

A comprehensive framework for modeling heterogeneous objects

Francisco Conde-Rodríguez · Juan-Carlos Torres-Cantero · Ángel-Luis García-Fernández · Francisco-Ramón Feito-Higueruela

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Many real objects are heterogeneous. They are composed of diverse materials, which are present in varying proportions. Materials inside the solid don't have to be uniformly distributed. So, methods capable of accurately model not only the boundary of the solid, but also the distribution of material in every single point of its interior, are needed. In this paper we propose a new framework for modeling heterogeneous objects. The framework is comprehensive as it characterizes precisely heterogeneous objects, it defines an adequate mathematical model that captures the essence of such objects, and it defines a computational representation to represent the modeled objects in a computer. Our framework is based on Béziér hyperpatches and solves the main problems of this mathematical tool. We have implement it completely in order to check if it can model precisely real objects.

Keywords Object Modeling · Heterogeneous objects · Béziér

CR Subject Classification I.3.5.

1 Introduction and motivation

Heterogeneous objects are composed of different materials whose proportion along the solid is variable. These objects benefit from the best features due to the mix of materials they are made from. The mixture of materials that compose

F. Conde-Rodríguez · Á.L. García-Fernández · F.R. Feito-Higueruela
Departamento de Informática, University of Jaén, EPS, Campus las lagunillas s/n, 23071, Jaén, Spain
E-mail: [fconde | algarcia | ffeito]@ujaen.es

J.C. Torres-Cantero
Departamento de Lenguajes y Sistemas Informáticos, ETSIIT, University of Granada, c/Periodista Manuel Saucedo Aranda, s/n, 18071, Granada, Spain.
E-mail: jctorres@ugr.es




Fig. 1 Real heterogeneous motorcycle tire precisely modeled with our computer application

heterogeneous solids, are called heterogeneous materials or functionally graded materials. Heterogeneous materials are used to manufacture many types of real objects, e.g., medical implants, engine parts, or competition tires.

Designing heterogeneous objects is not an easy task. It is necessary a computer application, based on a well stated framework, to address all complex aspects of the design process.

In this paper, we describe a comprehensive framework that allows representing heterogeneous objects in a simple and efficient way. The framework is based on Béziér hyper-

patches, further developed and extended to solve the main problems of this well-known formulation. A hyperpatch is a continuous, three-parameter, single-valued function that define the coordinates of the set of points comprising the object, exterior as well as interior. The shape of the object is defined by geometric coefficients also called control points.

Our framework is able to maintain continuity between parametric cells, and also allows representing discontinuities if necessary, both in the geometry and the gradation of the used materials. It also keeps the validity of the represented object.

We also developed a simplified mesh of geometric coefficients, that allows a human operator to be focused on the main structure of the object and adjust fine details in a very simple and intuitive manner. The editing is performed by movements of geometric coefficients in a process assisted by the framework, allowing to automatically maintain first order continuity in those regions that need it. It is also possible to interactively create new object models with the aid of techniques such as extrusion, sweeping, or revolution of existing cells.

All this was done keeping a relatively low number of parametric cells, which simplifies its recording, processing, and transmission through a network.

We developed a computer application to test if the framework can accurately represent real objects, (See Fig. 1). Using our application, we modeled a real motorcycle tire from scratch, following precisely the blueprints included in the patent [11]. The whole process only took six hours.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2, some of the research works already carried out in this field are briefly described. Our comprehensive framework is described in Sect. 3. Subsect. 3.1, defines precisely what is a heterogeneous object and a valid material distribution, Subsect. 3.2 describes heterogeneous regular objects (hr-objects) which are the mathematical model inside our framework, Subsect. 3.3 describes heterogeneous composite Béziér hyperpatches that are the computational representation we use, and Subsect. 3.4 and 3.5 describe how our framework keeps two fundamental properties: validity and continuity. Next, in Sect. 4 we explain how heterogeneous objects can be edited, both geometry and material distributions, in a flexible and simple way, using our framework. In Sect. 5 we describe some of the operations that our framework provides to construct models of heterogeneous objects from scratch. In Sect. 6 several examples of real objects modeled with a computer application using our framework are shown. And finally, the conclusions of this work are summarized in Sect. 7.

