream task. These guidelines aim to maximize the few-shot performance of large language models (LLMs). Additionally, we propose the *visual data table* representation that incorporates visual features into the prompt and the LLM. Experimental results show that PROMPTCHART achieves significant improvements over prior one-shot and fine-tuned baselines, as evidenced by automatic metrics and human evaluation. In the future, we plan to explore dynamically selecting the demonstrations in the prompt to further optimize the performance of LLMs.

Limitations

One limitation of our work is the utilization of a fixed prompt for each task, which has the potential to restrict the model’s performance. To mitigate this issue, we made our best to explicitly set our proposed properties to cover the different challenges in the LCQA and CS benchmarks. Still, more investigation is needed to explore different prompt setups that might improve performance. In the factoid chart question answering task, our analysis of the challenges and incorporating them into our fixed prompt serves as an additional effort to address this issue. In addition, our manual human evaluations in §6.4 reveal that InstructGPT often makes logical & mathematical reasoning errors, as well as hallucinations & factual errors during generating long-form texts. In the future, we will focus on improving the VDTG module to make it more robust to different types of charts, as well as improving the logical and mathematical reasoning capabilities of LLMs.

Ethics Statement

7.1 Risk in Model Deployment

Deploying a technology developed by a third party such as OpenAI carries ethical considerations that must be addressed to ensure fairness and mitigate

potential harm. This involves choosing algorithms and performance metrics that promote fairness (Corbett-Davies et al., 2017), as well as identifying and addressing any biases in the pre-trained model. In this work, we evaluate the performance of the models by a factual correctness metric (Fabbri et al., 2022), which encourages the generated texts to be factually correct based on the input information and discourages hallucinations. However, it is important to acknowledge that although our method strives for factual correctness, it does not guarantee perfectly factual outputs and may be abused to spread misinformation among the public. In addition, through human evaluations, we observe that our proposed method does not generate any discriminatory or insulting responses. However, it is important to note that we cannot guarantee that our method will never produce harmful content. Vigilance is necessary to mitigate the risk of producing harmful outputs.

7.2 Human Evaluation

During the human evaluation experiments, we hired three annotators to score a total of 300 generated texts. To fairly compensate them, we paid them an hourly wage of \$15, which is higher than the local statutory minimum wage. Additionally, to protect the privacy of the annotators, we kept all annotations anonymized.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Natural Sciences & Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada and Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI). Do Xuan Long is supported by the A*STAR Computing and Information Science (ACIS) scholarship, A*STAR, Singapore.

References

- Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, Roman Ring, Eliza Rutherford, Serkan Cabi, Tengda Han, Zhitao Gong, Sina Samangooei, Marianne Monteiro, Jacob Menick, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andrew Brock, Aida Nematzadeh, Sahand Sharifzadeh, Mikolaj Binkowski, Ricardo Barreira, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Karen Simonyan. 2022. [Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Abhijit Balaji, Thuvaarakkesh Ramanathan, and

- Venkateshwarlu Sonathi. 2018. Chart-text: A fully automated chart image descriptor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.10636*.
- Iz Beltagy, Arman Cohan, Robert Logan IV, Sewon Min, and Sameer Singh. 2022. [Zero- and few-shot NLP with pretrained language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorial Abstracts*, pages 32–37, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anja Belz and Ehud Reiter. 2006. [Comparing automatic and human evaluation of NLG systems](#). In *11th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 313–320, Trento, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jon Louis Bentley. 1975. Multidimensional binary search trees used for associative searching. *Communications of the ACM*, 18(9):509–517.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Zhi-Qi Cheng, Qi Dai, Siyao Li, Jingdong Sun, Teruko Mitamura, and Alexander G Hauptmann. 2023. Chartreader: A unified framework for chart derendering and comprehension without heuristic rules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02173*.
- Jaemin Cho, Jie Lei, Hao Tan, and Mohit Bansal. 2021. Unifying vision-and-language tasks via text generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1931–1942. PMLR.
- Jinho Choi, Sanghun Jung, Deok Gun Park, Jaegul Choo, and Niklas Elmquist. 2019. Visualizing for the non-visual: Enabling the visually impaired to use visualization. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, volume 38, pages 249–260. Wiley Online Library.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2022. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Sam Corbett-Davies, Emma Pierson, Avi Feller, Sharad Goel, and Aziz Huq. 2017. Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness. In *Proceedings of the 23rd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 797–806.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *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)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander Richard Fabbri, Chien-Sheng Wu, Wenhao Liu, and Caiming Xiong. 2022. Qafacteval: Improved qa-based factual consistency evaluation for summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2587–2601.
- Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2022. Pal: Program-aided language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.10435*.
- Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020. [The curious case of neural text de-generation](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Enamul Hoque, Parsa Kavehzadeh, and Ahmed Masry. 2022. Chart question answering: State of the art and future directions. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, volume 41, pages 555–572. Wiley Online Library.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38.
- Katharina Kann, Sascha Rothe, and Katja Filippova. 2018. [Sentence-level fluency evaluation: References help, but can be spared!](#) In *Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 313–323, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shankar Kantharaj, Xuan Long Do, Rixie Tiffany Ko Leong, Jia Qing Tan, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. 2022a. [Opencqa: Open-ended question answering with charts](#). *The 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Shankar Kantharaj, Rixie Tiffany Leong, Xiang Lin, Ahmed Masry, Megh Thakkar, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. 2022b. [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)*,

- pages 4005–4023, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. [Large language models are zero-shot reasoners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Klaus Krippendorff. 2011. Computing krippendorff’s alpha-reliability.
- Kenton Lee, Mandar Joshi, Iulia Turc, Hexiang Hu, Fangyu Liu, Julian Eisenschlos, Urvashi Khandelwal, Peter Shaw, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. 2022. Pix2struct: Screenshot parsing as pretraining for visual language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03347*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fangyu Liu, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Francesco Piccinno, Syrine Krichene, Chenxi Pang, Kenton Lee, Mandar Joshi, Wenhua Chen, Nigel Collier, and Yasemin Altun. 2022a. Deplot: One-shot visual language reasoning by plot-to-table translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10505*.
- Fangyu Liu, Francesco Piccinno, Syrine Krichene, Chenxi Pang, Kenton Lee, Mandar Joshi, Yasemin Altun, Nigel Collier, and Julian Martin Eisenschlos. 2022b. Matcha: Enhancing visual language pretraining with math reasoning and chart derendering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09662*.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2023a. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9):1–35.
- Xiaoyi Liu, Diego Klabjan, and Patrick NBless. 2019. Data extraction from charts via single deep neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.11906*.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruo Chen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023b. Gpteval: Nlg evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16634*.
- Junyu Luo, Zekun Li, Jinpeng Wang, and Chin-Yew Lin. 2021. Chartocr: Data extraction from charts images via a deep hybrid framework. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 1917–1925.
- Ahmed Masry, Parsa Kavehzadeh, Xuan Long Do, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. 2023. Unichart: A universal vision-language pretrained model for chart comprehension and reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14761*.
- Ahmed Masry, Do Long, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq Joty, and Enamul Hoque. 2022. [ChartQA: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2263–2279, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nitika Mathur, Timothy Baldwin, and Trevor Cohn. 2020. [Tangled up in BLEU: Reevaluating the evaluation of automatic machine translation evaluation metrics](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4984–4997, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nitesh Methani, Pritha Ganguly, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Pratyush Kumar. 2020. Plotqa: Reasoning over scientific plots. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*.
- Ivona Najdenkoska, Xiantong Zhen, and Marcel Worring. 2023. [Meta learning to bridge vision and language models for multimodal few-shot learning](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.02155*.
- 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*, pages 311–318.
- Jorge Poco and Jeffrey Heer. 2017. Reverse-engineering visualizations: Recovering visual encodings from chart images. In *Computer graphics forum*, volume 36, pages 353–363. Wiley Online Library.
- M^a del Puy Pérez-Echeverría, Yolanda Postigo, and Cristina Marín. 2018. [Understanding of graphs in social science undergraduate students: selection and interpretation of graphs](#). *Irish Educational Studies*, 37(1):89–111.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Aaron Smith, Christian Hardmeier, and Joerg Tiedemann. 2016. [Climbing mont BLEU: The strange](#)

- world of reachable high-BLEU translations. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, pages 269–281.
- Tianxiang Sun, Yunfan Shao, Hong Qian, Xuanjing Huang, and Xipeng Qiu. 2022. Black-box tuning for language-model-as-a-service. In *ICML*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 20841–20855. PMLR.
- Liling Tan, Jon Dehdari, and Josef van Genabith. 2015. An awkward disparity between BLEU / RIBES scores and human judgements in machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Asian Translation (WAT2015)*, pages 74–81, Kyoto, Japan. Workshop on Asian Translation.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022a. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022b. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*.
- Douglas Whitaker and Tim Jacobbe. 2017. Students’ understanding of bar graphs and histograms: Results from the locus assessments. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 25(2):90–102.
- Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. 2022. Learning to prompt for vision-language models.

