

# Mean Value Coordinates for Arbitrary Planar Polygons

KAI HORMANN

Clausthal University of Technology

MICHAEL S. FLOATER

University of Oslo

---

Barycentric coordinates for triangles are commonly used in computer graphics, geometric modelling, and other computational sciences for various purposes, because they provide a convenient way to linearly interpolate data that is given at the corners of a triangle. The concept of barycentric coordinates can also be extended in several ways to convex polygons with more than three vertices, but most of these constructions break down when used in the non-convex setting. One choice that is not limited to convex configurations are the *mean value coordinates* and we show that they are well-defined for arbitrary planar polygons without self-intersections. Besides many other important properties, these coordinate functions are smooth and allow an efficient and robust implementation. They are particularly useful for interpolating data that is given at the vertices of the polygons and we present several examples of their application to common problems in computer graphics and geometric modelling.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: G.1.1 [Interpolation]: Interpolation formulas; I.3.3 [Computer Graphics]: Picture/Image Generation; J.6 [Computer-Aided Engineering]: Computer-Aided Design (CAD); I.3.7 [Computer Graphics]: Three-Dimensional Graphics and Realism—*Color, Shading, Shadowing, and Texture*

General Terms: Algorithms, Theory

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Barycentric coordinates, interpolation

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It follows from *Ceva’s Theorem* [Ceva 1678] that for any point  $v$  inside a planar triangle  $[v_1, v_2, v_3]$  there exist three masses  $w_1$ ,  $w_2$ , and  $w_3$ , such that, if placed at the corresponding vertices of the triangle, their centre of mass (or barycentre) will coincide with  $v$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{w_1v_1 + w_2v_2 + w_3v_3}{w_1 + w_2 + w_3} = v. \quad (1)$$

Möbius [1827] was the first to study such *mass points* and he defined  $w_1$ ,  $w_2$ , and  $w_3$  as the *barycentric coordinates* of  $v$ . Evidently, these barycentric coordinates are only unique up to multiplication by a common non-zero scalar and they are usually *normalized* to sum to one.

These normalized triangular barycentric coordinates are linear in  $v$  and have the additional property that the  $i$ -th coordinate has value 1 at  $v_i$  and 0 at the other  $v_j$ . This is why they are commonly used to linearly interpolate values given at the vertices of a triangle and have applications in computer graphics (e.g. Gouraud and Phong shading, texture mapping, ray-triangle-intersection), geometric modelling (e.g. triangular Bézier patches, splines over triangulations), and many other fields (e.g. the finite element method, terrain modelling).

---

Author’s address: K. Hormann, Department of Computer Science, Clausthal University of Technology, Julius-Albert-Str. 4, 38678 Clausthal-Zellerfeld, Germany; email: hormann@in.tu-clausthal.de; M. S. Floater, Department of Informatics, University of Oslo, P.O.Box 1053 Blindern, 0316 Oslo, Norway; email: michaelf@ifi.uio.no.

Permission to make digital/hard copy of all or part of this material without fee for personal or classroom use provided that the copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage, the ACM copyright/server notice, the title of the publication, and its date appear, and notice is given that copying is by permission of the ACM, Inc. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

© 20YY ACM 0730-0301/20YY/0100-0001 \$5.00

In many applications it would be useful to have a generalization of barycentric coordinates to arbitrary  $n$ -sided polygons or even sets of polygons in the plane with vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ . One would then like to have smooth *homogeneous barycentric coordinates*  $w_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that generalize Eq. (1),

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i(v)(v_i - v) = 0, \quad (2)$$

and associated *normalized barycentric coordinates*,

$$\lambda_i(v) = \frac{w_i(v)}{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j(v)}, \quad (3)$$

so that any point  $v$  in the plane can be written as an *affine combination* of  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  with weights  $\lambda_1(v), \dots, \lambda_n(v)$ . Furthermore, these coordinates should satisfy the *Lagrange property*

$$\lambda_i(v_j) = \delta_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

We discuss a general approach to constructing such homogeneous barycentric coordinates in Section 3, but for most choices the normalized coordinates in (3) either are not well-defined everywhere in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , or do not meet the constraints in (4). We then prove in Section 4 that the *mean value coordinates* fulfill both conditions and have a number of other important properties, like smoothness, linear independence, and refinability. They further enable a very efficient and robust implementation as shown in Section 5.

The main application of these coordinates is interpolation and in Section 6 we give several examples from computer graphics and geometric modelling that can be seen as interpolation problems and hence be solved with this approach. In particular, we propose an improved Phong shading method for non-triangular faces, a simple image warping technique, and interpolation of data that is specified on planar curves.

## 2. RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Barycentric Coordinates

Most of the previous work on barycentric coordinates discusses the extension to *convex* polygons. The first such generalization appears in the pioneering work of Wachspress [1975] who was interested in extending the finite element method. These *Wachspress coordinates* are rational polynomials and were later generalized to convex polytopes by Warren [1996] who also showed that they have minimal degree [Warren 2003]. They can be computed with simple and local formulas in the plane [Meyer et al. 2002] as well as in higher dimensions [Warren et al. 2004] and have many other nice properties like affine invariance. A simple geometric construction has recently been presented by Ju et al. [2005]. Malsch and Dasgupta have also been interested in finite element methods and extended Wachspress' approach to *weakly convex* polygons [Malsch and Dasgupta 2004a] and convex polygons with interior nodes [Malsch and Dasgupta 2004b].

Other generalizations of barycentric coordinates to convex polygons and even to the kernel of a star-shaped polygon were presented in the context of triangle mesh parameterization, for example the *shape preserving* [Floater 1997], the *discrete harmonic* [Pinkall and Polthier 1993; Eck et al. 1995], and the *mean value coordinates* [Floater 2003], where the latter have also been generalized to polyhedra of arbitrary genus in 3D independently by Floater et al. [2005] and Ju et al. [2005].

Also the natural neighbour interpolants that were proposed by Sibson [1980; 1981] for the purpose of scattered data interpolation provide barycentric coordinates for convex polygons, but like the coordinates in [Farin 1990] they are not more than  $C^1$ -continuous away from the data points. Hiyoshi and Sugihara [2000] extended Sibson's approach and presented  $C^k$ -continuous coordinates, but their computation is very costly and involves numerical integration.

Except for the discrete harmonic coordinates, all these coordinates have in common that they are *positive* over the interior of any convex polygon. In fact, this property has often been used in the definition of barycentric coordinates instead of the weaker interpolation condition (4) which is in any case a consequence of the positivity, as discussed by Floater et al. [2005]. They also proved that for a convex polygon the Wachspress and the mean value coordinates are the only positive coordinates with uniform scaling invariance that can be computed with a local three-point-formula.

For *non-convex* polygons a usual approach is to triangulate the domain and apply the standard barycentric coordinates on each triangle, but the result depends on the particular triangulation chosen and is only  $C^0$ -continuous over the edges of the triangles. To the best of our knowledge, Malsch and Dasgupta [2005] were the first to present smooth barycentric coordinates for non-convex polygons. Their coordinate functions are well-defined over the *convex hull* of any concave polygon with possible holes and the construction requires special treatment of the vertices on the convex hull. Based on the work of [Malsch et al. 2005], Sukumar and Malsch [2005] recently suggested another type of smooth barycentric coordinates for non-convex polygons that are not restricted to the convex hull, but these *metric coordinates* are no longer necessarily positive over the interior of a convex polygon.