2 Related work

A precise characterization of a heterogeneous object is presented in [7] by Kumar and Dutta. The mathematical model for heterogeneous objects (r_m -set / r_m -object) proposed by the authors captures very well the essence of this type of objects, so it is quite an appropriate mathematical model for computational representations of heterogeneous objects. The authors also present a computational representation by means of non-manifold B-reps based on r_m -objects.

Traditional solid modeling methods, boundary representation (B-rep), constructive solid geometry (CSG), or enumeration, are not the most suitable for heterogeneous objects. This is because they either do not allow representing the inside of the object, or use very simple functions for precisely modeling the interior.

Research on the use of hyperpatches as a tool for modeling heterogeneous objects [1] started during the 80s. Hyperpatches have an extraordinary capacity to precisely represent each point inside the object by allowing to designate the desired material to every point. However, there is a high degree of freedom with the mathematical tool, which needs to be refined so it can be a useful tool.

Several attempts have been made to refine hyperpatches:

Schmitt, Pasko and Schlick [14] suggested a method to model heterogeneous objects that uses FRep as the basic model combined with trivariate B-Splines primitives by CSG operations. This method can be very useful for rapid prototyping or virtual sculpting.

Qian and Dutta [12] suggested using B-Spline hyperpatches to represent heterogeneous objects. They focused on making it easy for the user to assign the materials to each point of the object considering the desired properties for that specific point. For this, the authors defined a diffusion process.

In [5], and later in [3] and [4], a model based on trivariate simplex splines was presented. This model is useful when constructing a representation of a heterogeneous object using a triangle mesh as the starting point. It allows obtaining very accurate tetrahedral spline decompositions. Variable continuity is defined between 0 and C^{n-1} , being n the degree of the splines. Because the models have been constructed from triangulations, the generated simplex B-Spline mesh is huge, even for objects with relatively simple geometries. The editing, as with any hyperpatch, is done by moving the control points.

Yang and Qian [16] describe a method for constructing complex geometries with B-Spline hyperpatches defined from curves using a lofting process. For certain problems, this method is a good approach.

Warkhedkar and Bhatt [15] used regular B-Spline hyperpatches to accommodate the slices from a CT scan and adjust the distribution values in the vertices of the B-Spline

control mesh to represent the human body. The visualization is done using classical techniques, such as marching cubes.

In [6], the authors describe a method based on functionally graded material (FGM), very adequate for rapid prototyping, for which it is not necessary to precisely model very complex geometries.

These current methods have certain weaknesses, such as:

- The classical formulations of hyperpatches produce completely continuous models or with no continuity at all. Mixed continuity is not allowed in classic hyperpatches. For example: Cubic B-Splines hyperpatches have coefficients that are aligned in regular grids and produce C^2 continuous objects. They can't model discontinuities, both in geometry or in distribution of materials, between adjacent cells. Knot insertion and other techniques try to solve this problem but make intricate the editing process.
- Hyperpatches *per se* do not address the problem of validity (the hyperpatch function *per se* is not injective), which is a very important property in a object modeling framework, because it prevents the modeling of non-sense objects.
- The natural way to edit a hyperpatch is by moving its geometric coefficients, however if these coefficients are treated independently, without the helping of the framework to perceive and maintain the existing relations among them, the editing is very unintuitive and difficult for modeling of new objects.
- Other current methods like CSG of B-rep, do not allow a precise representation of the inside of the object and its boundary.
- Despite its ability to make rapid prototypes, methods based on CSG, are not well suited to modeling complex geometries that cannot be obtained by boolean operations.
- Compact computational representations are preferable since they produce a finite set of symbols that facilitate its processing, storage, and transmission.

