

# Static/Dynamic Filtering for Mesh Geometry: Supplementary Material

## 1 Information for Test Data

Below are the vertex and face counts for the mesh models used in the paper:

Model	Sphere	Cube	Duck	Gargoyle	Armadillo	Knot
Figure No.	7	8	12	1	13	9
#Vertices	30006	24578	34059	50002	21582	50000
#Faces	60008	49152	68114	100000	43160	100000
Model	Merlion	Chinese Lion	Sunflower	Giraffe	Lee Perry Smith	Welsh Dragon
Figure No.	10	11	15	6	16	14
#Vertices	283235	50003	9859	14822	30549	1105352
#Faces	566465	100000	15156	29628	54629	2210673
Model	Bunny	Fandisk	Twelve			
Figure No.	17	17	17			
#Vertices	34817	6475	4610			
#Faces	69630	12946	9216			

Table A: Information on the testing mesh normals for SD normal filter.

The Giraffe texture image has  $1024 \times 1024$  pixels. The Sunflower texture image has  $256 \times 256$  pixels.

## 2 Comparison Between MM Algorithm and Fixed-Point Iteration

We compared the computational time between our fixed-point iteration solver and the MM algorithm, for optimizing the target function  $E_{SD}$ . The comparison is preformed using the following test models and parameter settings:

Model	$\lambda$	$\eta$	$\mu$	$\nu$
Armadillo	5	$1.5l_c$	2.5	0.27
Cube	$1 \cdot 10^4$	$5l_c$	0.8	0.2
Duck	10	$2l_c$	2.5	0.3
Knot	$1 \cdot 10^6$	$4l_c$	2.5	0.27
Gargoyle	5	$3l_c$	10	0.42
Merlion	10	$2.5l_c$	20	0.26

Table B: Test models and parameters for the computational time comparison between the MM algorithm and our fixed-point iteration solver.

For each test model, we ran the MM algorithm for 5 iterations, and our solver for 100 iterations. The MM algorithm were run twice, using Cholesky factorization and Conjugate Gradient to solve the linear system, respectively. All examples are run on a PC with 16GB memory and a quad-core 3.6GHz CPU. Whenever possible, the MM algorithm implementation utilizes OpenMP parallelization. The following table compares the timing and the target energy values for the resulting models:

Model	#Faces	Method	Initial Energy	Final Energy	Time(s)
Armadillo	43K	MM(CG)	93672.6	19679.8	7.55
		MM(Cholesky)	93672.6	19679.8	11.08
		Ours	93672.6	22381.8	1.67
Cube	49K	MM(CG)	$6.30 \cdot 10^7$	$1.20 \cdot 10^7$	74.06
		MM(Cholesky)	$6.30 \cdot 10^7$	$1.20 \cdot 10^7$	2529.27
		Ours	$6.30 \cdot 10^7$	$1.20 \cdot 10^7$	18.32
Duck	68K	MM(CG)	76113.7	16411.5	27.80
		MM(Cholesky)	76113.7	16411.5	188.61
		Ours	76113.7	20946.3	4.44
Knot	100K	MM(CG)	$6.69 \cdot 10^{10}$	99999.7	318.85
		MM(Cholesky)	$6.69 \cdot 10^{10}$	99999.7	2108.65
		Ours	$6.69 \cdot 10^{10}$	$1.03 \cdot 10^{10}$	43.87
Gargoyle	100K	MM(CG)	239660	37362	40.43
		MM(Cholesky)	239660	37362	283.92
		Ours	239660	37370.4	10.38
Merlion	566K	MM(CG)	$1.34 \cdot 10^6$	166076	571.43
		MM(Cholesky)	—	—	—
		Ours	$1.34 \cdot 10^6$	242718	62.83

Table C: Computational time (in seconds) for our fixed-point iteration solver, and the MM algorithm (using Cholesky factorization and Conjugate Gradient as linear system solver, respectively). The timing for Merlion using MM-Cholesky is not available, because the solver runs out of memory.

### 3 Parameter Settings

#### 3.1 Scale-aware filtering

The following table provides the parameter settings for the scale-aware normal filtering examples.