*Contributions.* We show that also the mean value coordinates can be used in the non-convex setting and even more generally for sets of arbitrary planar polygons without self-intersections. In particular, they are well-defined everywhere in the plane and can be computed with a simple and local formula. These properties make them an ideal tool for the interpolation of data that is given at the vertices. We also show that the mean value coordinates are smooth (i.e.  $C^\infty$ ) except at the vertices of the polygons where they are only  $C^0$ -continuous.

## 2.2 Interpolation

The interpolation of data that is given at the vertices of a set of polygons can be seen as a scattered data interpolation (SDI) problem and many different approaches exist to solve it, including radial basis functions [Beatson and Newsam 1992; Beatson et al. 2000; Buhmann 2000] and bivariate splines [Lee et al. 1997; Nürnberger and Zeilfelder 2000]. Such interpolation problems frequently occur in various fields of science and engineering (e.g. geology, reverse engineering, numerical simulation) but also in computer graphics and geometric modelling.

One example is *image warping* (see [Wolberg 1990; Glasbey and Mardia 1998; Milliron et al. 2002] for an overview of the state-of-the-art) and radial basis functions [Arad et al. 1994; Ruprecht and Müller 1995] as well as B-splines [Lee et al. 1995; 1997] have been used in this context.

Another important problem is that of *transfinite interpolation* where the data to be interpolated is given as functions over a set or network of planar curves. There exist a number of well-established methods for some special cases, like Coons' or Gordon surfaces [Farin 2002] for triangular- or rectangular-shaped input curves, but very few are known for the general case. The standard approach is to either sample the data and apply an SDI method or to solve a partial differential equation (PDE) with the given data as boundary conditions [Chai et al. 1998; Kounchev 2001]. But like the generalization of Sibson's interpolants that was suggested by Gross and Farin [1999], this is usually very costly to compute.

*Contributions.* Due to the Lagrange property of the mean value coordinates, interpolation of data that is given at the vertices of a set of polygons can be done directly and efficiently without solving a linear system. In the context of transfinite interpolation, the locality of the coordinate functions further enables a simple and progressive update of the solution if the sampling density is increased. Interestingly, the interpolating surfaces are often strikingly similar to interpolating thin plate splines, even though they require far less computational effort.




Fig. 1. We consider convex (a), star-shaped (b), simple (c), and sets of simple polygons (d).




Fig. 2. Notation used for angles, areas, and distances.

### 3. GENERAL CONSTRUCTION OF HOMOGENEOUS BARYCENTRIC COORDINATES

Let  $\Psi$  be an arbitrary simple polygon in the plane with  $n \geq 3$  distinct vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  and non-intersecting (open) edges  $e_i = (v_i, v_{i+1}) = \{(1 - \mu)v_i + \mu v_{i+1} : 0 < \mu < 1\}$ ; see Fig. 1 (a–c) for some examples. The situation in Fig. 1 (d), where  $\Psi$  is a set of (possibly nested) simple polygons, will be discussed in Section 4. For  $i = 1, \dots, n$  we define for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$  the usual Euclidian distance to  $v_i$  as  $r_i(v) = \|v_i - v\|$  and denote by  $\alpha_i(v)$  the *signed* angle in the triangle  $[v, v_i, v_{i+1}]$  at the vertex  $v$ . Then

$$A_i(v) = r_i(v)r_{i+1}(v)\sin(\alpha_i(v))/2 \quad (5)$$

and

$$B_i(v) = r_{i-1}(v)r_{i+1}(v)\sin(\alpha_{i-1}(v) + \alpha_i(v))/2 \quad (6)$$

are the *signed* areas of the triangles  $[v, v_i, v_{i+1}]$  and  $[v, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}]$ , respectively<sup>1</sup>; see Fig. 2. It is now well-known that

$$A_i(v), \quad -B_i(v), \quad A_{i-1}(v)$$

are *homogeneous* barycentric coordinates of  $v$  with respect to the triangle  $\Delta_i = [v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}]$ , in other words,

$$A_i(v)(v_{i-1} - v) - B_i(v)(v_i - v) + A_{i-1}(v)(v_{i+1} - v) = 0. \quad (7)$$

Often, these coordinates are divided by their sum  $C_i = A_{i-1}(v) + A_i(v) - B_i(v)$ , the area of  $\Delta_i$ , to give the *normalized* barycentric coordinates as ratios of areas.

Let us now consider the homogeneous coordinates of  $v$  with respect to all triangles  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$ . Then we have for any vertex  $v_i$  of  $\Psi$  three coordinates that correspond to  $v_i$ , one in each of the three triangles  $\Delta_{i-1}$ ,  $\Delta_i$ , and  $\Delta_{i+1}$ . If we now take a weighted average of these three coordinates and define

$$w_i(v) = b_{i-1}(v)A_{i-2}(v) - b_i(v)B_i(v) + b_{i+1}(v)A_{i+1}(v), \quad (8)$$

<sup>1</sup>Note that we always treat indices cyclically with respect to  $n$ , so that  $e_n = (v_n, v_1)$  and  $B_1(v) = \text{Area}[v, v_n, v_2]$ , for example.




Fig. 3. Zero-set of the denominator  $W(v)$  for the Wachspress (green) and the discrete harmonic coordinates (red) for a concave polygon (left) and contour plots of the normalized Wachspress (middle) and the discrete harmonic (right) coordinate function  $\lambda_i$  that corresponds to the topmost vertex.

where the weight functions  $b_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  can be chosen arbitrarily, then it follows from (7) that the functions  $w_i$  are homogeneous barycentric coordinates with respect to  $\Psi$ , because

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i(v)(v_i - v) = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(v)(A_i(v)(v_{i-1} - v) - B_i(v)(v_i - v) + A_{i-1}(v)(v_{i+1} - v)) = 0.$$

The critical part now is the normalization of these homogeneous coordinates, i.e. to guarantee that the denominator in (3) is non-zero for every  $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . For convex polygons this is relatively easy to achieve. Indeed, it follows from (8) that

$$W(v) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(v) = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(v)C_i \quad (9)$$

and since all  $C_i$  have the same sign if  $\Psi$  is convex,  $W(v)$  can never be zero as long as all the weight functions  $b_i$  are positive (or negative). But in the general case it is more difficult to avoid dividing by zero. Consider, for example, the *Wachspress* and *discrete harmonic coordinates* that can be generated by the weight functions


$$b_i^W = \frac{1}{A_{i-1}A_i} \quad \text{and} \quad b_i^D = \frac{r_i^2}{A_{i-1}A_i}.$$

Both coordinates are well-defined for  $v$  inside any convex polygon. However, inside a non-convex polygon,  $W(v)$  can be zero, and the normalized coordinates  $\lambda_i(v)$  may have non-removable poles, as illustrated for a concave quadrilateral in Fig. 3.

To avoid this problem, Eq. (9) suggests taking weight functions like  $b_i = 1/C_i$  so that  $W \equiv n$ . But although this particular choice gives well-defined (and linear) normalized coordinates  $\lambda_i$  as long as no three consecutive vertices of  $\Psi$  are collinear, they unfortunately do not satisfy Eq. (4). Another option that gives the *metric coordinates* [Sukumar and Malsch 2005] is

$$b_i^M = \frac{1}{C_i q_{i-1} q_i},$$

where the positivity of the functions  $q_i = r_i + r_{i+1} - \|v_{i+1} - v_i\|$  guarantees a non-vanishing denominator  $W(v)$ . The corresponding normalized coordinates satisfy the Lagrange property, but like the discrete harmonic coordinates, they are not necessarily bounded between 0 and 1 inside a convex polygon. Thus, an interpolating function may take on values outside the convex hull of the given data, which can be undesirable in some applications.