A Appendices

A.1 Extended Related Work

A.1.1 Chart Data Extraction

Information Extraction (IE) from charts is a challenging task due to variations in chart types and styles. Early works in this area use a combination of different approaches to creating a pipeline that extracts data from chart (Poco and Heer, 2017; Balaji et al., 2018). These feature-based approaches are shown to not generalize well on various kinds of charts. Therefore, more recent works adopt deep learning models to extract data from charts e.g. Choi et al. (2019) use the idea of detecting bounding boxes for bar charts. Liu et al. (2019) propose a recurrent network for pie charts. These methods achieved significant improvements. However, they are specifically designed for one type of chart. To overcome this, Luo et al. (2021) proposes a hybrid framework that can generate data from different types of charts. ChartOCR (Luo et al., 2021) achieves the SOTA results at the time, but similar to other pipeline-based methods, the error will propagate through the pipeline, hence can affect the performance drastically. As end-to-end approaches in other computer vision tasks gained attention, Liu et al. (2022b) propose an end-to-end model which was based on Pix2Struct (Lee et al., 2022) architecture and further tuned on chart derendering and math reasoning. Recently, Masry et al. (2023) propose *UniChart*, an end-to-end pretrained chart model which achieves state-of-the-art result on chart-to-table generation task. As the focus of this paper is on constructing prompts for the chart comprehension tasks, further exploration of end-to-end data extraction approaches is left for future works.

A.2 VDTG Training Details

We fine-tune UniChart (Masry et al., 2023) model for 50K steps with a batch size of 80. We use a learning rate of 1e-4 and 500 warmup steps. We evaluate the model every 1K steps and choose the best checkpoint for inference.

A.3 FCQA Prompt

Table 6 illustrates our full demonstrations for the task of factoid chart question answering. The samples are selected carefully from the validation split of ChartQA (Masry et al., 2022), each of them covers one question type that the InstructGPT model fails to answer presented in Fig. 2.

Index	Question	CCR Format: operands with visual attributes, operands without visual attributes, operators, reasoning, result	Question Type
1	How many data points on the disapprove line are above 50?	The disapprove number 51 and 50 are greater than 50. The answer is 2.	Complex Retrieval
2	How much value of 'Mostly bad news' increased from Jan. 2011 to Sept. 2011?	The value of 'Mostly bad news' in Jan. 2011 is 24 and in Sept. 2011 is 61. So the increase is $61 - 24 = 37$. The answer is 37.	Add/Subtract
3	What's the ratio of Lean Republican segment and Republican segment?	The value of Lean Republican segment is 39 and the value of Republican segment is 53. The ratio is $39 / 53 = 0.7358$. The answer is 0.7358.	Divide
4	What's the average value of the first two blue bars in the chart?	The first two blue bars are 30-34 years old with 0.35 and 25-29 years old with 0.31. The average value is $(0.35 + 0.31) / 2 = 0.33$. The answer is 0.33.	Visual Reasoning
5	What's the total sum of peak points of all three lines?	The peak point of red line is 80, the peak point of yellow line is 68, the peak point of green line is 7. The total sum of peak points is $80 + 68 + 7 = 155$. The answer is 155.	Compositional Reasoning
6	Is the average value of Andean Latin America and Cambodia more than the value of Thailand?	The value of Andean Latin America is 1.47 and the value of Cambodia is 0.77. So the average value of Andean Latin America and Cambodia is $(1.47 + 0.77) / 2 = 1.12$. The value of Thailand is 0.39. Since $1.12 > 0.39$, the average value of Andean Latin America and Cambodia is more than the value of Thailand. The answer is Yes.	Boolean

Table 6: Demonstrations for factoid chart question answering task. Samples are from the validation split of ChartQA (Masry et al., 2022) dataset.

A.4 LCQA Prompt

We present all the demonstrations used for LCQA task in Table 7. The 6 samples are selected carefully from the validation split of OpenCQA (Kantharaj et al., 2022a) dataset.

A.5 Chart Summarization Prompt

Table 8 presents all the demonstrations we use for the task of chart summarization. All 6 demonstrations are from Chart-to-Text dataset (Kantharaj et al., 2022b). The first three samples are taken from validation set of Pew dataset, whilst the last 3 from Statista dataset.

A.6 Visual Data Table Generator (VDTG)

There are two types of visual data tables that we constructed to train the model, as shown in Fig. 4.

Table 9 shows some samples outputs from our proposed VDTG module. We observe that the first two cases the VDTG model can generate the correct colors and positions of the labels. In the 3-rd case, however, the model makes an error when outputting the "light blue" instead of "blue". In the 4-th case, the model outputs the correct colors but wrong positions since the line "Women" should come first. In the 5-th case, it is challenging for the model to distinguish between the colors that are similar. In the 6-th case, the model also makes an error in generating blue instead of the correct color is gray.

A.7 Consistency of Generated Output with Demonstrations

There have one consistency property that we propose in our prompt construction rules for LCQA and CS tasks (§4): (iii) in §4. Although generating texts given a piece of information is a one-to-many relationship, i.e., there may have multiple correct answers, our motivation for this property is that the language model should answer consistently and correctly what it is taught through demonstrations. To verify this property in our proposed prompts, for each of LCQA and CS tasks, we input the proposed prompt and ask the model to generate the answer for each question in the prompt. The experimental results for LCQA and CS are illustrated in Table 10 and Table 11 respectively. We observe that although the textual outputs of the model sometimes are slightly different from the input demonstrations, the main points are kept without adding any hallucinating information, which verifies that our prompts satisfy (iii) (§4) property.

A.8 Analysis of Visual Data Table Representation

This section is to answer the research question: **"What is the maximal improvement we can obtain by integrating visual data tables instead of traditional data tables?"** To answer this question, we manually label the colors for a total of 203 color-related QA pairs in the human test set of ChartQA (Masry et al., 2022). We then examine the performance of InstructGPT model on these QA pairs