3 Our framework

Traditionally, to describe a new framework for modeling objects, a three-levels approach has been used [13,9]:

- **Physical objects.** They are the objects that need to be studied or manipulated. They may or may not exist.
- **Mathematical models.** Physical objects can not be modeled in a computer, so it is necessary to adopt adequate idealization thereof. These idealized objects must have a clear and intuitive connection with physical objects, and at the same time, be simple enough so that they can be represented in a discrete and limited computer.

- **Computational representations.** The final step in the modeling activity is to assign to the mathematical model a representation that can be suitable for its use in a computer.

We use this approach, so in the next three sections we explain each of these levels.

3.1 Material distribution

In this section we characterize the physical objects we are trying to model.

Kumar and Dutta, in [7] present a great mathematical characterization of heterogeneous objects. We use its characterization with slight variations.

Heterogeneous objects are composed of different constituent materials (also known as **primary materials**), which are present in varying proportions along the object. It is assumed that the number of primary materials n is finite. The material at a point \mathbf{p} in a object \mathbf{S} is a combination (mixture) of the n primary materials specified by the volume fractions of these materials. Thus, the \mathbb{R}^n set, with a vectorial space structure, is a mathematical space that defines the material distribution, each dimension representing a specific primary material.

Let $\mathbf{M} = \{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n\}$ be a set of primary materials, where each material m_i is a literal (the name of that material). Let $n = |\mathbf{M}|$ be the cardinality of the set \mathbf{M} . The **material distribution** of any given point \mathbf{p} of a heterofeneous object is represented by an element $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where each element a_i of the material distribution is the fraction of the volume occupied by the i -nth material at that point.

The volume fractions of each primary material must add up to 1, otherwise the objects in the real world are senseless. In other words, not all possible material distributions $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are appropriate. The valid space of material distributions \mathbf{V} can be defined as:

$$\mathbf{V} = \left\{ \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n a_i = 1, a_i \geq 0 \right\} \quad (1)$$

A material distribution \mathbf{a} is valid only if $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$; i.e., a material distribution is valid if its elements a_i are the coefficients of a convex combination on a set of primary materials \mathbf{M} .

A combination operation is defined over the set \mathbf{V} of valid material distributions. Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{V}$ be two valid material distributions, then its combination is given by:

$$\mathbf{a} \oplus_{\alpha} \mathbf{b} = \alpha \cdot \mathbf{a} + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \mathbf{b}, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1] \quad (2)$$

where α is an scalar that defines the contribution of each material distribution to the final result.




Fig. 2 Structure of a hr-object

The operation of combination \oplus_α is closed in \mathbf{V} . We think this formulation of the combination operation \oplus_α is simpler and straightforward than other proposed formulations.

3.2 Heterogeneous regular object

In this section we characterize the mathematical models we use in our framework.

The r_m -objects (made up by r_m -sets) proposed by Kumar and Dutta [7] are the appropriate mathematical idealization for heterogeneous objects. Here, we use r_m -objects as the mathematical model for a heterogeneous object, but with slight variations.

We force the material function to be piecewise continuous, in order to model discontinuities during material distribution. This is a very important capability of our framework. It allows abrupt change of materials along the modeled object.

The mathematical model we suggest is the hr-object, based on the r_m -sets and the r_m -objects of Kumar and Dutta. Let \mathbf{M} be a set of primary materials, and let $n = |\mathbf{M}|$ be the cardinality of the set \mathbf{M} .

A **heterogeneous regular object (hr-object)** (See Fig. 2) is defined as a ternion, $\mathbf{O} = \{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{V}, F\}$, where:

- \mathbf{S} is an r-set. $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is a limited set with its boundary defined by rigid and regular algebraic functions.
- $\mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the set of all valid material distributions.
- F is the material function; it assigns a valid material distribution \mathbf{a} (See Eq. 1) to each point \mathbf{p} of the r-set. The F function defines the way the primary materials are distributed along the volume of the object.

