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A large tree structure change. A totally new tree!
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## Solution

## > Solution 1: Rebuild kd-tree each frame

$>$ Rebuild kd-tree in a lazy manner, approximate SAH (Surface Area Heuristics) [Hunt et al. 06]
$>$ Can just move objects bounding boxes around and transform rays (for hierarchical movement) [Wald et al. 03]
$>$ Motion decomposition, fuzzy kd-trees [Günther et al. 06]

## Solution 2: use different hierarchical

 structure
## $>$ Bounding volume hierarchies (BVHs)

$>$ [Wald et al. 06b, Boulos et al. 06, Lauterbach et al. 06]
$>$ Grids
> [Wald et al. 06a]

# Ray Tracing Dynamic Scenes Using BVHs 

[Lauterbach et al. 06]

Dinesh Manocha, Christian Lauterbach<br>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

## Bounding Volume Hierarchies: BVHs

$>$ Tree of bounding volumes (sphere, AABB, OBB, $k$ -DOP, spherical shells, etc.)
$>$ Each bounding volume encloses "nearby" primitives
> Parent node primitives are union of children node primitives


## Spatial partitioning vs. Object Hierarchies

> Spatial partitioning:
$>$ space is subdivided into disjoint regions (e.g. grid, kd-tree, octree, ...)
$>$ Object hierarchy:
$>$ groups or clusters of objects/primitives are subdivided (BVH, s-kd-tree)

## Spatial partitioning vs. Object Hierarchies

$>$ Implications for ray tracing
> Spatial partitioning: Objects referenced in multiple nodes (overlap in object space)
>BVH Hierarchies: Nodes can overlap each other (overlap in 3D space)
$>$ Spatial partitioning allows easier front-to -back ordering

## BVHs for intersection tests

$>$ Widely used for intersection computations
$>$ Ray tracing
$>$ Visibility culling: view frustum and occlusion culling
$>$ Collision and proximity computations
$>$ Other applications

## BVH based RT algorithm

Pretty simple:
$>$ Start from root
$>$ If ray intersects AABB , try all children, too:
$>$ is inner node: recurse on both children
$>$ is leaf node: intersect with primitive(s)
$>$ Naïve implementation far slower than kd-tree!

## Why are BVHs slower?

$>$ Intersection test more costly
$>$ Up to 6 ray-plane intersections for AABB (slabs test)
> Just 1 for kd-tree
$>$ No front-to-back ordering
$>$ Cannot stop after finding first hit
$>$ Nodes take more space
$>32$ bytes vs. 8 bytes

## On the other hand...

$>$ AABBs can provide tighter fit automatically
$>$ No empty leafs, tree does not need to be as deep
$>$ Primitives only referenced once
$\Rightarrow$ less nodes in hierarchy
$>$ \#nodes known in advance (2n-1)
$>$ (if 1 primitive/leaf)

## More Importantly ...

## >AABBs can provide tighter fit automatically

$>$ No empty leafs, tree does not need to be as deep
>Primitives only referenced once
$\Rightarrow$ less nodes in hierarchy
>\#nodes known in advance (2n-1)
> (if 1 primitive/leaf)
$>$ Can be updated easily!

## VirginiaTech <br> Invent the Future <br> Hierarchy updates

$>$ What does updating mean?
$>$ Underlying geometry changes
$>$ Update will ensure correctness of hierarchy without rebuilding it
$>$ Should be faster than rebuild

## Dynamic Scenes: updating BVHs

$>$ Post-order traversal of BVH
$>$ Update children's AABB, then update own
$>$ At leaf level, update from primitives
$>$ Also update additional information such as axis
O(n) time
$>$ Usually a few ms for small scenes
$>$ May become too long for large models!