Index	Input	Output	Question Type
1	What opinion do the public have about earth warming? Title: Is there solid evidence the earth is warming? Mixed evidencel Total U,S population Context: Is there solid evidence the earth is warming? <S> Mixed evidencel <S> Yes, because of <S> Yes, because of <S> Yes but don't <S> No <S> Some evidencel <S> human activity <S> natura patterns <S> know cause <S> Don't know <S> Total U,S population <S> 47 % <S> 18% <S> 6% 21 % <S> 8% <S> Unaffiliated <S> 58% <S> 11% <S> 6% 18% <S> 7% <S> White mainline Protestants <S> 48% <S> 19% <S> 6% 19% <S> 8% <S> White non-Hispanic Catholics <S> 44% <S> 20% <S> 6% 22% <S> 8% <S> Black Protestants <S> 39% <S> 36% <S> 5% 15% <S> 5% <S> White evangelical Protestants <S> 17% <S> 7% <S> 11% <S> 34% <S> 31% <S> The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life <S> pewforum.ORG	The unaffiliated (58 %) are the most likely among the religious groups studied to say there is solid evidence the earth is warming because of human activity . White evangelical Protestants are the most likely to say there is no solid evidence the earth is warming (31 %) , and the least likely to believe that humans have contributed to heating up the planet (34 %) . While only 39 % of black Protestants say global warming is a result of human activity , they are , however , the least likely of the religions studied to deny global warming is occurring (15 %) .	Describe and Summary
2	Among families with opt-out moms, how is the difference in education between husbands and wives? Title: About One-in-Ten Highly Educated Mothers 'Opt Out' Among all educated moms 'opt-out' moms Context: About One-in-Ten Highly Educated Mothers "Opt Out" <S> Among all highly <S> educated moms <S> "opt-out" moms <S> 9% <S> are "opt-out" <S> moms <S> 37% More education <S> than husband <S> 45 <S> Same <S> education <S> as hus band <S> 18 <S> Less education <S> than husband <S> "Highly educated mothers have at least a Master's de gree, are ages 18 69 and <S> are living with the ir own child(ren) working younger than 18. family Among these moms, "opt-out" <S> mothers living are married with working hus band, annual family Among income above \$7 5, .000 <S> and say they are not working in forder to care for family. a professional degree is <S> considered equivalent to a Ph.D for the purpose of the compa rison of spousal <S> educational attainment. <S> Source: Pew Research Center analysis of March Current Population Surveys <S> Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS CPS), 2012 2013 <S> PEW RESEARCH CENTER	In 37 % of the cases , it is the stay - at - home wives who actually have a higher level of education . In 45 % of these families , the spouses have equal educational attainment , and in about 18 % of the cases , the husbands have more education than their wives .	Comparative
3	What was the trend among registered Hispanic voters about Trump's work? Title: Most Hispanic voters disapprove of Trump, dissatisfied with nation's direction Context: Most Hispanic voters disapprove of Trump, dissatisfied with nation's direction <S> % who are country with the today way things are <S> % who job president of the way Trump is handling <S> going in the country today <S> his job as president <S> Disapprove <S> Approve <S> Not so <S> Not so <S> Very strongly strongly Very <S> Dissatisfied <S> Satisfied <S> NET <S> NET <S> strongly <S> strongly <S> All Hispanic RVs <S> 68 <S> 51 <S> 17 8 23 <S> 30 <S> 67 <S> 32 <S> Dem/Lean Dem <S> 93 <S> 73 <S> 20 3 4 <S> 80 <S> 19 <S> 1211 17 <S> 75 <S> Rep/Lean Rep <S> 22 <S> 58 <S> 45 <S> 54 <S> Note: Based on Hispanic registered voters. Share of respondents who didn't offer an answer not shown. Figures may not add to NET due to <S> rounding. <S> Source: National Survey of Latinos conducted Dec. 3-23, 2019 <S> PEW RESEARCH CENTER	About two - thirds of Hispanic registered voters (68 %) disapprove of the job Trump is doing as president , including 51 % who disapprove very strongly . The 30 % of Hispanic voters who approve of Trump includes 23 % who approve strongly	Discover
4	Describe the trend in job availability to people over the past years. Title: Job Availability in Your Area 2001 2008 Context: Job Availability in Your Area <S> 2001 2008 <S> Difficult to find <S> Plenty of jobs <S> 66 <S> 60 <S> 480 <S> 40 <S> 20 <S> Q <S> 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008	Overall , a majority (53 %) says that jobs are difficult to find in their community while only about a third (34 %) says there are plenty of jobs available . The percentage saying that jobs are difficult to find locally has increased modestly since February 2007 (48 %) . In October 2003 , 66 % said that jobs were difficult to find , the highest percentage expressing that view since the start of the Bush administration .	Describe and Summary
5	How was the public's attention on different news? Title: News Interest vs. News Coverage Context: News Interest vs. News Coverage <S> April 13-19 <S> Pirates <S> 16 <S> 34 <S> Economy 27 <S> 18 <S> C <S> Tea parties <S> 3 <S> 6 <S> Obama abroad <S> 3 <S> Cuba policy <S> 2 <S> CIA memos <S> Interest: percent who named story as most closely followed <S> Coverage: percent of news coverage devoted to story	34 % say they followed stories about the continued at-tempts by pirates to hijack ships more closely than any other story last week , while 27 % say they followed stories about the U.S. economy most closely . 9 % say they followed the tea party protests more closely than any other story .	Comparative
6	Does China believe that Japan has sufficiently apologized for their actions during WW2? Title: Chinese unchanged in belief that Japan has yet to sufficiently apologize for actions during World War I % Chinese saying Japan has for its military actions during the 1930s and 1940S Context: Chinese unchanged in belief that Japan has yet to <S> sufficiently apologize for actions during World War I <S> % Chinese saying Japan has for its military actions during the 1930s and <S> 1940S <S> Apologized No apology <S> Not apologized <S> sufficiently <S> sufficiently necessary <S> 2016 <S> 77% <S> 10% <S> 2% <S> 2013 <S> 78 <S> 2008 <S> 76 <S> 8 <S> 2006 <S> 81 <S> Source: Spring 2016 Global Attitudes Survey Q84. <S> PEW RESEARCH CENTER	Roughly three - quarters (77 %) say Japan has not adequately expressed regret , and such Chinese sentiment is largely unchanged since 2006 . Only 10 % believe Tokyo has apologized enough .	Discover

Table 7: Demonstrations for long-form chart question answering task. Samples are from the validation split of the OpenCQA (Kantharaj et al., 2022a) dataset. The chart images are provided in Table 10.




Figure 4: Two types of visual data tables. The left-hand side is *horizontal* whilst the right-hand one is *vertical*.

Index	Input	Output	Summarization Type
1	Seven-in-ten Americans said in 2019 that their personal info was less secure than five years earlier % of U.S. adults who said they felt as if their personal information was less secure than it was five years ago <SEP> Seven-in-ten Americans said in 2019 that their personal info was less secure than five years earlier % of U.S. adults who said they felt as if their personal information was less secure than it was five years ago More About Less secure the same secure 6 24 70 Note: Those who did not give an answer are not shown. Source: Survey conducted June 3- 17, 2019. "Americans and Privacy: Concerned, Confused and Feeling Lack of Control Over Their Personal Information PEW RESEARCH CENTER	Before the outbreak, Americans strongly believed their personal data was more vulnerable than in the past. In a June 2019 survey, 70% of Americans said their personal information was less secure than it was five years earlier. Just 6% of Americans said they felt their information was more secure than in the past, while 24% said their personal information was about as secure as it was five years earlier. Experts have suggested that data security could be threatened for companies shifting to remote work – as well as ordinary people who are spending more time online – during the coronavirus outbreak.	Perceptual and Cognitive
2	Figure by Race, Ethnicity and Citizenship, 2007 <SEP> Figure Composition of Sentenced Federal Offenders, by Race, Ethnicity and Citizenship, 2007 196 of sentenced offenders) U.S. citizen Non-U.S. citizen 40 29 25 21 Hispanic White Black Notes: Percentages may not total due to rounding. The category "Other" is excluded Source: Pew Hispanic Center analysis of United States Sentencing Source: Commission Monitoring of Federal Criminal Sentences data, 2007	Sharp growth in illegal immigration and increased enforcement of immigration laws have dramatically altered the ethnic composition of offenders sentenced in federal courts. In 2007, Latinos accounted for 40% of all sentenced federal offenders, more than triple their share (13%) of the total U.S. adult population. The share of all sentenced offenders who were Latino in 2007 was up from 24% in 1991, according to an analysis of data from the United States Sentencing Commission (USSC) by the Pew Hispanic Center, a project of the Pew Research Center.	Visual Encoding
3	Half of voters, including a majority of Biden supporters, expect it will be difficult to vote in this year's election % of registered voters who expect voting in the November elections to be <SEP> Half of voters, including a majority of Biden supporters, expect it will be difficult to vote in this year's election % of registered voters who expect voting in the November elections to be Republican Support Democratic Support All voters Republican Support Democratic Support candidate candidate 90 Easy 85 83 64 50 40 10 Difficult 15 17 35 49 60 Oct Aug Oct Aug Oct Aug 18 -20 '18 20 '18 -20 House Presidential election election Notes: Based on registered voters Based on supporters of Republican and Democratic House candidates in 2018 Trump and Biden supporters in 2020 No answer responses not shown. Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted July 27-Aug 2 2020 PEW RESEARCH CENTER	Far more voters expect voting to be difficult this year than in 2018, according to a survey of registered voters conducted July 27 to Aug. 2. Around half of registered voters (49%) said they expect voting to be very or somewhat difficult this year, while the other half (50%) expect it to be very or somewhat easy. That represents a major change from October 2018, when just 15% of voters said they expected voting in that year. As midterms to be difficult and 85% said they expected it to be easy.	Statistical and Comparative
4	Turnover from retail sale of bakery products and cereals (including rice and pasta) in the United Kingdom (UK) from 2008 to 2018 (in million GBP) Context: Year & Turnover in million GBP <SEP> 2018 & 21890 <SEP> 2017 & 21433 <SEP> 2016 & 20757 <SEP> 2015 & 22187 <SEP> 2014 & 20372 <SEP> 2013 & 20352 <SEP> 2012 & 20078 <SEP> 2011 & 18818 <SEP> 2010 & 17875 <SEP> 2009 & 16719 <SEP> 2008 & 15816 .	This statistic shows the total annual turnover of the retail sale of bakery products and cereals (including rice and pasta products) in the United Kingdom from 2008 to 2018 . Turnover has grown steadily , reaching a peak of approximately 22 billion British pounds in 2015 before declining the following year . By 2018 turnover had almost completely recovered and amounted to 21.9 billion pounds .	Perceptual and Cognitive
5	Number of nights spent camping or in caravans in Great Britain in 2019 , by type (in millions) Context: type & Nights spent in millions <SEP> Glamping/alternative accommodation e.g. yurt, tipi, ecopod & 1.7 <SEP> Static caravan (owned) & 9.4 <SEP> Tent & 12.5 <SEP> Static caravan (rented) & 16.8 <SEP> Touring caravans (towed/camper-van/motorhome) & 19.8	This statistic shows the number of nights spent camping or in caravans in Great Britain in 2019 , by type . Almost 20 million nights were spent by domestic tourists in touring caravans in Great Britain , while 12.5 million nights were spent camping in tents .	Statistical and Comparative
6	Barbados : National debt in relation to gross domestic product (GDP) from 2015 to 2025 Context: Year & National debt in relation to GDP <SEP> 2025* & 100.11% <SEP> 2024* & 105.68% <SEP> 2023* & 111.34% <SEP> 2022* & 117.24% <SEP> 2021* & 124.53% <SEP> 2020 & 134.09% <SEP> 2019 & 122.22% <SEP> 2018 & 125.59% <SEP> 2017 & 158.26% <SEP> 2016 & 149.45% <SEP> 2015 & 147.02%	This statistic shows the national debt of Barbados from 2015 to 2020 in relation to the gross domestic product (GDP) , with projections up until 2025 . The figures refer to the whole country and include the debts of the state , the communities , the municipalities and the social insurances . In 2020 , the national debt of Barbados amounted to approximately 134.09 percent of the GDP .	Visual Encoding

