Spatial Data Structures

- Ray-Triangle Intersections
- Bounding Volume Hierarchy
- Spatial-Partitioning Structures

Ray-Mesh Intersection

- **Last lecture:** closest triangle to a point
- What if we want to find the closest triangle a ray intersects?
	- A ray is a point + a direction vector
	- More constrained problem
	- Naïve approach (brute force) still needs to check every triangle!

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}\n&\text{origin}&\text{unit direction}\\
\text{point along ray}&\text{time}&\text{time}\n\end{array}
$$

- Spatial data structures allow us to compute ray-mesh intersections without having to check every triangle
- Think of building these structures as a preprocessing step
	- Building can take a while
	- Searching must be fast!

Ray-Plane Intersection

Given a plane defined as $N^{\mathrm{T}}x = c$

We can find the intersection point by plugging in the ray for x

 $N^{T}(\mathbf{o} + t\mathbf{d}) = c$

Substitute the time into the ray equation to find the intersection point

$$
\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{o} + \left(\frac{\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{o}}{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{T}} d}\right) \mathbf{d}
$$

Ray-Triangle Intersection

- Not much different:
	- i) Compute ray-plane intersection to find point **p** on plane
	- ii) Perform point-in-triangle test for point **p**
		- Barycentric coordinates
- Not a very efficient algorithm...
	- Can we combine both steps into one?
	- Idea: use triangle edges as bases for points on the plane

 $\mathbf{0} + t \mathbf{d} = (1 - u - v) * p_0 + u * p_1 + v * p_2$

- That's 3 equations, 3 unknowns (t, u, v)
- If there's a unique solution $(t, ^* u^*, v^*)$, and

 $t^* \geq 0, u^* \geq 0, v^* \geq 0, u^* + v^* \leq 1$

then there's an intersection.

(be careful about the numerical rounding errors)

Moller-Trumbore Algorithm

Given the below equation

 $\mathbf{0} + t \mathbf{d} = (1 - u - v) \cdot \mathbf{p}_0 + u \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 + v \cdot \mathbf{p}_2$

Rearrange the terms until unknowns are on one side

$$
o - p_0 = u * (p_1 - p_0) + v * (p_2 - p_0) - td
$$

Rewrite in terms of variables**

$$
s = u * e_1 + v * e_2 - td
$$

Rewrite as a matrix operation

$$
\mathbf{s} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_1 & \mathbf{e}_2 & -\mathbf{d} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \\ t \end{bmatrix}
$$

Solve using Cramer's rule

$$
s = \mathbf{0} - p_0
$$

\n
$$
e_1 = p_1 - p_0
$$

\n
$$
e_2 = p_2 - p_0
$$
\n
$$
e_3 = p_1 - p_0
$$
\n
$$
e_4 = p_2 - p_0
$$
\n
$$
e_4 = p_1 - p_0
$$
\n
$$
e_2 = p_2 - p_0
$$
\n
$$
e_3 = p_1 - p_0
$$

What if D=0? What does it mean?

**

15-362/662 | Computer Graphics Lecture 09 | Spatial Structures

 $s = \mathbf{0} - p_0$

Moller-Trumbore Visualized

Spatial Data Structures

- Naïve ray-mesh intersection requires checking every triangle for ray-triangle intersection
	- Meshes have millions to billions of triangles
	- O(n) exectution
- Idea: sort triangles in a way where we can perform quick intersection tests on groups of triangles at a time

Bounding Box

- Precompute the smallest axis-aligned bounding box around all primitives
	- Keep track of smallest and largest (x,y,z) coordinates for all primitives
- Check for ray-box intersection
	- If **misses**, we are done
	- If **passes**, check all triangles
- Saves time for rays that clearly miss the mesh, but…
	- Still O(n) for rays that intersect the box

More Bounding Boxes

- What if we had 2 levels of bounding boxes?
	- Global bounding box
		- Head bounding box
		- Body bounding box
- Check for global ray-box intersection • If **misses**, we are done **can we make this recursive?**
	- If **passes**,
		- Check for head ray-box intersection
			- If **misses**, continue
			- If **passes**, check all triangles in head
		- Check for body ray-box intersection
			- If **misses**, continue
			- If **passes**, check all triangles in body
- Better, some rays can now pass the global bbox but neither the head/body bbox
	- We have tighter checks rays need to pass in order to search underlying triangles

A Hierarchy of…Bounding Volumes?