Fig. 4. Notation used in Lemma 4.1 for the refinement of  $\Psi$  to  $\hat{\Psi}$ .

In this paper we want to study the *mean value coordinates* which are generated by the weight functions

$$b_i^{MV} = \frac{r_i}{A_{i-1}A_i}.$$

With this particular choice of  $b_i$ , Eq. (8) becomes

$$w_i = \frac{r_{i-1}A_i - r_iB_i + r_{i+1}A_{i-1}}{A_{i-1}A_i}, \quad (10)$$

which is the formula given by Floater et al. [2005]. By using (5), (6), and some trigonometric identities this simplifies to

$$w_i = 2 \frac{\tan(\alpha_{i-1}/2) + \tan(\alpha_i/2)}{r_i}, \quad (11)$$

which (up to the factor 2) is the formula that originally appeared in [Floater 2003]. Note that these  $w_i$  are *three-point coordinates* [Floater et al. 2005] in the sense that  $w_i$  depends only on  $v_i$  and its two neighbours  $v_{i-1}$  and  $v_{i+1}$ . The same holds for the Wachspress and the discrete harmonic coordinates, but not for the metric coordinates which depend on  $v_{i-2}, \dots, v_{i+2}$  and therefore are *five-point coordinates*.

#### 4. PROPERTIES OF MEAN VALUE COORDINATES

To study the behaviour of the mean value coordinates  $w_i$  from (11) let us first assume  $v \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Psi$  where  $\Psi$  is a simple polygon or a set of (possibly nested) simple polygons. Then it follows that  $-\pi < \alpha_i(v) < \pi$  and  $r_i(v) > 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , so that all homogeneous coordinate functions  $w_i$  from (11) are well-defined. Under these conditions we can show the following refinement rule.

**LEMMA 4.1.** *Let  $\hat{v} = (1 - \mu)v_j + \mu v_{j+1}$  with  $0 < \mu < 1$  be some point on the edge  $e_j$ . If we refine the polygon  $\Psi$  to  $\hat{\Psi}$  by adding  $\hat{v}$  between  $v_j$  and  $v_{j+1}$  (see Fig. 4) and denote the homogeneous coordinates with respect to  $\hat{\Psi}$  by  $\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_n$  and  $\hat{w}$ , then we have  $w_j = \hat{w}_j + (1 - \mu)\hat{w}$ ,  $w_{j+1} = \hat{w}_{j+1} + \mu\hat{w}$ , and  $w_i = \hat{w}_i$  for  $i \neq j, j + 1$ .*

**PROOF.** For  $i \neq j, j + 1$ , the statement follows directly from the fact that the mean value coordinates are three-point coordinates. According to Eq. (11), the remaining three homogeneous coordinates of  $\hat{\Psi}$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}_j &= 2(\tan(\alpha_{j-1}/2) + \tan(\hat{\alpha}^-/2))/r_j, \\ \hat{w} &= 2(\tan(\hat{\alpha}^-/2) + \tan(\hat{\alpha}^+/2))/\hat{r}, \\ \hat{w}_{j+1} &= 2(\tan(\hat{\alpha}^+/2) + \tan(\alpha_{j+1}/2))/r_{j+1}. \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 5. Partitioning into sectors with exit (solid) and entry edges (dashed).

If  $v$ ,  $v_j$ , and  $v_{j+1}$  are collinear, then  $\alpha_j = \hat{\alpha}^- = \hat{\alpha}^+ = 0$  and it is easy to verify that  $\hat{w}_j = w_j$ ,  $\hat{w} = 0$ , and  $\hat{w}_{j+1} = w_{j+1}$ . Otherwise, all three angles are non-zero and we can write  $(1 - \mu)$  and  $\mu$  as ratios of areas,

$$1 - \mu = \frac{\text{Area}[v, \hat{v}, v_{j+1}]}{\text{Area}[v, v_j, v_{j+1}]} = \frac{\hat{r} \sin \hat{\alpha}^+}{r_j \sin \alpha_j} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \frac{\text{Area}[v, v_j, \hat{v}]}{\text{Area}[v, v_j, v_{j+1}]} = \frac{\hat{r} \sin \hat{\alpha}^-}{r_{j+1} \sin \alpha_j}.$$

We then find

$$\frac{r_j}{2}(w_j - \hat{w}_j - (1 - \mu)\hat{w}) = \tan(\alpha_j/2) - \tan(\hat{\alpha}^-/2) - \frac{\sin \hat{\alpha}^+}{\sin \alpha_j} (\tan(\hat{\alpha}^-/2) + \tan(\hat{\alpha}^+/2)),$$

and

$$\frac{r_{j+1}}{2}(w_{j+1} - \hat{w}_{j+1} - \mu\hat{w}) = \tan(\alpha_j/2) - \tan(\hat{\alpha}^+/2) - \frac{\sin \hat{\alpha}^-}{\sin \alpha_j} (\tan(\hat{\alpha}^-/2) + \tan(\hat{\alpha}^+/2)),$$

where both right hand sides simplify to zero after using first the identity  $\tan(x/2) = (1 - \cos x)/\sin x$  and then the sine and cosine addition formulas for  $\alpha_j = \hat{\alpha}^- + \hat{\alpha}^+$ .  $\square$

An immediate consequence of this refinement rule is that the sum of homogeneous coordinates does not change under this kind of refinement.

**COROLLARY 4.2.** *If  $\Psi$  is refined to  $\hat{\Psi}$  as in Lemma 4.1, then  $W = \hat{W}$ .*

But it is even more important that this sum never vanishes.

**THEOREM 4.3.** *The sum  $W(v)$  of the homogeneous mean value coordinates (11) is non-zero for all  $v \notin \Psi$ .*

**PROOF.** Let us first assume that  $\Psi$  is a single simple polygon with positive orientation and that  $v$  lies in the interior of  $\Psi$ . We then consider the rays from  $v$  through the vertices  $v_i$  and add all intersection points of the rays with the edges of the polygon to  $\Psi$  as shown in Fig. 5. According to Corollary 4.2 this does not change  $W(v)$ . Next we consider for any of the radial sectors between two neighbouring rays all edges inside the sector and classify them as *exit edges* (solid) or *entry edges* (dashed), depending on whether a traveller coming from  $v$  exits or enters the interior of  $\Psi$  at the edge. If we define for each edge  $e_i = (v_i, v_{i+1})$  the value

$$\kappa_i = \left( \frac{1}{r_i} + \frac{1}{r_{i+1}} \right) \tan(\alpha_i/2),$$

then it follows from the orientation of  $\Psi$  that  $\kappa_i$  is positive if  $e_i$  is an exit edge and negative if  $e_i$  is an entry edge. And for edges  $e_i$  that lie on one of the rays, we have  $\kappa_i = 0$ .




Fig. 6. Orientation (arrows), interior (grey), and sign of  $W$  ( $+/-$ ) for a set of simple polygons.

