

Physically-based simulation

Particle based systems


Reminder - Physically-based particle system

1. Description

Particle is fully described by: Position p , Speed v , Mass m

fundamental quantities: position and linear momentum $P = m v$

Momentum preserved through time when no external forces are applied



2. Evolution

- Fundamental principle of the dynamics

Force applied on particle $F(p, v, t)$

$$\begin{cases} p'(t) = v(t) \\ P'(t) = m v'(t) = F(p, v, t) \end{cases}$$

- Conservation of energy (ex. kinetic energy $(1/2 m v^2)$ +potential energy = const, etc.)
- Lagrangian, or Hamiltonian

Reminder - Physically-based particle system

3. Numerical Solution

ODE (Ordinary Differential Equation) formulated as an **Initial Value Problem**


$$\text{ex. } \begin{cases} p'(t) = v(t) \\ mv'(t) = F(p, v, t) \end{cases}, \quad \text{with } v(0) = v_0, p(0) = p_0$$

- Discretize in time $t^k = k h$, $h = \Delta t = \text{time step}$.
 $\Rightarrow$ Build a discrete numerical solution $p^k = p(t^k)$, $v^k = v(t^k)$.
- We can consider initially the following iterative scheme

$$\begin{cases} v^{k+1} = v^k + h F(p^k, v^k, t^k)/m \\ p^{k+1} = p^k + h v^{k+1} \end{cases}$$

Simple to implement, reasonably OK for simple examples (more details later).


Example : Rigid spheres



System modeling

Particles modeling the center of hard spheres.

- Spheres can collide with surrounding obstacles
- Spheres can collide with each others
- *System*: N particles with position p_i , speed v_i , mass m_i , modeling a sphere of radius r_i .
 - Initial conditions $p_i(0) = p_i^0, v_i(0) = v_i^0$
- *Forces*: Single gravity forces $F_i = m_i g$. Collisions handled by *impulses*.
- *Temporal evolution*: Fundamental principle of dynamics $v_i(t) = p'_i(t), v'_i(t) = g$
- *Numerical solution*
$$\begin{cases} v^{k+1} = v^k + h g \\ p^{k+1} = p^k + h v^{k+1} \end{cases}$$



Collision with a plane


Plane $\mathcal{P}$: parameterized using a point a and its normal n .

$$\{p \in \mathbb{R}^3 \in \mathcal{P} \Rightarrow (p - a) \cdot n = 0\}$$

- Sphere above plane : $(p_i - a) \cdot n > r_i$
- Sphere in collision: $(p_i - a) \cdot n \leq r_i$
- Collision detection algorithm

```
for(int i=0; i<N; ++i)
{
    float detection = dot(p[i]-a, n);
    if (detection <= r[i])
    {
        // ... collision response
    }
}
```

What should we do when a collision is detected



Collision response with plane

Suppose exact contact: $(p_i - a) \cdot n_i = r_i$

Collision response = **Update speed**

Split $v = v_{//} + v_{\perp}$

$$-v_{\perp} = (v \cdot n) n$$


$$-v_{//} = v - (v \cdot n)n$$

New speed

$$v^{new} = \alpha v_{//} - \beta v_{\perp} = \alpha v - (\beta + \alpha) (v \cdot n)n$$


$1 - \alpha \in [0, 1]$ Speed loss in $//$ direction (friction)

$1 - \beta \in [0, 1]$ Speed loss in $\perp$ direction (impact)



Result: Collision response

Applying collision response on speed only



Collision response with plane : position

In real case (discrete time) no exact contact, but penetration $(p_i - a) \cdot n_i < r_i$
 $\Rightarrow$ Need to compute collision response at contact point.

Three possibilities

(1) Correct position in projecting on the
constraint

(+) *Simple to implement*


(-) *Physically incorrect position*

(2) Approximate the correct position


(3) Go backward in to find exact instant of
collision

(+) *Physically correct*

(-) *Computationally heavy (binary search, etc.)*



Result: Projecting position on plane




$$p_i^{new} = p_i + d n$$

$$d = r_i - (p_i - a) \cdot n_i : \text{distance of penetration}$$

Collision between sphere

Given 2 spheres $(p_1, v_1, r_1, m_1), (p_2, v_2, r_2, m_2)$.

Collision when $\|p_1 - p_2\| \leq r_1 + r_2$



Response to collision in speed


$$\begin{cases} v_1^{new} = v_1 - \frac{j}{m_1} u \\ v_2^{new} = v_2 + \frac{j}{m_2} u \end{cases}$$

Rem. If $m_1 = m_2$, spheres switch between their $\perp$ speed

j : impulse (sudden change of momentum)

$$j = 2 \frac{(v_1 - v_2) \cdot u}{\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2}}$$

$$u = \frac{p_1 - p_2}{\|p_1 - p_2\|}$$



Collision response with sphere - Derivation

- Conservation of momentum of the center of mass (COM)

$$m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2 = m_1 v_1^{new} + m_2 v_2^{new}$$

$$\Rightarrow m_2 (v_2^{new} - v_2) = -m_1 (v_1^{new} - v_1) = J, J: \text{the impulse}$$

The impulse is orthogonal to the separating plane between the two surfaces

$$J = j u, u = (p_1 - p_2) / \|p_1 - p_2\|$$

- Conservation of the kinetic energy (elastic collision)

$$1/2 m_1 v_1^2 + 1/2 m_2 v_2^2 = 1/2 m_1 (v_1^{new})^2 + 1/2 m_2 (v_2^{new})^2$$

$$\Rightarrow m_1 v_1^2 + m_2 v_2^2 = m_1 \left(v_1 - \frac{j}{m_1} u \right)^2 + m_2 \left(v_2 + \frac{j}{m_2} u \right)^2$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 = -2 j v_1 \cdot u + \frac{j^2}{m_1} + 2 j v_2 \cdot u + \frac{j^2}{m_2}$$

$$\Rightarrow j = 2 \frac{v_1 - v_2}{1/m_1 + 1/m_2} \cdot u$$

Final result



Reprojection on the contact surface

$$p_1^{new} = p_1 + \frac{m_2}{m_1 + m_2} d u$$

$$p_2^{new} = p_2 - \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2} d u$$

$$d = r_1 + r_2 - \|p_1 - p_2\|$$

Numerical solution of ODE

General formulation

Consider relation given a system of **first order** differential equation

Mechanical systems are often expressed as

- *scalar equation of second order in p*
- *system of first order in (p, v)*

In general, we can write

$$u'(t) = \mathcal{F}(u(t), t)$$

If $\mathcal{F}$ is an affine function in u


$$u'(t) = A(t) u(t) + b(t)$$

When A is constant through time

$$u'(t) = A u(t) + b(t)$$

Example: Free fall under gravity


- Force $F(t) = m g$
- Second order differential equation: $p''(t) = g$
- First order system $\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}}_{u'(t)}'(t) = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} v(t) \\ g \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathcal{F}(u,t)}$
- Linear system $\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}}_{u'(t)}'(t) = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}}_A \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}}_{u(t)}(t) + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g \end{pmatrix}}_{b(t)}$
- Exact solution known: $p(t) = \frac{1}{2} g t^2 + v_0 t + p_0$



Note: variables are vectors - matrix can be expressed by block, or per components.

Example: 1D spring (/Harmonic oscillator)

- Force $F(t) = -k(p(t) - l^0)$, k spring stiffness, l^0 rest length
- Second order differential equation: $m p''(t) + k p(t) = k l^0$



- First order system $\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}}_{u'(t)}'(t) = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} v(t) \\ -k/m(p(t) - l^0) \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathcal{F}(u,t)}$
- Linear system $\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}}_{u'(t)}'(t) = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -k/m & 0 \end{pmatrix}}_A \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}}_{u(t)}(t) + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ k/m l^0 \end{pmatrix}}_b$

- Exact solution known: $p(t) = A \sin(\omega t + \varphi) + l^0$


$$\omega = \sqrt{k/m}, A^2 = (p^0 - l^0)^2 + \left(\frac{v_0}{\omega}\right)^2, \tan(\varphi) = \frac{p^0 - l^0}{v^0/\omega}$$

Example: 3D mass spring

- Force $F(t) = m g - k (\|p(t)\| - l^0) \frac{p(t)}{\|p(t)\|}$, k spring stiffness, l^0 rest length
- Second order differential equation: $m p''(t) = m g - k (\|p(t)\| - l^0) \frac{p(t)}{\|p(t)\|}$

- First order system $\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}}_{u'(t)}'(t) = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} v(t) \\ g - k/m (\|p(t)\| - l^0) \frac{p(t)}{\|p(t)\|} \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathcal{F}(u,t)}$

- Not linear
- No simple explicit solution



Existence of solution

Solving the physical system = Solving the **Initial Value Problem** (IVP)

- Find the solution of $u'(t) = \mathcal{F}(u, t), t \geq 0$
- With initial condition $u(t = 0) = u_0$


Cauchy-Lipschitz (/Picard-Lindelof) theorem states that

If $\mathcal{F}$ is Lipschitz with respect to u and continuous with respect to t

Then there exists a unique solution $u(t)$.

