

MVA


Geometry Processing and Geometric Deep
Learning

Today

- Last week: geometric characterization of surfaces
- Optimization of geometric energies for shape matching
 - The matching problem
 - Topology
 - Surface parametrization
 - Surface deformation

Surface Correspondence Problem

- Which points on one object correspond to points on another?




- Two approaches:
 1. Look for shared geometric structure
 2. Seek best alignment

Deformation Transfer






<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9SDWKIVHnUM>

Segmentation Transfer



Statistical Shape Analysis



Shapes in dataset: numbered left to right, top to bottom


PCA on area-based shape differences

PCA on conformal shape differences

Variability localization for area


Variability localization for conformal

Paleontology





Mapping Problem

- Given a pair of shapes, find corresponding points
- An ideal map:
 - Preserves important features
 - Is fast to compute




Mapping Problem

- Given a pair of shapes, find corresponding points
- An ideal map:
 - Preserves important features
 - Is fast to compute
 - Has low distortion (preserves geodesic distances)




Mapping Problem

- Given a pair of shapes, find corresponding points
- An ideal map:
 - Preserves important features
 - Is fast to compute
 - Has low distortion (preserves geodesic distances)
 - Is *continuous* and bijective




Surface to Surface Map On Meshes





Vertex-To-Vertex Map

- Nearest neighbors on HKS and heat diffusion
 - Partial matching
 - No topological matching
 - Low cost
 - No continuity




Common Methods For Computing Maps

- **Spectral methods:** Laplacian eigenfunctions
 - Fast and very flexible but no guarantees
- **Cross parametrization:** find correspondences in a common domain
 - Slow but bijective and continuous
- **Deformations:** non-rigid alignment of surfaces
 - Slow but does not guarantee continuity




Parameterization for Matching




Cross Parameterization for Continuous Maps

- Topological obstruction to the computation of maps
- Triangle mesh parametrization
 - Tutte embedding
 - Conformal mappings
 - And more...
- Computing correspondences




Topological Obstruction

- There is no **continuous bijective** map between these two shapes




Topology

- Local geometry fully determines a surface (cf. first lecture)
- Topology studies **global** characteristics





Topology

- **Equivalent paths:** equal up to a continuous deformation.
- Two paths are **independent** if they are not related by a continuously deformation




Equivalent




Independent

Topology

- **Contractible loop:** closed path that can be continuously contracted to a point.
- Otherwise, **non-contractible** loops.




Contractible




Non-contractible

Topology

- **Contractible loop:** closed path that can be contracted to a single vertex.
- Otherwise, **non-contractible** loops.




All loops are contractible



Some loops are
non-contractible


Topology

- **Contractible loop:** closed path that can be contracted to a single vertex.
- Otherwise, **non-contractible** loops.




Topology

- **Genus:** number of independent loops divided by 2 (“number of holes”)



genus 0



genus 1




genus 2



genus 3



Topology and Continuous Deformation

- There exists a continuous and bijective **map** between any two surfaces with same genus



Topology and Continuous Deformation

- There exists a continuous and bijective **map** between any two surfaces with same genus
- It does not mean that there exists a bijective and continuous **deformation**




Topology and Continuous Deformation

- There is no **continuous bijective** map between these two shapes




Genus 0




Genus 1

Manifold Meshes without Boundaries

- Euler-Poincaré formula $F - E + V = 2 - 2g$
- # edges
faces # vertices
genus



$$\begin{aligned} F &= 6 \\ E &= 12 \\ V &= 8 \\ 2-2g &= 6-12+8=2 \end{aligned}$$




$$\begin{aligned} F &= 7776 \\ E &= 11664 \\ V &= 3890 \\ g &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

[20 proofs](#)

Manifold Meshes without Boundaries

- Euler-Poincaré formula $F - E + V = 2 - 2g$

[20 proofs](#)




$$F = 600$$

$$E = 900$$

$$V = 300$$

$$g = 1$$



$$F = 2408$$

$$E = 3612$$

$$V = 1200$$

$$g = 3$$


Topological Conclusion

- The genus is a global invariant of a surface
- The genus is easily computed with Euler-Poincaré formula
- Surfaces with same genus can continuously mapped into each other




Cross Parameterization for Continuous Maps

- Topological obstruction to the computation of maps
 - Triangle mesh parametrization
 - Tutte embedding
 - Conformal mappings
 - And more...
- Computing correspondences




Parameterization Problem

Given a surface (mesh) \mathcal{M} in R^3 and a planar domain Ω :
Find a bijective map $\Psi : \Omega \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{M}$.




