Efficient Computation of Constrained Parameterizations on Parallel Platforms

Th. Athanasiadis, G. Zioupos and I. Fudos

Motivation

Mesh parameterization is a powerful geometry processing tool

Applications

- Remeshing
- Texture mapping
- Segmentation
- Shape search
- Morphing
- Other ...

 Conclusion: fast and robust mesh parameterization is central to many applications



Parameterization Definitions





Ω

- Parameter domain $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$
- Bijective Mapping $f: S \to \Omega$ and $f^{-1}: \Omega \to S$

(one-to-one correspondence between Ω and S)

Properties of Parameterization

- A parameterization may introduce distortion
- Maps are characterized by their distortion:
 - Minimizing angle distortion : conformal
 - Minimizing area distortion : authalic
 - Minimizing distance distortion : isometric



Research Highlights – Contributions

- A simplified formulation for the isometric parameterization problem
- An efficient non linear solver using parallel platforms (GPU, Multicore cpus)
- An iterative untangling algorithm for computing initial solution for the non linear solver
- A cut-and-paste application using the parallel solver



Parameterization Definitions



Figure 1: Ideal triangle $\Delta v_0 v_1 v_2$ and its similar triangle $\Delta v'_0 v'_1 v'_2$ on \mathbb{R}^2 along with the corresponding mappings.

- W : Edge matrix (Jacobian) of ideal triangle
- A : Edge matrix of the physical triangle
- ▶ S = AW⁻¹

Isometric Parameterization Formulation



^[1] P. M. Knupp, Algebraic mesh quality metrics, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 23 (1) (2001) 193-218.

[2] K. Hormann, G. Greiner, MIPS: An efficient global parametrization method, in: P.-J. Laurent, P. Sablonniere, L. L. Schumaker(Eds.), Curve and Surface Design: Saint-Malo 1999, Innovations in Applied Mathematics, Vanderbilt University Press, Nashville, TN, 2000, pp. 153–162.

University of Ioannina

SMI'I 3

Non Linear Solver

A system of non linear equations is formed

- By using the right non linear equations for each triangle we can control different properties of the final map
 - Conformal
 - Isometric
 - Smoothing (equal angles)



Defining Different Ideal Triangles



Constraints

Hard constraints

Can be added in the system but an initial unfolded parameterization is required

Soft constraints

• Can be trivially supported, the metrics prevent folding due to the barrier form $(\eta_{shape} \rightarrow \infty)$. Therefore, we can add a quadratic term in the non linear equations



Our approach

Constrained parameterization

- Compute an initial solution with a linear parameterization method
- Fix the boundaries and the internal constraints
- Untangle the mesh
- Proceed as in the unconstrained case
- Unconstrained case (free or fixed boundary):
 - Set the proper non linear equations equation for smoothing, conformal or isometric mapping
 - Solve the non linear problem with limited memory BFGS (L-BFGS)



L-BFGS Benefits

Faster convergence than Conjugate Gradient

- Low memory requirement (Configurable)
- No hessian computation is required
- Simple implementation only blas-1 operations are required
- Highly parallel suitable for implementation on the GPU



L-BFGS Convergence



- A few vectors of previous solutions (history) are hold for building a hessian approximation.
- The speed of convergence depends on the number of vectors of history retained
- A few vectors (3-7) are sufficient for good performance

GPU Implementation of the Solver

OpenCL I.I used

- High accuracy and blas-I operations on GPU (important for BFGS)
- A lot of memory optimizations on derivative and function computation
 No dive
 - Coalesced memory access
 - Minimized branch divergence





Untangling extensions

Directly minimize the sum areas of all inverted elements

$$minf(x) = -\sum_{i}^{n} det(\mathbf{A})$$

 Numerical Instability close to the solution due to invariance of the area to shearing operations