The solution is called the **integral curve** of the IVP.

- $\mathcal{F}$ can be seen as a vector field
(Vector field in 6D for $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3, v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$)
- Solution is a path along this vector field passing by u_0



Solving the ODE exactly

Equation is linear

Homogeneous, constant coefficients

$$u'(t) = A u(t), u(0) = u_0$$
$$\Rightarrow u(t) = u_0 \exp(A t)$$

Non-Homogeneous, constant coefficients

$$u'(t) = A u(t) + b(t), u(0) = u_0$$
$$\Rightarrow u(t) = u_0 \exp(A t) + \exp(A t) \int_{t'=0}^t b(t') \exp(-A t') dt'$$

Homogeneous, variable coefficients

$$u'(t) = A(t) u(t), u(0) = u_0$$
$$\Rightarrow \text{No closed-form solution in the general case}$$

- Rem. Unfortunately, in general, $u(t)$ is **not** $u_0 \exp\left(\int_0^t A(t') dt'\right)$

Equation is non linear

No general method

$\Rightarrow$ Numerical approaches are required most of the time

Numerical solution

1st order Explicit Euler

Naive numerical scheme: Approximation of the derivative

$$\frac{u^{k+1} - u^k}{h} = \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

$$\Rightarrow u^{k+1} = u^k + h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

In the linear case

$$u^{k+1} = (\mathbf{I} + h \mathbf{A}) u^k + h b^k$$

Pro : very easy to implement

Is u^k a good approximation of the true solution $\tilde{u}(t^k)$?

Explicit Euler - study case


Free fall under gravity

- True solution $\tilde{u}(k h) = p_0 + (k h)v_0 + \frac{(k h)^2}{2} g$

- Numerical scheme: $\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & h \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^k + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ h g \end{pmatrix}$

- Numerical solution: $p^k = p_0 + k h v_0 + \frac{k(k-1)}{2} h^2 g$

$\Rightarrow$ **Not exact** : Error $e^k = |u^k - \tilde{u}(k h)| = \frac{g}{2} k h^2$



red: true solution


blue: numerical solution

Explicit Euler - study case

1D spring

- True solution: permanent oscillation

- Numerical scheme:
$$\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & h \\ -K/m h & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^k + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ K/m h l^0 \end{pmatrix}$$



red: true solution

red: numerical solution

- Numerical solution diverge to ∞
- Worse than bad accuracy for Graphics

Explicit Euler - study case

1D spring: Analysis of the system energy

- Energy $E = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{K}{2}(p - l^0)^2$

$$E^{k+1} = \frac{1}{2}m \left(-\frac{K}{m}\Delta t (p^k - l^0) + v^k \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}K(p^k + \Delta t v^k - l^0)^2$$

$$E^{k+1} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}m(v^k)^2 + \frac{1}{2}K(p^k - l^0)^2}_{E^k} + \frac{1}{2} \left[\underbrace{\frac{K^2}{m}(\Delta t)^2(p^k - l^0)^2}_{>0} - \underbrace{2K\Delta t(p^k - l^0)v^k}_{=0} + \underbrace{K(\Delta t)^2(v^k)^2}_{>0} \right]$$

$$E^{k+1} = E^k + \epsilon (\Delta t)^2, \epsilon > 0$$

$\Rightarrow$ gain of energy

$\Rightarrow$ divergence

Accuracy of a numerical method - general definition

- Define the **local truncation error** τ :

Error accumulated during one step, assuming perfect knowledge of the true solution

$$\tau_k = \|\tilde{u}(t^k) - u^k\|, \text{ assuming } u^{k-1} = \tilde{u}(t^{k-1})$$

- A numerical scheme is said to be accurate of order k , if its local truncation error is in $\mathcal{O}(h^{k+1})$.

Explicit Euler is of order 1, at every step we add an error in $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$.

Stability of a numerical method - general definition

- Classical stability of a method studied on $u'(t) = \lambda u(t)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.
 - The true solution $\tilde{u}(t) = \exp(\lambda t)$ converge if $\Re_e(\lambda) \leq 0$.
 - For linear system, λ refers to eigenvalues of A .
 - For non linear system, λ refers to eigenvalues of the Jacobian of $\mathcal{F}$
- A numerical method is *unconditionnaly stable* if $\Re_e(\lambda) \leq 0 \Rightarrow$ stable discrete solution.
- Otherwise, it is conditionnally stable/unstable.
- Region of stability: Set of conditions on λ such that the discrete solution doesn't diverge.

Rem.

- A numerical solution can diverge even when the true ODE solution converge when using unstable numerical method.
- Converseley, a numerical solution can converge even when the true ODE solution diverge when using stable numerical method.
- Stability ! = Accuracy.

Stability analysis of explicit Euler


$$u'(t) = \lambda u(t)$$

$$\Rightarrow u^{k+1} = u^k + \lambda u^k \text{ using explicit Euler}$$

$$\Rightarrow u^{k+1} = (1 + \lambda h) u^k$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{Stable if } |1 + \lambda h| \leq 1 \text{ (conditionnal stability)}$$

$$|1/h + \lambda| \leq 1/h: \text{ Interior of a disc centered on } (-1/h, 0) \text{ with radius } 1/h$$



Rem. For 1D elastic spring

$$\lambda = \pm i \sqrt{K/m}$$

$$\Rightarrow |1 + i \sqrt{K/m} h| = \sqrt{1 + K/m h^2} > 1$$

$\Rightarrow$ Explicit euler is always unstable on the elastic spring problem.

Other approach: Implicit method

Other approach: Implicit Euler

Explicit Euler

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

u^k is known to compute u^{k+1}

- In the linear case

$$u^{k+1} = (\mathbf{I} + h \mathbf{A}) u^k + h b(t^k)$$

Implicit Euler

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + h \mathcal{F}(u^{k+1}, t^{k+1})$$

u^{k+1} appears in RHS

$\Rightarrow$ Need to solve $u^{k+1} - h \mathcal{F}(u^{k+1}, t^{k+1}) = u^k$

- In the linear case : solve a linear system

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + h (\mathbf{A} u^{k+1} + b(t^{k+1}))$$

$$\Rightarrow u^{k+1} = (\mathbf{I} - h \mathbf{A})^{-1} (u^k + h b(t^{k+1}))$$

Implicit Euler - study case

Free fall under gravity

- True solution $\tilde{u}(k \Delta t) = p_0 + (k \Delta t)v_0 + \frac{(k \Delta t)^2}{2} g$


- Numerical scheme: $\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -h \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \left(\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^k + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g \end{pmatrix} \right)$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & h \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^k + \begin{pmatrix} h^2 g \\ h g \end{pmatrix}$$

- Numerical solution: $p^k = p_0 + (k \Delta t)v_0 + \frac{k(k+1)}{2} (\Delta t)^2 g$

$\Rightarrow$ Not exact : Error $e^k = |u^k - \tilde{u}(k \Delta t)| = \frac{k}{2} (\Delta t)^2 g$

Same error magnitude than explicit Euler



- red: True solution
- magenta: Implicit Euler
- blue: Explicit Euler

Implicit Euler - study case

1D spring


- True solution: permanent oscillations

- Numerical scheme:
$$\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -h \\ K/m h & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \left(\begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^k + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ K/m h l^0 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$
$$\Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^{k+1} = \frac{1}{1+h^2 K/m} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & h \\ -K/m h & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ v \end{pmatrix}^k + \begin{pmatrix} K/m h^2 l^0 \\ K/m h l^0 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

Eigenvalues of $(I - Ah)^{-1}$ are $\frac{1 \pm i \sqrt{\frac{K}{m}} h}{1 + \frac{K}{m} h^2}$

$$\Rightarrow \left| \frac{1 \pm i \sqrt{\frac{K}{m}} h}{1 + \frac{K}{m} h^2} \right| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{K}{m} h^2}} < 1 \Rightarrow \text{always converge}$$

Even if the true solution oscillates



Stability analysis of Implicit Euler

What are the general conditions for which $u'(t) = \lambda u(t)$ converge using Implicit Euler ?