## Dynamic scenes: BVH degradation

$>$ Quality of BVH may decrease over animation
$>$ Update does not change tree topology
$>$ Rebuild may be necessary
$>$ How to detect?
$>$ In worst-case scene:
$>$ Performance dropping an order of magnitude over 20 animation frames
$>$ Not as bad for normal scenes, though Invent the Future

## Quality degradation

$>$ Use heuristic to detect degradation
> Assume performance lower when BVHs contain lots of empty space:


## Rebuild heuristic

$>$ How to measure quality?
$>$ Use ratio of surface area parent to children
>SA(parent) / (SA(child1) + SA(child2) )
$>$ Save on rebuild for each node (4 bytes/node)
$>$ On each update: compare to initial value
$>$ Sum up differences and normalize
$>$ If above threshold: initiate rebuild
> $30-40 \%$ work well in practice

## Video

# Ray Tracing Animated Scenes using Coherent Grid Traversal 

[Wald et al. 06a]

I Wald, T Ize, A Kensler, A Knoll, S Parker SCI Institute, University of Utah

## Coherent Grid Traversal

$>$ A new traversal techniques for uniform grids
> ... that makes packet/frustum traversal compatible with grids
$>\ldots$ thus achieves performance competitive with fastest kd-trees
$>\ldots$ and which allows for per-frame rebuilds (dynamic scenes)

Invent the Future

## What's so special about grids?

Since 70'ies: Lots of different RT data structures
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$\rightarrow$ Of all these, grid is only that is not hierarchical !

## What's so special about grids?

$>$ Grid is not hierarchical...
$>\rightarrow$ Much simpler to build (similar to 3D
-rasterization, very fast)
$>$ Build-times in the paper: 2.2M "Soda Hall" in 110 ms
$>\rightarrow$ Ideally suited for handling dynamic scenes
$>$ Full rebuild every frame, no restrictions at all!

## What is so special about dynamic scenes ?

$>$ All of the recent advancements of RT are for kd -trees !
> Pre-2000: Tie between grids and kd-trees...
$>$ [Wald '01]: New concept $\rightarrow$ "coherent ray tracing" (for kd -tree)
$>$ Trace "packets" of coherent rays $\rightarrow$ 10x faster than single rays
$>$ [Woop '05]: First RT hardware prototype $\rightarrow$ RPU (for kd-tree)
$>$ [Reshetov '05]: New concept $\rightarrow$ "multilevel ray tracing" (kd -tree)
$>$ Trace packets using bounding frusta $\rightarrow$ another 10x faster than CRT!
$>$ But: (good) kd-trees are (too) costly to build...

## Ray Tracing \& Dynamic Scenes

> SIGGRAPH ‘05: Dynamic Scenes huge problem
$>$ Ray tracing has become very fast (MLRT:
~100fps)
$>$ If ray tracing is to ever replace rasterization, it must support dynamic scenes (games...)
$>$ But: All our fast RT algos are for kd-trees...
> ... and kd-trees can't do dynamic scenes ...

## Ray Tracing \& Dynamic Scenes

> SIGGRAPH ‘05: Dynamic Scenes huge problem
$>$ Since then, lots of research
$>$ Lazy kd-tree construction (Razor [Stoll, Mark ‘06])
$>$ Fast BVH and kd-tree construction (yet unpublished)
$>$ Motion decomposition [Günther et al. '06]
$>$ Dynamic BVHs [Wald et al. '06, Lauterbach et al. '06]
> Hybrid BVH/kd-trees [Woop ‘06, Havran ‘06, Wachter ‘06, ...]
$>$ Coherent Grid Traversal [Wald et al. '06]

## Using grids for dynamics - Where's the problem ?

$>$ 2005: Grid too slow to traverse (vs kd-tree)...
> Fact: Fast RT needs "packets" \& "frusta" concepts
> Traverse multiple packets over same node of DS
$>$ Rather simple for hierarchical data structures...
$>$ Test both children in turn for overlap w/ packet
$>$ If child overlaps: traverse it, else: skip it.
$>$ (it's as simple as that)
$>\ldots$ but not for grids

## Grids and Packets - Where's the problem ?

$>$ Packets \& grids: "Non-trivial task"
$>$ In which order to test the nodes ? ABCD or ABDC?
$>$ What to do when packet diverges?
$>$ 3DDDA etc break in that case...
$>$ Split diverging packet?
$>$ Quickly degenerates to single-ray traversal...
$>$ Fix by re-merging packets ?
> Non-trivial \& costly ...