Cutting To a Disk

- For non-disk topology: need to creates artificial boundaries
- For high genus, the cut graph is constructed from non-contractible loops



Parameterization for Texture Mapping



Bodypaint 3D

Parameterization – Applications

Mesh simplification:

- Approximate the geometry using few triangles

Idea:

- Decouple geometry from appearance



~600k triangles



~600 triangles


Parameterization – Applications

Mesh simplification:

- Approximate the geometry using few triangles

Idea:

- Decouple geometry from appearance




Observation: appearance (light reflection) depends on the geometry + normal directions.

Parameterization – Applications

Normal Mapping with parameterization:

- Store normal field as an RGB texture.




Parameterization – Applications

Normal Mapping

Idea:


- Decouple geometry from appearance
- Encode a normal field inside each triangle



Cohen et al., '98
Cignoni et al. '98

Parameterization – Applications

General Idea: Things become easier in a canonical domain
(e.g. on a plane).




11

Other Applications:



- Surface Fitting
 - Editing
 - Mesh Completion
 - Mesh Interpolation
 - Morphing and Transfer
 - Shape Matching
 - Visualization
 - Feature Learning
- ...

Parameterization Problem

Given a surface (mesh) \mathcal{M} in R^3 and a planar domain Ω :
Find a bijective map $\Psi : \Omega \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{M}$.



Parameterization – Many Possibilities




We need to quantify the distortion induced by the map

Parameterization onto the plane


Recall a related problem.

Mapping the Earth: find a parameterization of a 3d object onto a plane.



Mapping the earth


Mercator: meridians and latitudes are mapped to straight lines



Gerardus Mercator (1569)

Mapping the earth


Mercator: undefined at poles, distorts areas



Gerardus Mercator (1569)




Mapping the earth

Mercator: undefined at poles, distorts areas, preserves angles



Mapping the earth


Lambert cylindrical projection: distorts angles, preserves areas




Johann Heinrich Lambert (1772)

Mapping the earth


Cahill–Keyes polyhedral projection: compromise




Different kinds of parameterization



Mercator
conformal



Cahill-Keyes



Lambert
Preserves area

Different kinds of Parameterization


Various notions of distortion:

1. Equiareal: preserving areas
2. Conformal: preserving angles of intersections
3. Isometric: preserving geodesic distances


Theorem: Isometric = Conformal + Equiareal

Parameterization Problem

Given a surface (mesh) \mathcal{M} in R^3 and a planar domain Ω :
Find a bijective map $\Psi : \Omega \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{M}$.



Distortion of a Triangle




J_t : Jacobian of the transformation

Distortion energy: $E(f) := \sum_{t \in F} \text{distortion}(J_t)$

Distortion Minimization

J_t : Jacobian of the transformation $x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} u_t(x) \\ v_t(x) \end{pmatrix}$




$$J_t = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial u}{\partial X} & \frac{\partial v}{\partial X} \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial Y} & \frac{\partial v}{\partial Y} \end{pmatrix} = (\nabla u \quad \nabla v)$$

1. Isometric mapping: $J_t^\top J_t = I$
2. Conformal mapping: $\nabla v = n \times \nabla u$
3. Equiareal mapping: $\det J_t = 1$


Distortion energy can be non-linear and difficult to optimize for.

Distortion Minimization


1. Isometric mapping: $J_t^\top J_t = I$ (local rotation)
2. Conformal mapping: $\nabla v = n \times \nabla u$ (local rotation + scaling)
3. Equiareal mapping: $\det J_t = 1$ (same local area)




Initial grid



Isometric



Conformal




Equireal

Distortion energy can be non-linear and difficult to optimize for.