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + h \lambda u^{k+1}$$

$$\Rightarrow (1 - h \lambda) u^{k+1} = u^k$$

$$\Rightarrow u^{k+1} = \frac{1}{1 - h \lambda} u^k$$


$$\text{Stability condition: } \left| \frac{1}{1 - h \lambda} \right| \leq 1 \Rightarrow |1 - h \lambda| \geq 1$$

$|1/h - \lambda| \geq 1/h$: exterior of a disc centered on $(1/h, 0)$ with radius $1/h$

$\Rightarrow$ Fully enclose $\mathbb{R}_e(\lambda) \leq 0$

$\Rightarrow$ Implicit euler is unconditionally stable

Rem. May converges even when the true solution does not.



Comparison Explicit Euler / Implicit Euler

Explicit Euler

- $u^k = u^k + h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$
- $u^k = (\mathbf{I} + h \mathbf{A}) u^k + h b(t^k)$
- Accuracy: 1st Order
- Stability:
 - Conditional $|1 + h\lambda| \geq 1$
 - Solution to spring model diverges

Implicit Euler

- $u^{k+1} = u^k + h \mathcal{F}(u^{k+1}, t^{k+1})$
- $u^k = (\mathbf{I} - h \mathbf{A})^{-1} (u^k + h b(t^{k+1}))$
- Accuracy: 1st Order
- Stability:
 - Unconditionnaly stable
 - Solution to spring model converge to l^0

Higher order method

Higher accuracy can be achieved using Taylor expansion.

$$\text{ex. } u^{k+1} = u^k + h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k) + \frac{h^2}{2} \frac{d\mathcal{F}}{dt}(u^k, t^k)$$

- Second order accurate: **2nd order explicit Euler**
 - Can achieve arbitrary accuracy.
 - In practice: computing derivatives of $\mathcal{F}$ is complex.
- $\Rightarrow$ Not often used

Runge-Kutta methods

Runge-Kutta numerical methods allow to

- Reach higher order accuracy
- Only involve knowledge of $\mathcal{F}$, without its derivatives
- Involves several evaluation of $\mathcal{F}$ at various points

2nd order Runge-Kutta: RK2

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + \frac{1}{2} (k_1 + k_2)$$

$$k_1 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

$$k_2 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k + k_1, t^k + h)$$

Accuracy, stability ?

Computing Accuracy

Reminder: Local truncation error

$$\tau_k = \|\tilde{u}(t^k + h) - u(t^k + h)\|$$

Assuming true solution at time t_k : $\tilde{u}(t^k) = u(t^k)$ (and all its derivatives).

General methodology to compute accuracy

- (1) Compute Taylor expansion of the numerical scheme
 - Express $u(t^k + h)$ at position (u^k, t^k)
- (2) Compute Taylor expansion of the exact differential equation
 - Express $\tilde{u}(t^k + h)$ at position (u^k, t^k) , given $\tilde{u}'(t^k) = \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$
- (3) Compare both expressions

RK2 - Accuracy

(1) Compute Taylor expansion of the numerical scheme

$$\text{RK2 definition: } u(t^k + h) = u^k + \frac{1}{2}(k_1 + k_2)$$

$$k_1 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

$$k_2 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k + k_1, t^k + h)$$

$$\Rightarrow k_2 = h \left(\mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k) + k_1 \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u}(u^k, t^k) + h \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t}(u^k, t^k) + \mathcal{O}(h^2) \right) \quad (\text{differential on } k_1 \text{ and on } h)$$

$$\Rightarrow k_2 = h\mathcal{F} + h^2 \mathcal{F} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u} + h^2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{O}(h^3) \quad (\text{dropping parameters } (u^k, t^k))$$

$$u(t^k + h) = u^k + \frac{1}{2} \left[h\mathcal{F} + \left(h\mathcal{F} + h^2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u} \mathcal{F} + h^2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t} + \mathcal{O}(h^3) \right) \right]$$

$$\Rightarrow u(t^k + h) = u^k + h\mathcal{F} + \frac{h^2}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u} \mathcal{F} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t} \right) + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$$

RK2 - Accuracy

(2) Compute Taylor expansion of the exact differential equation

$$\tilde{u}(t^k + h) = \tilde{u}(t^k) + h \tilde{u}'(t^k) + \frac{h^2}{2} \tilde{u}''(t^k) + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$$

Assuming exact solution at t^k : $\tilde{u}^{(n)}(t^k) = u^{(n)}(t^k)$ + Injecting the ODE relation $u'(t^k) = \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{u}(t^k + h) = u(t^k) + h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k) + \frac{h^2}{2} \frac{d\mathcal{F}}{dt}(u^k, t^k) + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$$

$$\Rightarrow \tilde{u}(t^k + h) = u(t^k) + h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k) + \frac{h^2}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u}(u^k, t^k) u'(t^k) + \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t}(u^k, t^k) \right) + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$$

$$\text{Drop parameter } (u^k, t^k) \Rightarrow \tilde{u}(t^k + h) = u^k + h \mathcal{F} + \frac{h^2}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u} \mathcal{F} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial t} \right) + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$$

(3) Compare both expressions

$$\tau_k = \|\tilde{u}(t^k + h) - u(t^k + h)\| = \mathcal{O}(h^3)$$

$\Rightarrow$ **RK2 is 2nd order accurate**

RK2 - Stability

Study $u'(t) = \lambda u(t) \Rightarrow \mathcal{F}(u, t) = \lambda u(t)$

$$- k_1 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k) = h \lambda u^k$$

$$- k_2 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k + k_1, t^k + h) = h \lambda (u^k + h \lambda u^k) = (h \lambda + h^2 \lambda^2) u^k$$

$$\Rightarrow u^{k+1} = u^k + \frac{1}{2} (k_1 + k_2)$$


$$\Rightarrow u^{k+1} = \left(1 + h \lambda + \frac{h^2}{2} \lambda^2\right) u^k$$

$$\text{Stability condition } \left|1 + h \lambda + \frac{h^2}{2} \lambda^2\right| \leq 1$$

$\Rightarrow$ RK2 is conditionnaly stable (explicit method)

More stable than explicit Euler

(Still unstable for oscillatory 1D spring)



Other Runge-Kutta methods

Midpoint method (2nd order accuracy)

$$k_1 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

$$k_2 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k + k_1/2, t^k + h/2)$$

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + h k_2$$

RK4 (Classical Runge-Kutta)

$$k_1 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

$$k_2 = h \mathcal{F}\left(u^k + \frac{k_1}{2}, t^k + \frac{h}{2}\right)$$


$$k_3 = h \mathcal{F}\left(u^k + \frac{k_2}{2}, t^k + \frac{h}{2}\right)$$

$$k_4 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k + k_3, t^k + h)$$

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + \frac{1}{6}(k_1 + 2k_2 + 2k_3 + k_4)$$

RK4 - Case study

- Rk4 conditionally stable for oscillating spring
 - Not permanent oscillations: Slight decrease of magnitude through time*
- Large improvement of accuracy compared to implicit Euler



$h = 0.2$, error rk4 $\simeq 10^{-4}$

- red: true solution

- black: rk4

- magenta: implicit Euler

$$\text{Stability region: } \left| 1 + h\lambda + \frac{h^2}{2}\lambda^2 + \frac{h^3}{6}\lambda^3 + \frac{1}{24}h^4\lambda^4 \right| \leq 1$$


In the case of oscillating spring: $\lambda = i\sqrt{K/m} = i\omega$

$$\text{Stable if } \left| 1 + ih\omega - \frac{h^2}{2}\omega^2 - i\frac{h^3}{6}\omega^3 + \frac{h^4}{24}\omega^4 \right| \leq 1$$

$$\Rightarrow 1 - \frac{h^6\omega^6}{72} + \frac{h^8\omega^8}{576} \leq 1$$

$$\Rightarrow h^6\omega^6(h^2\omega^2 - 8)/576 \leq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow h \leq \frac{2^{3/2}}{\omega} = \frac{2^{3/2}}{\sqrt{K/m}} \simeq \frac{2.8}{\sqrt{K/m}}$$