Bounding Volume Hierarchy (BVH)

- Recursively partition nodes into smaller nodes
	- Stop when node contains no more than several primitives
- The resulting **BVH** mimics a tree
	- Root node encompasses all primitives
	- Each non-root node has a parent
	- Each non-leaf node has two children
		- Some BVHs can have more than 2 children
	- Each leaf node points to a handful of primitives

Stanford Bunny BVH visualizing 10th level

• Ray-Triangle Intersections

- Bounding Volume Hierarchy
- Spatial-Partitioning Structures

Let's look at an example

Bounding boxes will sometimes intersect!

BVH Traversal

```
struct BVHNode {
  // is the node a leaf
 bool leaf;
  // min/max coordinates enclosing primitives
  Bbox bbox;
 // left child (can be NULL)
  BVHNode *child1;
 // right child (can be NULL)
  BVHNode *child2;
 // for leaves, stores primitives
 Primitive *primList;
}
struct HitInfo {
  // the primitive the ray hit
 Primitive *prim;
 // the time along the ray the hit occured
 float t;
}
```

```
void hit(Ray* ray, BVHNode* node, HitInfo* best)
{
  // test if ray hits node's bbox
  HitInfo hit = intersect(ray, node->bbox);
  if (hit.prim == NULL || hit.t > best.t))
    return;
  // for leaves, check each primitive
  if (node->leaf) {
    for (each primitive p in node->primList) {
      hit = intersect(ray, p);
      if (hit.prim != NULL && hit.t < best.t) {
        best.prim = p;
        best.t = t;
      }
    }
  } else {
    // traverse BOTH children
    hit(ray, node->child1, best);
    hit(ray, node->child2, best);
  }
}
```
BVH Traversal

{

}


```
void hit(Ray* ray, BVHNode* node, HitInfo* best)
  HitInfo hit = intersect(ray, node->bbox);
  if (hit.prim == NULL || hit.t > best.t))
    return;
  \textbf{h}_\text{f} We don't ALWAYS need to check both children.
     finder Recall the first example where we terminated
       ^{\rm hit}after searching only the \epsilonif (hit.prim != NULL && hit.t < best.t) {
         best.prim = p;
        best.t = t;
       }
     }
  } else {
    // traverse BOTH children
    hit(ray, node->child1, best);
    hit(ray, node->child2, best);
  }
          after searching only the closer bbox.
```
Better BVH Traversal

Better BVH Traversal

So we know how to traverse a BVH, But how do we build one?

BVH Partitioning

What is the best way to partition these primitives?

BVH Partitioning

We can split them into equal # of primitives... …but bboxes take up large area

BVH Partitioning

We can split them into the smallest possible bboxes… …but some bboxes will have many more primitives

• The cost of intersecting a node is:

$$
C = C_{trav} + p_A C_A + p_B C_B
$$

- Where:
	- C_{trap} measures the cost of intersecting the current node's bbox
	- p_A measures the probability of a ray intersecting child node A given it intersects the parent node of A
	- C_A measures the cost of intersecting a primitive in child node A's subtree

Surface Area Heuristic gives us a quantitative way of telling us if a partition is good A better partition will have a lower cost

• The cost of intersecting a node is:

$$
C = C_{trav} + p_A C_A + p_B C_B
$$

- Where:
	- \cdot $\left| C_{trap} \right|$ measures the cost of intersecting the current node's bbox
	- p_A measures the probability of a ray intersecting child node A given it intersects the parent node of A
	- C_A measures the cost of intersecting a primitive in child node A's subtree

- Fixed cost associated with bbox intersection
- Having too large a BVH depth means we have to check too many bboxes before finding a primitive