Formalizing Parametrization

How do you solve this problem numerically:



Define a measure of distortion: $E(f) := \sum_{t \in F} \text{distortion}(J_t)$

Define a parametrization as the minimum of energy:

$$(u_{\text{opt}}, v_{\text{opt}}) = \arg \min_{f=(u,v)} E(f) \quad \text{given boundary conditions}$$

Parametrization with Fixed Boundary


- Can we compute a parametrization by solving a linear system
- Assume we know exactly where the boundary must go



Spring Model for Parameterization

Given a mesh (T, P) in 3D find a bijective mapping $g(\mathbf{p}_i) = \mathbf{u}_i$ given constraints: $g(\mathbf{b}_j) = \mathbf{u}_j$ for some $\{\mathbf{b}_j\}$

Model: imagine a **spring** at each edge of the mesh.
If the boundary is fixed, let the interior points find an **equilibrium**.




Spring Model for Parameterization

Recall: potential energy of a spring stretched by distance x :

$$E(x) = \frac{1}{2}kx^2$$

k : spring constant.



Spring Model for Parameterization

Given an embedding (parameterization) of a mesh, the potential energy of the whole system:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \sum_e \frac{1}{2} D_e \|\mathbf{u}_{e1} - \mathbf{u}_{e2}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{1}{2} D_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j\|^2 , \quad \mathcal{N}_i \text{ set of vertices adjacent to } i \end{aligned}$$

Where $D_e = D_{ij}$ is the spring constant of edge e between i and j

Goal: find the coordinates $\{\mathbf{u}_i\}$ that would minimize E .

Note: the boundary vertices prevent the degenerate solution.

Parameterization with Barycentric Coordinates

Finding the optimum of:

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{1}{2} D_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j\|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{u}_i} = 0 &\Rightarrow \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} D_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j) = 0 \\ &\Rightarrow \mathbf{u}_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij} \mathbf{u}_j, \text{ where } \lambda_{ij} = \frac{D_{ij}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} D_{ij}} \end{aligned}$$

i.e. each point \mathbf{u}_i must be an **convex combination** of its neighbors.
Hence: barycentric coordinates.

Parameterization with Barycentric Coordinates

To find a minimizer of E in practice:

1. Fix the boundary points $\mathbf{b}_i, i \in \mathcal{B}$
2. Form linear equations

$$\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{b}_i, \quad \text{if } i \in \mathcal{B}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij} \mathbf{u}_j = 0, \quad \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{B}$$

3. Assemble into *two* linear systems (one for each coordinate):

$$LU = \bar{U}, \quad LV = \bar{V} \quad L_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ -\lambda_{ij} & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i, i \notin \mathcal{B} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$


4. Solution of the linear system gives the coordinates: $\mathbf{u}_i = (u_i, v_i)$
Note: system is very sparse, can solve efficiently.

Parameterization with Barycentric Coordinates

Does this work?

Tutte's spring-embedding theorem:

Every **barycentric** drawing of a 3-connected planar graph (triangle mesh) is a valid embedding if its boundary is **convex**.



Laplace Operator

Laplace operator in Euclidean space:

Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\nabla \cdot (\nabla f) = \Delta f = \sum_i^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} f$$

$$\Delta f = Lf$$

Laplacian Matrix

Our system of equations (forgetting about boundary):

$$\mathbf{u}_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij} \mathbf{u}_j, \text{ where } \lambda_{ij} = \frac{D_{ij}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} D_{ij}}$$

$$LU = 0 \quad L_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ -\lambda_{ij} & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad L \text{ is not symmetric}$$

Alternatively, if we write it as:

$$\mathbf{u}_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} D_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} D_{ij} \mathbf{u}_j$$

We get:

$$LU = 0 \quad L_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i} D_{ik} & \text{if } i = j \\ -D_{ij} & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad L \text{ is symmetric}$$

Parameterization with Barycentric Coordinates

Example:



Uniform weights:

$$D_{ij} = 1$$

Laplacian Matrix

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -5 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -5 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -5 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_x &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ b_y &= \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$




Parameterization with Barycentric Coordinates

Linear Reproduction:

- If the mesh is already **planar** we want to recover the original coordinates.

Problem:

- Uniform weights do not achieve linear reproduction
- Same for weights proportional to distances.



Parameterization with Barycentric Coordinates

Linear Reproduction:

- If the mesh is already **planar** we want to recover the original coordinates.

Problem:

- Uniform weights do not achieve linear reproduction
- Same for weights proportional to distances.

Solution:

- If the weights are **barycentric** with respect to **original points**:

$$\mathbf{p}_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij} \mathbf{p}_j, \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij} = 1$$


The resulting system will recover the planar coordinates.