Parameter	Cube			Sphere	
	Filtered-1	Filtered-2	Filtered-3	Filtered-1	Filtered-2
$\lambda$	500	100	100	100	100
$\eta$	$5 l_c$	$6 l_c$	$3.5 l_c$	$1.2 l_c$	$3 l_c$
$\mu$	3	20	20	0.8	1.5
$\nu$	2	0.35	0.09	0.3	0.17

Table D: Parameters for scale-aware mesh normal filtering.

#### 3.2 Geometry feature enhancement

The following table provides parameters for the geometry feature enhancement results.

Parameter	Lee			Welsh Dragon			Gargoyle			Armadillo		
	$M^0$	$M^1$	$M^2$	$M^0$	$M^1$	$M^2$	$M^0$	$M^1$	$M^2$	$M^0$	$M^1$	$M^2$
$\lambda$	1	1	500	10	10	10	5	1.5	0.5	2	1.5	1
$\eta$	$5l_c$	$3l_c$	$5 l_c$	$7.5l_c$	$5l_c$	$2.5l_c$	$3l_c$	$2.5l_c$	$2.5l_c$	$2.5l_c$	$1.5l_c$	$1 l_c$
$\mu$	1.5	1.5	3	20	20	20	10	10	10	1.5	1.5	1.5
$\nu$	0.5	0.5	2	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.42	0.3	0.3	0.45	0.33	0.23

Table E: Parameters for geometry feature enhancement.

### 3.3 Comparison with $\ell_0$ optimization and RGNF

Below are the parameters the comparison between our method and  $\ell_0$  optimization and RGNF.

Method	Parameter	Cube	Knot	Merlion (Bottom)	Merlion (Top)
$\ell_0$	$\lambda$	5	50	5	5
	$\alpha_0$	0.1	1	0.1	0.1
	$\beta_0$	$1 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1 \cdot 10^{-3}$
	$\mu_\alpha$	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
	$\mu$	1.414	1.414	1.414	1.414
	$\beta_{max}$	$1 \cdot 10^4$	$1 \cdot 10^4$	$5 \cdot 10^3$	200
RGNF	$\sigma_s$	8	5	5	5
	$\sigma_r$	0.1	0.35	0.6	0.1
	$N_{iter}$	5	5	5	5
Ours	$\lambda$	$1 \cdot 10^4$	$1 \cdot 10^6$	100	$1 \cdot 10^4$
	$\eta$	$5l_c$	$2l_c$	$2l_c$	$3l_c$
	$\mu$	0.8	2.5	2	20
	$\nu$	0.4	0.3	0.23	0.12

Table F: Parameters for the comparison between SD filtering,  $\ell_0$  optimization, and RGNF.

### 3.4 Texture image filtering

The following tables parameter settings for texture image filtering results.

Parameter	Sunflower			Giraffe	
	$T^0$	$T^1$	$T^2$	Filtered-1	Filtered-2
$\lambda$	100	100	100	10	10
$\eta$	$1l_c$	$0.28l_c$	$0.20l_c$	$1l_c$	$1l_c$
$\mu$	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
$\nu$	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.1	0.08

Table G: Parameters for texture image filtering.

### 3.5 Mesh denoising

Below are the parameters for mesh denoising examples.

Method	Parameter	Bunny	Fandisk	Twelve
GMNF	$r$	2.0(2.7 $\times$ )	2.0(2.6 $\times$ )	2.0(2.6 $\times$ )
	$\sigma_r$	0.55	0.30	0.27
	$k_{iter}$	4	50	75
	$v_{iter}$	4	20	20
Ours	$\lambda$	100	100	250
	$\eta$	$0.4l_c$	$0.7l_c$	$1.5l_c$
	$\mu$	20	20	60
	$\nu$	0.3	0.27	0.28
	$W_{closeness}$	2.5	0.6	2
	$k_{iter}$	20	50	20
	$v_{iter}$	5	10	100

Table H: Parameters for mesh denoising.

