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Abstract

Notebooks such as Jupyter became a popular environment for data science, because they support interactive data exploration and provide a convenient way of interleaving code, comments and visualizations. Alas, most notebook systems use an architecture that leads to a limited model of interaction and makes reproducibility and versioning difficult.

In this paper, we present Wrattler, a new notebook system built around provenance that addresses the above issues. Wrattler separates state management from script evaluation and controls the evaluation using a dependency graph maintained in the web browser. This allows richer forms of interactivity, an efficient evaluation through caching, guarantees reproducibility and makes it possible to support versioning.

1 Introduction

Notebooks [5, 15] are literate programming [6] systems that allow interleaving text, code and outputs. To aid reproducible, exploratory data science, notebook systems should provide:

Richer interaction model. Web browsers are increasingly powerful and allow moving parts of data exploration to the client-side. Notebooks should leverage this and give live previews when writing code to perform simple data exploration.

Transparent state management. The state maintained by a notebook should be transparent and accessible to external tools. This would allow versioning of state and development of tools that provide hints based on the notebook state.

Multiple languages and tools. A notebook should make it easy to combine multiple programming languages. A cell written in one language should be able to automatically access data frames defined in other languages.

Improved reproducibility. Changing code in a cell should invalidate results that depend on data frames defined in the cell. Reverting a change should immediately revert the result to the previous one and show it immediately using a cache.

Supporting these is a challenge that combines several research areas. We need programming language techniques to efficiently update live previews during editing, provenance methods to track data dependencies and data representation that can be shared across languages.

Wrattler is a new notebook system that supports the above features. We follow a line of work combining provenance tracking with notebooks [7, 14], but rather than extending existing systems, we revisit two core aspects of the notebook architecture (Section 2). First, Wrattler uses a dependency graph to track provenance between cells and even function calls inside individual cells (Section 3.1). When a cell is changed, relevant parts of a graph are invalidated. This guarantees reproducibility and enables more efficient re-computation. Second, Wrattler introduces a data store that separates state management from code execution (Section 3.2). The data store handles versioning and simplifies the support for polyglot programming.

Together, these two changes to the standard architecture of notebook systems make Wrattler notebooks (Section 4) polyglot, reproducible (with an easy and reliable state rollback) and live (with efficient re-computation on change that enables live preview during data exploration).

2 Wrattler architecture

Standard notebook architecture consists of a notebook and a kernel. The kernel runs on a server, evaluates code snippets and maintains state they use. Notebook runs in a browser and sends commands to the kernel in order to evaluate cells selected by the user. As illustrated in Figure 1, Wrattler splits the server functionality between two components:
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Figure 1. In notebook systems such as Jupyter, state and execution is managed by a kernel. In Wrattler, those functions are split between data store and language runtimes. Language runtimes can run on the server-side (e.g. Python) or client-side (e.g. TheGamma).
**3 Wrattler components**

Wrattler runs in the web browser and communicates with the data store and language runtimes that may run on the server or in the browser. An example of browser-based language runtime is TheGamma [12], discussed in Section 3.3.

### 3.1 Dependency graph

At runtime, Wrattler maintains a dependency graph that is composed from sub-graphs created by individual language runtimes. The graph is acyclic and a node can only depend on earlier nodes. Each node has a value which may be:

- A language-specific value that Wrattler does not understand. This is kept in the browser and re-computed when the notebook is re-opened.
- A data frame. Data frame is stored in the data store and browser keeps a reference (URL) of the frame. This is understood by all language runtimes and provides a way of exchanging data between multiple languages.

Figure 2 shows a sample dependency graph. Wrattler creates two nodes for each cell (representing the cell and its source code) and a node for each data frame exported by a cell (e.g. the rightmost node in the first cell). Nodes in subsequent cells may depend on data frames exported by earlier cells.

Wrattler treats data frames in a special way. They are stored in data store and each language runtime is responsible for loading them into a native language representation (e.g. pandas in Python and array of records in JavaScript).

**Dependency graph construction.** The dependency graph is updated after every code change. Wrattler invokes individual language runtimes to parse each cell. Language runtimes that run in the browser (e.g. TheGamma) produce a fine-grained syntax tree. The result of parsing the whole notebook is then a list of elements obtained for each cell.

Wrattler then walks over the syntax tree and binds a dependency graph node to each syntactic element using a process described in Figure 3. The antecedents of a node are the nodes that it depends on. This typically includes inputs for an operation or instance on which a member access is performed.