Now let  $e_i$  be one of the entry edges. Then there always exists an exit edge  $e_j$  in the same sector that is closer to  $v$ ; see Fig. 5. But as  $\alpha_i = -\alpha_j$  and at least one of the inequalities  $r_j \leq r_{i+1}$  and  $r_{j+1} \leq r_i$  is strict, we have

$$\kappa_j = \left( \frac{1}{r_j} + \frac{1}{r_{j+1}} \right) \tan(\alpha_j/2) > \left( \frac{1}{r_i} + \frac{1}{r_{i+1}} \right) \tan(-\alpha_i/2) = -\kappa_i.$$

This means that the negative  $\kappa_i$  of the entry edge  $e_i$  is counterbalanced by the positive  $\kappa_j$  of the exit edge  $e_j$ . As this holds for all entry edges (without using any exit edge twice), we conclude that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i > 0.$$

But the sum of the  $\kappa_i$  can be rearranged, by a change of summation index, to be half the sum of the  $w_i$  from Eq. (11) and therefore  $W(v)$  is positive for any  $v$  inside  $\Psi$ . Likewise one can show that  $W$  is negative over the exterior of  $\Psi$  and vice versa if  $\Psi$  is negatively oriented.

If  $\Psi$  is a set of (possibly nested) simple polygons, then the same line of arguments holds as long as entry and exit edges keep alternating in each radial sector. But this can easily be guaranteed by requiring the orientation of the single polygons to alternate as shown in Fig. 6. If we further define the interior of such a set of polygons to be the regions “left” of the polygons (marked grey in Fig. 6), then it follows that  $W$  is positive over the interior of  $\Psi$  and negative otherwise.  $\square$

A consequence of Theorem 4.3 is that the normalization in Eq. (3) is well-defined for arbitrary planar polygons without self-intersections. And as the normalized mean value coordinates  $\lambda_i$  are a composition of analytic functions it follows that they are  $C^\infty$  over the open set  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Psi$ . But the question remains whether the  $\lambda_i$  have a continuous extension to the whole plane and satisfy the Lagrange property (4). In the case of convex polygons, the answer to both questions is positive and moreover, the  $\lambda_i$  are linear along the edges of  $\Psi$  [Floater et al. 2005]. We will now show that this also holds for arbitrary polygons.

**THEOREM 4.4.** *Let  $v^* = (1 - \mu)v_j + \mu v_{j+1}$  with  $0 < \mu < 1$  be some point on the edge  $e_j$  of  $\Psi$ . Then the normalized mean value coordinates  $\lambda_i$  converge to  $(1 - \mu)\delta_{i,j} + \mu\delta_{i,j+1}$  at  $v^*$ .*

**PROOF.** Let us consider the open disk  $D_\epsilon = D_\epsilon(v^*) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x - v^*\| < \epsilon\}$  around  $v^*$  with  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $D_\epsilon$  does not contain  $v_j$  and  $v_{j+1}$  and does not intersect any other edges of  $\Psi$  than  $e_j$  (see Fig. 7). Then  $w_i(v)$  with  $i \neq j, j+1$  is well-defined for any  $v \in D_\epsilon$  and only  $w_j$  and  $w_{j+1}$  have poles for  $v \in D_\epsilon \cap e_j$ . To remove these poles we consider the slightly modified functions  $\tilde{w}_i = w_i A_j / 2$ . For  $i \neq j, j+1$  these are still well-defined functions over  $D_\epsilon$  with  $\tilde{w}_i(v) = 0$  for  $v \in D_\epsilon \cap e_j$ . Furthermore we have

$$\tilde{w}_j = 2 \frac{\tan(\alpha_{j-1}/2) + \tan(\alpha_j/2)}{r_j} \frac{r_j r_{j+1} \sin \alpha_j}{4} = \frac{r_{j+1}}{2} (\tan(\alpha_{j-1}/2) \sin \alpha_j + (1 - \cos \alpha_j))$$




Fig. 7. Notation used in the proofs of Theorem 4.4 (left) and Theorem 4.6 (right).

and likewise

$$\tilde{w}_{j+1} = \frac{r_j}{2} (\tan(\alpha_{j+1}/2) \sin \alpha_j + (1 - \cos \alpha_j)),$$

which are also both well-defined everywhere in \$D\_\epsilon\$. In particular, for any \$v \in D\_\epsilon \cap e\_j\$ we have \$\sin \alpha\_j(v) = 0\$ and \$\cos \alpha\_j(v) = -1\$ so that \$\tilde{w}\_j(v) = r\_{j+1}(v)\$ and \$\tilde{w}\_{j+1}(v) = r\_j(v)\$.

When we normalize the functions \$\tilde{w}\_i\$ as in (3), then the common factor \$A\_j/2\$ cancels out and we get functions \$\tilde{\lambda}\_i\$ that agree with \$\lambda\_i\$ for any \$v \in D\_\epsilon \setminus e\_j\$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i(v) = \frac{\tilde{w}_i(v)}{\sum_{k=1}^n \tilde{w}_k(v)} = \frac{w_i(v)A_j(v)/2}{\sum_{k=1}^n w_k(v)A_j(v)/2} = \frac{w_i(v)}{\sum_{k=1}^n w_k(v)} = \lambda_i(v).$$

The advantage of the \$\tilde{\lambda}\_i\$ is that they are also well-defined over \$D\_\epsilon \cap e\_j\$ so that we have

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow v^*} \lambda_i(v) = \tilde{\lambda}_i(v^*) = \frac{\tilde{w}_i(v^*)}{\sum_{k=1}^n \tilde{w}_k(v^*)} = \frac{\delta_{i,j} r_{j+1}(v^*) + \delta_{i,j+1} r_j(v^*)}{r_{j+1}(v^*) + r_j(v^*)}$$

and the proof is completed by noting that \$r\_j(v^\*) = \mu \|v\_j - v\_{j+1}\|\$ and \$r\_{j+1}(v^\*) = (1 - \mu) \|v\_j - v\_{j+1}\|\$. □

*Remark 4.5.* Note that the functions \$\tilde{\lambda}\_i\$ are composed of analytic functions and thus are \$C^\infty\$ over \$D\_\epsilon(v^\*)\$.

**THEOREM 4.6.** *The normalized mean value coordinates \$\lambda\_i\$ converge to \$\delta\_{i,j}\$ at \$v\_j\$.*

**PROOF.** Let us consider again a small open disk \$D\_\epsilon\$ around \$v\_j\$ that intersects only the edges \$e\_{j-1}\$ and \$e\_j\$ of \$\Psi\$ so that \$D\_\epsilon \setminus \Psi\$ decomposes into the two open sets \$D\_\epsilon^+\$ and \$D\_\epsilon^-\$. (see Fig. 7). We further choose \$\epsilon\$ small enough such that \$D\_\epsilon\$ does not intersect the infinite straight line through \$v\_{j-1}\$ and \$v\_{j+1}\$, which in turn guarantees \$w\_j(v) \neq 0\$ for all \$v \in D\_\epsilon \setminus \Psi\$. Dividing both the numerator and the denominator of \$\lambda\_i\$ by \$w\_j\$ then gives

$$\lambda_i = \frac{(w_i/w_j)}{1 + \sum_{k \neq j} (w_k/w_j)} \quad \text{for } i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_j = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k \neq j} (w_k/w_j)},$$

and so it is sufficient to show that \$w\_i(v)/w\_j(v)\$ converges to 0 at \$v\_j\$ for all \$i \neq j\$. Using the identity \$\tan x + \tan y = \sin(x+y)/(\cos x \cos y)\$ we have \$w\_i/w\_j = (r\_j/r\_i)R\_{ij}\$ with

$$R_{ij} = \frac{\sin((\alpha_{i-1} + \alpha_i)/2) \cos(\alpha_{j-1}/2) \cos(\alpha_j/2)}{\sin((\alpha_{j-1} + \alpha_j)/2) \cos(\alpha_{i-1}/2) \cos(\alpha_i/2)} \quad (12)$$

and since \$\lim\_{v \rightarrow v\_j} r\_j(v) = 0\$ and \$\lim\_{v \rightarrow v\_j} r\_i(v) = \|v\_i - v\_j\| > 0\$ for \$i \neq j\$, it is sufficient to show that \$R\_{ij}\$ is bounded in absolute value over \$D\_\epsilon \setminus \Psi\$ for \$i \neq j\$. As the numerator in this quotient is clearly bounded in absolute value by 1, even though not all terms necessarily converge at \$v\_j\$, it remains to show that the denominator is bounded away from zero.