### 3.6 Explanation of parameters

- $\ell_0$  [1] (Table F):
  - $\lambda$ : weight for the  $L_0$  term in the target function.
  - $\beta_0$ : initial weight for the differential term.
  - $\mu$ : it is the speed at increasing  $\beta$ .
  - $\beta_{max}$ : max weight for the differential term.
  - $\alpha_0$ : initial weight for the regular term.
  - $\mu_\alpha$ : it is the speed at decreasing  $\alpha$ .
- RGNF [3] (Table F):
  - $\sigma_s$ : it is related to the scale size of geometry features.
  - $\sigma_r$ : it is related to the desired smoothness of the final results.
  - $N_{iter}$ : number of iterations for updating normals.
- GMNF [4] (Table H):
  - $r$ : radius for the geometrical neighborhood, also shown as the ratio with respect to the average distance between neighboring face centroids; not applicable if a topological neighborhood is used.
  - $\sigma_r$ : variance of the range kernel.
  - $k_{iter}$ : number of iterations for updating normals.
  - $v_{iter}$ : number of iterations for a vertex update.
- Ours (Tables B, D, E, F, G, H):
  - $\lambda$ : it controls the scale of the preserved geometry features.
  - $\eta$ : it controls the neighborhood size.
  - $\mu$ : it controls the desired smoothness.
  - $\nu$ : it controls the desired filter scale.
  - $k_{iter}$ : number of iterations for updating vertex position from filtered normals.
  - $v_{iter}$ : number of times for performing SD normal filter.

## 4 Convergence of Fixed-Point Iteration

In this section, we prove that the fixed-point iteration without normalization (Equation (13) in the paper) is guaranteed to converge to a local minimum of the target function  $E_{SD}$  (Equation (4) in the paper). Note that each fixed-point iteration is a single step of Jacobi iteration for the linear system that minimizes the following majorization function

$$F^k(\mathbf{N}) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \left( (\mathbf{N}_i - \hat{\mathbf{N}}_i)^T \mathbf{D} (\mathbf{N}_i - \hat{\mathbf{N}}_i) + \lambda \mathbf{N}_i^T \mathbf{M}^k \mathbf{N}_i \right),$$

where  $\mathbf{N}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) are vectors that collect the  $x$ -,  $y$ -, and  $z$ -coordinates of the face normal variables, and  $\hat{\mathbf{N}}_i$  are their values on the input mesh. The matrix  $\mathbf{N}^k$  is determined from the current variable values  $\mathbf{N}^k$ , and the matrix  $\mathbf{D} + \lambda \mathbf{M}^k$  is symmetric positive and diagonally dominant. We will prove the following

**Proposition 1.** *The fixed-point iteration produces new variable values  $\mathbf{N}^{k+1}$  for which  $F^k(\mathbf{N}^{k+1}) < F^k(\mathbf{N}^k)$ , unless  $\mathbf{N}^k$  is the minimum of  $F^k$  in which case  $\mathbf{N}^{k+1} = \mathbf{N}^k$ .*

Note that  $F^k(\mathbf{N}) \geq E_{\text{SD}}(\mathbf{N})$  for all  $\mathbf{N}$ , and  $F^k(\mathbf{N}^k) = E_{\text{SD}}(\mathbf{N}^k)$ . Moreover, if  $\mathbf{N}^k$  is a minimum of  $F^k$ , then it is also a local minimum of  $E_{\text{SD}}$  [2]. Therefore, we have  $E_{\text{SD}}(\mathbf{N}^k) \leq F^k(\mathbf{N}^k) < F^k(\mathbf{N}^k) = E_{\text{SD}}(\mathbf{N}_k)$ , unless  $\mathbf{N}_k$  is local minimum of  $E_{\text{SD}}$  in which case  $\mathbf{N}^{k+1} = \mathbf{N}^k$ . In other words, the fixed-point iteration is guaranteed to decrease the target function  $E_{\text{SD}}$  until it converges to a local minimum of  $E_{\text{SD}}$ .