Table 8: Demonstrations for chart summarization task. Samples are obtained from the validation split of Chart-to-Text (Kantharaj et al., 2022b) dataset with the first three from Pew, and the last three from Statista. All the chart images are provided in Table 11.

in three different settings: (1) with ground-truth visual data tables, (2) with original data tables, (3) with our generated visual data tables from VDTG module. The experimental results are shown in Appendix A.8. We observe that with the ground-truth colors, the performance of the model is improved significantly, nearly twice compared to the case without them. This observation not only verifies the effectiveness of our proposed visual data table representation but also reveals a huge room for further improvements.

A.9 Illustrative Cases for Proposed Properties of LCQA and CS Prompts

Table 14 shows the illustrative of the variants of our LCQA prompt which do not satisfy property (ii), (iii) in §4. We derive 2 main observations.

First, not guaranteeing (ii) makes the answers commonly lack findings for *Discovery* queries (first 2 samples). Second, the demonstrations that do not ensure (iii) commonly have very long answers. By using these demonstrations not satisfying (ii), (iii) in the prompt, we observe that the model commonly generates very long answers which makes them likely to suffer from factual errors (last 2 examples).

A.10 Error Analysis Case Studies

Table 16 shows our case studies as discussed in §6.4.

A.11 Benchmarks Statistics

We present the statistics of the benchmarks we use in Table 1. ChartQA focuses on logical and vi-

Index	Chart Image	Generated Visual Data Table
1	<p>Human Rights Violations, 2012 <small>Human rights violations measured on a scale from 0 to 10 (where 10 is worst). This is an aggregated metric on that basis of multiple categories, including: press freedom, civil liberties, political freedoms, human rights, judicial process, independence, religious practices, labor and workers.</small></p>	Country Human Rights Violations, 2012 <0x0A> Central African Republic (red) 8.5 <0x0A> Iraq (purple) 8.3 <0x0A> Gabon (Teal) 6.8 <0x0A> Suriname (orange) 5.3 <0x0A> Peru (gray) 4.9
2		Characteristic Nominal (blue) Real Terms (navy blue) <0x0A> 2019/20 11.97 12.11 <0x0A> 2018/19 11.35 11.57 <0x0A> 2017/18 11.94 11.76 <0x0A> 2016/17 11.61 12.25 <0x0A> 2015/16 11.34 12.3 <0x0A> 2014/15 12.46 13.55 <0x0A> 2013/14 11.62 12.97 <0x0A> 2012/13 12.76 14.43 <0x0A> 2011/12 12.57 14.35 <0x0A> 2010/11 13.06 15.24 <0x0A> 2009/10 13.22 15.76 <0x0A> 2008/09 12.46 15.03 <0x0A> 2007/08 11.94 14.76 <0x0A> 2006/07 11.43 14.48 <0x0A> 2005/06 10.87 14.21 <0x0A> 2004/05 10.03 13.36 <0x0A> 2003/04 9.76 13.3 <0x0A> 2002/03 9.37 13.03 <0x0A> 2001/02 8.66 12.42 <0x0A> 2000/01 7.89 11.38 <0x0A> 1999/00 7.74 11.48 <0x0A> 1998/99 7.22 10.86 <0x0A> 1997/98 6.41 9.76 <0x0A> 1996/97 5.73 8.8
3	<p>Social media users experience a mix of positive, negative emotions while using these platforms <small>% of social media users who say they... see content on social media that makes them feel...</small></p>	Frequently (dark blue) Sometimes (light blue) NET <0x0A> Lonely 7 24 31 31 <0x0A> Depressed 13 36 49 49 <0x0A> Inspired 16 53 69 69 <0x0A> Connected 21 49 71 71 <0x0A> Angry 25 47 71 71 <0x0A> Amused 44 44 88 88
4		Characteristic Men (blue) Women (navy blue) <0x0A> 2019 945.74 120.01 <0x0A> 2018 928.34 1181.71 <0x0A> 2017 906.45 1160.94 <0x0A> 2016 894.49 1154.19 <0x0A> 2015 895.74 1150.61 <0x0A> 2014 892.76 1156.91 <0x0A> 2013 880.11 1134.59 <0x0A> 2012 863.35 1118.29 <0x0A> 2011 846.25 1001.84 <0x0A> 2010 818.71 1069.38 <0x0A> 2009 766.65 1021.74 <0x0A> 2008 751.52 998.79 <0x0A> 2007 733.65 983.84 <0x0A> 2006 725.31 971.54 <0x0A> 2005 719.52 959.92 <0x0A> 2004 708.46 941.77 <0x0A> 2003 669.77 887.1 <0x0A> 2002 645.65 852.11 <0x0A> 2001 619.74 817.46 <0x0A> 2000 587.16 756.59
5	<p>Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey want fewer Syrian refugees allowed into their country <small>In your opinion, should we allow more refugees from Syria into our country, fewer refugees or about the same as we do now?</small></p>	Entity More (green) About the same (gray) Fewer (orange) None (VOL) <0x0A> Turkey nan nan 30 53 <0x0A> Christian 10 33 53 63 <0x0A> Sunni 12 49 36 <0x0A> Shia 17 44 33 <0x0A> Jordanian 6 63 27 <0x0A> Syrian 64 11 26 <0x0A> Jordan 8 60 23
6		Country Scheduled teaching time that teachers are in the classroom, 2002 to 2016 <0x0A> Egypt (gray) 93.8% (2002) <0x0A> Tunisia (blue) 89.8% (2005) <0x0A> Madagascar (blue) 80.0% <0x0A> Mozambique (blue) 58.0% (2013) 44.0

Table 9: Sample outputs of our VDTG module. The first two cases the model detects the correct colors and positions, while the last 4 cases the model fails.

visual reasoning questions, while OpenCQA targets open-ended questions with explanatory answers

and Chart-to-Text is a benchmark for chart summarization task.

