

# Real-time Physically Based Rendering - Implementation -

R&D Department, tri-Ace, Inc.

Yoshiharu Gotanda      Tatsuya Shoji

# Image Based Lighting (IBL)



- Lighting that uses a texture (an image) as light source
  - How is it different than Environment Mapping?
    - In a broad sense, environment mapping is one of the techniques of Image Based Lighting



# Physically Based IBL



- Ad-hoc IBL vs. Physically-based IBL
  - Has the same differences and similarities between ad-hoc rendering and physically based rendering
  - Ad-hoc rendering
    - Each process needed for rendering is implemented one by one, ad-hoc
  - Physically Based Rendering
    - The entire renderer is designed and built based on physical premises such as the Rendering Equation and etc.

# Physically Based IBL advantages



- Guarantees a rendering result that is close to shading under punctual light sources
  - Materials in a scene dominated by direct lighting and indirect lighting seem the same
    - Consistency is preserved through different lighting
    - Artists spend less time tweaking parameters
    - Even in a scene dominated by indirect lighting, materials look realistic
    - No need to use an environment map for glossy objects
      - Just add an IBL light source

# PBIBL implementation



- Implementing IBL as an approximation of the rendering equation
  - Physically Based Image Based Lighting is one of possible examples to reasonably implement physically based rendering




# Equations

$$L_o(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \int_{\Omega} f_r(\mathbf{x}, \omega', \omega) L_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega') (\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n}) d\omega'$$

$$f_r(\mathbf{x}, \omega', \omega) = \frac{R_d}{\pi} (1 - F_0) + (0.0397436 \text{shininess} + 0.0856832) \frac{F_{\text{spec}}(F_0) (\mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^{\text{shininess}}}{\max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \omega', \mathbf{n} \cdot \omega)}$$

substitute



$$F_{\text{spec}}(F_0) = F_0 + (1 - F_0) (1 - \omega \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^5$$

$$L_o(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \int_{\Omega} (\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n}) \left( \frac{R_d}{\pi} (1 - F_0) + (0.0397436 \text{shininess} + 0.0856832) \frac{\left( F_0 + (1 - F_0) (1 - \omega \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^5 (\mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^{\text{shininess}} \right)}{\max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \omega', \mathbf{n} \cdot \omega)} \right) L_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega') d\omega'$$

# Decompose integral



$$L_o(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{R_d}{\pi} (\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n})(1 - F_0)L_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega') + (c_1 \cdot shi + c_2) \frac{(\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n}) \left( F_0 + (1 - F_0)(1 - \omega \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^5 \right) (\mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^{shi}}{\max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \omega', \mathbf{n} \cdot \omega)} L_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega') d\omega'$$

$$\text{IEM}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\pi} (\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n}) L_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega') d\omega'$$

Irradiance Environment Map  
(IEM)

$$\text{REM}(\omega, shi) = \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^{shi} L_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega') d\omega'$$

Pre-filtered Radiance Environment Map  
(PFREM)

$$\text{AmbientBRDF}(\omega, shi, F_0) = \int_{\Omega} (c_1 \cdot shi + c_2) \frac{(\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n}) \left( F_0 + (1 - F_0)(1 - \omega \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^5 \right)}{\max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \omega', \mathbf{n} \cdot \omega)} d\omega'$$

AmbientBRDF Volume Texture

# Implement Ambient BRDF



$$\text{AmbientBRDF}(\omega, shi, F_0) = \int_{\Omega} (c_1 \cdot shi + c_2) \frac{(\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n}) \left( F_0 + (1 - F_0)(1 - \omega \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^5 \right)}{\max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \omega', \mathbf{n} \cdot \omega)} d\omega'$$

- Precompute this equation off line and store result to a volume texture
  - U – Dot product of eye vector ( $\omega$ ) and normal ( $\mathbf{n}$ )
  - V – *shininess*
  - W –  $F_0$



# AmbientBRDF texture usage



- Fetch the texture
  - For specular component

$$\bullet \text{ Use the value for } \int_{\Omega} (c_1 \cdot shi + c_2) \frac{(\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n}) \left( F_0 + (1 - F_0)(1 - \omega \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|})^5 \right)}{\max(\mathbf{n} \cdot \omega', \mathbf{n} \cdot \omega)} d\omega'$$

- For diffuse component
  - $R_d^*(1 - \text{the value})$ 
    - For optimization
  - Ideally values for diffuse component should be precomputed and stored to the texture for accurate shading

