

# The curvature and dimension of a closed surface

S. Halayka – sjhalayka@gmail.com

October 26, 2019

## Abstract

In this short memorandum, the curvature and dimension properties of the 2-sphere surface of a 3-dimensional ball and the  $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set are considered. Tessellation is used to approximate each surface, primarily because the  $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set is otherwise non-differentiable (having no well-defined surface normals). It is found that the curvature of a closed surface *must* lead to fractional dimension.

## 1 Overview

Unlike in traditional geometry where dimension is an integer (e.g.  $(3+1)$ -dimensional space-time), fractional (non-integer) dimension occurs in *fractal* geometry. In fractal geometry, there are currently many ways to calculate the dimension of a surface [1, 2]. This memo uses a new method of calculating the fractional dimension of a surface – it is *curvature* that leads to this fractional dimension.

Our main focus will be on the curvature and dimension of tessellated closed surfaces. For example, Marching Cubes [3] can be used to generate triangular tessellations (meshes), where dimension  $D \in (2.0, 3.0)$ .

Our attention will be drawn to the difference in curvature and dimension between a 2-sphere and the  $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set. We will generate both a 2-sphere and the  $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set by using iterative quaternion equations.

Some notes are given at the end of this memo.

## 2 The tessellation of a closed surface

Approximating the surface of a 3-dimensional shape as a mesh allows us to calculate the surface's dimension  $D \in (2.0, 3.0)$ . This includes approximation of both a 2-sphere and the  $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set.

First we calculate, for each triangle, the average dot product of the triangle's face normal  $\hat{n}_i$  and its 3 neighbouring triangles' face normals  $\hat{o}_1, \hat{o}_2, \hat{o}_3$ :

$$d_i = \frac{\hat{n}_i \cdot \hat{o}_1 + \hat{n}_i \cdot \hat{o}_2 + \hat{n}_i \cdot \hat{o}_3}{3} \in (-1.0, 1.0]. \quad (1)$$

Because we assume that there are 3 neighbours per triangle, the mesh must be *closed* (no cracks or holes, precisely 2 triangles per edge). The reason why the value  $-1.0$  is not achievable is because that would lead to intersecting triangles.

Then we calculate the normalized measure of curvature:

$$k_i = \frac{1 - d_i}{2} \in [0.0, 1.0). \quad (2)$$

Once  $k_i$  has been calculated for all triangles, we can then calculate the average normalized measure of curvature  $K$ , where  $t$  is the number of triangles in the mesh:

$$K = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t k_i = \frac{k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_t}{t} \in (0.0, 1.0). \quad (3)$$

The reason why the value  $0.0$  is not achievable is because we are dealing with a closed surface, and so there's bound to be *some* curvature.

The dimension of the closed surface is:

$$D = 2 + K \in (2.0, 3.0). \quad (4)$$

As far as we know, this method of calculating the dimension of a closed surface is new. The entire C++ code for generating a mesh can be found at [4]. The entire C++ code for calculating a mesh's dimension can be found at [5].

### 3 Vanishing versus non-vanishing curvature

Where  $r \in [2, \infty)$  is the *integer* sampling resolution,  $g_{\max} \in (-\infty, \infty)$  is the sampling grid maximum extent,  $g_{\min} \in (-\infty, \infty)$  is the sampling grid minimum extent, and  $g_{\max} > g_{\min}$ , the Marching Cubes step size is:

$$\ell = \frac{g_{\max} - g_{\min}}{r - 1} \in (0.0, \infty). \quad (5)$$

In this memo  $g_{\max} = 1.5$ ,  $g_{\min} = -1.5$ , and  $r$  is variable.

On one hand, a 2-sphere can be generated by the iterative quaternion Julia set equation

$$Z = Z^2 + C, \quad (6)$$

where the translation constant is  $C = 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0$ . For a 2-sphere, the *local* curvature all but vanishes as  $\ell$  decreases (as  $r$  increases):

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow 0.0} K(\ell) = 0.0. \quad (7)$$

This results in a dimension of practically (but never quite)  $2.0$ , which is to be expected from a non-fractal surface. See Figures 1 - 3.

On the other hand, the  $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set can be generated by the iterative quaternion equation

$$Z = Z \cos(Z). \quad (8)$$

For the  $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set, the local curvature does not necessarily vanish as  $\ell$  decreases:

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow 0.0} K(\ell) \neq 0.0. \quad (9)$$

This results in a dimension considerably greater than 2.0 (but not equal to or greater than 3.0), which is to be expected from a fractal surface. See Figures 4 - 7.

For more information on iterative quaternion equations, and how to perform quaternion multiplication, addition, and cos, see [6].

## 4 Notes

Hopefully, the following notes and figures are helpful if there is difficulty envisioning the curvature and dimension in the case of Marching Cubes.

### 4.1 Triangle area for the $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set

The largest triangle area in the mesh can be used to normalize the result of  $k_i$ . This has been implemented in the source code [5]. This is done because there are sliver triangles produced by Marching Cubes. This was not implemented in the paper for the sake of simplicity.

### 4.2 Box-counting dimension for the $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set

It is simple to obtain the number of boxes that are required to cover the  $2.x$ -dimensional surface of a 3-dimensional fractal set, thanks to Marching Cubes. One can simply ask: how many triangles are generated per this or that marched cube? If the answer is more than zero, then that particular marched cube covers the surface – the number of boxes (the box count) is increased by one. The box-counting dimension is calculated as usual, and is left up as an exercise for the reader.