## VirginiaTech <br> Invent the Future <br> Coherent Grid Traversal

$>$ First: Transform all rays into "canonical grid space"
$>$ i.e., [0,0,0]-[Nx,Ny,Nz]
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## Coherent Grid Traversal

$>$ Idea: Consider only frustum, not "set of rays"
> Traverse "slice by slice" instead of "cell to cell"
$>$ Pick "major traversal axis" (e.g., max component of 1st ray)
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## Coherent Grid Traversal

$>$ Idea: Consider only frustum, not "set of rays"
> Traverse "slice by slice" instead of "cell to cell"
$>$ For each slice, compute frustum/slice overlap
$>$ Float-to-int gives overlapped cell IDs
$>$ Intersect all cells in given slice
> Loop: incrementally compute next slice's overlap box
>4 additions...

## n

$\longrightarrow$

## Coherent Grid Traversal

$>$ Idea: Consider only frustum, not "set of rays"
> Traverse "slice by slice" instead of "cell to cell"
$>$ For each slice, compute frustum/slice overlap
$>$ Float-to-int gives overlapped cell IDs
$>$ Intersect all cells in given slice
> Loop: incrementally compute next slice's overlap box
>4 additions...


## CGT features

$>$ Expensive setup phase
$>$ Transform rays to canonical grid coordinate system
> Determine major march direction (simple)
$>$ Compute min/max bounding planes (slopes and offsets)
> Compute first and last slice to be traversed (full frustum clip)
$>$ But: Very simple traversal step
$>$ Overlap box update: 4 float additions (1 SIMD instruction)
$>$ Get cell IDs: 4 float-to-int truncations (SIMD...)
$>$ Loop over overlapped cells (avg: 1.5-2 cells per slice)

## Traversal fast, but ...

## Grid usually less efficient than kd-tree
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Grid usually less efficient than kd-tree
First sight: Frustum makes it worse...
$>$ But: Two easy fixes
$>$ Bad culling $\rightarrow$ SIMD Frustum culling in Packet/Tri Isec [Dmitriev et al.]
$>$ Re-intersection: Mailboxing [Haines]

Mailbox detects
re-intersection


## CGT efficiency

$>$ Surprise: Mailboxing \& Frustum culling very effective
$>$ Both standard techniques, both limited success for kd-trees
$>$ Grid \& Frustum: Exactly counter weak points of CGT ...
$>$ "Hand"
$>$ Grid w/o FC \& MB : 14 M ray-tri isecs
$>$ Grid with FC \& MB: . 9 M ray-tri isecs (14x less)
$>$ Kd-tree $\quad: .85 \mathrm{M}$ ray-tri isecs ( $5 \%$ less than grid)
$>$ And: cost indep of \#rays $\rightarrow$ very cheap (amortize)

## Results

## Impact of Method: Compare to single-ray \& kd-tree

$>$ Comparison to single-ray grid
$>$ Fast single-ray traverser, macrocell if advantageous, ...
$\Rightarrow$ Speedup $6.5 x$ to 20.9x, usually $\sim 10 x$
$>$ Comparison to kd-tree
$>$ To OpenRT: $2 x-8 x$ faster (2M Soda Hall: $4.5 x$ )
$>$ To MLRT: $\sim 3 x$ slower (but much less optimized)
$>$ Tests performed on "kd-tree friendly" models

## Overall Performance

> Build time: Usually affordable even on single CPU...
$>$ Traversal results (1024^2, dual 3.2 GHz Xeon PC)
> X/Y: X=raycast only; Y=raytrace+shade+texture+shadows


## Discussion

$>$ Comparison to state-of-the-art BVH or kd-tree
> Somewhat harder to code and "get right" than, e.g., BVH
$>$ Usually somewhat slower ( $\sim 1.5 \mathrm{x}-3 \mathrm{x}$ )
> More susceptible to incoherence \& teapot-in-stadium cases
$>$ Pure frustum tech.: Visits all cells in frustum even if not touched by any ray!
> BUT:
$>$ It works at all ! (Who'd have thought 12m ago ?)
$>\sim 10 x$ faster than single-ray grid
$>$ Benefits better from additional coherence ( $4 x \mathrm{AA}$ at 2 x cost)
$>$ "Maybe" better suited for regular data or special HW (Cell, GPUs)
$>$ Most flexible wrt dynamic $\rightarrow$ no limitation at all

## Conclusion

$>$ Have developed a new technique that
$>$ Makes grid compatible with packets \& frusta
$>$ Is competitive with BVHs and kd-trees
$>$ Most general in handling dynamic scenes
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