• The cost of intersecting a node is:

$$
C = C_{trav} + p_A C_A + p_B C_B
$$

- Where:
	- c_{trav} measures the cost of intersecting the current node's bbox
	- p_A measures the probability of a ray intersecting child node A given it intersects the parent node of A
	- C_A measures the cost of intersecting a primitive in child node A's subtree

• For a convex object A inside a parent convex object B, the probability that a random ray that hits B also hits A is given by the ratio of the surface areas S_A and S_R of these objects:

$$
P(\text{hit}A|\text{hit}B) = \frac{S_A}{S_B}
$$

• The cost of intersecting a node is:

$$
C = C_{trav} + p_A C_A + p_B C_B
$$

- Where:
	- C_{trap} measures the cost of intersecting the current node's bbox
	- p_A measures the probability of a ray intersecting child node A given it intersects the parent node of A
	- C_A measures the cost of intersecting a primitive in child node A's subtree

- For a node C_A , this is the cost of checking all primitives held by this box
	- All triangles have the same cost C_{tri}
	- For N_A triangles, cost is $N_A C_{tri}$

• The cost of intersecting a node is:

$$
C = C_{trav} + p_A C_A + p_B C_B
$$

- Where:
	- C_{trap} measures the cost of intersecting the current node's bbox
	- p_A measures the probability of a ray intersecting child node A given it intersects the parent node of A
	- C_A measures the cost of intersecting a primitive in child node A's subtree
- New equation:

$$
C = C_{trav} + \frac{S_A}{S_C} N_A C_{tri} + \frac{S_B}{S_C} N_B C_{tri}
$$

• C_{trap} , C_{tri} and S_c are constants, so we can remove them when computing the minimum cost:

$$
C' = S_A N_A + S_B N_B
$$

- Minimizes surface area deviation
- Minimizes primitive deviation

We know what a good partition is, but how do we actually build a partition


```
for(axis : [x, y, z]) {
      sort(primitives, axis);
     n = primitives.length();
     for(int i = 0; i < n; i+=32) { // check every B primitives (B = 32)
            a = \text{bbox}(primitive[0,i]);b = \text{bbox}(primitive[1, n]);
            cost = a.area * i + b.area * (n - i);
            if(cost < best cost) { best cost = cost; best particular = i; best axis = axis; }}
}
partition(best axis, best partition);
```



```
for(axis : [x, y, z]) {
     sort(primitives, axis);
     n = primitives.length();
     bin n = bin.length();
     for(int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
          bin = compute bucket(primitves[i].centroid) // find bin that triangle lies in
                bin.bbox.add(primitves[i]); } // add triangle to bin
     for(int j = 0; j < bin n; j++) {
           a = bbox(bin[0,j]); // add bins to partitions instead of triangles
          b = bbox(bin[j, bin n]); // add bins to partitions instead of triangles
           // same as before 
     }
}
```


[x-axis binning]

Cost = 3 prims * (0.15) + 8 prims * (0.87)

Cost = 6 prims * (0.38) + 5 prims * (0.43)

Cost = 9 prims * (0.81) + 2 prims * (0.18)

Cost = 3 prims * (0.19) + 8 prims * (0.91)

Cost = 6 prims * (0.32) + 5 prims * (0.36)

Cost = 9 prims * (0.94) + 2 prims * (0.13)

Recurse with each child node

What About Ordering?

What About Ordering?

What About Ordering?

