## Lecture 19:

# Systems Trends in Real-Time Ray Tracing + Course Review 

Visual Computing Systems<br>Stanford CS348K, Fall 2018

## Presentations: next Tuesday

- 10-minute slots per project group
- Aim for eight minutes of speaking + 2 minutes discussion
- Key goal of the presentation:
- Tell the class:
- What the problem was (goals and constraints)
- What the most interesting part of the project was ("The challenging part was how we solved...")
- Provide a clear piece of evidence that your goals were achieved ("here is our graph of performance vs. ..")


# A few clear talk tips 

## For a full treatment see: http://graphics.stanford.edu/~kayvonf/misc/cleartalktips.pdf

## 1.

## Establish inputs, outputs, and constraints (goals and assumptions)

## Establish goals and assumptions early

- Given these inputs, we wish to generate these outputs
- We are working under the following constraints
- Example: the outputs should have these properties
- Example: the algorithm...
- Should be real-time
- Should be parallelizable
- Cannot require artist intervention
- Must be backward compatible with this content creation pipeline

Your contribution is typically a system or algorithm that meets the stated goals under the stated constraints.

## 2.

## Always, always, always explain any figure or graph

(the audience does not want to think about things you can tell them)

## Explain every figure

- Explain every visual element used in the figure (don't make the audience decode a figure)
- Refer to highlight colors explicitly (explain why the visual element is highlighted)


## Multi-sample locations



Sample coverage multiple times per pixel (for anti-aliased edges)

Example voice over: "Here I'm showing you a pixel grid, a projected triangle, and the location of four sample points at each pixel. Sample points falling within the triangle are colored red.

## Explain every figure

- Lead the listener through the key points of the figure

■ Useful phrase:"As you can see..."

- It's like verbal eye contact. It keeps the listener engaged and makes the listener happy... "Oh yeah, I can see that! I am following this talk!"


## Pixels at triangle boundaries are shaded multiple times

Shading computations per pixel


Example voice over: "Now I'm showing you two adjacent triangles, and I'm coloring pixels according to the number of shading computations that occur at each pixel as a result of rendering these two triangles. As you can see from the light blue region, pixels near the boundary of the two triangles get shaded twice.

## Explain every results graph

- May start with a general intro of what the graph will address (anticipate result)
- Then describe the axes (and your axes better have labels!)
- Then describe the one point that you wish to make with this results slide (more on this later!)


## Merging reduces total shaded quad fragments

## 1/2-pixel-area triangles: 8 x reduction



Example voice over: "Our first questions were about performance: how much did merging reduce the number of the shaded quad fragments? And we found out that the answer is a lot. This figure plots the number of shading computations per pixel when rendering different tessellations of the big guy scene. X-axis gives triangle size. If you look at the left side of the graph, which corresponds to a high-resolution micropolygon mesh, you can see that merging, shown by yellow line, shades over eight times less than the convention pipeline.

## 3.

## In the results section: One point per slide! One point per slide! One point per slide!

(and the point is the title of the slide!!!)

Merging reduces total shaded quad fragments
1/2-pixel-area triangles: $8 x$ reduction

## Merging reduces total shaded quad fragments

Ten-pixel-area triangles: $2 x$ reduction


Extra shading occurs at merging window boundaries


Nearly identical visual quality


Current GPU (no merging)


## For micropolygons: factor of eight across scenes

$1 / 2$ pixel area triangles
Average improvement: 8.1x


## Differences exist near silhouettes



Merging reduces total shaded quad fragments 1/2-pixel-area triangles: 8 x reduction

Extra shading occurs at merging window boundaries


Nearly identical visual quality


Merging reduces total shaded quad fragments Ten-pixel-area triangles: 2 x reduction


For micropolygons: factor of eight across scenes 1/2 pixel area triangles


Differences exist near silhouettes


## - Place the point of the slide in the title:

- Provide audience context for interpreting the graph ("Let me see if I can verify that point in the graph to check my understanding")


## Corollary to the one point per slide rule

- In general, you don't want to show data on a results slide that is unrelated to the point of the slide
- This usually means you need to remake the graphs from your paper (it's a pain, but sorry, it's important) *