Chart Image	Demonstration's Output	Generated Output																																										
<p>Is there solid evidence the earth is warming?</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Is there solid evidence the earth is warming?</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Group</th> <th>Yes because of human activity</th> <th>Yes because of natural patterns</th> <th>Yes, but don't know exactly</th> <th>No</th> <th>Don't know</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total U.S. population</td> <td>47%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unaffiliated</td> <td>58%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White evangelical Protestants</td> <td>48%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White non-Hispanic Catholics</td> <td>44%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black Protestants</td> <td>39%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White evangelical Protestants</td> <td>34%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: Pew Research Center analysis of 2012-2013 Current Population Surveys. © 2013 PEW RESEARCH CENTER.</p>	Group	Yes because of human activity	Yes because of natural patterns	Yes, but don't know exactly	No	Don't know	Total U.S. population	47%	18%	6%	21%	8%	Unaffiliated	58%	11%	6%	18%	7%	White evangelical Protestants	48%	19%	6%	19%	8%	White non-Hispanic Catholics	44%	20%	6%	22%	8%	Black Protestants	39%	36%	5%	15%	5%	White evangelical Protestants	34%	17%	7%	31%	11%	<p>The unaffiliated (58 %) are the most likely among the religious groups studied to say there is solid evidence the earth is warming because of human activity . White evangelical Protestants are the most likely to say there is no solid evidence the earth is warming (31 %) , and the least likely to believe that humans have contributed to heating up the planet (34 %) . While only 39 % of black Protestants say global warming is a result of human activity , they are , however , the least likely of the religions studied to deny global warming is occurring (15 %) .</p>	<p>The opinion of the public on earth warming varies among religious groups. The unaffiliated are the most likely among the religious groups studied to say there is solid evidence the earth is warming because of human activity (58%). White evangelical Protestants are the most likely to say there is no solid evidence the earth is warming (31%) and the least likely to believe that humans have contributed to heating up the planet (34%). While only 39% of black Protestants say global warming is a result of human activity, they are, however, the least likely of the religions studied to deny global warming is occurring (15%).</p>
Group	Yes because of human activity	Yes because of natural patterns	Yes, but don't know exactly	No	Don't know																																							
Total U.S. population	47%	18%	6%	21%	8%																																							
Unaffiliated	58%	11%	6%	18%	7%																																							
White evangelical Protestants	48%	19%	6%	19%	8%																																							
White non-Hispanic Catholics	44%	20%	6%	22%	8%																																							
Black Protestants	39%	36%	5%	15%	5%																																							
White evangelical Protestants	34%	17%	7%	31%	11%																																							
<p>About One-in-Ten Highly Educated Mothers "Opt Out"</p> <p>"Highly educated mothers" have at least a Master's degree, are ages 18-69 and are living with their own child(ren) younger than 18. Among these moms, "opt-out" mothers are married with working husbands, annual family income above \$75,000 and say they are not working in order to care for family. A professional degree is considered equivalent to a Ph.D. for the purpose of the comparison of spousal educational attainment.</p> <p>Source: Pew Research Center analysis of March Current Population Surveys Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS-CPS), 2012-2013. PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	<p>In 37 % of the cases , it is the stay - at - home wives who actually have a higher level of education . In 45 % of these families , the spouses have equal educational attainment , and in about 18 % of the cases , the husbands have more education than their wives .</p>	<p>Among families with opt-out moms, 37% have the stay-at-home wives with a higher level of education than the husbands. 45% of these families have equal educational attainment between spouses, and 18% of the cases have the husbands with more education than the wives.</p>																																										
<p>Most Hispanic voters disapprove of Trump, disaffected with nation's direction</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Disapproval of Trump and Disaffection with Nation's Direction</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Group</th> <th>Disapprove</th> <th>Approve</th> <th>Disaffected</th> <th>Satisfied</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All Hispanic voters</td> <td>68</td> <td>30</td> <td>67</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dem/Lean Dem</td> <td>78</td> <td>20</td> <td>90</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rep/Lean Rep</td> <td>22</td> <td>78</td> <td>45</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: Based on Hispanic registered voters. Shows of respondents who both offer an answer and show figures may not add to 100% due to rounding. Source: Hispanic Survey of Latinos conducted Dec. 5-23, 2016. PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	Group	Disapprove	Approve	Disaffected	Satisfied	All Hispanic voters	68	30	67	30	Dem/Lean Dem	78	20	90	10	Rep/Lean Rep	22	78	45	54	<p>About two - thirds of Hispanic registered voters (68 %) disapprove of the job Trump is doing as president , including 51 % who disapprove very strongly . The 30 % of Hispanic voters who approve of Trump includes 23 % who approve strongly</p>	<p>Among Hispanic registered voters, there is strong disapproval of President Trump's job performance. About two-thirds (68%) of Hispanic voters disapprove of the job Trump is doing as president, including 51% who disapprove very strongly. The 30% of Hispanic voters who approve of Trump includes 23% who approve strongly.</p>																						
Group	Disapprove	Approve	Disaffected	Satisfied																																								
All Hispanic voters	68	30	67	30																																								
Dem/Lean Dem	78	20	90	10																																								
Rep/Lean Rep	22	78	45	54																																								
<p>Job Availability in Your Area 2001-2008</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Job Availability in Your Area 2001-2008</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Difficult to find</th> <th>Plenty of jobs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>44</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>53</td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>66</td> <td>24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>58</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>55</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>53</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>48</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>53</td> <td>34</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Difficult to find	Plenty of jobs	2001	44	42	2002	53	39	2003	66	24	2004	58	31	2005	55	35	2006	53	37	2007	48	41	2008	53	34	<p>Overall , a majority (53 %) says that jobs are difficult to find in their community while only about a third (34 %) says there are plenty of jobs available . The percentage saying that jobs are difficult to find locally has increased modestly since February 2007 (48 %) . In October 2003 , 66 % said that jobs were difficult to find , the highest percentage expressing that view since the start of the Bush administration .</p>	<p>Overall, a majority (53%) says that jobs are difficult to find in their community while only about a third (34%) says there are plenty of jobs available. The percentage saying that jobs are difficult to find locally has increased modestly since February 2007 (48%). In October 2003, 66% said that jobs were difficult to find, the highest percentage expressing that view since the start of the Bush administration.</p>															
Year	Difficult to find	Plenty of jobs																																										
2001	44	42																																										
2002	53	39																																										
2003	66	24																																										
2004	58	31																																										
2005	55	35																																										
2006	53	37																																										
2007	48	41																																										
2008	53	34																																										
<p>News Interest vs. News Coverage April 13-19</p> <table border="1"> <caption>News Interest vs. News Coverage April 13-19</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Topic</th> <th>Interest: percent who named story as most closely followed</th> <th>Coverage: percent of news coverage devoted to story</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pirates</td> <td>34</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Economy</td> <td>27</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tea parties</td> <td>9</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Obama abroad</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cuba policy</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CIA memos</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Topic	Interest: percent who named story as most closely followed	Coverage: percent of news coverage devoted to story	Pirates	34	16	Economy	27	18	Tea parties	9	7	Obama abroad	6	3	Cuba policy	3	3	CIA memos	2	5	<p>34 % say they followed stories about the continued attempts by pirates to hijack ships more closely than any other story last week , while 27 % say they followed stories about the U.S. economy most closely . 9 % say they followed the tea party protests more closely than any other story .</p>	<p>34% of the public say they followed stories about the continued attempts by pirates to hijack ships more closely than any other story last week, while 27% say they followed stories about the U.S. economy most closely. 9% say they followed the tea party protests more closely than any other story.</p>																					
Topic	Interest: percent who named story as most closely followed	Coverage: percent of news coverage devoted to story																																										
Pirates	34	16																																										
Economy	27	18																																										
Tea parties	9	7																																										
Obama abroad	6	3																																										
Cuba policy	3	3																																										
CIA memos	2	5																																										
<p>Chinese unchanged in belief that Japan has yet to sufficiently apologize for actions during World War II</p> <p>% Chinese saying Japan has... for its military actions during the 1930s and 1940s</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Chinese Beliefs About Japan's Apology</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Not apologized sufficiently</th> <th>Apologized sufficiently</th> <th>No apology necessary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>77%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>76</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>76</td> <td>8</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>81</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: Spring 2016 Global Attitudes Survey, Q84. PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	Year	Not apologized sufficiently	Apologized sufficiently	No apology necessary	2016	77%	10%	2%	2013	76	4	2	2008	76	8	2	2006	81	3	4	<p>Roughly three - quarters (77 %) say Japan has not adequately expressed regret , and such Chinese sentiment is largely unchanged since 2006 . Only 10 % believe Tokyo has apologized enough .</p>	<p>Roughly three-quarters (77%) of Chinese people say that Japan has not adequately expressed regret for their actions during World War II, and this sentiment has been largely unchanged since 2006. Only 10% of Chinese people believe that Japan has apologized enough for their actions during the war.</p>																						
Year	Not apologized sufficiently	Apologized sufficiently	No apology necessary																																									
2016	77%	10%	2%																																									
2013	76	4	2																																									
2008	76	8	2																																									
2006	81	3	4																																									

Table 10: For each demonstration in our prompt, we ask the language model to generate its expected output, given its input. We then compare the generated output from the model with its expected output.

