

Lecture 22:

Dynamics and Time Integration

Computer Graphics
CMU 15-462/15-662, Spring 2016

Last time: animation

- Added motion to our model
- Interpolate keyframes
- Still a lot of work!
- Today: physically-based animation
 - often less manual labor
 - often more compute-intensive
- Leverage tools from physics
 - dynamical descriptions
 - numerical integration
- Payoff: beautiful, complex behavior from simple models
- Widely-used techniques in modern film (and games!)



Dynamical Description of Motion

“A change in motion is proportional to the motive force impressed and takes place along the straight line in which that force is impressed.”

—Sir Isaac Newton, 1687

“Dynamics is concerned with the study of forces and their effect on motion, as opposed to kinematics, which studies the motion of objects without reference to its causes.”

—Sir Wiki Pedia, 2015

(Q: Is keyframe interpolation dynamic, or kinematic?)

The Animation Equation

- Already saw the rendering equation
- What's the animation equation?

$$\text{force} \rightarrow F = m a \leftarrow \begin{matrix} \text{mass} \\ \text{acceleration} \end{matrix}$$

The “Animation Equation,” revisited

■ Well actually there are some more equations...

■ Let's be more careful:

- Any system has a configuration

$$q(t)$$

- It also has a velocity $\dot{q} := \frac{d}{dt} q$

- And some kind of mass M

- There are probably some forces F


- And also some constraints $g(q, \dot{q}, t) = 0$

■ E.g., could write Newton's 2nd law as $\ddot{q} = F/m$

■ Makes two things clear:

- acceleration is 2nd time derivative of configuration



- ultimately, we want to solve for the configuration q



Generalized Coordinates

- Often describing systems with many, many moving pieces
- E.g., a collection of billiard balls, each with position x_i
- Collect them all into a single vector of generalized coordinates:

$$q = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$$




- Can think of q as a single point moving along a trajectory in $\mathbb{R}^n$
- This way of thinking naturally maps to the way we actually solve equations on a computer: all variables are often “stacked” into a big long vector and handed to a solver.
- (...So why not write things down this way in the first place?)


Generalized Velocity

- Not much more to say about generalized velocity: it's the time derivative of the generalized coordinates!

$$\dot{q} = (\dot{x}_0, \dot{x}_1, \dots, \dot{x}_n)$$



All of life (and physics) is just traveling along a curve...



Ordinary Differential Equations

- Many dynamical systems can be described via an ordinary differential equation (ODE) in generalized coordinates:

change in configuration over time $\rightarrow$ $\frac{d}{dt} q = f(q, \dot{q}, t)$ $\leftarrow$ velocity function

- ODE doesn't have to describe mechanical phenomenon, e.g.,

$$\frac{d}{dt} u(t) = au$$

“rate of growth is proportional to value”

- Solution? $u(t) = be^{at}$
- Describes exponential decay ($a < 1$), or really great stock ($a > 1$)
- “Ordinary” means “involves derivatives in time but not space”

Dynamics via ODEs

- Another key example: Newton's 2nd law!

$$\ddot{q} = F/m$$

- “Second order” ODE since we take two time derivatives
- Can also write as a system of two first order ODEs, by introducing new “dummy” variable for velocity:


$$\dot{q} = v$$

$$\dot{v} = F/m$$

- Splitting things up this way will make it easy to talk about solving these equations numerically (among other things)

Simple Example: Throwing a Rock

- Consider a rock* of mass m tossed under force of gravity g
- Easy to write dynamical equations, since only force is



$$\ddot{q} = g/m \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{q} &= v \\ \dot{v} &= g/m \end{aligned}$$

Solution:


$$\begin{aligned} v(t) &= v_0 + \frac{t}{m}g \\ q(t) &= q_0 + tv_0 + \frac{t^2}{2m}g \end{aligned}$$

(What do we need a computer for?!)

*Yes, this rock is spherical and has uniform density.

Slightly Harder Example: Pendulum

- Mass on end of a bar, swinging under gravity
- What are the equations of motion?
- Same as “rock” problem, but constrained
- Could use a “force diagram”
 - You probably did this for many hours in high school/college



Lagrangian Mechanics



Joe Lagrange

■ Beautifully simple recipe:

1. Write down kinetic energy K

2. Write down potential energy U

3. Write down Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} := K - U$

4. Dynamics then given by Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{becomes (generalized)} \\ \text{"MASS TIMES ACCELERATION"} \end{array} \longrightarrow \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{q}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q} \longleftarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{becomes (generalized) "FORCE"} \end{array}$$

■ Why is this useful?