# AmbientBRDF comparison



AmbientBRDF OFF

AmbientBRDF ON



# Generate textures



- Use AMD CubeMapGen?
  - It can't be used for real-time processing on multi-platform, because it is released as a tool / library

# Generate textures



- Use AMD CubeMapGen?
  - It can't be used for real-time processing on multi-platform, because it is released as a tool / library


But it has become open-source ^

- Even so, the quality is not perfect and there is room for improvement

# Generate IEM

$$\text{IEM}(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\pi} (\omega' \cdot \mathbf{n}) L_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega') d\omega'$$

- Implement this equation straightforwardly on GPU
  - Diffuse BRDF is Lambert
    - In the case of IBL, the use of other models doesn't bring any significant differences
      - Strictly speaking, it depends of the intensity distribution in an IBL image
    - Texture resolution is 16x16x6



# Generate IEM (2)




- Using a radiance map reduced to 8x8x6
  - Store accurately precomputed  $\Delta\omega$  to the texture using spherical quadrilateral
    - AMD CubeMapGen uses approximated  $\Delta\omega$
  - Normalizing coefficient is also stored in the texture
  - Fp16 format
  - $8 \times 8 \times 5 = 320$  tap filter on GPU
    - Xbox360 0.5ms
    - PS3 2.0ms
      - Would be better on SPU

# Optimize diffuse term



- Using SH lighting instead of IEM for a high performance configuration
  - Our engine already implements SH lighting
    - No extra GPU cost
  - Compute the coefficients from 6 texels at the center in each face



Spherical Harmonics

Irradiance Map

# Generate REM





$$\text{REM}(\omega, shi) = \int_{\Omega} \left( \mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{\omega' + \omega}{|\omega' + \omega|} \right)^{shi} L_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega') d\omega'$$

- Pre-filtered Mipmapped Environment Map
  - Compute the equation with different shininess values and store results to each mipmapped texture
  - Blinn based NDF?
    - Approximated with Phong
      - This is a compromise solution because the specular highlight shape changes due to different microfacet models
    - Only fitting the size difference of NDFs using shininess

# Fitting shininess

- $\cos^n \theta \approx \cos^{4.2n} \frac{\theta}{2}$



# Generate PMREM (1)



- Box-filter kernel filtering
  - Simply use bilinear filtering to generate mipmaps
  - LOD values are set according to shininess
    - Quality is quite low
    - Not even an approximation
  - Use as a fastest profile for dynamic PMREM generation

# Box kernel filter




# Generate PMREM (2)



- Gaussian kernel filtering
  - Apply 2D Gaussian blur to each face
    - Not physically based
      - As the blur radius increases, visual artifacts from error in  $\Delta\omega$  become noticeable
    - The cube map boundary problem is noticeable
      - Even using overlapping (described later) for slow gradation generated by the blur process, since filtering isn't performed over edges, banding is perceived on the edges when colors are changed rapidly
    - Use as the second fastest profile for dynamic PMREM generation


# Gaussian kernel filter



# Generate PMREM(3)



- Spherical Phong kernel filtering
  - The shininess values are converted using the fitting function
  - The cube map boundary problem still exists
    - We expected to solve it before the implementation
    - The reason is that, since the centers of adjacent pixels across the edges are not matched, the filtered colors are also not matched



# Spherical Phong kernel filter



# Phong kernel implementation(GPU)



- Brute force implementation similar to irradiance map generation
  - In the final implementation, a face is subdivided into 9 rectangles for texture fetch reduction
    - Faster by 50%
    - $9 \times 6 = 54$  shaders are used for each mip level
  - Subdivision is not used below  $16 \times 16$ 
    - It becomes ALU bound as texture cache efficiently works for smaller textures

# Phong kernel implementation(CPU)



- Offline generation by the tool for static IBL
  - SH coefficients and PMREM are automatically generated during scene export
    - For performance, 64x64x6 PMREM is only supported for static IBL
    - Brute force implementation
      - All level mipmaps are generated from the top level texture at the same time
    - Core2 8 hardware threads @ 2.8GHz
      - 64x64x6 : 5.6s
      - 32x32x6 : 0.5s
      - SSE & multithread