We prove Proposition 1 by showing that a single step of the Jacobi iteration

$$\mathbf{N}^{k+1} = \mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{N}} - \mathbf{R}\mathbf{N}^k)$$

is guaranteed to decrease  $F^k$  unless  $\mathbf{N}^k$  is the minimum. Here  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  are the diagonal and off-diagonal parts of the matrix  $\mathbf{D} + \lambda\mathbf{M}^k$  respectively, such that  $\mathbf{D} + \lambda\mathbf{M}^k = \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{R}$ . Our proof is inspired by a post from StackExchange user Hui Zhang<sup>1</sup>. First, we denote the minimum of  $F^k$  by

$$\mathbf{N}^* = (\mathbf{D} + \lambda\mathbf{M}^k)^{-1}\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{N}},$$

and let

$$\mathbf{P}^k = \mathbf{N}^{k+1} - \mathbf{N}^k, \quad \mathbf{E}^k = \mathbf{N}^* - \mathbf{N}^k.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{D} + \lambda\mathbf{M}^k)\mathbf{E}^k &= \mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{D} + \lambda\mathbf{M}^k)(\mathbf{N}^* - \mathbf{N}^k) = \mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{N}} - (\mathbf{D} + \lambda\mathbf{M}^k)\mathbf{N}^k) \\ &= \mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{N}} - (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{R})\mathbf{N}^k) = \mathbf{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{N}} - \mathbf{R}\mathbf{N}^k) - \mathbf{Q}^{-1}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{N}^k \\ &= \mathbf{N}^{k+1} - \mathbf{N}^k = \mathbf{P}^k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when  $\mathbf{N}^k$  is the minimum of  $F^k$ , we have  $\mathbf{E}^k = \mathbf{0}$  and as a result  $\mathbf{N}^{k+1} - \mathbf{N}^k = \mathbf{0}$ . If  $\mathbf{N}^k$  is not the minimum of  $F^k$ , then the above formula indicates that  $\mathbf{P}^k \neq \mathbf{0}$  we denote  $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{D} + \lambda\mathbf{M}^k$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} &F^k(\mathbf{N}^{k+1}) - F^k(\mathbf{N}^k) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 -2(\mathbf{N}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{N}_i^k)^T \mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{N}}_i + (\mathbf{N}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{N}_i^k)^T \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{N}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{N}_i^k) + 2(\mathbf{N}_i^{k+1} - \mathbf{N}_i^k)^T \mathbf{K}\mathbf{N}_i^k \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 -2(\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T \mathbf{K}\mathbf{N}_i^* + (\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T \mathbf{K}\mathbf{P}_i^k + 2(\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T \mathbf{K}\mathbf{N}_i^k = \sum_{i=1}^3 (\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T \mathbf{K}\mathbf{P}_i^k - 2(\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T \mathbf{K}\mathbf{E}_i^k \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 (\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T \mathbf{K}\mathbf{P}_i^k - 2(\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{P}_i^k = \sum_{i=1}^3 (\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T (\mathbf{K} - 2\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{P}_i^k, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{E}_i^k, \mathbf{P}_i^k$  denotes the columns of  $\mathbf{E}^k, \mathbf{P}^k$ , respectively. Note that the off-diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  are non-negative, while the diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  are all positive, and  $\mathbf{K}$  is diagonally dominant. Therefore, with  $\mathbf{Q}$  being the diagonal part of  $\mathbf{K}$ , matrix  $\mathbf{K} - 2\mathbf{Q}$  is negative definite. And with  $\mathbf{P}^k \neq \mathbf{0}$ , we have  $\sum_{i=1}^3 (\mathbf{P}_i^k)^T (\mathbf{K} - 2\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{P}_i^k < 0$ , meaning that  $F^k(\mathbf{N}^{k+1}) < F^k(\mathbf{N}^k)$ .

## References

- [1] Lei He and Scott Schaefer. Mesh denoising via  $L_0$  minimization. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 32(4):64:1–64:8, 2013.
- [2] Kenneth Lange. *MM Optimization Algorithms*. SIAM, 2016.
- [3] Peng-Shuai Wang, Xiao-Ming Fu, Yang Liu, Xin Tong, Shi-Lin Liu, and Baining Guo. Rolling guidance normal filter for geometric processing. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 34(6):173, 2015.
- [4] Wangyu Zhang, Bailin Deng, Juyong Zhang, Sofien Bouaziz, and Ligang Liu. Guided mesh normal filtering. *Comput. Graph. Forum*, 34(7):23–34, 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://scicomp.stackexchange.com/questions/1478/jacobi-iteration-to-reduce-the-quadratic-function>