- often easier to come up with (scalar) energies than forces
- very general, works in any kind of generalized coordinates
- helps develop nice class of numerical integrators (symplectic)

Great reference: Sussman & Wisdom, "Structure and Interpretation of Classical Mechanics"

Lagrangian Mechanics - Example

■ Generalized coordinates for pendulum?

$$q = \theta \leftarrow \text{just one coordinate: angle with the vertical direction}$$

■ Kinetic energy (mass m)?

$$K = \frac{1}{2} I \omega^2 = \frac{1}{2} m L^2 \dot{\theta}^2$$

■ Potential energy?


$$U = mgh = -mgL \cos \theta$$

■ Euler-Lagrange equations? (from here, just “plug and chug”—even a computer could do it!)

$$\mathcal{L} = K - U = m \left(\frac{1}{2} L^2 \dot{\theta}^2 + gL \cos \theta \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{q}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\theta}} = mL^2 \dot{\theta} \qquad \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} = -mgL \sin \theta$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{q}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \boxed{\ddot{\theta} = -\frac{g}{L} \sin \theta}$$



Solving the Pendulum

- Great, now we have a nice simple equation for the

$$\ddot{\theta} = -\frac{g}{L} \sin \theta$$

- For small angles (e.g., clock pendulum) can approximate as

$$\ddot{\theta} = -\frac{g}{L} \theta \quad \Rightarrow \quad \theta(t) = a \cos(t \sqrt{g/L} + b)$$


“harmonic oscillator”



- In general, there is no closed form solution!
- Hence, we must use a numerical approximation
- ...And this was (almost) the simplest system we can think of!
- (What if we want to animate something more interesting?)


Not-So-Simple Example: Double Pendulum

- Blue ball swings from fixed point; green ball swings from blue one
- Simple system... not-so-simple motion!
- Chaotic: perturb input, wild changes to output
- Must again use numerical approximation




Not-So-Simple Example: n-Body Problem

- Consider the Earth, moon, and sun—where do they go?
- Solution is trivial for two bodies (e.g., assume one is fixed)
- As soon as $n \geq 3$, again get chaotic solutions (no closed form)



Credit: Governato et al / NASA




**For animation, we want to simulate
these kinds of phenomena!**

Example: Flocking




Simulated Flocking as an ODE


- Each bird is a particle
- Subject to very simple forces:
 - attraction to center of neighbors
 - repulsion from individual neighbors
 - alignment toward average trajectory of neighbors
- Solve large system of ODEs (numerically!)
- Emergent complex behavior (also seen in fish, bees, ...)



attraction



repulsion



alignment

Particle Systems

- More generally, model phenomena as large collection of particles
- Each particle has a behavior described by (physical or non-physical) forces
- Extremely common in graphics/games
 - easy to understand
 - simple equation for each particle
 - easy to scale up/down
- May need many particles to capture certain phenomena (e.g., fluids)
 - may require fast hierarchical data structure (kd-tree, BVH, ...)



Example: Crowds



Where are the bottlenecks in a building plan?

Example: Crowds + “Rock” Dynamics



Dave Fothergill vfx

Example: Particle-Based Fluids




(Fluid: particles or continuum?)

Example: Granular Materials




Bell et al, "Particle-Based Simulation of Granular Materials"

Example: Molecular Dynamics



(model of melting ice crystal)

Example: Cosmological Simulation



Tomoaki et al - v^2 GC simulation of dark matter (~ 1 trillion particles)


Example: Mass-Spring System

- Connect particles x_1, x_2 by a spring of length L_0
- Potential energy is given by

$$U = \frac{1}{2}k(L - L_0)^2$$


stiffness current length rest length

$$= \frac{1}{2}k(|x_1 - x_2|^2 - L_0)^2$$



- Connect up many springs to describe interesting phenomena
- Extremely common in graphics/games
 - easy to understand
 - simple equation for each particle
- Often good reasons for using continuum model (PDE)

Example: Mass Spring System



Example: Mass Spring + Character



Example: Hair



**Ok, I'm convinced.
So how do we solve these
things numerically?**

Numerical Integration

- Key idea: replace derivatives with differences
- In ODE, only need to worry about derivative in time
- Replace time-continuous function $q(t)$ with samples q_k in

$$\frac{d}{dt} q(t) = f(q(t))$$

⇓

**new configuration
(unknown—want to solve for this!)**

↘

$$\frac{q_{k+1} - q_k}{\tau} = f(q)$$

↗

**current configuration
(known)**

↖

**“time step,” i.e., interval of
time between q_k and q_{k+1}**

↗

**Wait... where do we
evaluate the velocity
function? At the new
or old configuration?**

↖

Forward Euler

- Simplest scheme: evaluate velocity at current configuration
- New configuration can then be written explicitly in terms of known data:

new configuration current configuration velocity at current time

$$q_{k+1} = q_k + \tau f(q_k)$$

- Very intuitive: walk a tiny bit in the direction of the velocity
- Unfortunately, not very stable—consider pendulum:



starts out slow...