# Generate PFREM (4)




- Poisson kernel filtering
  - Implemented a faster version of Phong kernel filtering
    - Apply about 160tap filter with one lower level mipmap texture
      - Quality is compromised even with this process
    - Many taps are needed for desired quality
      - Didn't work as optimization
      - Didn't work well with Overlapping process
    - Not used because of bad quality and performance

# Comparisons

Box kernel filter



Gaussian kernel filter



Spherical Phong kernel filter

# Mipmap LOD



- Mipmap LOD parameter is calculated for generated PMREM


- Select the mip level according to shininess
    - Using `texCUBElod()` for each pixel

$$lod = a - 0.5 \log_2 shininess$$

- $a$  is calculated according to the texture size and shininess
    - With trilinear filtering
  - Each shininess value corresponding to each mip level is calculated by fitting
    - Fitted for both Box Filter Kernel and Phong Filter Kernel

# Edge overlapping

- Need to solve the cubemap boundary problem
  - No bilinear filtering is applied on the cubemap boundaries of each face with DX9 hardware
  - Problematic especially for low resolution mipmaps (1x1 or 2x2)
  - Edge fixup in AMD CubeMapGen




# Edge overlapping (1)



- Blend adjacent boundaries by 50%
  - Simplified version of AMD CubeMapGen's Edge Fixup
    - Adjacent texels across the boundaries become the same colors
      - If corners, the colors become the average of adjacent three texel colors
      - If 1x1, the color becomes the average of all faces
        - » All texels become the same color
    - Banding is still noticeable because color gradation velocity varies

# Edge overlapping (1)



# Edge overlapping (2)



- Blend multiple texels
  - For the next step, blend 2 texels
    - In order to reduce gradation velocity variation, blend 2 texels by 1/4 and 3/4 ratio
      - Same approach as CubeMapGen
      - However, banding is still noticeable in the case where gradation acceleration drastically varies
      - As the area where banding is noticeable increases, the impression gets worse
      - Because the blurred area increases, the accuracy of the integration decreases
        - » Worse rendering quality

# Edge overlapping (3)





- 4 texel blend?
  - More blends don't make sense according to our research
    - 4 texel blending in CubeMapGen is not so high quality
    - Moreover, the precision as a signal decreases

# Bent Phong filter kernel




- This algorithm blends normals instead of colors
  - Similar to the difference between Gouraud Shading and Phong Shading
- The normal from the center of the cube map through the center of the texel is bent by an offset angle
  - The offset angle is interpolated from zero at the center of the face to a target angle at the edge
  - The target angle is the angle between the two normals of adjacent face's edge texels
    - The result from just the above steps was improved, but still not perfect
    - Then, using only 50% of target angle gave a much better result
- In the final implementation, the target angle is additionally modified based on the blur radius
  - Large radius : 100% of target angle used
  - Small radius : 50% used
  - Since optimal values for the target angle are image dependant, adjust the values by visual adjustment instead of mathematical fitting


# Bent Phong filter kernel



# Bent Phong filter kernel



Edge overlapping w/ Phong filter kernel



Bent Phong filter kernel

# Implemented configurations



- Dynamic IBL

Resolution	Shininess	Filtering	Edge fixup
16x16x6	1-500	None	Edge overlapping
32x32x6	1-1000	2D Gaussian	Edge overlapping
16x16x6	1-250	Spherical Phong	Bent Phong
32x32x6	1-1000	Spherical Phong	Bent Phong

- Static IBL

Resolution	Shininess	Filtering	Edge fixup
32x32x6	1-1000	Spherical Phong	Bent Phong
64x64x6	1-2000	Spherical Phong	Bent Phong

# Problems with large shininess



- In practice with IBL, materials still look glossy even with shininess of 1,000 or 2,000
  - For mirror like materials, shininess of ten thousands is preferred
  - Difficult to have high enough resolution mipmap textures, because of memory and performance issues
- Adding the mirror reflection option
  - When this functionality is turned on, the original high resolution texture is automatically chosen




# IBL Blending



- Blending is necessary when using multiple Image Based Lights
  - Implemented blending between an SH light and an IBL
    - Popping was annoying when the blend factor cross 50%
    - Not practical
  - Blending by fetching Radiance Map twice
    - Diffuse term is blended with SH
    - For optimization, this process is performed only for the specified attenuation zone
      - Switching shader

# IBL Blending



# IBL Offset

- A little tweak for a local reflection problem with IBL
  - The usual method
    - Reflection vector is modified according to the virtual IBL position
$$\mathbf{R}' = \text{normalize}\left(c(\mathbf{P}_{obj} - \mathbf{P}_{IBL}) + \mathbf{R}\right)$$
    - $c$  is computed from the IBL size, the object size and another coefficient which is adjusted by hand.



