

Proofs of two Theorems concerning Sparse Spacetime Constraints

Christian Schulz
MPI Informatik

Christoph von Tycowicz
Freie Universität Berlin

Hans-Peter Seidel
MPI Informatik

Klaus Hildebrandt
MPI Informatik

March 19, 2018

Abstract

In the SIGGRAPH 2014 paper [SvTSH14] an approach for animating deformable objects using sparse spacetime constraints is introduced. This report contains the proofs of two theorems presented in the paper.

1 Introduction

In this report, we provide proofs of two theorems stated in [SvTSH14]. In Sections 2 and 4, we briefly review the background of the theorems and introduce some notation. Sections 3 and 5 contain the proofs. For more background on animating deformable objects using spacetime optimization, we refer to [WK88, KA08, BdSP09, HTZ⁺11, HSvTP12, BSG12].

2 Sparse Constraints and Linear Dynamics

We consider a linearized finite elements discretization of an elastic solid. The dynamics of the solid are described by a coupled system of linear ordinary second-order differential equations of the form

$$M \ddot{u}(t) + (\alpha M + \beta K) \dot{u}(t) + K u(t) + g = 0, \quad (1)$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the displacement vector, M is the mass matrix, K is the stiffness matrix, $\alpha M + \beta K$ a Rayleigh damping term, and g a constant vector. We use spacetime constraints to force the object to interpolate a set of keyframes. We will first look at the following simple set of keyframes. For a set of $m + 1$ nodes $\{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_m\}$, we specify interpolation constraints

$$u(t_i) = u_i \quad (2)$$

and additionally the constraints

$$\dot{u}(t_0) = v_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{u}(t_m) = v_m \quad (3)$$

on the velocity at the boundary of the time interval. To satisfy these constraints, we need to inject an additional force to the system. This force is determined in a optimization problem, where the objective functional is

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_m} \|M \ddot{u} + (\alpha M + \beta K) \dot{u} + K u + g\|_{M^{-1}}^2 dt. \quad (4)$$

For some arbitrary u the $E(u)$ measures the squared L^2 -norm of the additional force.

The eigenvalues and eigenmodes of (1) are solutions to the equation

$$K \phi_i = \lambda_i M \phi_i.$$

We consider a basis $\{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n\}$ of \mathbb{R}^n consisting of eigenmodes. In [HSvTP12] it was shown that the minimizer u of E over all $\tilde{u} \in H^2([t_0, t_m], \mathbb{R}^n)$ subject to the constraints (2) and (3) are of the form

$$u(t) = \sum_i \omega_i(t) \phi_i, \quad (5)$$

where the $\omega_i(t)$ are so-called *wiggly splines* [KA08]. The wiggly splines are solutions to the one-dimensional form of the spacetime optimization problem described above.

2.1 Sparse spacetime constraints

Instead of the interpolation constraints (2) and (3), in [SvTSH14] linear constraints of the form

$$A_k u(t_k) = a_k \quad \text{and} \quad B_k \dot{u}(t_k) = b_k$$

are considered. Here A_k, B_k are rectangular matrices and a_k, b_k are vectors. The constraints are sparse in the sense that the number of constraints at each node t_k is less than n . For example, only the positions of a part of the object are prescribed.

Since the computation is, for efficiency, performed in a low-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^n , the constraints are formulated as least squares constraints

$$E_C(u) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^m \left(c_A \|A_k u(t_k) - a_k\|^2 + c_B \|B_k \dot{u}(t_k) - b_k\|^2 \right), \quad (6)$$

where c_A and c_B are constants.

3 The First Theorem

The first theorem, [SvTSH14, Theorem 1], shows that the minimizers of the spacetime optimization problem with sparse (least squares) constraints can be described using the eigenmodes and the wiggly splines.

Theorem 1 *The minimizers of the energy $E(u) + E_C(u)$ among all functions in the Sobolev space $H^2((t_0, t_m), \mathbb{R}^n)$ are of the form (5) and are twice differentiable at any node t_k where no velocity is prescribed and once differentiable at all other nodes.*