### 4.3 Marching Squares

Marching Squares [7] can be used to generate closed line paths, where dimension  $D \in (1.0, 2.0)$ . For each line segment, the average dot product of the line segment's surface normal  $\hat{n}_i$  and its 2 neighbouring line segments' surface normals  $\hat{o}_1, \hat{o}_2$  is:

$$d_i = \frac{\hat{n}_i \cdot \hat{o}_1 + \hat{n}_i \cdot \hat{o}_2}{2} \in (-1.0, 1.0]. \quad (10)$$

Because we assume that there are 2 neighbours per line segment, the line segment mesh must be *closed* (precisely 2 line segments per end point). The reason why the value  $-1.0$  is not achievable is because that would lead to intersecting line segments.

See Figure 8 for an example input (a 2-dimensional greyscale image, consisting of  $8 \times 8$  pixels) and output (a  $1.x$ -dimensional closed set of line segments) of the Marching Squares algorithm, approximating a 1-sphere (a circle), where sampling resolution is  $r = 8$ .

Illustrated in Figure 9 is a section of a closed line path, with surface normals. The average dot product of neighbouring line segments is  $d_i = 0.0$ . This leads to a normalized measure of curvature  $k_i = (1 - d_i)/2 = 0.5$ , which in turn leads to an average normalized measure of curvature  $K = 0.5$ . The dimension is  $D = 1 + K = 1.5$ .

See Figure 10 for a section of a closed line path as it goes from dimension 1.0 (at top) to 1.9999 (at bottom). In the end, where the dimension is 1.9999, the result is practically a rectangle. The reason why the dimension cannot be 2.0 is because that would lead to intersecting line segments.

## 4.4 Marching Hypercubes

There is research on Marching Hypercubes at [8, 9]: where dimension  $D \in (3.0, 4.0)$ , the output is a closed set of tetrahedra. As local curvature all but vanishes, the tetrahedra become as close to regular as possible. For example, where  $P_{tc}$  is the tetrahedron centre,  $P_{fc}$  is the first face's centre, and  $P_{ntc}$  is the first neighbouring tetrahedron's centre:

$$\hat{n}_1 = \text{normalize}(P_{tc} - P_{fc}), \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{o}_1 = \text{normalize}(P_{fc} - P_{ntc}), \quad (12)$$

and likewise for the other 3 neighbouring tetrahedra, the value of  $d_i$  is:

$$d_i = \frac{\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{o}_1 + \hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{o}_2 + \hat{n}_3 \cdot \hat{o}_3 + \hat{n}_4 \cdot \hat{o}_4}{4} \in (-1.0, 1.0]. \quad (13)$$

Because we assume that there are 4 neighbours per tetrahedron, the tetrahedral mesh must be *closed* (precisely 2 tetrahedra per face). The reason why the value  $-1.0$  is not achievable is because that would lead to intersecting tetrahedra.

Imagine wrinkly space, begetting curvature, and thus increased dimension.

## References

- [1] Mandelbrot, B. (1967). "How Long is the Coast of Britain? Statistical Self-Similarity and Fractional Dimension". *Science*. 156 (3775): 636–8.
- [2] Mandelbrot, B. (1982). "The Fractal Geometry of Nature". ISBN 978-0716711865.
- [3] Lorensen, W. E.; Cline, Harvey E. (1987). "Marching cubes: A high resolution 3d surface construction algorithm". *ACM Computer Graphics*. 21 (4): 163–169
- [4] [https://github.com/sjhalayka/marching\\_cubes](https://github.com/sjhalayka/marching_cubes)
- [5] <https://github.com/sjhalayka/meshdim>
- [6] Halayka, S. (2009) "Some visually interesting non-standard quaternion fractal sets". *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*. Volume 41, Issue 5.

- [7] Maple, C. (2003). "Geometric design and space planning using the marching squares and marching cube algorithms". Proc. 2003 Intl. Conf. Geometric Modeling and Graphics. pp. 90–95
- [8] Bhaniramka, P; Wenger R.; Crawfis R. (2000) "Isosurfacing in higher dimensions," Proceedings Visualization 2000. VIS 2000 (Cat. No.00CH37145), Salt Lake City, UT, USA, 2000, pp. 267-273.
- [9] Bhaniramka, P; Wenger R.; Crawfis R. (2004) "Isosurface construction in any dimension using convex hulls," in IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 130-141, March-April 2004.



Figure 1: Low resolution ( $r = 10$ ) surface for the iterative quaternion equation  $Z = Z^2 + C$ , where  $C = 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0$ . The surface's dimension is 2.02.




Figure 2: Medium resolution ( $r = 100$ ) surface for the iterative quaternion equation  $Z = Z^2 + C$ , where  $C = 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0$ . The surface's dimension is 2.06.



Figure 3: High resolution ( $r = 1000$ ) surface for the iterative quaternion equation  $Z = Z^2 + C$ , where  $C = 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0$ . The surface's dimension is practically 2.0.



Figure 4: Low resolution ( $r = 10$ ) surface for the iterative quaternion equation  $Z = Z \cos(Z)$ . The surface's dimension is 2.05.



Figure 5: Medium resolution ( $r = 100$ ) surface for the iterative quaternion equation  $Z = Z \cos(Z)$ . The surface's dimension is 2.11.



Figure 6: High resolution ( $r = 1000$ ) surface for the iterative quaternion equation  $Z = Z \cos(Z)$ . The surface's dimension is 2.08.



Figure 7: A 2-dimensional slice of the iterative quaternion equation  $Z = Z \cos(Z)$ , showing the self-similar nature of the set at all scales.





Figure 8: Marching Squares input and output.



Figure 9:  $D = 1.5$ .



Figure 10:  $D = 1$  to  $D = 1.9999$ .