Unlike other proposed models, the domain of our material function F is not \mathbb{E}^3 . This make it possible to apply

deformations to the modeled heterogeneous objects without losing information on the material distributions.

F is a piecewise continuous function:

Let $\{\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2, \dots, \mathbf{S}_p\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{S})$ be a partition of \mathbf{S} , i.e.:

$$\mathbf{S}_i \cap \mathbf{S}_j = \emptyset, \quad i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{i=1}^p \mathbf{S}_i = \mathbf{S}.$$

$$F(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{cases} F_i : \mathbf{S}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{V} \\ F_i(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{a}, \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{S}_i \quad 1 \leq i \leq p \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Each function F_i is continuous in the \mathbf{S}_i set in which it is defined. We called hr-set to each of the sub-sets \mathbf{S}_i (every volume in which the F function is continuous).

As can be seen in Eq. 3, the material function F defines the way the materials are distributed in the volume of the object. It assigns a valid distribution of materials to each point \mathbf{p} of the r-set.

The material function F does not have to be continuous in the whole r-set \mathbf{S} . This allows modeling complex objects with discontinuities both in geometry and material distributions.

The **external geometric boundary** of the regular heterogeneous object \mathbf{O} , $b_{ext}(\mathbf{O})$, is the boundary of the regularized union of the \mathbf{S}_i sets.

$$b_{ext}(\mathbf{O}) = b\left(\bigcup_i \mathbf{S}_i\right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq p$$

The points that don't belong to $b_{ext}(\mathbf{O})$, but belong to $b(\mathbf{S}_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, that is, those points that are not in the boundary of the regular heterogeneous object but only in the boundary of some of the hr-sets that form it, are called **internal boundary points**.

$$b_{int}(\mathbf{O}) = b_{ext}(\mathbf{O}) \setminus \bigcup_i b(\mathbf{S}_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq p$$

Internal boundary points are part of more than one hr-set. They are irregular points that may have two or more associated material distributions.

Let $\underline{\mathbf{p}} \in b_{int}(\mathbf{O})$ be a point belonging the internal boundary points of the hr-object \mathbf{O} .

Let $\mathbf{L} = \{l_1, \dots, l_m\} \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, be the set of the indices of the sets to which the point $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$ belongs: $\underline{\mathbf{p}} \in \bigcup_{l_i \in \mathbf{L}} b(\mathbf{S}_{l_i}) \subseteq b_{int}(\mathbf{O})$,

and let $l_{min} = \min(\mathbf{L})$

We define the material function on this internal boundary point $F(\underline{\mathbf{p}})$ as:

$$F(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) = F_{l_{min}}(\underline{\mathbf{p}})$$

Thus the material function F is injective in these points, so the hr-object is valid.




Fig. 3 Three-dimensional array of $4 \times 4 \times 4 = 64$ geometric coefficients with indices i, j , and k varying from 0 to 3

Note that \mathbf{M} is not part of the mathematical definition of heterogeneous regular object, because the only thing that matters is its cardinality $n = |\mathbf{M}|$ (number of primary materials for a specific problem). Applications using the hr-objects will assign the meaning of each material.

3.3 Heterogeneous Composite Béziér Hyperpatches

Finally, in this section, we characterize the computational representation we use in our framework.

Hyperpatches (also known as parametric objects or tri-variate objects) are a mathematical tool that has been successfully used to represent objects [10]. They have a clear advantage over other classical tools, such as boundary representation (B-rep), constructive solid geometry (CSG), or decomposition models (exhaustive enumeration, octrees, etc.): they allow to accurately represent not only the boundary of the object, but also the interior. A **hyperpatch** is a set of points whose coordinates are the result of a vectorial, continuous, single-valued function:

$$\mathbf{B}(u, v, w) = (x(u, v, w), y(u, v, w), z(u, v, w))$$




Fig. 4 Boundary elements associated to a hyperpatch. From left to right: corner points, boundary isoparametric curves and boundary isoparametric surfaces

where the parametric variables u, v , and w are usually limited to values within the closed interval $[0, 1]$.