...gradually moves faster & faster!

Where did all this extra energy come from?

Forward Euler - Stability Analysis

- Let's consider behavior of forward Euler for simple linear ODE:

$$\dot{u} = -au, \quad a > 0$$

- Importantly: u should decay (exact solution is $u(t)=e^{-at}$)

- Forward Euler approximation is

$$\begin{aligned} u_{k+1} &= u_k - \tau a u_k \\ &= (1 - \tau a) u_k \end{aligned}$$

- Which means after n steps, we have

$$u_n = (1 - \tau a)^n u_0$$

- Decays only if $|1-\tau a| < 1$, or equivalently, if $\tau < 2/a$
- In practice: need very small time steps if a is large ("stiff system")

Backward Euler

- Let's try something else: evaluate velocity at next configuration
- New configuration is then implicit, and we must solve for it:

new configuration current configuration velocity at next time

$$q_{k+1} = q_k + \tau f(q_{k+1})$$

- Much harder to solve, since in general f can be very nonlinear!
- Pendulum is now stable... perhaps too stable?

starts out slow...



Where did all the
energy go?

...and eventually stops moving completely.

Backward Euler - Stability Analysis

- Again consider a simple linear ODE:

$$\dot{u} = -au, \quad a > 0$$

- Remember: u should decay (exact solution is $u(t)=e^{-at}$)

- Backward Euler approximation is

$$(u_{k+1} - u_k) / \tau = -au_{k+1}$$

$$\iff u_{k+1} = \frac{1}{1+\tau a} u_k$$

- Which means after n steps, we have

$$u_n = \left(\frac{1}{1+\tau a} \right)^n u_0$$

- Decays if $|1+\tau a| > 1$, which is always true!

- $\Rightarrow$ Backward Euler is unconditionally stable for linear ODEs

Symplectic Euler

- Backward Euler was stable, but we also saw (empirically) that it exhibits numerical damping (damping not found in original eqn.)
- Nice alternative is symplectic Euler
 - update velocity using current configuration
 - update configuration using new velocity
- Easy to implement; used often in practice (or leapfrog, Verlet, ...)
- Pendulum now conserves energy almost exactly, forever:

starts out slow...




...and keeps on ticking.

(Proof? The analysis is not quite as easy...)


Numerical Integrators

- Barely scratched the surface
- Many different integrators
- Why? Because many notions of “good”:
 - stability
 - accuracy
 - consistency/convergence
 - conservation, symmetry, ...
 - computational efficiency (!)
- No one “best” integrator—pick the right tool for the job!
- Could do (at least) an entire course on time integration...
- Great book: Hairer, Lubich, Wanner



Computational Differentiation

- So far, we've been taking derivatives by hand
- Very often in simulation, need to differentiate extremely complicated functions (e.g., potential energy, to get forces)
- Several different techniques:
 - keep doing it by hand! (laborious & error prone, but potentially fast)
 - numerical differentiation (simple to code, but usually poor accuracy)
 - automatic differentiation (bigger code investment, better accuracy)
 - symbolic differentiation (can help w/ "by-hand", often messy results)
 - geometric differentiation (sometimes simplifies "by hand" expressions)



Review: Derivatives

■ Suppose I have a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; x \mapsto f(x)$

■ Q: How do I define its first derivative with respect to x , at x_0 ?

$$f'(x_0) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x_0 + \epsilon) - f(x_0)}{\epsilon}$$

■ In dynamical simulation, often need to consider functions

$$f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; q \mapsto f(q) \text{ (e.g., potential)}$$

■ Directional derivative looks a lot like ordinary derivative:

$$D_X f(q_0) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(q_0 + \epsilon X) - f(q_0)}{\epsilon} \text{ (Q: is } D_X f \text{ vector or scalar?)}$$

■ Gradient is vector ∇f that yields $D_X f$ when you take inner product:

$$\langle \nabla f(q_0), X \rangle = D_X f(q_0) \text{ (e.g., gradient of potential is force)}$$

Numerical Differentiation


- Taking all those derivatives by hand is a lot of work!
(Especially if you're just developing/debugging)
- Idea: replace derivatives with differences (as we did w/

$$f'(x_0) \Rightarrow \frac{f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0)}{h}$$

h ← now has fixed size

- But how do we pick h ?
- Smaller is better... right?
- Not always! Must be careful.
- Can also be expensive!

e.g., what if f were some kind of radiance integral?