For  $i \neq j-1, j$ , the angle functions  $\alpha_i$  are clearly continuous over  $D_\epsilon$  with  $-\pi < \alpha_i(v) < \pi$  and thus  $\cos(\alpha_i(v)/2) > 0$  for all  $v \in D_\epsilon$ . The remaining two angle functions  $\alpha_{j-1}$  and  $\alpha_j$ , on the other hand, are continuous over  $D_\epsilon \setminus \Psi$  but not well-defined at  $v_j$ . However, by considering the quadrilateral  $(v_{j-1}, v_j, v_{j+1}, v)$  and noting that the angles of this quadrilateral at  $v_{j-1}$  and  $v_{j+1}$  vanish as  $v$  converges to  $v_j$  it is easy to see that the sum  $\alpha(v) = \alpha_{j-1}(v) + \alpha_j(v)$  converges to  $2\pi - \beta$  for  $v \in D_\epsilon^+$  and to  $-\beta$  for  $v \in D_\epsilon^-$  with  $\beta$  as in Fig. 7. Therefore, the function  $|\sin((\alpha_{j-1} + \alpha_j)/2)|$  is continuous over  $D_\epsilon^+ \cup D_\epsilon^- \cup \{v_j\}$  with

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow v_j} |\sin((\alpha_{j-1}(v) + \alpha_j(v))/2)| = |\sin(\beta/2)| > 0,$$

so that the term  $\sin((\alpha_{j-1} + \alpha_j)/2)$  is guaranteed to be bounded away from zero over  $D_\epsilon \setminus \Psi$ . The two observations together immediately show that the denominator of  $R_{ij}$  in (12) is bounded away from zero for  $i \neq j-1, j+1$ . However, the same arguments also hold if  $i = j-1$  because  $R_{ij}$  then simplifies by cancellation to

$$R_{j-1,j} = \frac{\sin((\alpha_{j-2} + \alpha_{j-1})/2) \cos(\alpha_j/2)}{\sin((\alpha_{j-1} + \alpha_j)/2) \cos(\alpha_{j-2}/2)}$$

and similarly in the remaining case  $i = j+1$ .  $\square$

With these results we can now give a precise definition of the normalized mean value coordinates for arbitrary planar polygons and summarize their properties.

**Definition 4.7.** For any set of simple polygons  $\Psi$  we call the functions  $\lambda_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  with

$$\lambda_i(v) = \begin{cases} \frac{w_i(v)}{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j(v)} & \text{if } v \notin \Psi \text{ with } w_i \text{ as defined in Eq. (11),} \\ (1-\mu)\delta_{i,j} + \mu\delta_{i,j+1} & \text{if } v = (1-\mu)v_j + \mu v_{j+1} \in e_j, \\ \delta_{i,j} & \text{if } v = v_j \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

the *mean value coordinates* of  $\Psi$ .

**COROLLARY 4.8.** *The mean value coordinates  $\lambda_i$  have the following properties:*

- (1) **Affine precision:**  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \varphi(v_i) = \varphi$  for any affine function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ .
- (2) **Lagrange property:**  $\lambda_i(v_j) = \delta_{i,j}$ .
- (3) **Smoothness:**  $\lambda_i$  is  $C^\infty$  everywhere except at the vertices  $v_j$  where it is only  $C^0$ .
- (4) **Partition of unity:**  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \equiv 1$ .
- (5) **Similarity invariance:** if  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is a similarity<sup>2</sup> and  $\hat{\Psi} = \varphi(\Psi)$ , then  $\lambda_i(v) = \hat{\lambda}_i(\varphi(v))$ .
- (6) **Linear independence:** if  $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \lambda_i(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$  then all  $c_i$  must be zero.
- (7) **Refinability:** if we refine  $\Psi$  to  $\hat{\Psi}$  by splitting  $e_j$  at  $\hat{v} = (1-\mu)v_j + \mu v_{j+1}$ , then  $\lambda_j = \hat{\lambda}_j + (1-\mu)\hat{\lambda}_{j+1} = \hat{\lambda}_{j+1} + \mu\hat{\lambda}$ , and  $\lambda_i = \hat{\lambda}_i$  for  $i \neq j, j+1$ .
- (8) **Edge property:**  $\lambda_i$  is linear along the edges  $e_j$  of  $\Psi$ .
- (9) **Positivity:**  $\lambda_i$  is positive inside the kernel of star-shaped polygons, in particular inside convex polygons.

**PROOF.** (1) follows from Eqs. (8) and (3) and implies (4) with  $\phi \equiv 1$ . (2), (8), and (9) follow directly from the definitions in Eqs. (13) and (11) and (3) from Theorems 4.4 and 4.6 and Remark 4.5. We conclude (5) from the fact that the  $w_i$  in Eq. (11) depend only on angles and distances and that any uniform scale factor cancels out by the normalization. (6) can be deduced from (2) and (7) follows from Lemma 4.1.  $\square$

Fig. 8 illustrates the typical behaviour of the mean value coordinates for a set of simple polygons.

<sup>2</sup>A transformation is called a similarity if it is a translation, rotation, reflection, uniform scaling, or combination of these.




Fig. 8. In this example,  $\Psi$  is a set of four simple polygons. The contour plots visualize the three mean value coordinates  $\lambda_i$  that correspond to the vertices marked by fat dots.



Fig. 9. Colour interpolation with mean value coordinates (left) and metric coordinates (right) for the polygons from Fig. 8 and regions where the interpolation of the individual colour channels has been truncated for values below 0 (dark shade) and above 255 (light shade).

Note that most of these properties (in particular the affine precision and the Lagrange property) can also be derived from the integral construction that was used in [Ju et al. 2005] to derive mean value coordinates in three dimensions. But proving that the coordinates are well-defined for concave shapes and smooth across the boundary is less obvious and has not been done so far, to the best of our knowledge.

The main application of these generalized barycentric coordinates is the interpolation of values that are given at the vertices  $v_i$  of  $\Psi$ . In other words, if a data value  $f_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is specified at each  $v_i$ , then we are interested in the function  $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  that is defined by

$$F(v) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(v) f_i \quad (14)$$

Due to the Lagrange and edge properties of the coordinates, this function interpolates  $f_i$  at  $v_i$  and is linear along the edges  $e_i$  of  $\Psi$ .

An example where the  $f_i$  are RGB colour values is shown in Fig. 9. As the mean value coordinates are not necessarily positive for arbitrary polygons, it can happen that the interpolated RGB values are outside the valid range  $[0, 255]$ . In this case we simply truncate the values to 0 or 255, respectively. As a result, the interpolation function  $F$  is only  $C^0$  along certain curves and these artefacts are noticeable in the plot. The same holds for interpolation with the metric coordinates of Sukumar and Malsch [2005].