This vectorial function defines the coordinates of the set of points that make up the object. For every 3-tuple of values of the parametric variables (u, v, w) , the \mathbf{B} function provides the coordinates of a point $\mathbf{p} = (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ of the object. Thus, a hyperpatch is a parametric projection of a solid domain (a unit size cube) in the three-dimensional space. The domain of the projection is known as parametric space \mathbb{U} , and the projection range is called modeling space \mathbb{R}^3 .

The **geometric form** of the hyperpatch is:

$$\mathbf{p}(u, v, w) = \sum_{i=0}^3 \sum_{j=0}^3 \sum_{k=0}^3 \mathbf{g}_{ijk} B_i^3(u) B_j^3(v) B_k^3(w) \quad u, v, w \in [0, 1]$$

where $\mathbf{g}_{ijk} = (x_{ijk}, y_{ijk}, z_{ijk})$ are the **geometric coefficients** that define the shape of the object and B^3 are **cubic blending functions** that combine these coefficients to obtain all the points of the object. The geometric coefficients are also known as **control points**. As can be seen, the shape of the object is directly linked to the geometric coefficients.

There are several types of blending functions that can be used to combine geometric coefficients. For this work, we have chosen cubic Béziér blending functions [8].

$$\begin{aligned} B_0^3(t) &= (1-t)^3 & B_1^3(t) &= 3t(1-t)^2 \\ B_2^3(t) &= 3t^2(1-t) & B_3^3(t) &= t^3 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In the tricubic case, $4 \times 4 \times 4 = 64$ geometric coefficients are used to define a hyperpatch (as can be seen in Fig. 3). It is usually useful to think that these coefficients are organized in a three-dimensional array with indices i, j , and k varying from 0 to 3.

A set of boundary elements is associated to each tricubic Béziér hyperpatch, perfectly defining its boundary (See Fig.4):

- Six surfaces that are obtained by fixing the value of one of the parametric coordinates u, v, w , which takes the value 0 or 1, while the other two run freely along the $[0, 1]$ interval. They are called **isoparametric boundary surfaces**. For example $\mathbf{B}(0, v, w)$ or \mathbf{B}_{0vw} .

- Twelve curves obtained by fixing the value of two of the parametric coordinates u, v, w , which take the value 0 or 1, while the third runs freely along the $[0, 1]$ interval. These are called **isoparametric boundary curves**.
- Eight points obtained by fixing the value of the three parametric coordinates u, v, w , which take the value 0 or 1. These are called **corner points**.

The Béziér functions were chosen because:

- They interpolate the eight corner point of a parametric Béziér hyperpatch, that is, the hyperpatch passes through these points.
- The tangents to each corner point are defined by only its neighboring geometric coefficients (in the array of 64 coefficients). Thus, moving a control point close in the array to a corner point, have a clear effect on the shape of the hyperpatch around that corner point.

Béziér hyperpatches accurately model their interior. However, it is not possible to determine material distribution at every point; thus, it is necessary to define the **heterogeneous Béziér hyperpatch** as follows [1]:

$$\mathbf{B}_m = \sum_{i=0}^3 \sum_{j=0}^3 \sum_{k=0}^3 \mathbf{h}_{ijk} B_i^3(u) B_j^3(v) B_k^3(w) \quad u, v, w \in [0, 1] \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_{ijk} = (\mathbf{p}_{ijk}, \mathbf{a}_{ijk})$ are the **heterogeneous geometric coefficients**, which are pairs of values. The elements

$$\mathbf{p}_{ijk} = (x_{ijk}, y_{ijk}, z_{ijk}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

are the points that define the shape of the hyperpatch, and the elements

$$\mathbf{a}_{ijk} = (a_{1_{ijk}}, a_{2_{ijk}}, \dots, a_{n_{ijk}}) \in \mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$$

are the material distributions defining the gradation of the different materials throughout the hyperpatch.