Dormand Prince (ode45)

$$k_1 = h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

$$k_2 = h \mathcal{F}\left(u^k + \frac{1}{5}k_1, t^k + \frac{1}{5}h\right)$$

$$u_5^{k+1} = u^k + h \left(\frac{35}{384}k_1 + \frac{500}{1113}k_3 + \frac{125}{192}k_4 - \frac{2187}{6784}k_5 + \frac{11}{84}k_6 \right)$$

$$k_3 = h \mathcal{F}\left(u^k + \frac{3}{40}k_1 + \frac{9}{40}k_2, t^k + \frac{3}{10}h\right)$$

$$u_4^{k+1} = u^k + h \left(\frac{5179}{57600}k_1 + \frac{7571}{16695}k_3 + \frac{393}{640}k_4 - \frac{92097}{339200}k_5 + \frac{187}{2100}k_6 + \frac{1}{40}k_7 \right)$$

$$k_4 = h \mathcal{F}\left(u^k + \frac{44}{45}k_1 - \frac{56}{15}k_2 + \frac{32}{9}k_3, t^k + \frac{4}{5}h\right)$$

$$k_5 = h \mathcal{F}\left(u^k + \frac{19372}{6561}k_1 - \frac{25360}{2187}k_2 + \frac{64448}{6561}k_3 - \frac{212}{729}k_4, t^k + \frac{8}{9}h\right)$$

$$k_6 = h \mathcal{F}\left(u^k + \frac{9017}{3168}k_1 - \frac{355}{33}k_2 + \frac{46732}{5247}k_3 + \frac{49}{176}k_4 - \frac{5103}{18656}k_5, t^k + h\right)$$

$$k_7 = h \mathcal{F}\left(u^k + \frac{35}{384}k_1 + \frac{500}{1113}k_3 + \frac{125}{192}k_4 - \frac{2187}{6784}k_5 + \frac{11}{84}k_6, t^k + h\right)$$

u_5^{k+1} is 5th order, u_4^{k+1} is 4th order $\Rightarrow$ Automatic error estimation for adaptive time steps.

Embedded method

[J. Dormand, P. Prince. A family of embedded Runge-Kutta formulae. J. of Computation and Applied Mathematics, 1980].

Symplectic methods / semi-implicit

Introduction to symplectic methods

Standard approaches trade-off

- Explicit methods: (+) Simple to compute, (-) limited stability
- Implicit methods: (-) Hard to compute (especially on non linear functions), (+) very stable
- Oscillatory systems are not easy to model
 - (-) Numerical solution either diverge or converge.

Symplectic approach

- *Remark:* Mechanical systems have position and speed variables
 - Derivative of position is linear w/r speed
 - Derivative of speed is more complex (forces - non linear)
- ⇒ *General idea:* separate treatment of speed and position

Semi-implicit:

- Implicit scheme for position p^{k+1} (linear part)
 - Explicit scheme for speed v^{k+1} (non linear part)
- ⇒ In practice: use speed v^{k+1} to evaluate p^{k+1} .

Pro

- (+) As simple as explicit method to implement
- (+) Improved stability
- (+) Well adapted to oscillatory systems

Semi implicit method

Simplest semi-implicit method: **Semi-implicit Euler** / **Verlet**

General case

$$v^{k+1} = v^k + h \mathcal{F}_v(p^k, v^k, t^k)$$

$$p^{k+1} = p^k + h \mathcal{F}_p(p^k, v^{k+1}, t^k)$$

Application to classical mechanical cases

$$p'(t) = v(t), m v'(t) = F(p, v, t)$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} v^{k+1} = v^k + h F(p^k, v^k, t^k)/m \\ p^{k+1} = p^k + h v^{k+1} \end{cases}$$

(+) *Trivially easy to convert explicit Euler to semi-implicit Euler*

Expressed using positions only

$$p^{k+1} = p^k + h(v^k + h F(p^k, v^k, t^k))$$

$$p^{k+1} = p^k + h \left(\frac{p^k - p^{k-1}}{h} + h F(p^k, v^k, t^k)/m \right)$$

$$\Rightarrow p^{k+1} = 2 p^k - p^{k-1} + h^2 F(p, v, t)/m$$

1st order accurate (like explicit/implicit Euler) in position and speed.

Stability on oscillatory system

1D spring system: $F(p^k, v^k, t^k) = -K p^k$

$$p^{k+1} = 2p^k - p^{k-1} - h^2 K/m p^k$$

$$\Rightarrow p^{k+1} = (2 - h^2 K/m) p^k - p^{k-1}$$

Stable and permanent oscillation when $h < \frac{2}{\sqrt{K/m}}$

Demonstration

- Study the roots of the associated characteristic equation

- $x^2 + (y - 2)x + 1 = 0$, with $y = h^2 K/m$

- Discriminant $\Delta = y(y - 4)$, with roots $r = \frac{(2-y) \pm \sqrt{y(y-4)}}{2}$

- Two cases:

$\Delta < 0 \Rightarrow y \in]0, 4[: r = \frac{(2-y) \pm i\sqrt{y(4-y)}}{2} \Rightarrow |r| = 1/2 \sqrt{(2-y)^2 + y(4-y)} = 1 \Rightarrow$ Permanent oscillations (stable)

$\Delta \geq 0 \Rightarrow y \leq 0$, or $y \geq 4 : |r| > 1$ Unstable solution

- Finally, stable for $y \in]0, 4[\Rightarrow h^2 K/m < 4 \Rightarrow h < \frac{2}{\sqrt{K/m}}$, and system oscillate permanently

Higher order symplectic

2nd order Velocity Verlet

$$\begin{cases} v^{k+1/2} &= v^k + \frac{h}{2} F(p^k, v^k, t^k)/m \\ p^{k+1} &= p^k + h v^{k+1/2} \\ v^{k+1} &= v^{k+1/2} + \frac{h}{2} F(p^{k+1}, v^{k+1/2}, t^{k+1})/m \end{cases}$$


- Remains stable with permanent oscillation for $h \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{K/m}}$
- Still simple to implement

Example for 1D elastic spring

```
for(int k=0; k<N; ++k) {  
    v = v + h/2 * (-K/m*p);  
    p = p + h*v;  
    v = v + h/2 * (-K/m*p);  
}
```

Comparison between approaches

Small $h = 0.2/\omega$




True solution , *Semi-implicit Euler* , *Velocity Verlet* , *Runge-Kutta RK4*


- RK4 - best behavior (undistinguishable from true solution)

Comparison between approaches

Larger $h = 1.0/\omega$



Temporal evolution of p^k



Temporal evolution of energy

$$E = 1/2m (v^k)^2 + 1/2K(p^k)^2$$

True solution , *Semi-implicit Euler* , *Velocity Verlet* , *Runge-Kutta RK4*

- RK4 loose energy and p^k converge toward l^0
- Symplectic integrator keep oscillating

Summary and extensions

Numerical integration of ODE

General formulation: $u'(t) = \mathcal{F}(u, t)$, $u(t) = (p(t), v(t))$.

Explicit Euler

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + \Delta t \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^k)$$

(+) Easy to implement

(-) Worst scheme in all cases (divergence, low accuracy)

Explicit Runge-Kutta

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + \Delta t \sum_j \alpha_j k_j$$

(+) Good **accuracy**

(+) Efficient to apply

(+/-) Stability OK for non-stiff problem, diverge on stiff problem

(-) Artificial damping for constant energy system

Implicit methods

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + \Delta t \mathcal{F}(u^{k+1}, t^{k+1})$$

(+) Good to deal with **stiff problem** - very stable

(-) Add numerical damping (converge even if solution oscillates)

(-) Hard/computationally costly to apply on non linear problem

Symplectic integrator

$$v^{k+1} = v^k + \Delta t F^k / m$$

$$p^{k+1} = p^k + \Delta t v^{k+1}$$

(+) Handle well constant energy system, preserves energy (Hamiltonian systems)

(+) Simple and efficient to implement

(-) Less accurate than RK

(-) Diverge on stiff problem

Extension - Automatic time stepping

Adjust h to limit errors at each step


(1) Evaluate error in comparing:

- u_1^k computed using one step h
- u_2^k computed using two steps $h/2$.
- $e^k = \|u_1^k - u_2^k\|$