# Matching IBL with point light



- In the case where area lighting becomes practical with IBL, punctual lights becomes problematic
  - When adjusting specular for punctual lights, artists tend to set smaller (blurrier) shininess values than physically based values
    - But it is too blurry for IBL
    - When adjusted for IBLs, it is too sharp for punctual lights
  - No way for artists to adjust specular without matching

# Shininess hack



- Not mathematical matching, but matching the result from punctual lights to the result from IBL
  - Anyhow, this is a hack
    - The coefficient can't be precisely adjusted
      - Depends on the shape of the object lit
      - Depends on the size of the light source
    - Shininess value is compensated by the lighting attenuation factor
      - In the case of distant light source, shininess value tends to be the original shininess value
      - In the case of close light source, shininess values tends to be smaller than the original value

$$\text{shininess}' = \text{shininess}(\text{saturate}\left(\frac{60}{\text{light\_size}}(1 - \text{attenuation\_factor})\right))^2$$

# Shininess hack




# Shininess hack



# HDR IBL Artifact



- The rendering result looks unnatural when the high intensity light that should be occluded is coming from grazing angles
  - Generally multiply by the ambient occlusion factor
    - Enough for LDR IBL
  - The artifact is noticeable when HDR IBL has a big difference of intensities, just like the real world
    - Multiplying by the ambient occlusion factor isn't enough



# HDR IBL Artifact



# Why does the artifact occur?



- Because it is physically based
  - It is sometimes very noticeable
    - It unnaturally looks too bright on some pixels (edge of objects)
  - This artifact occurs when all of the following are present: Fresnel effect, high intensity value from HDR IBL, physically based BRDF models, and high shininess values

Example of a material with a refractive index of 1.5

	Light intensity	E.H	Schlick	shininess	Result
Worst case	10.0	0.1	0.61	500	12.644
Best case	1.0	1.0	0.04	10	0.00502

A difference of about 2,500times!

# Multiplying by AO factor



- Is not enough
  - Enough for LDR IBL and non physically based
    - Unnoticeable
  - Not enough for HDR IBL and physically based at all
    - If an AO factor is 0.1,
      - $12.64 * 0.1 = 1.264$  with the example
      - Still higher than 1.0
  - Need a more aggressive occlusion factor


# Novel Occlusion Factor



- Need almost zero for occluded cases
  - Not enough with 0.3 or 0.1 for HDR
    - Need 0.01 or less
  - Very small values for not occluded area are problematic
  - Need to compute an occlusion term designed for the specular component
    - High-order SH?
    - No more extra parameters!

# Specular Occlusion

- SO is acquired from AO
  - Use AO factor as HBAO or SSAO
    - But precomputed AO factor is not HBAO factor
      - Using AO factor as HBAO factor that assumes that the pixel is occluded by the same angle for all horizontal directions
      - In other words, you can consider that the same occlusion happens for all directions in the case of SSAO




# Aqcuire Specular Occlusion



- In the case where a pixel is isotropically occluded from the horizon without gaps
  - AO factor becomes


$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\alpha \int_0^{2\pi} \cos \theta \sin \theta d\phi d\theta = \cos^2 \alpha$$

- Neither conventional AO nor HBAO are isotropic for horizontal directions, but Specular Occlusion forcibly assumes that it is




# Specular Occlusion implementation

- Required SO (Specular Occlusion) factor should satisfy the following as much as possible
  - Where  $\theta = 0$ , SO = 0
  - Where  $\theta = \cos^{-1}(AO^{0.5})$ , SO = 0.5~~ight~~  
    - Specular term becomes 0.5 where the pixel is occluded by a half at the occluded position
  - Where  $\theta = \pi/2$ , SO = 1



# Specular Occlusion



Ambient Occlusion



Specular Occlusion

# SO implementation (1)



$$SO = \text{saturate}\left((\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{E})^2 + 2AO - 1\right)$$

- The first equation that satisfies the condition
  - Though this satisfies the conditions as Specular Occlusion, it is not physically based
  - Since Specular Occlusion literally represents the occlusion factor for the specular term, it should be affected by the shininess value