## 5. IMPLEMENTATION

For the actual computation of the interpolation function  $F$  we basically use the definition in Eq. (13), but we suggest a slight modification for determining the homogeneous coordinates  $w_i$  from Eq. (11) that avoids the computation of the angles  $\alpha_i$  and enables an efficient handling of the special cases that can occur. If we

```

function  $F(v)$ 
  for  $j = 1$  to  $m$  do
    for  $i = 1$  to  $n_j$  do
       $s_{j,i} := v_{j,i} - v$ 
    for  $j = 1$  to  $m$  do
      for  $i = 1$  to  $n_j$  do
         $i^+ := (i \bmod n_j) + 1$ 
         $r_{j,i} := \|s_{j,i}\|$ 
         $A_{j,i} := \det(s_{j,i}, s_{j,i^+})/2$ 
         $D_{j,i} := \langle s_{j,i}, s_{j,i^+} \rangle$ 
        if  $r_{j,i} = 0$  then //  $v = v_{j,i}$ 
          return  $f_{j,i}$ 
        if  $A_{j,i} = 0$  and  $D_{j,i} < 0$  then //  $v \in e_{j,i}$ 
           $r_{j,i^+} := \|s_{j,i^+}\|$ 
          return  $(r_{i^+}f_i + r_i f_{i^+})/(r_i + r_{i^+})$ 
       $f := 0$ 
       $W := 0$ 
      for  $j = 1$  to  $m$  do
        for  $i = 1$  to  $n_j$  do
           $i^+ := (i \bmod n_j) + 1$ 
           $i^- := ((i - 2) \bmod n_j) + 1$ 
           $w := 0$ 
          if  $A_{j,i^-} \neq 0$  then
             $w := w + (r_{j,i^-} - D_{j,i^-}/r_{j,i})/A_{j,i^-}$ 
          if  $A_{j,i} \neq 0$  then
             $w := w + (r_{j,i^+} - D_{j,i^+}/r_{j,i})/A_{j,i^+}$ 
           $f := f + wf_{j,i}$ 
           $W := W + w$ 
    return  $f/W$ 

```

Fig. 10. Pseudo-code for evaluating the interpolation function.

let  $s_i(v) = v_i - v$  and denote the dot product of  $s_i$  and  $s_{i+1}$  by  $D_i$ , then we have

$$\tan(\alpha_i/2) = \frac{1 - \cos(\alpha_i)}{\sin(\alpha_i)} = \frac{r_i r_{i+1} - D_i}{2A_i},$$

and we use this formula as long as  $A_i(v) \neq 0$ . Otherwise,  $v$  lies on the line through  $v_i$  and  $v_{i+1}$  and we distinguish three cases. If  $v = v_i$  or  $v = v_{i+1}$ , then we do not bother to compute the  $w_i(v)$  and simply set  $F(v) = f_i$  or  $F(v) = f_{i+1}$ . Likewise, if  $v$  lies on the edge  $e_i$ , then we use the linearity of  $F$  along  $e_i$  to determine  $F(v)$  directly. Note that we can easily identify this case because it implies  $D_i(v) < 0$ . Finally, if  $v$  is not on  $\Psi$  then we conclude that  $\alpha_i(v) = 0$  and therefore  $\tan(\alpha_i(v)/2) = 0$ .

The pseudo-code for computing  $F(v)$  is given in Fig. 10. To clarify the situation with multiple polygons, we assume that  $\Psi$  is a set of  $m$  simple polygons  $\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_m$  where each  $\Psi_j$  has  $n_j$  vertices  $v_{j,1}, \dots, v_{j,n_j}$ . Note that indices  $(j, i+1) = (j, i^+)$  and  $(j, i-1) = (j, i^-)$  are treated cyclically with respect to  $\Psi_j$ .

## 6. APPLICATIONS AND RESULTS

We now present three applications of the mean value coordinates that demonstrate their potential impact on computer graphics and geometric modelling.




Fig. 11. Rendering of three pentagons with flat (a), Gouraud (b), Phong (c), and generalized Phong shading (d).

### 6.1 Phong Shading for Arbitrary Polygons

The standard approach to treating an arbitrary polygon in the rendering pipeline is to first tessellate it into triangles and then process each triangle in turn. For example, *OpenGL* automatically splits a pentagonal face into three triangles (possibly depending on the choice of the first vertex). This gives the expected result if flat shading is used, but the splits become visible as soon as Gouraud shading or Phong shading is turned on; see Fig. 11 (a–c).

Phong shading uses triangular barycentric coordinates to linearly interpolate the normals that are given at the vertices of the face over each generated triangle. This can be seen for the two triangles that are marked by the red and blue spots in the Phong-shaded result. Since the lower two vertices of both triangles have identical normals, the interpolated normal as well as the resulting colour value vary linearly inside the triangles. Instead, we can improve the idea of Phong shading and use mean value coordinates to smoothly interpolate the normals over the whole polygon, giving a much more pleasant rendering result; see Fig. 11 (d).

Note that the polygons in this example are flat and extending the mean value interpolation to general 3D polygons would require to use a two-dimensional reference polygon. This may become difficult to handle for complex polygons but for the special case of 3D quadrilaterals, Hormann and Tarini [2004] have shown how to effectively use mean value coordinates for rendering and rasterization.

### 6.2 Image Warping

Another potential application of the generalized barycentric coordinates is image warping as they offer a particularly simple solution to this problem that can briefly be stated as follows.

Given a rectangular region  $\Omega$ , a set of *source polygons*  $\Psi$  with vertices  $v_i \in \Omega$ , and a topologically equivalent<sup>3</sup> set of *target polygons*  $\hat{\Psi}$  with vertices  $\hat{v}_i \in \Omega$ , we would like to construct a smooth *warp function*  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  that maps each  $v_i$  to  $\hat{v}_i$ . This warp function can then be used to deform a *source image*  $I : \Omega \rightarrow C$  that maps  $\Omega$  to some colour space  $C$  into a *target image*  $\hat{I} : \Omega \rightarrow C$  by simply setting  $\hat{I} = I \circ f^{-1}$ . For practical reasons, the *inverse mapping*  $g = f^{-1}$  is often constructed instead of  $f$ .

Such an inverse warp function can easily be defined with the mean value coordinates  $\hat{\lambda}_i$  of  $\hat{\Psi}$ . It follows immediately from the Lagrange property that the function

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\lambda}_i(x) v_i \quad (15)$$

maps each  $\hat{v}_i$  to  $v_i$  and thus defines a proper inverse warp function. The warped image can now be generated by simply setting the colour of each target pixel  $x$  in  $\hat{I}$  to the colour of the source point  $g(x)$  in  $I$ . In our examples we used a simple bilinear interpolation to determine  $I(g(x))$  from the  $2 \times 2$  grid of pixels surrounding  $g(x)$ .

<sup>3</sup> $\Psi$  and  $\hat{\Psi}$  must have the same number of components and vertices per component.




Fig. 12. Warping an image (a) with mean value coordinates (b) and radial basis functions (c,d) by moving the vertices of two nested polygons (blue).




Fig. 13. The Leaning Tower of Pisa (a) can be straightened by a barycentric warp function which maps the two source polygons in (b) to the target polygons in (c). The Straight Tower of Pisa is shown in (d) and the difference between the pictures in (e).

Like warping with B-splines and radial basis functions with linear precision, this *barycentric warp* reproduces affine transformations. In other words, if  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is an affine transformation and  $\hat{\Psi} = \varphi(\Psi)$  then  $\hat{I} = I \circ \varphi^{-1}$ . Indeed, since  $v_i = \varphi^{-1}(\hat{v}_i)$  it follows from the affine precision of the mean value coordinates that  $g(x) = \varphi^{-1}(x)$  in (15).