(2) Using embedded method $e^k = \|u_1^k - u_2^k\|$

Update

- $h^{new} = A h$ when $e^k < C_1$, ($A > 1$)
- $h^{new} = h/A$ when $e^k > C_2$



Implicit Euler on non-linear problem

$$u^{k+1} = u^k + h \mathcal{F}(u^{k+1}, t^{k+1})$$

- For high dimensional $\mathcal{F}$ - no explicit known inverse function
- Idea: Linearize $\mathcal{F}$ at u^k , assuming $\|u^{k+1} - u^k\|$ small.

$$\begin{aligned} u^{k+1} &= u^k + h \left(\mathcal{F}(u^k, t^{k+1}) + (u^{k+1} - u^k) \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u}(u^k, t^{k+1}) \right) \\ \Rightarrow \left(\mathbf{I} - h \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u}(u^k, t^{k+1}) \right) u^{k+1} &= \left(\mathbf{I} - h \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u}(u^k, t^{k+1}) \right) u^k + h \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^{k+1}) \\ u^{k+1} &= u^k + \left(\mathbf{I} - h \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u}(u^k, t^{k+1}) \right)^{-1} \mathcal{F}(u^k, t^{k+1}) \end{aligned}$$

- In theory only conditionally stable; In practice: very stable
 - Requires the expression of Jacobian matrix $\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial u}$ - large sparse matrix
 - Requires inversion of a linear system at every steps
- $\Rightarrow$ Used for stable simulation with large time step

Implicit Euler on non-linear problem - particle system

For standard particles systems

- $p^{k+1} = p^k + h v^k$
- $v^{k+1} = v^k + h M^{-1} F(p^{k+1}, v^{k+1})$

With M the diagonal matrix of particles masses, assuming force F doesn't depends on t .

Linear approximation on force F

$$M v^{k+1} = M v^k + h \left(F(p^k, v^k) + \underbrace{(p^{k+1} - p^k)}_{h v^{k+1}} \frac{\partial F}{\partial p}(p^k, v^k) + (v^{k+1} - v^k) \frac{\partial F}{\partial v}(p^k, v^k) \right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(M - h \frac{\partial F}{\partial v} - h^2 \frac{\partial F}{\partial p} \right) v^{k+1} = \left(M - h \frac{\partial F}{\partial v} \right) v^k + h F(p^k, v^k)$$

[D. Baraff, A. Witkin. Large steps in Cloth Simulation. ACM SIGGRAPH 98]

Position based dynamics (PBD)

Non-linear constraints (non penetration, constant length, etc)

- can make explicit integration diverging (arbitrary gain of energy)
- are hard to integrate within implicit integrators

PBD - Use symplectic integrator expressed using position only

- Speed is computed implicitly as $(p^{k+1} - p^k)/h$
- Handle constraints using explicit projection of positions.

PBD algorithm

For **all** k

Integrate position (without constraints) $p[k+1] = \text{integrator}(p[k], p[k-1], t)$

For **all** constraints

Project $p[k+1]$ on constraints

Compute new speed **if** needed $v[k+1] = (p[k+1] - p[k])/h$

(+) Unconditionally stable even for stiff constraints

(+) Simple to implement

(-) Low accuracy, no energy preserving

Popular in Computer Graphics

[M. Muller et al. Position Based Dynamics. VRIPHYS 2006]

Extensions: XPBD, Projective dynamics, ...

Physically-based simulation

Deformable models

Material model

Elasticity: Shape goes back toward its original rest position when external forces are removed.

- Purely elastic models don't lose energy when deformed (potential $\leftrightarrow$ kinetic)



Plasticity: Opposite of elasticity. Plastic material don't come back to their original shape (/change their rest position during deformation).

- Ductile material - can allow large amount of plastic deformation without breaking (plastic)
- Brittle - Opposite (glass, ceramics)

Viscosity: Resistance to flow (usually for fluid, ex. honey)

In reality


- *Elasto-plastic materials:* Allow elastic behavior for small deformation, and plastic at larger one.
- *Visco-elastic materials:* Elastic properties with delay.



Modeling elastic shapes with particles

Spring mass systems


- Particles (position, speed, mass): samples on shape
- Springs : link closed-by particles in the reference shape




1D curve structure



2D surface structure



3D volume structure






Spring structure

How to model spring connectivity ?

- **Structural springs:** 1-ring neighbors springs ($\simeq$ mesh edges)




(+) Limit elongation/contraction, (-) Allows shearing, and bending



$\Rightarrow$ Add extra springs connectivity

- **Shearing springs:** Diagonal links


- **Bending springs:** 2-ring neighborhood



Cloth Simulation

Mass-spring cloth simulation

- Particles are sampled on a $N \times N$ grid.
 - Each particle has a mass m ($m_{cloth} = N^2 m$)
- Set structural, shearing and bending springs.



Forces

- On each particle: gravity + drag + spring forces

- $$F_i(p, v, t) = m_i g - \mu v_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_i} K_{ij} \left(\|p_j(t) - p_i(t)\| - L_{ij}^0 \right) \frac{p_j(t) - p_i(t)}{\|p_j(t) - p_i(t)\|}$$


- $\mathcal{V}_i$: neighborhood of particle i

- L_{ij}^0 : rest length of spring ij

Associated ODE $\forall i, \begin{cases} p'_i(t) = v_i(t) \\ v'_i(t) = F_i(p, v, t)/m_i \end{cases}$


Note on Mass-Spring numerical solution

- Non-linear ODE
- Large K_{ij} : good length preservation, but stiff ODE
⇒ divergence of explicit schemes.
- Avoid explicit Euler (divergence)
- Semi-implicit Euler/Verlet works fine for low K_{ij}
Semi-implicit Euler + PBD allows simple integration + stable stiff springs
[Muller et al. [PBD](#), [Inextensible clothing in Computer Games](#)]
- RK4 more accurate (but higher complexity than Verlet)
- Implicit Euler : requires linearization, but very stable



Collisions

- Simple approach : Handled as collision between particles and shapes
 - (+) Simple and efficient
 - (-) Collision may still appears within a triangle
- ⇒ Exhaustive approach: point-face + edge-edge



Limitation of mass spring model and continuous model

- Does mass-spring system converge toward a unique solution when sampling increase ?

⇒ No :(

Depends on the connectivity → bad for physical accuracy

Corollary

- Mass-springs work well for grid-mesh structure (draping)
- Less for arbitrary triangular meshes

1st improvment: Change toward energy formulation for bending springs (limits locking effect)

$$F = \frac{\partial E}{\partial p}$$

$$E = \frac{1}{2} K L \kappa^2, \kappa: \text{curvature}$$

[Cho et al, Stable but Responsive Cloth, ACM SIGGRAPH 2002]





Triangle as continuous elements

- Defining Bending Energy between triangles

$$- W_B(x) = \sum_{\text{edges } e} (\theta_e - \theta_e^0) \frac{\|e^0\|}{h_e^0}$$


[E. Grinspun et al., Discrete Shells, SCA 2003]

(or expressed using forces in [R. Bridson et al., SCA 2003])





- Going toward full FEM numerical resolution

- B. Thomaszewski et al. [SCA 2006], [VRIPHYS 2008], [EG 2009].




Clothing

- Stitch 2D patterns together to generate full cloth
- Cloths are developable material (preserve isometry to their 2D patterns)



[Thalman et al. 2002]



[Umetani et al., 2011]

Advanced collision



Self collision

- Handled as moving point in collision with moving triangle
- Given a triangle $P_1(t)P_2(t)P_3(t)$ and a point $P(t)$, with $P_k(t) = P_k(t_0) + v_{P_k}(t)$
- $P(t_i)$ in collision with triangle $P_1(t_i)P_2(t_i)P_3(t_i)$ at time t_i if
$$\exists(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in [0, 1]^3, P(t_i) = \alpha P_1(t_i) + \beta P_2(t_i) + \gamma P_3(t_i)$$
$$\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1$$
$$(P(t_i) - P_1(t_i)) \times n(t_i) = 0, n(t_i) \text{ normal to the triangle}$$

(necessary condition to help computation)

[X. Provot. Collision and self-collision handling in cloth model dedicated to design garments. Graphics Interface 1997.]

