

ASSIGNMENT 2

MATINF4170

SPLINE METHODS

Ivar Haugaløkken Stangeby

February 9, 2017

Exercise 2.2

In this exercise we want to find the individual polynomial pieces of the cubic B-splines:

- i) $B[0, 0, 0, 0, 1](x)$;
- ii) $B[0, 1, 1, 1, 1](x)$;
- iii) $B[0, 1, 1, 1, 2](x)$.

Instead of computing these directly, we first show the general claim that

$$B[a, \overbrace{b, \dots, b}^p, c](x) = \frac{(x-a)^p}{(b-a)^p} B[a, b](x) + \frac{(c-x)^p}{(c-b)^p} B[b, c](x),$$

outlined in exercise 2.7 (note that we do allow $a = b$, $b = c$).

Base case We proceed by induction, and the base case consists of $p = 0$. The right hand side then directly evaluates to $B[a, b](x) + B[b, c](x)$, which is equal to $B[a, c]$ as the knot intervals are adjacent.

Induction step For the inductive step, we assume the claim holds for $p = k - 1$, and show it must also hold for $p = k$. We then have

$$B[a, \overbrace{b, \dots, b}^k, c](x) = \frac{(x-a)}{(b-a)} B[a, \overbrace{b, \dots, b}^{k-1}, b](x) + \frac{(c-x)}{(c-b)} B[b, \overbrace{b, \dots, b}^{k-1}, c](x),$$

and applying the induction hypothesis yields

$$= \frac{(x-a)^k}{(b-a)^k} B[a, b](x) + \frac{(c-x)^k}{(c-b)^k} B[b, c](x).$$

This closes the induction. It then follows that

- i) $B[0, 0, 0, 0, 1](x) = (1-x)^3 B[0, 1](x)$;
- ii) $B[0, 1, 1, 1, 1](x) = x^3 B[0, 1](x)$;
- iii) $B[0, 1, 1, 1, 2](x) = x^3 B[0, 1](x) + (2-x)^3 B[1, 2](x)$,

using the zero-convention. This can be verified by direct computation.

When it comes to smoothness, if we have a knot t_j of multiplicity m , then the derivatives of the spline $B_{j,p}$ of order $0, 1, \dots, p - m$ are continuous at the knot t_j . For the above B-splines, we have knot multiplicity of 4, 4 and 3 respectively, hence for $B[0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$ we have a discontinuity at $x = 0$ as $p - m = 3 - 4 = -1$. This can also be seen by comparing the two limits at 0. By the same token, $B[0, 1, 1, 1, 1]$ has a discontinuity at $x = 1$. The B-spline $B[0, 1, 1, 1, 2]$ on the other hand exhibits C^0 continuity at the knot $x = 1$.

Exercise 2.6

Induction proof

We wish to show the identity

$$B(t_i | t_j, \dots, t_{j+p+1}) = B(t_j | t_i, \dots, t_{i-1}, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_{j+i+p}) \quad (1)$$

holds for $i = j, \dots, j + p + 1$.

Base case: Note that the B-spline on the right hand side is one degree lower than that on the left. Hence, our base case consists of $p = 1$. With $p = 1$ we have three cases: $t_i = t_j, t_{j+1}$ and t_{j+2} . In general we have

$$B(x | t_j, t_{j+1}, t_{j+2}) = \frac{x - t_j}{t_{j+1} - t_j} B(x | t_j, t_{j+1}) + \frac{t_{j+2} - x}{t_{j+2} - t_{j+1}} B(x | t_{j+1}, t_{j+2}).$$

Plugging in $x = t_j$ both terms evaluates to zero, and since t_j is outside the interval $[t_{j+1}, t_{j+2}]$, the right hand side of equation (1) also evaluates to zero. By symmetry, the same holds for $x = t_{j+2}$. For $x = t_{j+1}$, we get $B(x | t_j, t_{j+1}) = 0$, while $B(x | t_{j+1}, t_{j+2}) = 1$. By definition, the right hand side of equation (1) also evaluates to 1. This concludes the base case.

Induction step: For the inductive step, we assume that equation (1) holds for degree $p - 1$. For degree p , the left hand side of equation (1) then reads:

$$B(t_i | t_j, \dots, t_{j+p+1}) = \frac{t_i - t_j}{t_{j+p} - t_j} B(t_i | t_j \dots t_{j+p}) + \frac{t_{j+p+1} - t_i}{t_{j+p+1} - t_{j+1}} B(t_i | t_{j+1} \dots t_{j+p+1}),$$

which by the induction hypothesis yields

$$\frac{t_i - t_j}{t_{j+p} - t_j} B(t_i | t_j \dots, t_{i-1}, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_{j+p}) + \frac{t_{j+p+1} - t_i}{t_{j+p+1} - t_{j+1}} B(t_i | t_{j+1}, \dots, t_{i-1}, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_{j+p+1}).$$

Evaluating the right hand side of equation (1) using the recursive definition, yields the same result. This closes the induction.