Another property of the barycentric warp is that it is linear along the edges of the polygons. Fig. 12(b) shows the result of warping the image in (a) after moving the vertices of two nested polygons. The exterior polygon with 14 vertices controls the global shape of the warp, while the interior polygon with 10 vertices is used to deform the star. The result is smooth and the star is clearly mapped to a star with straight edges.

For comparison, we also generated the *thin plate spline* warp (c) using radial basis interpolation with basis function  $\phi(r) = r^2 \log r$  (see [Arad et al. 1994] for details). This warp does not reproduce the straight edges of the star, but a common trick to overcome this drawback is to sample the edges with additional vertices. For example, by taking 20 samples per edge, we obtained the result in (d). It is very similar to the barycentric warp, but takes considerably longer to compute; 20 seconds for a  $600 \times 600$  image on a 2.8 Ghz Pentium, while the barycentric warp took less than one second. This is due to the large linear system that needs to be solved and the large number of basis functions that have to be evaluated. In general, if  $n$  is the number of vertices in  $\Psi$  and  $k$  is the number of samples per edge, then solving the linear system with a standard method is an  $O(k^3 \cdot n^3)$  operation and evaluating the  $m$  pixels of  $\hat{I}$  is of order  $O(m \cdot k \cdot n)$ . Of course there exist specialized solvers that can reduce the cost for solving the linear system, but the advantage of the barycentric warp is that it does not require any system to be solved and the whole computation is of order  $O(m \cdot n)$  only.




Fig. 14. Three curves with normal vectors (left) and a LIC visualization of the interpolated vector field (right). The colour refers to the length  $\ell$  of the vectors (white:  $\ell = 1$ , blue:  $\ell > 1$ , red:  $\ell < 1$ ).

We conclude that the barycentric warp is particularly useful whenever straight edges need to be preserved. For example, making the boundary of the rectangular image one of the source and the target polygons guarantees that the warped image will be rectangular too; see Fig. 13.

### 6.3 Transfinite Interpolation

The mean value coordinates also provide an efficient solution to the following interpolation problem. Given a set of closed planar curves  $c_j$  and some  $d$ -dimensional data over these curves  $d_j : c_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  we would like to have a function  $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  that interpolates the given data, i.e.  $F(v) = d_j(v)$  for any  $v \in c_j$ .

The obvious approach is to approximate the given curves  $c_j$  with a set of polygons  $\Psi$  whose vertices  $v_i$  lie on the curves  $c_j$ . Then the function  $F$  in Eq. (14) with  $f_i = d_j(v_i)$  clearly is an approximate solution of the stated interpolation problem. And as the polygons  $\Psi$  converge to the curves  $c_j$  by increasing the sampling density, so does the function  $F$  converge to the desired solution.

The interesting fact now is that the structure of the mean value coordinates allows an efficient update of the solution if the sampling density is increased. Assume that we computed  $F(v)$  and also  $W(v)$  for some point  $v \notin \Psi$  and then refine  $\Psi$  to  $\hat{\Psi}$  by adding a vertex  $\hat{v}$  with data value  $\hat{f} = d_j(\hat{v})$  between  $v_j$  and  $v_{j+1}$ . Then it follows by a consideration very similar to the one in the proof of Lemma 4.1 that

$$w_j = \hat{w}_j + \sigma \hat{w}, \quad w_{j+1} = \hat{w}_{j+1} + \tau \hat{w},$$

and

$$\hat{W} = W + \rho \hat{w}, \tag{16}$$

where  $\rho(v)$ ,  $\sigma(v)$ ,  $\tau(v)$  are the normalized barycentric coordinates<sup>4</sup> of  $\hat{v}$  with respect to the triangle  $[v, v_j, v_{j+1}]$  and  $\hat{w}$  is the new homogeneous coordinate function corresponding to  $\hat{v}$ . We can then write the value of the refined interpolation function  $\hat{F}$  at  $v$  as

$$\hat{F} = F + \frac{\hat{w}}{\hat{W}} (\hat{f} - \rho F - \sigma f_j - \tau f_{j+1}). \tag{17}$$

<sup>4</sup>Note that  $\rho(v)$ ,  $\sigma(v)$ , and  $\tau(v)$  are not well-defined if  $v$ ,  $v_j$ , and  $v_{j+1}$  are collinear. In this special case we conclude  $\hat{w} = 0$ ,  $w_j = \hat{w}_j - 2 \tan(\hat{\alpha}^-/2)/r_j$ , and  $w_{j+1} = \hat{w}_{j+1} - 2 \tan(\hat{\alpha}^+/2)/r_{j+1}$ , leading to slightly different update formulas for  $\hat{F}$  and  $\hat{W}$ .




Fig. 15. Interpolation of height values (red) that are given as smooth functions over the four curves in (a) with mean value coordinates (b) and with a thin plate spline (c). The difference of both surfaces is shown in (d).




Fig. 16. Discrete curvature plots with histograms of the mean (left) and the Gaussian curvature (right) of the mean value interpolant and the thin plate spline.

Therefore, both  $F(v)$  and  $W(v)$  can be updated by a computation with constant cost for  $v \notin \Psi$ . If  $v \in \Psi$  and  $v$  is either a vertex of  $\Psi$  or lies on an edge  $e_k$  with  $k \neq j$ , then we simply have  $\hat{F}(v) = F(v)$  by definition. Only if  $v \in e_j$  it is required to compute  $\hat{F}(v)$  (and possibly  $\hat{W}(v)$ ) from scratch.

In the example in Fig. 14, we exploited this recurrence relation as follows. We first sampled the three given curves uniformly with 100 vertices  $v_i$  and computed the curve normals  $n_i$  at  $v_i$ . Then we evaluated the interpolating function  $F$  and the sum of homogeneous coordinates  $W$  on a regular  $512 \times 512$  grid, yielding values  $F_{kl}$  and  $W_{kl}$  with  $0 \leq k, l \leq 511$ . We finally refined  $\Psi$  successively by splitting the edge with the largest approximation error to the curve and updated  $F_{kl}$  and  $W_{kl}$  according to (17) and (16). We stopped the refinement process as soon as  $\max_{k,l} \|\hat{F}_{kl} - F_{kl}\| < 0.001$ , i.e. when the maximum update went below 1% of the length of the given vectors. The final polygon consisted of 357 vertices and it took about 10 seconds to compute the final values  $F_{kl}$ .

Another example where we interpolated height data is shown in Fig. 15. We uniformly sampled the four curves with 2,500 vertices and evaluated the interpolating function over a regular  $500 \times 500$  grid, which took about 62 seconds. A comparison to the interpolating thin plate spline<sup>5</sup> showed the height difference between both surfaces to be less than 10% of the maximum value. Using standard finite differencing, we also computed discrete curvature plots of both surfaces (see Fig. 16) which reveal a very similar behaviour, but it is hard to judge which one is to be preferred.

<sup>5</sup>We thank Rick Beatson for providing us with the thin plate solution.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that the mean value coordinates naturally generalize the concept of triangular barycentric coordinates to arbitrary polygons without intersections and even to sets of such polygons. The mean value coordinates have a number of important properties and are particularly useful for the interpolation of data that is given at the vertices of the polygons. As shown in Figs. 12, 15, and 16, the behaviour of the interpolant is similar to that of thin plate splines, but it can be evaluated directly in  $O(n)$  operations without having to solve the fitting problem first. In our implementation we have typically seen around 10,000,000 evaluations of the coordinates  $\lambda_i$  per second.