[R. Bridson et al. Robust Treatment of Collisions, Contact and Friction for Cloth Animation. ACM SIGGRAPH 2002]



Advanced collision

Multiple collisions

- *Solving each collisions separately may lead to new ones without converging to collisions free state*

⇒ Rigid Impact Zone - Incremental approach


1. Detected collisions are grouped by proximity (same face, edge, etc)
2. Each group is handled as collision between rigid body
3. Treated groups are merged together.
4. Iterate at step 1 with larger groups

- Recently handled on the GPU

[Tang et al., I-Cloth: Incremental Collision Handling for GPU-Based Interactive Cloth Simulation, ACM SIGGRAPH Asia 2018]

- Robust generic approach using tetrahedrization of air volume

[Muller et al., Air Meshes for Robust Collision Handling, ACM SIGGRAPH 2015]



[Provot et al., 97]







Untangling cloths

Specific problem of collision when no previous state is known.

How to solve collision ?

- Geometrical displacement + penalty based forces
ex. Optimize intersection contour minimization
[Baraf et al. 2002], [Volino et al 2006]

- Implicit surfaces
[Buffet et al. 2019]



Wrinkles in cloth modeling

Obtaining cloths wrinkles requires high resolution simulations

(-) Computationally costly, difficult to parameterized, lack of control



Idea: Separate low resolution cloth simulation from local wrinkles appearance

- Cloth is a developable material (cannot compress/stretch w/r 2D pattern)
- Detect compression on numerical surface → add wrinkles



Model wrinkles using







- Texture deformation [Hadap et al., IEEE Proc. on Viz. 1999]
- Subdivision mesh with PBD length constraints [Muller and Chentanez, SCA 2010]
- Example data and ML [Wang et al. ACM SIGGRAPH 2010]
- Strain to generate geometrical wrinkles [Rohmer et al., ACM SIGGRAPH Asia 2011]




Geometrical wrinkles from strain

Compute strain on low resolution mesh

$$F = [e'_1 - e_1 \quad e'_2 - e_2], \quad \sigma = F F^T, \quad (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \text{Spectrum}(\sigma)$$






- Analyse main direction of compression ($0 < \min(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) < 1$) as a vector field
- Generate stream lines $\rightarrow$ *wrinkle curves*



Geometrical wrinkles from strain

Create geometrical deformation using
implicit surfaces

Allow smooth blending between wrinkles



Animating fluids

Fluid in grid: Stable Fluids

Consider a rectangular grid filled with fluid

Direct approach: Solve Navier-Stokes equation using finite differences on the grid.

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla p + f - u \cdot \nabla u + \nu \Delta u$$


(-) Stability hard to achieve, loose advection details on the grid. (ex. [\[Foster and Metaxas, 97\]](#))

Well known improvement: **Jos Stam, Stable Fluids, ACM SIGGRAPH 1999**

- First idea: get rid of explicit pressure expression
 - Pressure p models incompressible behavior.
 - Project velocity u into divergence free field at each step instead of tracking pressure values.



$$\Rightarrow \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = P(f - u \cdot \nabla u + \nu \Delta u)$$

P projection operator such that $\text{div}(u) = 0$




Stable fluids method

General approach: split each component



- Advection: Method of characteristics (use explicit position, trace back their trajectory in time)
- Diffusion: Use implicit finite differences
- Project: Poisson solver



Jos Stam, Real-Time Fluid Dynamics for Games, 2003

Stable fluids example

?


Level Set methods introduction

Eulerian models (ex. stable fluids) do not handle natively free boundaries such as fluid/air.

Idea: Track surface boundary using implicit surfaces

- Encode fluid volume by $\Omega = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^3, \varphi(p) = 0\}$, φ stored within a 3D grid.
- Solve Navier-Stokes equation within Ω
- Deform fluid volume using implicit surface deformation $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla \varphi = 0$ (advection)

Introduced by Ronald Fedkiw, Nick Foster, Stanley Osher (ex. [\[Practical Animation of Liquids, ACM SIGGRAPH 2001\]](#))




Particles Level Set

Limitation of level sets: smoothing and loss of volume from grid interpolation

⇒ Use of **Particle Level Set Method**

- [D. Enright et al. Hybrid Particle Level Set Method for Improved Interface Capturing. J. Comp. Physics 2001]
- [D. Enright et al. Animation and Rendering of Complex Water Surfaces, ACM SIGGRAPH 2002]



0:00 / 0:21

0:00 / 0:13

D. Enright et al. (8 min / frames)

Free surface water

Specific lightweight models for free surface of ocean-like water

Often based on **Shallow water equation** (neglect depth velocity compo

[A. Fournier, W. T. Reeves. A simple Model of Ocean Waves, ACM SIGGRAPH 1986]

[D. Hinsinger et al. Interactive Animation of Ocean Waves. SCA 2002]

[Jerry Tessendorf, Simulating Ocean Water, ACM SIGGRAPH Course Notes 2004]




ex. *Trochoid models*

Particles following circular trajectories, waves propagates

$$x(u, v, t) = u + e^{k v} \sin(k(u + c t)) / k$$

$$x(u, v, t) = v - e^{k v} \cos(k(u + c t)) / k$$


$$k = 2\pi \lambda$$



Used for procedural ocean modeling


(+) Simple and scalable

(-) Interaction with other objects



[Manteaux et al. Space-time sculpting of liquid animation, MIG 2016]

Free surface water - Example



size	256
choppiness	1.5
windX	10
windY	10
sunDirectionX	-1
sunDirectionY	1
sunDirectionZ	1
exposure	0.35
Close Controls	

Animating fluids

SPH

General SPH idea

Pure Lagrangian: particles can follow surface deformation precisely

But how to evaluate values (density, speed, etc) between particles ?

Pure Eulerian: Values are known at fixed point in space

But how to follow deformation of surface boundaries ?

⇒ SPH Idea:

- Reconstruct surface from arbitrary samples in space using convolution
- Allow samples to be advected with the fluid

(+) Particle based model: can interact with other shapes

(+) Handle naturally arbitrary boundaries


(+) Scalable

Initial used in Astronomy

[L. Lucy, A numerical approach to the testing of the fission hypothesis. The Astronomical Journal, 1977.]



Fluid body



Set of fluid parcels

$\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, m, V, \rho, p$

Sampling and density

Arbitrary quantity A at position p can be expressed as a convolution

$$A(p) = (A \star \delta)(p) = \int_{\Omega} A(q) \delta(p - q) \, dq$$

First approximation: $\delta \rightarrow W_h$


$$A(p) \simeq \int_{\Omega} A(q) W_h(p - q) \, dq$$

W_h smooth kernel with limited support (/test functions)

W_h converge to δ when $h \rightarrow 0$

$$\Rightarrow \forall h, \int_{\Omega} W_h(p) \, dp = 1$$

Classical *low pass* reconstruction (/average) for functions around p





Model

Second approximation : discrete sampling of A at position p_i .

$$A(p) = \int_{\Omega} A(q) W_h(p - q) dq$$

$$A(p) = \sum_i A(p_i) W_h(p - p_i) V_i$$

V_i is the small volume (/area in 2D) associated to the i th samples.



SPH Model for fluid

For a fluid: $m_i = \rho_i V(p_i)$


- m_i total mass associated to the volume at sample i
- ρ_i local density (supposed constant over the volume)

- General SPH formulation for a quantity A at position p

$$A(p) = \sum_i \frac{m_i}{\rho_i} A(p_i) W_h(p - p_i)$$

- Special case of the density

$$\rho(p) = \sum_i m_i W_h(p - p_i)$$



SPH Relations

- Local value at position p

$$A(p) = \sum_i \frac{m_i}{\rho_i} A(p_i) W_h(p - p_i)$$

- Gradient (symmetric) at position p

$$\nabla A(p) = \rho(p) \sum_i m_i \left(\frac{A(p)}{\rho^2} + \frac{A(p_i)}{\rho_i^2} \right) \nabla W_h(p - p_i)$$

- Laplacien (symmetric) at position p

$$\triangle A(p) = 2 \sum_i \frac{m_i}{\rho_i} \frac{(p - p_i) \cdot (A(p) - A(p_i))}{\|p - p_i\|^2 + \epsilon h^2} \nabla W_h(p - p_i), \epsilon = 10^{-2}$$

Note: derivatives are symetrized such that $\nabla A(p_i)/p_j = \nabla A(p_j)/p_i$

See for instance [\[Desbrun and Cani, EGCAS 96\]](#)

SPH for Navier Stokes

Continuous case

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = g - \frac{\nabla p}{\rho} + \nu \Delta v$$

Using discrete SPH formulation at position p_i

$$v'_i(t) = g - \sum_j m_j \left(\frac{p_i}{\rho_i^2} + \frac{p_j}{\rho_j^2} \right) \nabla W_h(p_i - p_j) + 2\nu \sum_j \frac{m_j}{\rho_j} \frac{(p_i - p_j) \cdot (v_i - v_j)}{\|p_i - p_j\|^2 + \epsilon h^2} \nabla W_h(p_i - p_j)$$

- Pressure given by the Tait equation of state

$$p(p) = K \left(\frac{\rho(p)}{\rho_0} - 1 \right)^\alpha, \rho > \rho_0$$


ρ_0 : rest density 1000 Kg/m^3 , $\alpha \simeq 7$ for water, K stiffness constant.