# SO implementation (1)




# SO implementation (2)



$$SO = \text{saturate}\left( ((\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{E}) + AO)^{0.01shininess} - 1 + AO \right)$$

- Equation taking into account the shininess value
  - More physically based than the first one
  - SO suddenly changes with larger shininess values
  - High computational cost with Pow
    - A little visual contribution to the result
    - Smaller occlusion effect than expected

# SO implementation (2)




# SO implementation (3)



$$SO = \text{saturate}\left(\left((\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{E}) + AO\right)^2 - 1 + AO\right)$$

- Optimizing the second equation
  - The physically based correctness with respect to shininess decreases
  - Stable as SO doesn't take into account shininess
    - Average occlusion effect becomes stronger
  - Optimized
    - The balance between quality and cost is good

# SO implementation (3)



# Ambient specular term computation



$$final = specular\_direct + specular\_ambient * SO$$

- Computing the final ambient term
  - With this equation, the pixel gets black, because the occluded pixel isn't lit by the ambient lights
    - In reality, the pixel would be illuminated by the some light reflected by some of the objects (interreflection)
    - The diffuse term has the same issue
      - AO itself is not such an aggressive occlusion term
      - Diffuse factor does not have such a high dynamic range
      - Not problematic
    - Problematic for the specular term
      - Unnaturally too dark

# Ambient specular term computation



# AS term computation (1)



$final = s\_d + \text{lerp}(diffuse\_ambient \cdot albedo, specular\_ambient, SO)$

- Computing pseudo interreflection
  - Fundamentally, it should take into account light and albedo at the reflected point
    - Because this implementation is “pseudo”, it takes into account light and albedo at the shading point
- The results
  - Visually, we desired a little more aggressive occlusion effect
    - Not based on physics
  - Depending on the position, the rendering result becomes strange
    - This implementation does not take into account the actual interreflection

# AS term computation (1)



# AS term computation (2)



$final = s\_d + \text{lerp}(\text{diffuse\_ambient} * AO, \text{specular\_ambient}, SO)$

- Multiplying by the AO factor instead of albedo
  - Interreflection like effect becomes smaller, but the occlusion effect becomes stronger
    - Visually preferable
    - Eventually, it depends on your preference
    - It is a good choice to make this an option for artists

# AS term computation (2)



# AS term computation (3)



$$final = s\_d + AO \cdot \text{lerp}(diffuse\_ambient \cdot AO, specular\_ambient, SO)$$

- Again, the AO factor is multiplied by the specular term
  - Makes the specular effect for ambient lighting robust
    - Not based on physics
    - The SO factor itself approximates the approximation
    - Relatively adjusted to conservative result
      - It also depends on your preference

# AS term computation (3)



# AS term computation (4)



$$final = s\_d + \text{lerp}(\text{diffuse\_ambient} \cdot AO^2, \text{specular\_ambient}, SO)$$

- The secondary AO factor is only multiplied by the diffuse term
  - Still your preference
    - This term is optional according to your preference
    - Not physical reason, but artistic direction

# AS term computation (4)



# Applying to the entire specular term



$$final = s\_d \cdot SO + AO \cdot \text{lerp}(diffuse\_ambient \cdot AO, specular\_ambient, SO)$$

- SO factor is also available for the specular term with punctual lights
  - In our case, this is used for punctual lights
    - Big advantage with HDR, physically based materials and textures



# W/o Specular Occlusion (Only AO)



# With Specular Occlusion



# IBL performance



ms @ 1280x720

	IBL	IBL+ 1direct light	SH	SH (no AmbientBRDF)
X360	5.8	7.0	5.0	4.5
PS3	5.9	7.9	5.1	4.3



# Physically based IBL



# Physically based IBL



# Physically based IBL



With the specular term for IBL

Without the specular term for IBL



# Conclusion



- When using physically based IBL
  - Area lighting which is difficult with punctual lights becomes feasible
    - Soft lighting by a large light source
    - Sharp lighting by a small light source
  - Consistent material representation with scenes by either direct and indirect lighting
    - Reduce hand adjustment by artists
    - Easy to set physically correct parameters to materials
  - True HDR representation becomes possible

# Acknowledgements

- R&D department, tri-Ace, Inc.
  - Tatsuya Shoji
  - Elliott Davis
- Thanks for the English version
  - Sébastien Lagarde, Marc Heng and Naty Hoffman

# Questions?



<http://research.tri-ace.com>