After re-indexing (sorting) based on leaf nodes

After re-indexing (sorting) based on leaf nodes

Edge Cases

In these cases, pick a random partition

BVH Review

Building the BVH:

- 1) Pick axis [x,y,z]
	- 1) Sort primitives on axis by centroid
	- 2) Bin primitives $(B = 32)$
	- 3) Partition primitives by bin along axis
	- 4) Compute cost, saving best result
- 2) Construct 2 child nodes from best cost result
- 3) Recurse until few primitives (< 4) left in node

Traversing the BVH:

- 1) Check if ray hits current node bbox
- 2) If hit, find which child node is closer to ray
- 3) Recurse down closer child
- 4) If the farther child node is closer to the ray than the hit discovered, recurse down the farther child

Traversal cost is $O(log(N))$, same as tree-search

Axis-Aligned BVH

• **What is an axis-aligned BVH?**

- By searching for partitions along the axes [x,y,z], we are constraining ourselves to build partitions with bounding boxes that are axis-aligned
- **How do we make a non-axis-aligned BVH?**
	- Simple! Just search for partitions that are not constrained to [x,y,z]
		- Easy in theory, difficult in practice
- **What are the pros/cons of non-axis-aligned BVH?**
	- [+] Better cost
	- [+] Nodes have less likelihood of having empty space
	- [-] More work to compute partitions
	- [-] Larger intersection cost for non-aligned bboxes
	- [-] More memory overhead

Axis-Aligned BVH

- **Are non-axis-aligned BVHs actually faster?**
	- Yes, and no.

$$
C = C_{trav} + \frac{S_A}{S_C} N_A C_{tri} + \frac{S_B}{S_C} N_B C_{tri}
$$

- Surface area ratio $\frac{S_A}{S_C}$ decreases with better-fitting bboxes
- Bounding box intersection cost C_{trav} increases with more compute required to check unaligned bbox
- **How to check for intersection with non-axis-aligned bbox?**
	- Bbox now has an extra transform matrix T taking it from the parent's coordinate space to its own coordinate space
		- Apply the inverse transform to the bbox and ray and compute axis-aligned intersections
	- Larger memory overhead, now need to store the transform with each node

• Ray-Triangle Intersections

• Bounding Volume Hierarchy

• Spatial-Partitioning Structures

Primitive vs. Spatial

• **Primitive Partitioning**

- Bounding Volume Hierarchy
	- [+] More flexible to geometry
	- [+] Easier to update (animation)
	- [-] Volumes can overlap
	- [-] Unable to terminate on first hit

• **Spatial Partitioning**

- K-D Trees
- Uniform Grid
- Quad/Octree
	- [+] No volume overlap
	- [+] Can terminate on first hit
	- [-] Higher potential for empty space
	- [-] May intersect primitive multiple times

K-D Trees

- Recursively partition space via axis-aligned partitioning planes
	- Interior nodes correspond to spatial splits
	- Node traversal proceeds in front-to-back order
	- Unlike BVH, can terminate search after first hit is found
	- Still $O(log(N))$ performance

K-D Trees

- **Consider:** Triangle 1 overlaps multiple zones
	- Triangle 1 is checked for intersection when checking red zone first
		- Ray intersects triangle 1
		- But triangle 2 is closer
- **Requirement:** intersection point must lie within zone

Uniform Grid

- Partition space into equal sized volumes (volumeelements or **"voxels"**)
- Each voxel contains primitives that overlap
- Walk ray through volume in order
	- Very efficient implementation possible (think: 3D line rasterization)
	- Only consider intersection with primitives in voxels the ray intersects
- What is a good number of voxels?
	- Should be proportional to total number of primitives N
	- Number of cells traversed is proportional to $O({\sqrt[3]{N}})$
		- A line going through a cube is a cubed root
		- Still not as good as $O(log(N))$

Uniform Grid

Too few cells Requires checking every primitive

Too many cells Walking through a lot of empty space

Uniform Grid

- Uniform grid cannot adapt to non-uniform distribution of geometry in scene
	- Unlike K-D tree, location of spatial partitions is not dependent on scene geometry

Monsters University (2013) Pixar

Where Uniform Grids Work

Legend of Zelda: Tears of the Kingdom (2023) Nintendo

Quad-Tree/Octree

- Like uniform grid, easy to build
- Has greater ability to adapt to location of scene geometry than uniform grid
	- Still not as good adaptability as K-D tree
- **Quad-tree:** nodes have 4 children
	- Partitions 2D space
- **Octree:** nodes have 8 children
	- Partitions 3D space

Spatial Data Structures Review