Parameterization with Barycentric Coordinates

Solution:

- Barycentric coordinates with respect to original points:


$$\mathbf{p}_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij} \mathbf{p}_j, \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij} = 1$$





- If a point \mathbf{p}_i has 3 neighbors, then the barycentric coordinates are **unique**.
- For more than 3 neighbors, many possible choices exist.

Barycentric (cotangent) weights

$$D_{ij} = \frac{\cot(\alpha_{ij}) + \cot(\beta_{ij})}{2}$$




- Weights can be negative – not always valid
- Weights depend only on angles - close to conformal
- 2D reproducible






Barycentric (mean value) weights

$$D_{ij} = \frac{\tan(\gamma_{ij} / 2) + \tan(\delta_{ij} / 2)}{2 \| V_i - V_j \|}$$




- Result visually similar to harmonic
- No negative weights – **always** valid
- 2D reproducible




Barycentric Coordinates


uniform




harmonic




mean-value



Fixed vs Free boundary





Tutte embedding



images by Mirela Ben-Chen

Fixed vs Free boundary



images by Mirela Ben-Chen


Conformal Mappings

J_t : Jacobian of the transformation $x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} u_t(x) \\ v_t(x) \end{pmatrix}$

Conformal mapping: $\nabla v = n \times \nabla u$

Riemann Mapping Theorem:

Any surface topologically equivalent to a disk, **can be** conformally mapped to a unit disk.



Conformal Mappings


J_t : Jacobian of the transformation $x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} u_t(x) \\ v_t(x) \end{pmatrix}$

Conformal mapping: $\nabla v = n \times \nabla u$

Riemann Mapping Theorem:

Any surface topologically equivalent to a disk, **can be** conformally mapped to a unit disk.

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta v &= \operatorname{div} \nabla v \\ &= \operatorname{div}(n \times \nabla u) \\ &= \operatorname{curl} \nabla u \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$



$$\Delta u = 0$$

Conformal Mappings

J_t : Jacobian of the transformation $x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} u_t(x) \\ v_t(x) \end{pmatrix}$

Conformal mapping: $\nabla v = n \times \nabla u$

Riemann Mapping Theorem:


Any surface topologically equivalent to a disk, **can be** conformally mapped to a unit disk.

If a map $S \rightarrow (u,v)$ is conformal then both u and v are harmonic:

$$\Delta_S u = 0 \quad \Delta_S v = 0$$

Δ_S : Laplacian on S .

Like Tutte embeddings: each point must be an **convex combination** of its neighbors.



Conformal Free Boundary Method

J_t : Jacobian of the transformation $x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} u_t(x) \\ v_t(x) \end{pmatrix}$

Conformal mapping: $\nabla v = n \times \nabla u$

Solve in a least-squares sense:

$$\begin{aligned} E_C(u, v) &= \sum_{t \in T} A_t \|\nabla v - n \times \nabla u\|_t^2 \quad , A_t \text{ area of triangle t} \\ &= u^\top W u + v^\top W v - \sum_{\substack{ij \text{ at bnd}}} (u_i v_j - u_j v_i) \end{aligned}$$

W Cotangent matrix

Conformal Free Boundary Method

$$\min_{u,v} E_C(u, v) = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} W & M \\ M^\top & W \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{Subject to: } \|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 = 1$$


Equivalent to the eigenvalue problem:

$$\begin{pmatrix} W & M \\ M^\top & W \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } A \text{ the area matrix}$$


Optimal solution: eigenfunction associated to the **third** smallest eigenvalue

The first eigenfunctions are constant







Conformal Free Boundary Method



Conformal Mappings




Reducing Distortion - More Cuts



Going Further: Curvature Prescription

- **Parametrization:** find a deformation to a surface with zero Gaussian curvature
- Gather Gaussian curvature into “cone points”
 - Target curvature is not 0 everywhere
- Cuts must pass through cone points
- Position of the cuts has no impact on the distortion

Going Further: Curvature Prescription



Adding more and more cone singularities...


(Texture courtesy NASA Earth Observatory), from Soliman et al. 2018

Free boundary methods ...