Automatic Differentiation

- Completely different idea: do arithmetic simultaneously on a function and its derivative.
- I.e., rather than work with values f , work with tuples (f, f')
- Use chain rule to determine rules for manipulating tuples
- Example function: $f(x) = ax^2$
- Suppose we want the value and derivative at $x=2$
- Start with the tuple $(x, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} x) |_{x=2} = (2, 1)$
- How do we multiply tuples? $(u, u') * (v, v') = (uv, uv' + vu')$
 - for derivatives, we apply the chain rule
 - values just get multiplied
- So, squaring our tuple yields $(2, 1) * (2, 1) = (4, 4)$
- And multiplying by a scales the value and derivative: $(4a, 4a)$
 - (did we get it right?)
- Pros: good accuracy, reasonably fast
- Cons: have to redefine all our arithmetic operators!
 - (must have access to code!)

Symbolic Differentiation

- Yet another approach (though related to automatic one...)
- Build explicit tree representing expression
- Apply transformations to obtain derivative
- Pros: only needs to happen once!
- Cons: serious development investment
- But, can often use existing tools
 - Mathematica, Maple, etc.
- Current systems not great with vectors, 3D
- Often produce unnecessarily complex formulae...




$$\frac{\sin(-z)}{x + 5y}$$

Geometric Differentiation


- Sometimes symbolic differentiation misses the “big picture”
- E.g., gradient of triangle area w.r.t. vertex position p

Mathematica output:

```
(2 (b2 - c2) (-b2 c1 + a2 (-b1 + c1) + a1 (b2 - c2) +
b1 c2) + 2 (b3 - c3) (-b3 c1 + a3 (-b1 + c1) + a1 (b3
- c3) + b1 c3))/(4 Sqrt((a2 b1 - a1 b2 - a2 c1 + b2 c1
+ a1 c2 - p b1 c2)^2 + (a3 b1 - a1 b3 - a3 c1 + b3 c1
+ a1 c3 - b1 c3)^2 + (a3 b2 - a2 b3 - a3 c2 + b3 c2 +
a2 c3 - b2 c3)^2)), (2 (b1 - c1) (a2 (b1 - c1) + b2 c1
- b1 c2 + a1 (-b2 + c2)) + 2 (b3 - c3) (-b3 c2 + a3 (-
b2 + c2) + a2 (b3 - c3) + b2 c3))/(4 Sqrt((a2 b1 - a1
b2 - a2 c1 + b2 c1 + a1 c2 - b1 c2)^2 + (a3 b1 - a1 b3
- a3 c1 + b3 c1 + a1 c3 - b1 c3)^2 + (a3 b2 - a2 b3 -
a3 c2 + b3 c2 + a2 c3 - b2 c3)^2)), (2 (b1 - c1) (a3
(b1 - c1) + b3 c1 - b1 c3 + a1 (-b3 + c3)) + 2 (b2 -
c2) (a3 (b2 - c2) + b3 c2 - b2 c3 + a2 (-b3 + c3)))/(4
Sqrt((a2 b1 - a1 b2 - a2 c1 + b2 c1 + a1 c2 - b1 c2)^2
+ (a3 b1 - a1 b3 - a3 c1 + b3 c1 + a1 c3 - b1 c3)^2 +
(a3 b2 - a2 b3 - a3 c2 + b3 c2 + a2 c3 - b2 c3)^2))
```



Not Covered: Contact Mechanics



Smith et al, "Reflections on Simultaneous Impact"

Notes

- **These SIGGRAPH course notes have an excellent description of how to write your own physically based simulation**
 - **<https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~baraff/sigcourse/>**

What you should know:

- Sketch a block diagram of a physically based simulation engine. Include modules for integrating the system forward in time, for calculating derivatives, for obtaining forces.
- How did you express state?
- Show state, and exact functionality of each module for a system where two 2D particles are connected by a spring. You may use forward Euler integration.
- The Euler-Lagrange equation is listed below. Explain each of the terms. Use the Euler-Lagrange equation to find the equations of motion for a particle acting under gravity, two particles connected by a spring, other simple systems.

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{q}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q}$$

- What equations are used for forward Euler integration? Forward Euler integration can suffer from two kinds of problems: (1) poor accuracy, and (2) instability. Explain these two problems. Illustrate each problem with a sketch.
- How do you set up Backward Euler integration? Is Backward Euler stable? Is it accurate? What problems may be observed when using Backward Euler? (Alternatively, what are the pros and cons of using Backward Euler?)
- Be prepared to explore other integration schemes, perhaps integrating a simple system forward a couple of steps by hand.
- We would typically use symbolic differentiation in a simulator, but sometimes it is convenient to use numerical differentiation. How would you numerically differentiate a given function $f(t)$?