Chart Image	Demonstration's Output	Generated Output
<p>Seven-in-ten Americans said in 2019 that their personal info was less secure than five years earlier % of U.S. adults who said they felt as if their personal information was _____ than it was five years ago</p> <p>Note: Those who did not give an answer are not shown. Source: Survey conducted June 3-17, 2019. "Americans and Privacy Concerned, Confused and Feeling Lack of Control Over Their Personal Information" PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	<p>Before the outbreak, Americans strongly believed their personal data was more vulnerable than in the past. In a June 2019 survey, 70% of Americans said their personal information was less secure than it was five years earlier. Just 6% of Americans said they felt their information was more secure than in the past, while 24% said their personal information was about as secure as it was five years earlier. Experts have suggested that data security could be threatened for companies shifting to remote work – as well as ordinary people who are spending more time online – during the coronavirus outbreak.</p>	<p>In 2019, seven in ten Americans reported feeling less secure about their personal information than they did five years prior. The survey, conducted between June 3-17, 2019, revealed that 6% of U.S. adults felt their personal information was more secure than five years earlier, while 24% reported feeling that it was the same. These findings suggest that the majority of Americans feel their personal data is more vulnerable now than it was before, a fear that has been compounded by the coronavirus pandemic and the increased reliance on digital communication.</p>
<p>Figure 1 Composition of Sentenced Federal Offenders, by Race, Ethnicity and Citizenship, 2007 (% of sentenced offenders)</p> <p>Notes: Percentages may not total due to rounding. The category "Other" is excluded. Source: Pew Hispanic Center analysis of United States Sentencing Commission Monitoring of Federal Criminal Sentences data, 2007</p>	<p>Sharp growth in illegal immigration and increased enforcement of immigration laws have dramatically altered the ethnic composition of offenders sentenced in federal courts. In 2007, Latinos accounted for 40% of all sentenced federal offenders, more than triple their share (13%) of the total U.S. adult population. The share of all sentenced offenders who were Latino in 2007 was up from 24% in 1991, according to an analysis of data from the United States Sentencing Commission (USSC) by the Pew Hispanic Center, a project of the Pew Research Center.</p>	<p>In 2007, 40% of all federal offenders sentenced in the U.S. were Latino, according to an analysis of United States Sentencing Commission data by the Pew Hispanic Center. This was more than triple the share of Latinos (13%) in the total U.S. adult population. The share of Latino offenders sentenced in federal courts had risen from 24% in 1991.</p>
<p>Half of voters, including a majority of Biden supporters, expect it will be difficult to vote in this year's election % of registered voters who expect voting in the November elections to be ...</p> <p>Notes: Based on registered voters. Based on supporters of Republican and Democratic House candidates in 2018. Trump and Biden supporters in 2020. No answer responses not shown. Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted July 27-Aug. 2, 2020. PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	<p>Far more voters expect voting to be difficult this year than in 2018, according to a survey of registered voters conducted July 27 to Aug. 2. Around half of registered voters (49%) said they expect voting to be very or somewhat difficult this year, while the other half (50%) expect it to be very or somewhat easy. That represents a major change from October 2018, when just 15% of voters said they expected voting in that year. As midterms to be difficult and 85% said they expected it to be easy.</p>	<p>This year, a majority of voters are expecting it to be difficult to vote in the November elections. According to a survey of registered voters conducted July 27 to Aug. 2, 49% of registered voters said they expect voting to be very or somewhat difficult this year, while the other half (50%) expect it to be very or somewhat easy. This is a stark contrast to the survey results from October 2018, when only 15% of voters said they expected voting in that year. As midterms to be difficult and 85% said they expected it to be easy. These results suggest that many Americans are feeling more uncertain and anxious about voting this year than in previous years.</p>
	<p>This statistic shows the total annual turnover of the retail sale of bakery products and cereals (including rice and pasta products) in the United Kingdom from 2008 to 2018. Turnover has grown steadily, reaching a peak of approximately 22 billion British pounds in 2015 before declining the following year. By 2018, turnover had almost completely recovered and amounted to 21.9 billion pounds.</p>	<p>This statistic shows the total annual turnover of the retail sale of bakery products and cereals (including rice and pasta products) in the United Kingdom from 2008 to 2018. Turnover has grown steadily, with a peak of approximately 22 billion British pounds in 2015 before declining the following year. By 2018, turnover had almost completely recovered and amounted to 21.9 billion pounds.</p>
	<p>This statistic shows the number of nights spent camping or in caravans in Great Britain in 2019, by type. Almost 20 million nights were spent by domestic tourists in touring caravans in Great Britain, while 12.5 million nights were spent camping in tents.</p>	<p>This statistic shows the number of nights spent camping or in caravans in Great Britain in 2019, by type. Nearly 20 million nights were spent by domestic tourists in touring caravans in Great Britain, while 12.5 million nights were spent camping in tents.</p>
	<p>This statistic shows the national debt of Barbados from 2015 to 2020 in relation to the gross domestic product (GDP), with projections up until 2025. The figures refer to the whole country and include the debts of the state, the communities, the municipalities and the social insurances. In 2020, the national debt of Barbados amounted to approximately 134.09 percent of the GDP.</p>	<p>This statistic shows the national debt of Barbados from 2015 to 2020 in relation to the gross domestic product (GDP), with projections up until 2025. The figures refer to the whole country and include the debts of the state, the communities, the municipalities and the social insurances. In 2020, the national debt of Barbados amounted to approximately 134.09 percent of the GDP.</p>

Table 11: For each demonstration in our prompt, we ask the language model to generate its expected output, given its input. We then compare the generated output from the model with its expected output.

Model	Aug. (%)	Human (%)	Avg. (%)
InstructGPT + CCR	-	30.86	-
PROMPTCHART	-	38.42	-
InstructGPT + CCR + <i>ground_truth</i> colors	-	60.95	-

Table 12: Effect of color information on color-related QA pairs (203 cases).

Chart Image	Input	Gold Answer	PROMPTCHART	Ablation Study Model																																										
<p>Republicans, Democrats want Trump to be 'more cautious' in the White House</p> <p><i>When it comes to the kind of things Trump says and tweets, once he becomes president... (%)</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Group</th> <th>There is no need for him to change (%)</th> <th>He will need to be more cautious (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>15</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rep/Lean Rep</td> <td>21</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dem/Lean Dem</td> <td>8</td> <td>90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: Don't know responses not shown. Q71. Source: Survey conducted Nov. 30-Dec. 3, 2016. PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	Group	There is no need for him to change (%)	He will need to be more cautious (%)	Total	15	82	Rep/Lean Rep	21	76	Dem/Lean Dem	8	90	<p>Question: How was Trump's on-line posture seen when he was becoming president?</p>	<p>In December, a majority of the public (82%) also said Trump should be more cautious in "the kinds of things he says and tweets" once he becomes president. Just 15% said there is no need for him to change.</p>	<p>When it comes to the kind of things Trump says and tweets, once he becomes president, 82% of Americans believe he will need to be more cautious, including 90% of Democrats and 76% of Republicans. Only 15% of Americans believe there is no need for Trump to change his online posture.</p>	<p>Most people, including both Republicans and Democrats, believe that Trump needs to be more cautious when it comes to what he says and tweets once he becomes President. 82% of the total population, 76% of Republicans and Lean Rep and 90% of Democrats and Lean Dem think Trump should be more cautious.</p>																														
Group	There is no need for him to change (%)	He will need to be more cautious (%)																																												
Total	15	82																																												
Rep/Lean Rep	21	76																																												
Dem/Lean Dem	8	90																																												
<p>Seven-in-Ten Continue to Support Path to Legal Status for Undocumented</p> <p><i>Undocumented immigrants in the U.S. who meet certain requirements...</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Should have a way to stay legally</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Should not be allowed to stay</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Don't know</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Apply for citizenship: 43% Apply for perm. res.: 24%</p> <p>Survey conducted Dec. 3-7, 2014. PEW RESEARCH CENTER/USA TODAY</p>	Response	Percentage	Should have a way to stay legally	70%	Should not be allowed to stay	27%	Don't know	3%	<p>How does public feel about supporting undocumented immigrants?</p>	<p>70% say there should be a way for undocumented immigrants to stay in the country legally, if they meet certain requirements. Most of those who support legal status think there should be a way for unauthorized immigrants to become citizens (43% overall), while 24% say the path should only include permanent residency.</p>	<p>A large majority of the public (70%) support a path to legal status for undocumented immigrants in the US who meet certain requirements. This includes 43% who support a path to citizenship and 24% who support a path to permanent residency. Only 27% of people oppose a path to legal status for undocumented immigrants and 3% are not sure.</p>	<p>Seven-in-ten Americans (70%) say undocumented immigrants currently living in the US should be allowed to stay in the country legally, if they meet certain requirements, while 27% say they should not be allowed to stay.</p>																																		
Response	Percentage																																													
Should have a way to stay legally	70%																																													
Should not be allowed to stay	27%																																													
Don't know	3%																																													
<p>High favorable ratings for various groups in Jordan and Lebanon; splits arise in other nations</p> <p><i>% who say they have a(n) ___ view of...</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Country</th> <th>Group</th> <th>Unfavorable (%)</th> <th>Favorable (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Jordan</td> <td>Muslims</td> <td>4</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Christians</td> <td>5</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Lebanon</td> <td>Christians</td> <td>6</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sunnis</td> <td>12</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shiites</td> <td>13</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">India</td> <td>Hindus</td> <td>3</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Muslims</td> <td>24</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Philippines</td> <td>Christians</td> <td>3</td> <td>97</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Muslims</td> <td>41</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Tunisia</td> <td>Sunnis</td> <td>19</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shiites</td> <td>64</td> <td>12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: Don't know responses not shown. Sources: Mobile Technology & Its Social Impact Survey 2018, Q39INDa&b, Q39JORrela&b, Q39LEBrela-c, Q39PHIrela&b, Q39TUNrela&b. "Attitudes Toward Diversity in 11 Emerging Economies" PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	Country	Group	Unfavorable (%)	Favorable (%)	Jordan	Muslims	4	95	Christians	5	89	Lebanon	Christians	6	85	Sunnis	12	80	Shiites	13	76	India	Hindus	3	95	Muslims	24	69	Philippines	Christians	3	97	Muslims	41	57	Tunisia	Sunnis	19	66	Shiites	64	12	<p>What is the favourable ratings of Philippines given by Christians and Muslims?</p>	<p>in Christian - majority Philippines, favorable views of Christians were nearly universal (97%) while just 57% said the same of Muslims in their country.</p>	<p>The favorable ratings for Christians and Muslims in the Philippines are 97% and 57% respectively.</p>	<p>A large majority of the public (70%) support a path to legal status for undocumented immigrants in the US who meet certain requirements. This includes 43% who support a path to citizenship and 24% who support a path to permanent residency. Only 27% of people oppose a path to legal status for undocumented immigrants and 3% are not sure.</p>
Country	Group	Unfavorable (%)	Favorable (%)																																											
Jordan	Muslims	4	95																																											
	Christians	5	89																																											
Lebanon	Christians	6	85																																											
	Sunnis	12	80																																											
	Shiites	13	76																																											
India	Hindus	3	95																																											
	Muslims	24	69																																											
Philippines	Christians	3	97																																											
	Muslims	41	57																																											
Tunisia	Sunnis	19	66																																											
	Shiites	64	12																																											
<p>Public especially concerned about germline editing</p> <p><i>% of U.S. adults who say gene editing giving healthy babies a much reduced risk of serious diseases would be more acceptable, less acceptable or make no difference...</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Condition</th> <th>More acceptable (%)</th> <th>Less acceptable (%)</th> <th>No difference (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>If effects were limited to that person and could not be passed on</td> <td>34</td> <td>23</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>If it changed the genetic makeup of the whole population</td> <td>17</td> <td>49</td> <td>31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: Respondents who did not give an answer are not shown. Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted March 2-28, 2016. PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	Condition	More acceptable (%)	Less acceptable (%)	No difference (%)	If effects were limited to that person and could not be passed on	34	23	40	If it changed the genetic makeup of the whole population	17	49	31	<p>What do Americans think about gene editing?</p>	<p>Roughly half of adults (49%) said gene editing would be less acceptable to them if the effects "changed the genetic makeup of the whole population," versus just 17% who said it would be more acceptable. When asked about an alternate scenario in which the effects of gene editing are limited to a single person, more Americans said it would be more acceptable than less acceptable (34% to 23%).</p>	<p>A majority of Americans (34%) say that gene editing to give healthy babies a much reduced risk of serious diseases would be more acceptable, while 23% say it would be less acceptable and 40% say it would make no difference. However, when asked about gene editing that would change the genetic makeup of the whole population, only 17% say it would be more acceptable, while 49% say it would be less acceptable and 31% say it would make no difference.</p>	<p>Americans are more concerned than accepting when it comes to gene editing. According to a survey conducted in March 2016 by the Pew Research Center, 34% of U.S. adults say that gene editing that would give healthy babies a much reduced risk of serious diseases would be more acceptable, while 40% say it would make no difference and 23% say it would be less acceptable. When it comes to gene editing that would change the genetic makeup of the whole population, only 17% say it would be more acceptable, while 49% say it would be less acceptable and 31% say it would make no difference.</p>																														
Condition	More acceptable (%)	Less acceptable (%)	No difference (%)																																											
If effects were limited to that person and could not be passed on	34	23	40																																											
If it changed the genetic makeup of the whole population	17	49	31																																											