Proof. Assume that u is a minimizer of $\mathcal{E} = E + E_C$ and that $v \in H^2((t_0, t_m), \mathbb{R}^n)$. The variation $\delta_v \mathcal{E}(u)$ of \mathcal{E} at u in the direction of v satisfies

$$\delta_v \mathcal{E}(u) = \delta_v E(u) + \delta_v E_C(u).$$

The variation $\delta_v E_C(u)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_v E_C(u) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (E_C(u + hv) - E_C(u)) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2h} \left(\sum_{k=0}^m \left(c_A \|A_k(u(t_k) + hv(t_k)) - a_k\|^2 + c_B \|B_k(\dot{u}(t_k) + h\dot{v}(t_k)) - b_k\|^2 \right) - E_C(u) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^m \left((A_k v(t_k))^T (A_k u(t_k) - a_k) + (B_k \dot{v}(t_k))^T (B_k \dot{u}(t_k) - b_k) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider the energy E and abbreviate $D = \alpha M + \beta K$. The variation $\delta_v E(u)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_v E(u) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (E(u + hv) - E(u)) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2h} \left(\int_{t_0}^{t_m} \|M(\ddot{u} + h\ddot{v}) + D(\dot{u} + h\dot{v}) + K(u + hv) + g\|_{M^{-1}}^2 dt - E(u) \right) \\ &= \int_{t_0}^{t_m} (\ddot{v}^T + \dot{v}^T D M^{-1} + v^T K M^{-1}) (M\ddot{u} + D\dot{u} + Ku + g) dt \\ &= \int_{t_0}^{t_m} v^T (M\ddot{u} + (2K - D M^{-1} D)\dot{u} + K M^{-1}(Ku + g)) dt \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^m (\dot{v}^T + v^T D M^{-1}) (M\dot{u} + D\dot{u} + Ku + g) \Big|_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} + \sum_{k=1}^m v^T (M\ddot{u} + D\dot{u} + K\dot{u}) \Big|_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we decomposed the integral over $[t_0, t_m]$ into a sum of integrals over the intervals $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ and used integration by parts twice for each of the

summands. We write u, v , and g in the eigenbasis $\{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n\}$

$$u(t) = \sum_i \omega_i(t)\phi_i, \quad v(t) = \sum_i v_i(t)\phi_i, \quad g = \sum_i g_i\phi_i$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_v E(u) &= \int_{t_0}^{t_m} \sum_i v_i (\ddot{\omega}_i + 2(\lambda_i - 2\delta_i^2)\dot{\omega}_i + \lambda_i(\lambda_i\omega_i + g_i)) dt \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_i (v_i(\ddot{\omega}_i + 2\delta_i\dot{\omega}_i + \lambda_i\omega_i) - (\dot{v}_i + 2\delta_i v_i)(\dot{\omega}_i + 2\delta_i\omega_i + \lambda_i\omega_i + g_i)) \Big|_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The variation $\delta_v \mathcal{E}(u)$ vanishes for any v because u is a minimizer of \mathcal{E} . From the calculation of $\delta_v E_C(u)$ we see that $\delta_v E_C(u)$ depends only on the values of u, \dot{u}, v , and \dot{v} at the nodes t_k (and is independent of the values u, \dot{u}, v , and \dot{v} take at any t in one of the open intervals (t_k, t_{k+1})). Then the integrals

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_m} v_i (\ddot{\omega}_i + 2(\lambda_i - 2\delta_i^2)\dot{\omega}_i + \lambda_i(\lambda_i\omega_i + g_i)) dt$$

must vanish for all $v_i \in H^2((t_0, t_m), \mathbb{R})$. This implies

$$\ddot{\omega}_i + 2(\lambda_i - 2\delta_i^2)\dot{\omega}_i + \lambda_i(\lambda_i\omega_i + g_i) = 0.$$

The last equation is exactly the characterization of the wiggly splines, see [SvTSH14, Equation (4)]. This shows that u is of the form (5).

The function u is once differentiable at the nodes t_k because any function in $H^2((t_0, t_m), \mathbb{R})$ is (by the Sobolev's embedding theorem) once continuously differentiable. Now what remains is to show that u is twice differentiable at nodes where no velocity is specified. For this, we reorder the terms of (7):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_v E(u) &= \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \sum_i v_i(t_k) \left(\ddot{\omega}_i(\overrightarrow{t_k}) - \ddot{\omega}_i(\overleftarrow{t_k}) - 2\delta_i (\dot{\omega}_i(\overrightarrow{t_k}) - \dot{\omega}_i(\overleftarrow{t_k})) \right) - \dot{v}_i(t_k) \left(\dot{\omega}_i(\overrightarrow{t_k}) - \dot{\omega}_i(\overleftarrow{t_k}) \right) \\ &+ \sum_i (v_i(\ddot{\omega}_i + 2\delta_i\dot{\omega}_i + \lambda_i\omega_i) - (\dot{v}_i + v_i 2\delta_i)(\dot{\omega}_i + 2\delta_i\omega_i + \lambda_i\omega_i + g_i)) \Big|_{t_0}^{t_m}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\ddot{\omega}_i(\overrightarrow{t_k})$ denotes the second derivative at t_k of the restriction of ω_i to the interval $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$, and $\ddot{\omega}_i(\overleftarrow{t_k})$ denotes the second derivative at t_k of the restriction of ω_i to the interval $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$. If no velocity is prescribed at the node t_k , then $\dot{v}_i(t_k) (\dot{\omega}_i(\overrightarrow{t_k}) - \dot{\omega}_i(\overleftarrow{t_k}))$ has to vanish for all v_i . This implies $\dot{\omega}_i(\overrightarrow{t_k}) = \dot{\omega}_i(\overleftarrow{t_k})$ for all i . Hence, u is twice differentiable at t_k . ■