Note that a heterogeneous Béziér hyperpatch \mathbf{B}_m is a set formed by two sets:

$$\mathbf{B}_m = \{\mathbf{P}_m, \mathbf{A}_m\}$$

The set \mathbf{P}_m defines the shape of the hyperpatch, and the set \mathbf{A}_m defines the gradation of the different materials throughout it (See Fig. 5).

$$\mathbf{P}_m = \sum_{i=0}^3 \sum_{j=0}^3 \sum_{k=0}^3 \mathbf{p}_{ijk} B_i^3(u) B_j^3(v) B_k^3(w) \quad u, v, w \in [0, 1]$$

$$\mathbf{A}_m = \sum_{i=0}^3 \sum_{j=0}^3 \sum_{k=0}^3 \mathbf{a}_{ijk} B_i^3(u) B_j^3(v) B_k^3(w) \quad u, v, w \in [0, 1]$$

A **heterogeneous composite Béziér hyperpatch**, \mathbf{B} , is a finite collection of heterogeneous Béziér hyperpatches.

$$\mathbf{B} = \{\mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \dots, \mathbf{B}_m\}$$

where $\mathbf{B}_i = \{\mathbf{P}_i, \mathbf{A}_i\}$.

$\forall \mathbf{P}_i \in \mathbf{B}_i, \mathbf{P}_j \in \mathbf{B}_j \quad i \neq j, \quad \mathbf{P}_i \cap \mathbf{P}_j = \emptyset$. That is, the hyperpatches are pairwise disjoint, and at most, only share one, two or four corner points; one or four isoparametric boundary curves; and/or one isoparametric boundary surface.




Fig. 5 A heterogeneous Béziér hyperpatch \mathbf{B}_m , is composed by a set \mathbf{P}_m of points that defines the geometry of the hyperpatch, and a set \mathbf{A}_m of material distributions that defines the gradation of materials throughout the hyperpatch




Fig. 6 This parametric cell is **valid**, however, our condition of validity rejects it. This is an **advantage of our framework**, because the points inside this cell are not regularly distributed (encircled points in blue). Parametric cells with regular distributions of points inside them are preferable when modeling heterogeneous objects

A heterogeneous composite Béziér hyperpatch can be seen as a cell decomposition, in which each cell is a heterogeneous Béziér hyperpatch. From now on, we are going to use either **parametric cell** or hyperpatch to refer to the heterogeneous Béziér hyperpatches in this decomposition.

3.4 Validity

In any framework for object modeling, validity is a very important property [13,9], as it ensures that meaningless models of objects cannot be obtained. Therefore, in this section we will study the validity of objects modeled by using our framework.

If additional conditions are not established, the classic hyperpatch formulation does not guarantee the validity of the objects represented. For that reason, in 2001, we developed a validity condition for b-spline hyperpatches that easily extends to the Béziér case [2]. Our validity condition works by checking relative positions of geometric coefficients in each parametric cell. Thus, after editing the solid by moving some geometric coefficients it is only necessary to check the validity in those parametric cells containing these coefficients. This process is very fast and can be done in real time.

Our condition of validity is sufficient but not necessary. This means that some parametric cells, that are in fact valid, are rejected. However, this is an advantage of our validity condition, since the points inside the rejected heterogeneous Béziér hyperpatches, are not regularly distributed (See Fig. 6). Parametric cells with points regularly distributed inside them are preferable when modeling heterogeneous objects.

3.5 Continuity

There is zero-order continuity C^0 between two parametric cells \mathbf{B}_l and \mathbf{B}_m , if they share 16 boundary geometric coefficients. Let be $\mathbf{B}_l(1, v, w) = \mathbf{B}_m(0, v, w)$ the shared surface, then the coefficients $\mathbf{h}_{l_3jk} \in \mathbf{B}_l$ and $\mathbf{h}_{m_0jk} \in \mathbf{B}_m$ have to be equals $\forall j, k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.

Note that the reasoning is the same in the case of shared surfaces with fixed values of v or w .