- Solve for the (u,v) coordinates
 - MIPS [Hormann et al., 2000]
 - Stretch optimization [Sander et al., 2001]
 - LSCM (conformal, linear) [Levy et al., 2002]
 - DCP (conformal, linear) [Desbrun et al., 2002]
- Solve for the angles of the map (conformal)
 - ABF [Sheffer et al., 2001], ABF++ [Sheffer et al., 2004]
 - LinABF (linear) [Zayer et al., 2007]
- Solve for the edge lengths of the map by prescribing curvature
 - Circle patterns [Kharevych et al., 2006]
 - CPMS (linear) [Ben-Chen et al., 2008]
 - CETM [Springborn et al., 2008]
- Balance area/conformality
 - ARAP [Liu et al., 2008]
- More...

Some results





Linear Methods:



mean value




conformal




Purely linear methods can cause a very significant distortion.

Some results


Non-linear Methods:




ABF++







circle patterns



MIPS



stretch




Conclusions

Surface parameterization:

- No perfect mapping method
- A very large number of techniques exists
- Conformal model:
 - Nice theoretical properties
 - Leads to a simple (linear) system of equations
 - Closely related to the Poisson equation and Laplacian operator
- More general methods
 - Can get smaller distortion using non-linear optimization
 - Very difficult to guarantee bijectivity in general

Cross Parameterization for Continuous Maps


- Topological obstruction to the computation of maps
- Triangle mesh parametrization
 - Tutte embedding
 - Conformal mappings
 - And more...
- Computing correspondences



Parametrization for Correspondences

Input: a set constrained points and cut graph

Where to cut so that the parametrization of A and B are the same?




Parametrization for Correspondences

Seamless parametrization: set constrained points and cut graph, add global linear constraints on duplicated edges

$$g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \\ x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b & a \end{pmatrix} x + \tau$$

Affine transition functions:




Parametrization for Correspondences

Seamless parametrization: set constrained points and cut graph, add global linear constraints on duplicated edges

Affine transition functions:

$$g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \\ x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b & a \end{pmatrix} x + \tau$$



Cuts become « invisible »

Parametrization for Correspondences

In practice:

1. Find the duplicated boundary vertices $i_r, i_l \in \mathcal{B}$
2. Fix the constrained points $\mathbf{b}_i, i \in \mathcal{C}$
3. Solve the linear system of equations:

$$\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{b}_i, \quad \text{if } i \in \mathcal{C}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{i_r} - \mathbf{u}_{j_r} = g_\alpha(\mathbf{u}_{i_l} - \mathbf{u}_{j_l}), \quad \text{if } i, j \in \mathcal{B}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \lambda_{ij} \mathbf{u}_j = 0, \quad \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{B}$$

4. Solution of the linear system gives the coordinates: $\mathbf{u}_i = (u_i, v_i)$

Parametrization for Correspondences


Same cut graphs, same mapping.




Parametrization domain lack structure!

Toric Seamless Parameterization


- Three point cuts
- Rotation constraints on cuts
- Spring distortion
- Tiles the entire space





Toric Parameterization

- Three point cuts
- Rotation constraints on cuts
- Spring or LSCM distortion
- Tiles the entire space




Cuts are invisible!

Orbifold Tutte Embeddings, Aigerman et al. 2015


Toric Parameterization

- Compute continuous maps between surfaces from few constraints




Toric Parameterization


- Different space tiling
- Different parametric spaces




$$\left\{ \frac{\pi}{2}, \pi, \frac{\pi}{2} \right\}$$




$$\left\{ \frac{2\pi}{3}, \frac{2\pi}{3}, \frac{2\pi}{3} \right\}$$



$$\left\{ \pi, \frac{2\pi}{3}, \frac{2\pi}{6} \right\}$$




$$\left\{ \pi, \pi, \pi, \pi \right\}$$



Orbifold Tutte Embeddings, Aigerman et al. 2015
Spherical Orbifold Tutte Embeddings, Aigerman et al. 2017

Toric Parameterization

- Use image CNN on parametrization for segmentation




Conclusion

Toric parametrization


- Compute bijective maps from a small set of landmarks
- Very efficient
- Little control over the distortion

Surface Non-Rigid Alignment

- Compute a deformation for aligning shapes




Simpler problem: **Rigid Alignment**



- Given a pair of shapes, find the optimal *Rigid Alignment* between them.
- The unknowns are the rotation/translation parameters of the source onto the target shape.