- Density expressed using SPH evaluation $\rho(p_i) = \sum_j m_j W_h(p_i - p_j)$

SPH Kernel

- Smooth kernel


$$W_h(p) = \frac{315}{64 \pi h^3} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\|p\|}{h} \right)^2 \right)^3, \quad \|p\| \leq h$$



- Spiky kernel


Can give better results when used to compute pressure force (avoid particles cluster)

$$W_h(p) = \frac{15}{\pi h^3} \left(1 - \frac{\|p\|}{h} \right)^3, \quad \|p\| \leq h$$




- [Desbrun and Cani, Smoothed Particles: A new paradigm for animating highly deformable bodies, EG CAS 1996]
- [M. Muller et al., Particle-Based Fluid Simulation for Interactive Applications, SCA 2003]
- [M. Ihmsen et al., SPH Fluids in Computer Graphics, EG STAR 2014]


SPH examples



Muller 2003



M. Teschner 2012 - 20M particles



SPH extensions

(+) Very versatile (interaction between any deforming shapes)

Not only fluids

(-) Not well understood accuracy

(-) Compressible

[Solenthaler et al., Predictive-Corrective Incompressible SPH, ACM SIGGRAPH 2009]


[Ihmsen et al, Implicit Incompressible SPH, IEEE TVCG 2013]

(-) Limited time step


[Macklin and Muller, Position based Fluids, ACM SIGGRAPH 2013]

(-) Boundaries are hard to handle

[Brand et al., Pressure Boundaries for Implicit Incompressible SPH, ACM TOG 2018]



Bruno Levy






Macklin and Muller

Acceleration structure

SPH based on pair-wise interaction $\Rightarrow$ spatial sorting acceleration structure

- Uniform grid: simple and efficient.
- Verlet lists (wider neighborhood, updated every n steps only)
- List of vertices per cell, hash table for cell storage
- Spatial sorting for cache efficiency



M. Teschner

PIC/FLIP

Mix between particles and grid based approach.



Particles: advection, Grid: forces, pressure, viscosity

Use MAC grid (Marker-and-Cell)

Grid storing velocity on middle-edges, pressure on grid center.


- **PIC** approach - Transfert velocity from grid to particles
- **FLIP** approach - Add velocity difference from grid to particle
- **PIC/FLIP** : blending b/w two approaches

[Y. Zhu and R. Bridson, Animating Sand as a Fluid, ACM SIGGRAPH 2005]



PIC/FLIP Method

- Transfert particle velocity to the MAC grid (Store velocity u^k on grid)
- Evolve velocity on grid (pression, forces, viscosity) excepted advection to u^{k+1}
- Add velocity difference $\Delta u = u^{k+1} - u^k$ to particles using interpolation (FLIP approach)
- Blend particle velocity with interpolated grid velocity (PIC/FLIP)
- Advect particles along grid velocity field (solve ODE)



Character Animation

How to deform/animate character


Idea => Use a **Skeleton**

Animation Skeleton

- Set of frames (position,orientation)
- Describes the non-rigid parts of the characters
its degrees of freedom

Terminology animation skeleton

- **Joint** = A frame
- **Bone** = Segment between two joints




How to deform/animate character

Animating a character

- 1- Animate its skeleton (/posing)
- 2- Deform its *skin* accordingly (= skinning)

Note: Animation Skeleton != Anatomical skeleton



Character Animation

Skeletal Animation

Skeleton structure


Characteristics

- Hierarchical representation

All children follow the transformation of the parent

Need to define a root: usually at the hips/pelvis

- Convenient to express local deformation with respect to the
ex. Rotate knee from 20°



Converting local to global frames/joint coordinates


- With 4x4 matrices M

$$M_{global}^i = M_{global}^{i-1} M_{local}^i$$

- With translation t , rotation R

$$R_{global}^i = R_{global}^{i-1} R_{local}^i$$

$$t_{global}^i = t_{global}^{i-1} + R_{global}^{i-1} t_{local}^i$$



Encoding hierarchical skeleton

- Simplest encoding based on index within vector

```
Geometry=[M0, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5]
```

```
Parent = [-1,0,1,1,0,4]
```

- Convert local coordinates to global coordinates

```
local (Geometry) <- std::vector of rotation (r), translation (p)
```

```
global (Geometry) <- std::vector of rotation (r), translation (p)
```

```
global[0] = local[0];
```

```
for(size_t k=1; k<N; ++k)
```


```
{
```

```
    int parent = Parent[k];
```

```
    global[k].r = global[parent].r * local[k].r;
```

```
    global[k].p = global[parent].r * local[k].p + global[parent].p;
```




```
}
```



Forward kinematics


FK - Forward Kinematics

- Each joint angle is set manually
 - Adapted to set orientation of specific parts
 - Interpolate rotations during animation
- (+) Generates curved trajectory naturally



MiloScerny Animation

KF limits





Inverse Kinematics

IK: Inverse Kinematics


- Describe position (/and orientation) of *end-effectors* (contact, walking, etc)
- Compute joint angles reaching this position

$$p_k = p_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} l_i R_i u_i$$

R_i can be expressed with various rotation parameters (Matrices, Euler angles, axis/angle, quaternions, etc)



IK Example with two bones



[A. Aristidou et al. Inverse Kinematics Techniques
in Computer Graphics: A Survey. STAR EG. 2017.]

In general the general case $p_k = f(\theta_i)$

- Look for $\theta_i = f^{-1}(p_k)$
- f is a non linear function
- There may exists multiple solutions (or none)
- Solutions may exhibits discontinuities
- Closed form solution are not available

Two solutions defined by

$$\cos(\theta_1) = \frac{l_1^2 + x^2 + y^2 - l_2^2}{2l_1 \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}$$

$$\cos(\theta_2) = \frac{l_1^2 + l_2^2 - (x^2 + y^2)}{2l_1 l_2}$$

Inverse Kinematics

Numerical inversion of $p = f(\theta)$, $\theta = (\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{N-1})$.

Consider small step size $p \rightarrow p + \Delta p$

$$\Delta p \simeq \underbrace{\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} \right)}_J \Delta \theta$$


J - Jacobian matrix.

→ Not square ($3 \times N$), not invertible.

Possible solution - **Pseudo inverse**

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\theta = J^+ \Delta p \\ J^+ = J^T (J J^T)^{-1} \end{cases}$$


- Check that $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{J}^+ = \mathbf{I}_d$
- But check that $\Delta\theta = \mathbf{J}^+ \Delta p + (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{J}^+ \mathbf{J}) y$ is also solution, for any vector y .
- y : *Secondary task*



Inverse Kinematics

Example of secondary task use

Center of mass above the sustentation polygon





P. Baerlocher, R. Boulic. An inverse kinematics architecture enforcing an arbitrary number of strict priority levels. TVC 2004.

Inverse Kinematics

Heuristic alternative

ex. FABRIK.