[^0]
## Bad examples of results slides



## Simulation Results : RGS

© RGS Performance
\& 147-198 Mray/sec
\& Texture cache concerns : Mip-mapping \& Compression

|  | Ray | Cache hit rate (\%) |  | Bandwidth | Performance |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Test scene | type | Texture | Data | $(\mathrm{GB} / \mathrm{s})$ | $($ Mrays $/$ sec $)$ |
| Sibenik | Primary | - | 96.76 | 0.5 | 182.11 |
| (80K tri.) | FSR | - | 91.24 | 1.9 | 172.25 |
| Fairy | Primary | 93.25 | 96.87 | 0.8 | 175.66 |
| (179K tri.) | FSR | 81.49 | 94.91 | 1.9 | 147.45 |
| Ferrari | Primary | 86.12 | 98.09 | 0.6 | 183.28 |
| (210K tri.) | FSR | 75.95 | 95.71 | 2.0 | 163.67 |
| Conference | Primary | - | 98.44 | 0.2 | 198.32 |
| (282K tri.) | FSR | - | 95.72 | 0.8 | 158.79 |

- Notice how you (as an audience member) are working hard to interpret the trends in these graphs
- You are asking: what do these results say?
- You just want to be told what to look for



## 4.

## Titles matter.

If you read the titles of your talk all the way through, it should be a great summary of the talk.
(basically, this is "one-point-per-slide" for the whole talk)

## Examples of good slide titles

GPUs shade quad fragments ( $2 \times 2$ pixel blocks)

Texture data


Quad fragment


Greedy SRDH build optimizes over partitions and traversal policies

SAH:
foral1 (partitions in set-of-partitions) ...evaluate SAH and pick min...

SRDH:
forall (partitions in set-of-partitions)
forall (traversalkernels in set-of-kernels) ...evaluate SRDH and pick min...
$\operatorname{SRDH}(\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{L}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{r})=(1-\kappa(\mathrm{r}) \mathrm{H}(\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{r}))|\mathrm{R}|+(1-\kappa(\mathrm{r}) \mathrm{H}(\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{r}))|\mathrm{L}|$
use differences between neighboring texture coordinates to estimate derivatives

AAC IS AN APPROXIMATION TO THE TRUE AGGLOMERATIVE CLUSTERING SOLUTION.

Computation graph:


Primitive partitioning:


The reason for meaningful slide titles is convenience and clarity for the audience
"Why is the speaker telling me this again?"
(Why before what.)

## Read your slide titles in thumbnail view

Do they make all the points of the story you are trying to tell?


## 5.

## Practice.

## Even for a 10 minute class talk, practicing the talk out loud the night before goes a lot way

## Trends in real-time ray tracing

## D3D12 Ray Tracing Support

## Examples

- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LXoOWdIELJk
- UE4 Reflections
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IMSuGoYcT3s
- AtomicHeart Demo
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1lliQZw_p E


# Rasterization and ray casting are two algorithms for solving the same problem: determining "visibility from a camera" 

## Visibility problem



## The visibility problem

- What scene geometry is visible at each screen sample?
- What scene geometry projects into a screen pixel? (coverage)
- Which geometry is visible from the camera at that pixel? (occlusion)



## Basic rasterization algorithm

Sample $=2 \mathrm{D}$ point
Coverage: 2D triangle/sample tests (does projected triangle cover 2D sample point) Occlusion: depth buffer

```
initialize z_closest[] to INFINITY // store closest-surface-so-far for all samples
initialize color[] // store scene color for all samples
```

```
for each triangle t in scene:
```

for each triangle t in scene:
// loop 1: triangles
// loop 1: triangles
t_proj = project_triangle(t)
for each 2D sample s in frame buffer: // loop 2: visibility samples
if (t_proj covers s)
compute color of triangle at sample
if (depth of t at s is closer than z_closest[s])
update z_closest[s] and color[s]

```
"Given a triangle, find the samples it covers" (finding the samples is relatively easy since they are distributed uniformly on screen)


\section*{Depth buffer example}


\section*{The visibility problem (described differently)}
- In terms of casting rays from a simulated camera:
- What scene primitive is "hit" by a ray originating from a point on the virtual sensor and traveling through the aperture of the pinhole camera? (coverage)
- What primitive is the first hit along that ray? (occlusion)


\section*{Basic ray casting algorithm}

Sample = a ray in 3D
Coverage: 3D ray-triangle intersection tests (does ray "hit" triangle)
Occlusion: closest intersection along ray
```