> Therefore, we also apply a shearing minimization operator

Mesh Untangling Results



Results

m	ethod		model #	vertices	# faces	bijectivity	iters	# evals f	time	(s)
A	ARAP		Blech	27993	55296	yes	7	-	1.	95
Se	Solver(1000)		Blech	27993	55296	yes	1000	2633	1.0	65
Se	Solver(1500)		Blech	27993	55296	yes	1500	3658	2.	38
A	ARAP		argoyle	24406	48672	no	4	-	1.	08
SO	solver(5000)		argoyle	24406	48672	yes	5000	15570	10.	16
SO	olver(100	000) ga	argoyle	24406	48672	yes	10000	30551	19.	88
A	ARAP		julius	209083	416286	yes	28	-	59.	02
SO	solver(2500)		julius	209083	416286	yes	2500	5583	14.	71
solver(4000)		00)	julius	209083	416286	yes	4000	8943	23.	92
Method		Model	L2(min)	L2(max)	L2(rms)	Area(mir	n) Area	(max) Are	ea(rms)	Angular
ARAP		Blech	0.719205	1.35083	0.0812426	0.56589	2 2.	01864 0	.15528	0.005267
Solver(1	1000)	Blech	0.721571	1.39323	0.0628883	0.59590	2 4.	40744 0	.13110	0.008731
Solver(1	1500)	Blech	0.708662	1.48147	0.0573159	0.57474	5 4.	47457 0	.12180	0.005351
ARAP		Gargoyle	0.408068	7465.28	74.4895	0.00016	4 8	3.2565 1	.03866	0.421756
Solver(5	5000)	Gargoyle	0.18212	25.9687	3.81626	0.00527	7 31	1.9465 1	.78979	0.108743
Solver(1	10000)	Gargoyle	0.226868	16.4789	2.36491	0.01004	8 22	2.0854 1	.63601	0.121859
ARAP		Julius	0.63778	56.1057	0.203055	0.0048672	6	4.269 0	.34954	0.043286
Solver(2	2500)	Julius	0.575291	2.03919	0.155464	0.29920	3	8.559 0	.32586	0.041716
Solver(4	4000)	Julius	0.618229	2.00369	0.130395	0.31521	2	6.409 0	.28318	0.045691

[1] L. Liu, L. Zhang, Y. Xu, C. Gotsman, S. J. Gortler, A local/global approach to mesh parameterization, in: Proceedings of the Symposium on Geometry Processing, SGP '08, Eurographics Association, Aire-la-Ville, Switzerland, Switzerland, 2008, pp. 1495–1504

Results





Cut and paste procedure



Parameterize the base surface and the feature

- Base surface can be parameterized with any method
- Feature is parameterized with the OpenCL solver using a set of constrained vertices that match corresponding base feature vertices
- Feature surface is stored in a floating point texture with the use of its parameterization



Cut and Paste Procedure



- Deform the base surface vertices with Radial Basis Functions (RBFs) to produce a suitable smooth surface for pasting
- Final surface is computed by tessellating the base surface with the use of the floating texture (OpenGL 4.0 tessellator unit)
- Rotation and translation of the pasted feature can be performed on the fly



Cut and paste results



(a) Base surface

(b) Cut-and-paste without RBF







Conclusions

- A careful implementation of a non linear solver running on the GPUs is an order of magnitude faster than on the CPU
- Directly solving the non linear isometric parameterization problem without linear approximations or simplification is more robust and produce parameterizations with lower distortion. By using the power of GPUs the performance is comparable to the linear approximations
- Isometric parameterizations are a powerful tool when under sampling is an issue such as storing features for cut and paste operations



Thank you

Questions: <u>thathana@cs.uoi.gr</u> <u>fudos@cs.uoi.gr</u>

Software and source code:

www.cs.uoi.gr/~fudos/smi2013.html



This research has been co-financed by the European Union (European Social Fund - ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program "Education and Lifelong Learning" of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) - Research Funding Program: Heracleitus II. Investing in knowledge society through the European Social Fund.