We note that, in contrast to Sibson's coordinates for scattered data, the mean value coordinates have global support and are not everywhere positive in the case of arbitrary polygons. On the other hand it is probably due to these properties that the interpolants behave so nicely. In the context of image warping, this lack of positivity means that the barycentric warp function is not guaranteed to be one-to-one, except if both the source and the target polygon are convex. But nevertheless the method appears to work very well in practice.

## REFERENCES

- ARAD, N., DYN, N., REISFELD, D., AND YESHURUN, Y. 1994. Image warping by radial basis functions: Application to facial expressions. *CVGIP: Graph. Models and Image Proc.* 56, 2, 161–172.
- BEATSON, R. K., LIGHT, W. A., AND BILLINGS, S. 2000. Fast solution of the radial basis function interpolation equations: Domain decomposition methods. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 22, 5, 1717–1740.
- BEATSON, R. K. AND NEWSAM, G. N. 1992. Fast evaluation of radial basis functions: I. *Comput. Math. Appl.* 24, 12, 7–19.
- BUHMANN, M. 2000. Radial basis functions: the state-of-the-art and new results. *Acta Numerica* 9, 1–37.
- CEVA, G. 1678. *De lineis rectis se invicem secantibus, statica constructio*. Ludovici Montiae, Mediolanum.
- CHAI, J., MIYOSHI, T., AND NAKAMAE, E. 1998. Contour interpolation and surface reconstruction of smooth terrain models. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Visualization '98*. 27–33.
- ECK, M., DERROSE, T., DUCHAMP, T., HOPPE, H., LOUNSBERRY, M., AND STUETZLE, W. 1995. Multiresolution analysis of arbitrary meshes. In *Proceedings of SIGGRAPH '95*. 173–182.
- FARIN, G. 1990. Surfaces over Dirichlet tessellations. *Comput. Aided Geom. Design* 7, 1-4, 281–292.
- FARIN, G. 2002. *Curves and Surfaces for CAGD: A Practical Guide*, Fifth ed. The Morgan Kaufmann Series in Computer Graphics and Geometric Modeling. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco.
- FLOATER, M. S. 1997. Parameterization and smooth approximation of surface triangulations. *Comput. Aided Geom. Design* 14, 3, 231–250.
- FLOATER, M. S. 2003. Mean value coordinates. *Comput. Aided Geom. Design* 20, 1, 19–27.
- FLOATER, M. S., HORMANN, K., AND KÓS, G. 2005. A general construction of barycentric coordinates over convex polygons. *Advances in Comp. Math.* To appear.
- FLOATER, M. S., KÓS, G., AND REIMERS, M. 2005. Mean value coordinates in 3D. *Comput. Aided Geom. Design* 22, 7, 623–631.
- GLASBEY, C. A. AND MARDIA, K. V. 1998. A review of image warping methods. *J. Appl. Statistics* 25, 2, 155–171.
- GROSS, L. AND FARIN, G. 1999. A transfinite form of Sibson's interpolant. *Discr. Appl. Math.* 93, 1, 33–50.
- HIYOSHI, H. AND SUGIHARA, K. 2000. Voronoi-based interpolation with higher continuity. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual symposium on Computational geometry*. ACM Press, 242–250.
- HORMANN, K. AND TARINI, M. 2004. A quadrilateral rendering primitive. In *Graphics Hardware 2004*, T. Akenine-Möller and M. McCool, Eds. Eurographics Association, 7–14.
- JU, T., SCHAEFER, S., AND WARREN, J. 2005. Mean value coordinates for closed triangular meshes. *ACM Trans. Graphics* 24, 3, 561–566. Proceedings of ACM SIGGRAPH 2005.
- JU, T., SCHAEFER, S., WARREN, J., AND DESBRUN, M. 2005. A geometric construction of coordinates for convex polyhedra using polar duals. In *Geometry Processing 2005*, M. Desbrun and H. Pottmann, Eds. Eurographics Association, 181–186.
- KOUNCHEV, O. 2001. *Multivariate Polysplines: Applications to Numerical and Wavelet Analysis*. Academic Press, London, San Diego.
- LEE, S., CHWA, K.-Y., SHIN, S. Y., AND WOLBERG, G. 1995. Image metamorphosis using snakes and free-form deformations. In *Proceedings of SIGGRAPH '95*. 439–448.

- LEE, S., WOLBERG, G., AND SHIN, S. Y. 1997. Scattered data interpolation with multilevel B-splines. *IEEE Trans. Visual. and Comp. Graphics* 3, 3, 228–244.
- MALSCH, E. A. AND DASGUPTA, G. 2004a. Interpolations for temperature distributions: A method for all non-concave polygons. *Intern. J. Solids and Structures* 41, 8, 2165–2188.
- MALSCH, E. A. AND DASGUPTA, G. 2004b. Shape functions for polygonal domains with interior nodes. *Intern. J. Numer. Methods Eng.* 61, 8, 1153–1172.
- MALSCH, E. A. AND DASGUPTA, G. 2005. Algebraic construction of smooth interpolants on polygonal domains. *The Mathematica Journal* 9, 3, 641–658.
- MALSCH, E. A., LIN, J. J., AND DASGUPTA, G. 2005. Smooth two dimensional interpolants: a recipe for all polygons. *J. Graphics Tools* 10, 2, 27–39.
- MEYER, M., LEE, H., BARR, A. H., AND DESBRUN, M. 2002. Generalized barycentric coordinates on irregular polygons. *J. Graphics Tools* 7, 1, 13–22.
- MILLIRON, T., JENSEN, R. J., BARZEL, R., AND FINKELSTEIN, A. 2002. A framework for geometric warps and deformations. *ACM Trans. Graphics* 21, 1, 20–51.
- MÖBIUS, A. F. 1827. *Der barycentrische Calcul*. Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig.
- NÜRNBERGER, G. AND ZEILFELDER, F. 2000. Developments in bivariate spline interpolation. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 121, 1-2, 125–152.
- PINKALL, U. AND POLTHIER, K. 1993. Computing discrete minimal surfaces and their conjugates. *Experim. Math.* 2, 1, 15–36.
- RUPRECHT, D. AND MÜLLER, H. 1995. Image warping with scattered data interpolation. *Comp. Graphics and Applics.* 15, 2, 37–43.
- SIBSON, R. 1980. A vector identity for the Dirichlet tesselation. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* 87, 151–155.
- SIBSON, R. 1981. A brief description of natural neighbour interpolation. In *Interpolating Multivariate Data*, V. Barnett, Ed. Wiley, New York, 21–36.
- SUKUMAR, N. AND MALSCH, E. A. 2005. Recent advances in the construction of polygonal finite element interpolants. *Archives of Comput. Methods Eng.* 11, 4. In print.
- WACHSPRESS, E. L. 1975. *A Rational Finite Element Basis*. Academic Press, New York.
- WARREN, J. 1996. Barycentric coordinates for convex polytopes. *Advances in Comp. Math.* 6, 2, 97–108.
- WARREN, J. 2003. On the uniqueness of barycentric coordinates. In *Topics in Algebraic Geometry and Geometric Modeling*, R. Goldman and R. Krasauskas, Eds. Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 334. American Mathematical Society, 93–99.
- WARREN, J., SCHAEFER, S., HIRANI, A. N., AND DESBRUN, M. 2004. Barycentric coordinates for convex sets. Tech. rep., Rice University.
- WOLBERG, G. 1990. *Digital Image Warping*. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos.

Received Mmmm YYYY; revised Mmmm YYYY; accepted Mmmm YYYY