**Checking and evaluation.** Nodes in the dependency graph can be annotated with information such as the evaluated value of the syntactic element that the node represents. An important property of the binding process (Figure 3) is that, if there is no change in antecedents of a node, binding will return the same node as before. As a result, previously evaluated values attached to nodes in the graph are reused.

Wrattler re-evaluates parts of the dependency graph on demand and the displayed results and visualizations always reflect the current source code in the notebook. When the evaluation of a cell is requested, Wrattler recursively evaluates all the antecedents of the node and then evaluates the value of the node. The evaluation is delegated to a language runtime associated with the language of the node:

1. For Python nodes, the language runtime sends the source code, together with its dependencies, to a server that retrieves the dependencies and evaluates the code.
2. For TheGamma and JavaScript nodes, the language runtime collects values of the dependencies and runs the operation that the node represents in the browser.
For the purpose of this paper, the most important aspect of TheGamma is that scripts can be parsed and evaluated in the browser. This allows more interactive style of data exploration without round-trips to re-evaluate modified code.

4 Properties of Wrattler

The Wrattler architecture outlined in Section 2 allowed us to develop a prototype system with a number of properties that are difficult to obtain with traditional notebooks.

4.1 Reproducible, live and smart

The two most important aspects of the Wrattler architecture are that it separates the state from the language runtime (using a data store) and that it keeps a dependency graph based on the current notebook source code (on the client). The provenance information that is available thanks to this architecture enable a number of properties.

Reproducibility. The evaluation outputs displayed in Wrattler notebook always reflect the current source code. When code changes, Wrattler updates the dependency graph and hides invalidated visualizations. Because the data store caches earlier results, it is always possible to go back without re-evaluating the whole notebook.

Refactoring. The dependency graph allows us to implement notebook refactoring. For example, it is possible to extract only code necessary to produce a given visualization. For code written in TheGamma, this extracts individual operations; for Python or JavaScript, we can currently extract code at cell-level granularity.

Live previews. The dependency graph makes it possible to give live previews during development. When code changes, only values for new nodes in the graph need to be calculated. The fine-grained structure of the dependency graph for TheGamma makes it possible to update previews instantly.

Polyglot. Sharing the state via data store makes it possible to combine multiple language runtimes, as long as they support sharing data via data frames. In our prototype, this includes R, JavaScript and TheGamma script, but the extensibility model allows adding further languages.

4.2 Wrattler prototype

A prototype implementation of the Wrattler system is available on GitHub (http://github.com/wrattler). The prototype implements language runtimes for TheGamma script (Section 3.3), R and JavaScript. It builds a dependency graph (Section 3.1) and uses it to evaluate results of cells.

The data store (Section 3.2) stores data in Microsoft Azure in JSON format. Support for meta-data annotations and big data is not yet implemented. Storing notebook state in the data store also allowed us to develop an integration with DataDiff [17], which provides data cleaning recommendations.
5 Related work

The work in this paper directly follows the work on IPython and Jupyter systems [5, 15]. Wrattler shares many properties with those and aims to address some of their limitations. To address reproducibility, some Jupyter extensions and systems such as R markdown lock cells after evaluation.

Dataflow notebooks [7] attach unique hashes to cell evaluations. This allows the user to refer to dependencies explicitly and, in effect, construct a dependency graph manually. Scientific workflow systems [1, 11] manage evaluation over a dependency graph similarly to Wrattler, but allow editing it directly via a GUI, rather than through code in a notebook.

The noWorkflow project [14] links the two approaches by instrumenting Jupyter kernel with a mechanism for capturing provenance based on light-weight annotations. Vizer [9] focuses on integrating notebooks with spreadsheet-like interface. It internally uses a data store component similar to ours, but does not keep dependency graph on the client.

Our binding process is inspired by Roslyn [9] and extends an earlier work on TheGamma [13]. It is similar to methods used in live programming languages [3, 8], incremental compilation [16] and partial evaluation [2]. Wrattler adapts those methods to a notebook environment.

6 Summary

This paper presents early work on Wrattler – a new notebook system for data science that makes notebooks reproducible, live and polyglot. The properties of Wrattler are enabled by provenance information that is maintained thanks to two changes to the standard architecture of notebook systems.

First, Wrattler separates the state management from code execution. This allows versioning, polyglot notebooks and integration of third-party tools that can work directly with the data store. Second, Wrattler keeps a dependency graph on the client (web browser) and uses it to control evaluation. This guarantees reproducibility and allows faster feedback during development.
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