initialize color[] // store scene color for all samples
for each sample s in frame buffer: // loop 1: visibility samples (rays)
r = ray from s on sensor through pinhole aperture
r.min_t = INFINITY // only store closest-so-far for current ray
r.tri = NULL;

```
```

for each triangle tri in scene: // loop 2: triangles

```
for each triangle tri in scene: // loop 2: triangles
    if (intersects(r, tri)) { // 3D ray-triangle intersection test
    if (intersects(r, tri)) { // 3D ray-triangle intersection test
            if (intersection distance along ray is closer than r.min_t)
            if (intersection distance along ray is closer than r.min_t)
                        update r.min_t and r.tri = tri;
                        update r.min_t and r.tri = tri;
        }
        }
    color[s] = compute surface color of triangle r.tri at hit point
```

    color[s] = compute surface color of triangle r.tri at hit point
    ```

Compared to rasterization approach: just a reordering of the loops! (+ math in 3D) "Given a ray, find the closest triangle it hits"

The brute force "for each triangle" loop is typically implemented using a search acceleration structure. (A rasterizer's "for each sample" inner loop is not just a loop over all screen samples either.)

\section*{Bounding volume hierarchy (BVH)}
- Leaf nodes:
- Contain small list of primitives

\section*{- Interior nodes:}
- Proxy for a large subset of primitives
- Stores bounding box for all primitives in subtree


\section*{Bounding volume hierarchy (BVH)}


Left: two different BVH organizations of the same scene containing 22 primitives.

Is one BVH better than the other?

\section*{Ray-scene intersection using a BVH}
```

struct BVHNode {
bool leaf; // true if node is a leaf
BBox bbox; // min/max coords of enclosed primitives
BVHNode* child1; // "left" child (could be NULL)
BVHNode* child2; // "right" child (could be NULL)
Primitive* primList; // for leaves, stores primitives
};
struct HitInfo {
Primitive* prim; // which primitive did the ray hit?
float t; // at what t value along ray?
};
void find_closest_hit(Ray* ray, BVHNode* node, HitInfo* closest) {
HitInfo hit = intersect(ray, node->bbox); // test ray against node's bounding box
if (hit.prim == NULL || hit.t > closest.t))
return; // don't update the hit record
if (node->leaf) {
for (each primitive p in node->primList) {
hit = intersect(ray, p);
if (hit.prim != NULL \&\& hit.t < closest.t) {
closest.prim = p;
closest.t = t;
}
}
} else {
find_closest_hit(ray, node->child1, closest);
find_closest_hit(ray, node->child2, closest);
}}

```

\section*{Recall: rendering as a triple for-loop}

\section*{Naive"rasterizer":}
```

initialize z_closest[] to INFINITY
initialize color[]
for each triangle t in scene:
t_proj = project_triangle(t)
for each sample s in frame buffer: // loop 2: visibility samples
if (t_proj covers s)
for each light l in scene: // loop 3: lights
accumulate contribution of light l to surface appearance
if (depth of t at s is closer than z_closest[s])
update z_closest[s] and color[s]

```

\section*{Naive "ray caster":}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{initialize color[]} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{for each sample s in frame buffer: // loop 1: visibility samples} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
ray \(\mathbf{r}=\) ray from s through pinhole aperture out into scene \\
r.closest = INFINITY \\
// only store closest-so-far for current ray \\
r.triangleId = NULL;
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{for each triangle t in scene: // loop 2: triangles} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{if (intersects(r, t)) \{ // 3D ray-triangle intersection test if (intersection distance along ray is closer than r.closest) update r.closest and r.triangleId = t;}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
accumulate contribution of light \(l\) to appearance of intersected surface r.triangleId color[s] = surface color of r.triangleId at hit point;

\section*{Basic rasterization vs. basic ray casting}
- Basic rasterization:
- Stream over triangles in order (never have to store in entire scene, naturally supports unbounded size scenes)
- Store depth buffer (need random access to regular structure of fixed size)
- Ray casting:
- Stream over screen samples (rays)
- Never have to store closest depth so far for the entire screen (just current ray)
- Natural order for rendering transparent surfaces (process surfaces in the order the are encountered along the ray: front-to-back or back-to-front)
- Must store entire scene (random access to irregular structure of variable size: depends on complexity and distribution of scene)

\section*{Ray-scene intersection is a general visibility primitive} What object is visible along this ray?