Simpler problem: Rigid Alignment

- What does it mean for an alignment to be **good**?




Intuition: want corresponding points to be close after transformation.

Problems

1. We don't know what points correspond.
2. We don't know the optimal alignment.

Iterative Closest Point (ICP)

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

1. For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
2. Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$$

Iterative Closest Point (ICP)

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

- For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
- Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing: $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$

Iterative Closest Point

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

- For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
- Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing: $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$

Iterative Closest Point

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

- For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
- Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing: $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$

Iterative Closest Point

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

1. For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
2. Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing: $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$

Iterative Closest Point

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

- For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
- Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing: $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$

Iterative Closest Point

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

- For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
- Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing: $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$

Iterative Closest Point

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

- For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
- Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing: $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$

Iterative Closest Point

- Approach: iterate between finding correspondences and finding the transformation:




Given a pair of shapes, X and Y , iterate:

- For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.
- Find deformation \mathbf{R}, t minimizing: $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}x_i + t - y_i\|_2^2$

Iterative Closest Point

- Requires two main computations:
 1. Computing nearest neighbors.
 2. Computing the optimal transformation




Non-Rigid Alignment Problem

- Compute a deformation for aligning shapes
 - Non-rigid deformation!




As-Rigid-As Possible Deformation

- Compute a deformation for aligning shapes



Formalizing Deformation

How do you solve this problem numerically:



Define a measure of distortion: $E(f) := \sum_{t \in F} \text{distortion}(J_t)$

Define the **deformation** as the minimum of energy:

$$(u_{\text{opt}}, v_{\text{opt}}, w_{\text{opt}}) = \arg \min_{f=(u,v,w)} E(f) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{Possibly given} \\ \text{handle conditions} \end{array}$$

As-Rigid-As Possible Deformation

- Deformation of vertex neighborhood \mathcal{N}_i limited to a rotation R_i :

$$\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j = R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)$$


- Energy for edges incident to i :

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j - R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2$$

- Energy on all vertices:

$$E(\mathbf{u}, R) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j - R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2$$

$$w_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\cot \alpha_{ij} + \cot \beta_{ij})$$



As-Rigid-As Possible Deformation

- Solving the optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}, R} E(\mathbf{u}, R) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j - R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2$$

- Iterates between:
 - Minimization for \mathbf{u} (solve three linear systems of size nxn)
 - Minimization for each rotation R_i (compute SVD at each vertex)

As-Rigid-As Possible Deformation

Finding the optimum for the variable \mathbf{u} :

$$E(\mathbf{u}, R) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j - R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{u}_i} = 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j - R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow (W\mathbf{u})_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)$$

W Cotangent matrix

As-Rigid-As Possible Deformation

Finding the optimum for the variable R_i :

$$E(\mathbf{u}, R) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j - R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2$$

Under the constraint: $R_i^\top R_i = I$, $\det R_i = 1$

Equivalent to solving:

$$\max_{R_i} \langle R_i, B_i \rangle_F, \text{ with } B_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} (\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j)(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)^\top$$

Orthogonal Procrustes problem: there exists a closed form solution using the SVD


$$B_i = U \Sigma V^\top \text{ with } U, V \text{ orthogonal matrix} \quad R_i = U \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \det(UV^\top) \end{pmatrix} V^\top$$

As-Rigid-As Possible Deformation

- Solving the optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}, R} E(\mathbf{u}, R) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j - R_i(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)\|^2$$

- Iterates between:
 - Minimization for \mathbf{u} (solve three linear systems of size $n \times n$)
 - Minimization for each rotation R (compute SVD at each vertex)




Non-Rigid Surface Alignment

Given a pair of shapes, X and Y, iterate:

1. For each $x_i \in X$ find **nearest** neighbor $y_i \in Y$.

2. Find the deformation of X minimizing the

distance: $E(\mathbf{u}, R) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij} \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j - R_i(y_i - y_j)\|^2$



Non-Rigid Surface Alignment

- Pros:
 - Need to find a **good** deformation model
 - Strong regularization of the deformation (volume preservation, basis of deformation)
 - Lots of research and good theoretical understanding
- Cons:
 - Approximative matching (no continuity, no bijectivity)
 - Computationally slow
 - Often limited to small deformations