A. Aristidou, J. Lasenby. A fast iterative solver for the Inverse Kinematics problem. Graphical Models 2011



- Very fast, works ok for simple chain
- Doesn't handle global constraints well

Inverse Kinematics

Example



Blending skeleton animation

`three.js` - Skeletal Animation Blending (model from realitymeltdown.com)

camera orbit/zoom/pan with left/middle/right mouse button



Note: crossfades are possible with blend weights being set to (1,0,0), (0,1,0) or (0,0,1)

Motion graphs

Also called Move Trees

- Stores multiple precomputed animation
Manually design, motion capture, etc
- Find optimal transitions between different motions

- [Mizuguchi et al., Data driven motion transitions for interactive games, EG short paper, 2001]
- [Kovar et al., Motion Graphs, ACM SIGGRAPH 2002]
- [Heck and Gleicher, Parametric Motion Graphs, ACM SIGGRAPH 2007]






Controllers

Mix between predefined motions and physics

→ allow user perturbations



- Define target motions
- Use proportional derivative controllers (with feedback loop) to control forces and torques

- [M. Raibert and J. Hodgins. Animation of Dynamic Legged Locomotion, ACM SIGGRAPH 2001]
- [K. Yin et al., SIMBICON: Simple Biped Locomotion Control, ACM SIGGRAPH 2007]



Motion transfert

- Local coordinates mapping from skeletal motions
 - [C. Hecker et al., Real-time Motion Retargeting to Highly Varied User-Created Morphologies, SIGGRAPH 2008] (Spore)
- Including shape morphology
 - [Z. Liu et al., Surface based Motion Retargeting by Preserving Spatial Relationship, MIG 2018]



Animation design

Based on the *Line of Action*

- [Guay et al., The Line of Action: an Intuitive Interface for Expressive Character Posing, ACM SIGGRAPH Asia 2013]
- [Guay et al., Space-time sketching of character animation, ACM SIGGRAPH 2015]
- [Choi et al., SketchiMo: Sketch-Based Motion Editing for Articulated Characters, ACM SIGGRAPH 2016]

0:00 / 1:12

0:00 / 0:27

0:00 / 0:35

Skeletal animation and learning

Reinforcement learning from muscles

[Geijtenbeek et al., Flexible Muscle-Based Locomotion for Bipedal Creatures, ACM TOG 2013]

Learning physics-based controllers

[Won et al. How to Train Your Dragon: Example-Guided Control of Flapping Flight, ACM SIGGRAPH Asia 2017]

Neural networks for character control from large data base of motion capture data

[Holden et al., Phase-Functioned Neural Networks for Character Control, ACM TOG 2017]

0:00 / 1:18

0:00 / 0:38





Character Animation

Skin deformation

Animating skin

Animated character = A Skeleton + a Mesh

- We saw how to pose/animate skeleton
- Objective: How to deform the surrounding mesh given the skeleton



Brute force physically-based modeling



- Model muscles attached to bones
- Simulate muscle deformation using FEM
- Add an elastic skin layer on top of muscles

(+) Detailed dynamic results

(-) Computational time

(-) Tedious to setup and control



[Teran et al., Creating and Simulating Skeletal Muscle from the Visible Human Data Set. IEEE TVCG 2005]



30 muscles, 10×10^6 tetrahedrons



Geometrical approach: Rigid Skinning

- Associate mesh parts rigidly to nearby bone
- Compute vertex deformation using geometry



Geometrical approach: Rigid Skinning

- Associate mesh parts rigidly to nearby bone
- Compute vertex deformation using geometry





$$v_0^{local} = v_1^{local}$$

$$T_0^{-1} v_0 = T_1^{-1} v_1$$

$$v_1 = T_1 T_0^{-1} v_0 = Mv_0$$

Rigid skinning pro/cons

- (+) Skeleton is easy to built
- (+) Skeleton interation is intuitive to model rigid articulations
- (-) Discontinuities



Smooth skinning


Idea: Interpolate positions between associated frames

Ex. middle vertex position of a bending cylinder

$$p = 0.5p_1 + 0.5p_2$$

$$p = 0.5 M_1 p_0 + 0.5 M_2 p_0$$

$$p = (0.5 M_1 + 0.5 M_2) p_0$$



Smooth skinning - formulation



General formula

$$p = \left(\sum_i \omega_i M_i \right) p_0$$

$$p = \left(\sum_i \omega_i T_i (T_i^0)^{-1} \right) p_0$$

ω_i barycentric weights: $0 \leq \omega_i \leq 1$, $\sum_i \omega_i = 1$

Also called **Linear Blend Skinning** (LBS)





Rigid skinning

Smooth skinning (LBS)

Skinning Weights

How to compute skinning weights ?

- Paint them manually
- Automatic computation



Associating bones and skinning weights (or any animation handle) to mesh is called **Rigging**


Linear Blend Skinning

Widely used for character animation (in all modeling/animation software)

- Direct, intuitive control (through skeleton)
- Very efficient (matrix multiplication, GPU)

(-) But has well known defects:

- Artifacts for large angles
- Complex rigging settings



Candy wrapper






Collapsing elbow

Improving LBS

Study cases

- 1- Improving the interpolation
- 2- Preserving a constant volume
- 3- Improving rigidity and avoiding self collisions




1. Skinning Interpolation

Problem: Remember that linear interpolation of rigid deformation matrices may lead to artifacts

Skinning equation $p = \sum_i \omega_i M_i p_0$

$\Rightarrow$ *Linear interpolation of rigid frames (translation + rotation)*

Leads to non rigid deformation



Cannot use directly quaternion (each vertex should have a different center of rotation).

Dual quaternion

Idea: Use of **dual quaternions**

[L. Kavan et al. Geometric Skinning with Approximate Dual Quaternion Blending, ACM TOG 2008]

Dual quaternion = Generalization of quaternion to dual number


- $\hat{q} = q_0 + \epsilon q_\epsilon$
- ϵ : dual number $\epsilon^2 = 0$

dual number commonly used to model infinitesimal quantity (ex. used for automatic differentiation)

A dual quaternion $\hat{q} = q_0 + \epsilon q_\epsilon$ encodes a rigid transformation as a **screw motion**

Screw motion: rotation about an axis followed by a translation in the direction of this axis

- q_0 : pure rotation component
- q_ϵ : encodes translation component (dual part)




Dual quaternion

Given a quaternion q_0 and a translation t , its associated dual quaternion is

$$\hat{q} = q_0 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} q_t q_0, q_t = (t_x, t_y, t_z, 0)$$

Similarly to quaternion: angle/axis correspondance

- $\hat{q} = \cos(\hat{\theta}/2) + \hat{n} \sin(\hat{\theta}/2)$
- $\hat{\theta} = \theta_0 + \epsilon \theta_\epsilon$
 - θ_0 : angle of rotation
 - $\theta_\epsilon = t \cdot n_0$: amount of translation along n_0
- $\hat{n} = n_0 + \epsilon n_\epsilon$
 - n_0 : axis of rotation
 - $n_\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}((n_0 \times t) \cotan(\theta_0/2) + t) \times n_0$: called the moment of the rotation axis.




Dual Quaternion Skinning (DQS)


- Encode rigid transformation M into dual quaternion $\hat{q}_i$
- Perform blending in the dual quaternion space (ScLERP)

$$\hat{q} = \sum_i \omega_i \hat{q}_i$$


- Normalize resulting dual quaternion $\hat{q}_n = \hat{q} / \|\hat{q}\|$
- Apply $\hat{q}_n$ to p_0




LBS



DQS



LBS




DQS

Dual Quaternion VS LBS


Dual quaternion

- (+) Fully solves *candy wrapper* artifact
- (+) Almost as efficient as LBS
- (-) But may create artificial bulge

Not always preferred to LBS




LBS



DQS

2. Volume preserving skinning

- Optimization based model using tetrahedrons
[K. Zhou et al., Large Mesh Deformation Using the Volumetric Graph Laplacien, ACM SIGGRAPH 2005]
- Specific deformer
[A. Angelidis and K. Singh, Kinodynamic skinning using volume-preserving deformations, SCA 2007]
- Direct geometrical volume preservation
[D. Rohmer et al., Exact volume preserving skinning with shape control, SCA 2009]





Geometrical constant volume skinning

$$\begin{cases} \min \sum_k \frac{\|u_k\|^2}{\gamma_k} \\ \text{subject to } V(p_k + u_k) = V_{objective} \end{cases}$$

- u_k deformation vector

- γ_k weights

$$- V = \sum_{faces(l,m,n)} \frac{z_l + z_m + z_n}{6} \begin{vmatrix} x_m - x_l & y_m - y_l \\ x_n - x_l & y_n - y_l \end{vmatrix}$$



[SCA 2009]

3. Improving rigidity and avoiding self collision

Idea: Extend implicit surface modeling to skinning deformation

1- Approximate the surface around each bone using implicit surfaces


Blend implicit surfaces to get a continuous surface
store exact isovalue for each vertex


2- Deform the mesh using LBS/DQS

Deform each implicit surface rigidly with its associated bone


3- Project vertices back onto their original isovalues

Stop projection when intersection is detected







Implicit Skinning



LBS



DQS



Implicit Skinning

[R. Vaillant et al., Implicit Skinning: Real-Time Skin Deformation with Contact Modeling, ACM SIGGRAPH 2013]