What object is visible to the camera?
What light sources are visible from a point on a surface (Is a surface in shadow?)

What reflection is visible on a surface?


Direct illumination + reflection + transparency

\section*{Globalillumination solution}



\section*{Sampling light paths}


Image credit: Wann Jensen, Hanrahan

\section*{Another way to think about rasterization}
- Rasterization is an optimized visibility algorithm for batches of rays with specific properties
- Assumption 1: Rays have the same origin
- Assumption 2: Rays are uniformly distributed (across image plane... not uniformly distributed in angle)

\section*{Another way to think about rasterization}
- Rasterization is a efficient implementation of ray casting where:
- Scene intersection results for a batch of rays are computed at a time
- All rays originate from same origin
- Projection of rays distributed uniformly in plane of projection (Note: not uniform distribution in angle... angle between rays is smaller away from view direction)


\section*{Shadow mapping: ray origin need not be the scene's camera position}
- Place ray origin at position of a point light source
- Render scene to compute depth to closest object to light along uniformly distributed "shadow rays" (answer stored in depth buffer)
- Store precomputed shadow ray intersection results in a texture

"Shadow map" = depth map from perspective of a point light.
(Store closest intersection along each shadow ray in a texture map)


\section*{Result of shadow texture lookup approximates visibility result when shading fragment at \(x^{\prime}\)}


\section*{Shadow aliasing due to shadow map undersampling}


Shadows computed using shadow map


Correct hard shadows
(result from computing \(\mathbf{v}\left(\mathbf{x}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}^{\prime \prime}\right)\) directly using ray tracing)

\section*{Rasterization: ray origin need not be camera position}

\section*{Environment mapping: place ray origin at reflective object}

\section*{Yields approximation to true} reflection results. Why?

Cube map:
stores results of approximate mirror reflection rays
(Question: how can a glossy surface be rendered
 using the cube-map)

Center of projection


\section*{Why real-time ray tracing?}

\section*{Why ray tracing}
- Accurate lighting/shading effects
- Correct reflections from surfaces surfaces
- Correct shadows (no aliasing)
- Soft shadows
- Ambient occlusion
- "Global illumination" (multiple bounces)
- Software simplicity
- Many effects created from a single primitive (traceRay())
- This is was the "killer reason" to move to ray tracing for film rendering

\section*{Technologies that are making RTRT possible}
- Better algorithms: fast parallel BVH construction and traversal algorithms (SIGGRAPH/HPG circa 2010)
- GPU hardware evaluation:
- Faster GPUs, sufficient amounts of DRAM
- Increasingly flexible aspects of traditional GPU pipeline (bindless textures/resources)
- DNN-based image denoising
- Can make plausible images using small number of rays per pixel
- Make use of DNN hardware acceleration

\section*{Sampling noise}


\section*{One sample per pixel}


\section*{32 samples per pixe}


1024 samples per pixel

\section*{Example: NVIDIA Optix denoiser}
- https://developer.nvidia.com/optix-denoiser


\section*{Traditional graphics pipeline}


\section*{Keep in mind}
- An application developer has always been able to write a ray tracer in CUDA
- So the ability to use a GPU to perform ray tracing is nothing new
- So why a new API?

\section*{D3D12's DXR ray tracing "stages"}
- TraceRay is a blocking function


\section*{GPU understands format of BVH acceleration structure and "shader table"}


Shader Table

Root
Table


\section*{Surprising synergies}
- New GPU hardware for raytracing operations
- But ray tracing still too expensive for noise-free images in real-time
- Tensor core: specialized hardware for accelerated DNN computations
(that can be used to perform sophisticated denoising)


\section*{Summary}
- Ray tracing is an elegant, general purpose algorithm for rendering realistic images
- Simple: single operation for many effects
- Challenge = high cost: must trace large number of rays per pixel to reduce noise in rendered images
- Solutions:
- Hardware for ray-tracing specific operations
- Hardware for DNN acceleration used to implement new fast denoising operations```


[^0]:    * This is an example of a tip for conference talk polish: not necessary for class talks