Table 13: Samples to illustrate the outputs of PROMPTCHART and its variant without (L_2) (first 2 rows) and without (L_3) (last 2 rows) for LCQA task.






Chart Image	Gold Answer	PROMPTCHART	Ablation Study Model														
<p>Local TV Newsroom Budgets Grew in 2013 % of news directors who said their budgets...</p>  <table border="1"> <caption>Local TV Newsroom Budgets Grew in 2013</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Increased</td> <td>52%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Same</td> <td>34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Decreased</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Sure</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Percentage	Increased	52%	Same	34%	Decreased	7%	Not Sure	6%	<p>In the vast majority of local TV newsrooms, budgets either grew or held steady in 2013. About half of the news directors surveyed (52%) said they increased their news budgets last year, compared with 49% the year before and 38% in 2011. But there were differences by market size. Indeed, 54% of the mid-sized market stations (51-100) said they increased their budgets compared with 41% whose budgets were cut or stayed the same. But in the biggest 25 TV markets, the percentage of stations increasing their budgets in 2013 (48%) was identical to the percentage that cut or did not increase their spending.</p>	<p>In 2013, local TV newsroom budgets experienced an overall increase. According to a survey of news directors from all commercial local TV stations, 52% of respondents said their budgets had increased, 34% said their budgets remained the same, and 6% were not sure. Just 7% of news directors reported that their budgets had decreased. These results indicate that local TV newsroom budgets were largely stable or increased in 2013.</p>	<p>According to a survey of news directors at all commercial local stations conducted by RTDNA/Hofstra University, 52% of news directors said their budgets had increased, 34</p>				
Category	Percentage																
Increased	52%																
Same	34%																
Decreased	7%																
Not Sure	6%																
<p>29% Want 'Firm Stand' by U.S. Against Russia % saying it is more important for the U.S. to ...</p>  <table border="1"> <caption>29% Want 'Firm Stand' by U.S. Against Russia</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Not get too involved in the situation in Ukraine</td> <td>56%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Take a firm stand against Russian actions</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Don't know (vol.)</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Percentage	Not get too involved in the situation in Ukraine	56%	Take a firm stand against Russian actions	29%	Don't know (vol.)	15%	<p>As Russian troops remain in Ukraine's Crimea region and Crimea's Parliament has set up a secession vote, Americans prefer the U.S. to not get too involved in the situation. By a roughly two-to-one margin (56% vs. 29%), the public says it is more important for the U.S. to not get involved in the situation with Russia and Ukraine than to take a firm stand against Russian actions.</p>	<p>In March 2014, Americans were divided on how the U.S. should respond to Russian actions in Ukraine. 29% believed it was more important for the U.S. to take a firm stand against Russian actions, while 56% said it was more important not to get too involved in the situation in Ukraine. 15% said they did not know or gave no opinion.</p>	<p>In 2014, 29% of Americans said it was more important for the United States to take a firm stand against Russian actions than to not get too involved in the situation in Ukraine. This sentiment was shared among 56% of those surveyed who chose not to answer. Only 15% of respondents said that it was more important for the United States not to get too involved in the situation in Ukraine. The survey was conducted by the Pew Research Center from March 6-9, 2014.</p>						
Category	Percentage																
Not get too involved in the situation in Ukraine	56%																
Take a firm stand against Russian actions	29%																
Don't know (vol.)	15%																
<p>Election, Economy Continue to Lead News Interest % following each story very closely:</p>  <table border="1"> <caption>Election, Economy Continue to Lead News Interest</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>U.S. Economy</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012 election</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WI recall election</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>European economies</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>al Qaeda leader killed</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vatican and U.S. nuns</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>PEW RESEARCH CENTER June 7-10, 2012.</p>	Category	Percentage	U.S. Economy	35	2012 election	30	WI recall election	21	European economies	18	al Qaeda leader killed	16	Vatican and U.S. nuns	6	<p>The public continued to track news about the economy and the presidential election, while paying less attention to another important political story – Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker's victory in a hard-fought recall election. The latest weekly News Interest Index, conducted June 7-10 among 1,000 adults by the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, finds that 35% say they followed reports about U.S. economic conditions very closely while 30% tracked news about the presidential election very closely. The public expressed less interest in news about the Wisconsin recall election (21% very closely), European economic problems (18%) and the CIA killing of an al Qaeda leader in a drone strike in Pakistan (16%).</p>	<p>In June 2012, 35% of Americans reported they were following news about the U.S. economy very closely. This was the leading story in terms of interest, with 30% of Americans saying they were following it very closely. This was followed by the 2012 election, with 21% of Americans following it very closely. 18% of Americans were following news about European economies very closely, 16% were following news about Al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden rounded out the top five stories, with 18% and 16% of adults saying they followed those stories "very closely." The Vatican and U.S. nuns dispute was the least followed story, with just 6% of adults following the story "very closely." These results are based on a June 7-10, 2012 survey conducted by the Pew Research Center.</p>	<p>In June 2012, Americans followed the U.S. economy the closest, with 35% of adults saying they followed the story "very closely." The 2012 presidential election and the Wisconsin recall election were the next most closely followed stories, with 30% and 21% of adults, respectively, following these stories "very closely." Europeans economies and the death of al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden rounded out the top five stories, with 18% and 16% of adults saying they followed those stories "very closely." The Vatican and U.S. nuns dispute was the least followed story, with just 6% of adults following the story "very closely." These results are based on a June 7-10, 2012 survey conducted by the Pew Research Center.</p>
Category	Percentage																
U.S. Economy	35																
2012 election	30																
WI recall election	21																
European economies	18																
al Qaeda leader killed	16																
Vatican and U.S. nuns	6																
<p>U.S. Median Household Income, 2008-2011 In 2011 dollars</p>  <table border="1"> <caption>U.S. Median Household Income, 2008-2011</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Income (2011 dollars)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>\$52,546</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>\$52,195</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>\$50,831</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>\$50,054</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: Census Bureau, Current Population Survey PEW RESEARCH CENTER</p>	Year	Income (2011 dollars)	2008	\$52,546	2009	\$52,195	2010	\$50,831	2011	\$50,054	<p>As for median household income, the most recent data we have is for 2011 (the Census Bureau will release 2012 numbers next week), but they show that after factoring in inflation, the median U.S. household income shrank 4.7 percent between 2008 and 2011. Little surprise, then, that more than half (54%) of the people in our survey said household incomes have hardly recovered since the recession, and a scant 2% said they've fully recovered.</p>	<p>From 2008 to 2011, median household income in the United States decreased slightly, according to data from the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey. In 2011 dollars, median household income was \$52,546 in 2008, \$51,195 in 2009, \$50,831 in 2010, and \$50,054 in 2011. This represents a drop of 4.2% over the four-year period.</p>	<p>The median household income in the United States decreased from 2008 to 2011, according to the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey. In 2008, the median household income was \$52,546, while in 2011, it had fallen to \$50,054. This represented a decrease of 4.1% in real terms, or a decrease of \$2,492 in inflation-adjusted dollars. The economic recession that began in 2008 was the main factor behind the decrease in median household income during this period.</p>				
Year	Income (2011 dollars)																
2008	\$52,546																
2009	\$52,195																
2010	\$50,831																
2011	\$50,054																