Application

We use the result proved above to evaluate the second order B-spline $B_{j,2}$ at its interior knots, t_{j+1} and t_{j+2} . The first interior knot gives

$$B(t_{j+1} | t_j, \dots, t_{j+3}) = B(t_{j+1} | t_j, t_{j+2}, t_{j+3}) = \frac{t_{j+1} - t_j}{t_{j+2} - t_j} \underbrace{B(t_{j+1} | t_j, t_{j+2})}_{=1} = \frac{t_{j+1} - t_j}{t_{j+2} - t_j}.$$

For the second interior knot, we have

$$B(t_{j+2} | t_j, \dots, t_{j+3}) = B(t_{j+2} | t_j, t_{j+1}, t_{j+3}) = \frac{t_{j+3} - t_{j+2}}{t_{j+3} - t_{j+1}} \underbrace{B(t_{j+2} | t_{j+1}, t_{j+3})}_{=1} = \frac{t_{j+3} - t_{j+2}}{t_{j+3} - t_{j+1}}.$$

Repeated interior knots

Assume now that we all interior knots are equal to some number z , i.e., we have knot multiplicity p at interior knots. That is $t_j < z < t_{j+p+1}$. By repeated use of the above result, we have that the j th B-spline can be evaluated as such:

$$B(z \mid t_j, \underbrace{z, \dots, z}_p, t_{j+p+1}) = B(z \mid t_j, t_{j+p+1}) = 1$$

as z lies in the interval $[t_j, t_{j+p+1})$. If we instead consider the B-splines $B_{i,p}$ where $i \neq j$ evaluated at z , then we have two cases:

- i) No overlapping knots, in which case $B_{i,p}(z) = 0$,
- ii) $k \leq p$ overlapping knots, either at the left or right end of the active knots:

$$B(z \mid t_i, \dots, t_{i+p-k}, \underbrace{z, \dots, z}_k) = B(z \mid t_i, t_{i+p-k}) = 0$$

or

$$B(z \mid \underbrace{z, \dots, z}_k, t_{i+k+1}, \dots, t_{i+p+1}) = B(z \mid t_{i+k+1}, \dots, t_{i+p+1}) = 0$$

by repeated application of above result.

Exercise 2.11

Given a knot vector $t = \{t_j\}_{j=1}^{n+p+1}$ and a real number $x \in [t_1, \dots, t_{n+p+1})$ we often find ourselves needing to determine exactly what knot interval the number x lies in, e.g., determine the index μ such that $t_\mu \leq x < t_{\mu+1}$. There are many ways of achieving this, and sometimes one can tailor the procedure to current context in order to achieve better performance. We examine a few methods, demonstrated in PYTHON, and for all of these we assume $x \in [t_1, \dots, t_{n+p+1})$. These have yet to be tested in a proper setting.

The Naive Approach This method finds the appropriate index by brute force. It has a linear computational complexity.

```
def IndexNaive(x, knots):
    for i in range(len(knots)-1):
        if knots[i] <= x < knots[i+1]:
            return i
```

Evaluation approach More often than not, when we repeatedly evaluate B-splines it is because we want to compute a set of points on the curve. We can use this, as well as the fact that knot sequences are increasing to our advantage. Letting the function start searching at the previous index, we significantly reduce the number of iterations.

```
def IndexEvaluation(x, knots, previous=0):
    for i in range(previous, len(knots)-1):
        if knots[i] <= x < knots[i+1]:
            return i
```

Binary approach Applying a binary search algorithm may also yield a small computational advantage. Instead of searching from start of knot vector to end, we start in the middle. Using the fact that knots are increasing, we can decide whether x lies to the left or to the right of the current knot.

```
def IndexBinary(x, knots):
    a = 0
    b = len(knots)-1
    while a <= b:
        c = (a + b) // 2
        if knots[c] <= x < knots[c+1]:
            return c
        else:
            if x < knots[c]:
                b = c - 1
            else:
                a = c + 1
```

Binary evaluation approach We could also hope to combine the binary search method with the one using the previous index as a starting point, to further narrow down our search range. This however, I can only see being more efficient if we evaluate points on the curve for a set of increasing parameter values, but that are not necessarily lying in adjacent knot intervals.

```
def IndexBinaryEvaluation(x, knots, previous=0):
    a = previous
    b = len(knots)-1
    while a <= b:
        c = (a + b) // 2
        if knots[c] <= x < knots[c+1]:
            return c
        else:
            if x < knots[c]:
                b = c - 1
            else:
                a = c + 1
```