4 Sparse Constraints and Warping

Rotation strain warping was introduced in [HTZ⁺11]. The goal there was to remove linearization artifacts from the deformation describe by the displacement u . The warp map W is a nonlinear map on the space of all possible displacements u . To integrate the warping into the spacetime optimization framework described above the least squares energy (6) is replaced by the nonlinear least squares energy

$$E_{WC}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^m \left(c_A \|A_k W(u(t_k)) - a_k\|^2 + c_B \|B_k DW \dot{u}(t_k) - b_k\|^2 \right).$$

Then, the objective functional

$$E(u) + E_{WC}(u) \tag{8}$$

is minimized over the space of displacements. The resulting motion is then warped minimizer $W(u(t))$.

5 The Second Theorem

The second theorem in [SvTSH14] shows that the minimizers of the nonlinear optimization problem can still be described using the eigenmodes and the wiggly splines.

Theorem 2 *The minimizers of the energy $E(u) + E_{WC}(u)$ among all functions in the Sobolev space $H^2((t_0, t_m), \mathbb{R}^n)$ are of the form (5) and are twice differentiable at any node t_k where no velocity is prescribed and once differentiable at all other nodes.*

Proof (Sketch). The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1. So we only sketch the proof here. We first calculate the variation $\delta_v E_{WC}(u)$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_v E_{WC}(u) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (E_{WC}(u + hv) - E_{WC}(u)) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2h} \left(\sum_{k=0}^m (c_A \|A_k W(u(t_k) + hv(t_k)) - a_k\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c_B \|B_k DW (\dot{u}(t_k) + h\dot{v}(t_k)) - b_k\|^2 \right) - E_{WC}(u) \tag{9} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^m ((A_k DW(v(t_k)))^T (A_k W(u(t_k)) - a_k) \\ &\quad + (B_k D^2 W(\dot{v}(t_k)))^T (B_k DW(\dot{u}(t_k)) - b_k)). \end{aligned}$$

The last step used the Taylor expansion

$$W(u(t_k) + hv(t_k)) = W(u(t_k)) + hDW(v(t_k)) + \mathcal{R}(h)$$

and

$$DW(\dot{u}(t_k) + h\dot{v}(t_k)) = DW(\dot{u}(t_k)) + hD^2W(\dot{v}(t_k)) + \mathcal{R}(h),$$

where $\mathcal{R}(h)$ is a remainder term for which $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathcal{R}(h) = 0$.

The rest is as in the proof of Theorem 1. We calculate the variation $\delta_v E(u)$ of E and represent u and v in the modal basis. This yields (7). From (9) we see that the variation $\delta_v E_{WC}(u)$ depends only on the values of u, \dot{u}, v , and \dot{v} at the nodes t_k (and is independent of the values u, \dot{u}, v , and \dot{v} take at any t in one of the open intervals (t_k, t_{k+1})). As described in the proof of Theorem 1, the minimizers are of the form (5) and they are twice differentiable at any node t_k , where no velocity is prescribed, and once differentiable at all other nodes. ■

References

- [BdSP09] Jernej Barbič, Marco da Silva, and Jovan Popović. Deformable object animation using reduced optimal control. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 28:53:1–53:9, 2009.
- [BSG12] Jernej Barbič, Funshing Sin, and Eitan Grinspun. Interactive editing of deformable simulations. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 31(4), 2012.
- [HSvTP12] Klaus Hildebrandt, Christian Schulz, Christoph von Tycowicz, and Konrad Polthier. Interactive spacetime control of deformable objects. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 31(4):71:1–71:8, 2012.
- [HTZ⁺11] Jin Huang, Yiyang Tong, Kun Zhou, Hujun Bao, and Mathieu Desbrun. Interactive shape interpolation through controllable dynamic deformation. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 17(7):983–992, 2011.
- [KA08] Michael Kass and John Anderson. Animating oscillatory motion with overlap: wiggly splines. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 27(3):28:1–28:8, 2008.
- [SvTSH14] Christian Schulz, Christoph von Tycowicz, Hans-Peter Seidel, and Klaus Hildebrandt. Animating deformable objects using sparse spacetime constraints. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 33(4), 2014.
- [WK88] Andrew Witkin and Michael Kass. Spacetime constraints. *Proc. of ACM SIGGRAPH*, 22:159–168, 1988.