Table 14: Samples to illustrate the outputs of PROMPTCHART and its variant without (S_1) (first 2 rows) and without (S_3) (last 2 rows) for CS task.

Chart Image	Question	PromptChart	InstructGPT	Gold Answer
<p>Deaths from eating disorders, 1990</p> <p>Total number of deaths from eating disorders and bulimia nervosa. This is measured across both sexes and all ages.</p>	How many color bars are there in the graph?	There are 4 color bars in the graph. The answer is 4.	There is only one color bar in the graph. The answer is 1.	4
<p>Little appetite for allowing more immigrants into India</p> <p>India should allow ___ immigrants</p>	What is the color of "More"?	The color of the pie represented "More" is Gray. The answer is Gray.	The color of the pie represented "More" is Orange. The answer is Orange.	Gray
<p>Concerns about India on the Rise Again</p> <p>Which is the greatest threat to Pakistan?</p>	What is the colour of India in the graph?	The colour of India in the graph is orange. The answer is orange.	The colour of India in the graph is not given in the data table. Therefore, the answer is not given.	Orange
<p>Some have had election arguments – few describe them as 'major'</p> <p>% who say they have had a ___ argument with another person over the 2016 election or its outcome</p>	Is the color of right-side bars lightest?	The color of right-side bars is light brown. The lightest color of the bars is light brown, the answer is Yes.	The right-side bars are Dem/Lean Dem and Rep/Lean Rep. The color of Dem/Lean Dem bar is lightest. The answer is Yes.	Yes
<p>Daily meat consumption per person, 1997</p> <p>Average daily meat consumption per person, measured in grams per person per day. Countries with daily meat consumption greater than the expected EU average of 165g per person are shown in red, yellow are those countries below 165g but exceeding the more ambitious limit of 80g per person, and in blue are those below 80g per person.</p>	Which color Bar shows the greatest Meat consumer?	The greatest meat consumer is Finland with 175.09. The color of Finland is Teal. So the answer is Teal.	The highest meat consumption is in Finland with 175.09. So the color bar that shows the greatest meat consumer is the bar for Finland. The answer is Finland.	Finland
<p>Yearly cost of closing the global poverty gap (million int-\$)</p> <p>To cost of closing the poverty gap is the amount of money that would be theoretically needed to lift the incomes of all poor people up to the global poverty line of \$1.90 a day. Estimates are expressed in international dollars (int. \$) using 2014 PPP conversion rates. The means that figures account for differences in price levels, as well as for inflation.</p>	What country had the highest yearly cost of closing global poverty in 2002?	The highest yearly cost of closing global poverty in 2002 is Comoros (gray) with 16.87. The answer is Comoros.	The highest yearly cost of closing global poverty in 2002 is Botswana with 144.7. The answer is Botswana.	Botswana


Table 15: The first four cases show PomptChart answers correctly by visual information whilst InstructGPT answers wrongly. The last two cases illustrate that visual information sometimes harms the model's performance. Both models are run in the few-shot setting with our proposed FCQA prompt.

Question 1: What is the average of all three bars?




Generated Answer 1: The average of the three bars is $(1.5 + 1.34 + 1.2) / 3 = 1.32$. The answer is 1.32.
Gold Answer 1: 1.346

Question 2: Is the average percentage of all three bars greater than 6%?




Generated Answer 2: The percentage of all three bars is $(7.19 + 6.85 + 6.2) / 3 = 6.746666667\%$. The answer is No, the average is not greater than 6%.
Gold Answer 2: Yes



Generated Summary 3: This statistic shows the quantity of cocaine seized in Italy from 2010 to 2019. In 2019, 8,269.54 kilograms of cocaine were seized in Italy, a significant increase from the 3,847.7 kilograms seized in 2010. The largest amount of cocaine seized during this period was in 2011, with 6,348.43 kilograms.

Gold Summary 3: The statistic shows the total quantity of cocaine seized in Italy from 2010 to 2019. In 2019, 8.3 thousand kilograms of cocaine were seized in the country, the largest amount registered between 2010 and 2019.


Question 4: What are the opinions of Independents on Obama?



Generated Answer 4: During Obama's second term, there has been a significant drop in support among Independents. In December 2012, 48% of Independents approved of Obama's job performance, compared to only 32% in November 2013, a decrease of 16 percentage points. By comparison, Democrats' approval of Obama's job performance only decreased by 10 percentage points (78% to 88%) and Republicans' approval decreased by only 2 percentage points (10% to 12%).

Gold Answer 4: Obama's approval ratings among Independents declined from 48% in December 2012 to 36% in November 2013, a drop of 21 points, which is larger than 10 point decline among Democrats and 7 point decline among Republicans.

Question 5: What are the views of the general public on LGBT figures?




Generated Answer 5: Among the general public, 32% of respondents named Ellen DeGeneres and 38% named Elton John as the first LGBT artist or public figure that comes to mind. Other names mentioned included Rosie O'Donnell (11%), Jason Collins (8%), Barney Frank (4%), Anderson Cooper (4%) and Rock Hudson (4%). A total of 38% of respondents said they didn't know.

Gold Answer 5: Jason Collins was the second-most frequently mentioned gay or lesbian public figure. 38% said they could not name any gay or lesbian entertainers or public figures.

U.S. apprehensions of family units rose substantially over past year

Number of family units and unaccompanied children apprehended at the U.S. southwest border per month, Jan.-Dec. 2018



Note: "Family unit" represents the number of individuals (either a child younger than 18, parent or legal guardian) apprehended with a family member.

Generated Summary 6: In 2018, the number of family units and unaccompanied children apprehended at the U.S. southwest border rose substantially, reaching a peak of 27,518 family units and 5,653 unaccompanied children in December. The number of apprehensions for both groups increased steadily throughout the year, starting at 4,766 family units and 3,202 unaccompanied children in January. The increase in family unit apprehensions is especially notable, as the number of family units apprehended in 2018 was nearly six times higher than the number apprehended in 2017. Experts suggest that the rise in apprehensions is due to a combination of factors, including increasing violence in Central American countries and more expansive U.S. immigration policies.

Gold Summary 6: In the months leading up to the shutdown, there was a large increase in the number of people in family units apprehended at the border. Monthly family apprehensions subsequently hit new highs each month from September through December, according to data going back to 2012. There were nearly 17,000 family member apprehensions in September, more than 23,000 in October, about 25,000 in November and a record of more than 27,000 in December.

Table 16: Case studies for error analysis. Red texts are errors and green ones are correct generations.