This zero-order continuity condition is too restrictive, so we developed a more flexible one. This is another contribution of our work. In our framework, zero-order continuity can be established for each of the four corner points of the shared surface independently (See Fig. 7).

For a given corner point, only three geometric coefficients have effect in the shape of the boundary isoparametric surface around it. They are its immediate neighbors. So, to obtain zero-order continuity around a given corner point, both cells have to share it, and have to share its immediate neighboring geometric coefficients.

Let be $\mathbf{h}_{l_3,3,3} = \mathbf{h}_{m_0,3,3}$ the shared corner point, then the neighbor geometric coefficients $\mathbf{h}_{l_3,3,2} = \mathbf{h}_{m_0,3,2}$, $\mathbf{h}_{l_3,2,3} = \mathbf{h}_{m_0,2,3}$ and $\mathbf{h}_{l_3,2,2} = \mathbf{h}_{m_0,2,2}$ have to be equals in order to obtain zero-order continuity around that corner point (See Fig. 7).

Our condition is very flexible and allows to model complex shapes easily.

Notice that a heterogeneous geometric coefficient $\mathbf{h}_{ijk} = (\mathbf{p}_{ijk}, \mathbf{a}_{ijk})$ has two components: a position in three-dimensional space $\mathbf{p}_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and a material distribution $\mathbf{a}_{ijk} \in \mathbf{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, so zero-order continuity C^0 applies to both the geometry as the distribution of the materials.

Both components are independent, so it is possible to establish C^0 continuity between two parametric cells for the geometry (the shape of the modeled object) but not for the material distribution.




Fig. 7 Zero-order continuity between two parametric cells can be established at corner point level. These two parametric cells share the corner points in dark blue and its immediate neighbors so they have C^0 continuity in the left side. In the right side, each cell have different corner points and different neighbors, so they don't have C^0 continuity




Fig. 8 The tangents to the points on the shared surface (light blue) are defined by the 16 geometric coefficients of the surface (dark blue) and its immediate neighbors (red) on each cell. In order to ensure C^1 continuity, each group of three coefficients must form two vectors that must be equal. In our framework, C^1 continuity can be established at corner point level, so the continuity condition of Eq. 8 can be set for each group of four shared coefficients independently (encircled points in blue)

We will study now first-order continuity C^1 . Let be \mathbf{B}_l and \mathbf{B}_m two parametric cells that share a boundary isoparametric surface. Let be $\mathbf{B}_l(1, v, w) = \mathbf{B}_m(0, v, w)$ the points of the shared surface.

The heterogeneous Béziér hyperpatches have first-order continuity C^1 in the shared surface if all the isoparametric curves with constant values of v and w passing through each point of the shared surface, have equal tangent vectors on both cells to these points.

$$\mathbf{B}_l^u(1, v, w) = \mathbf{B}_m^u(0, v, w) \quad \forall v, w \in [0, 1] \quad (6)$$

The tangents to these points depend on the 16 geometric coefficients that define the shared surface, and its immediate

neighbors on each cell. So, in order to ensure C^1 continuity, each group of three coefficients must form two vectors that must be equal.

Let be $\mathbf{h}_{*,j,k}$ one geometric coefficient shared between \mathbf{B}_l and \mathbf{B}_m . Let $\mathbf{v}_l = \mathbf{h}_{*,j,k} - \mathbf{h}_{l_{3-1,j,k}}$ the vector formed by the shared coefficient and its immediate neighbor in \mathbf{B}_l . And let $\mathbf{v}_m = \mathbf{h}_{m_{0+1,j,k}} - \mathbf{h}_{*,j,k}$ the vector formed by the shared coefficient and its immediate neighbor in \mathbf{B}_m . Then, there is C^1 continuity between \mathbf{B}_l and \mathbf{B}_m in the shared surface, if (see Fig. 8):

$$\mathbf{v}_l = \mathbf{v}_m \quad \mathbf{h}_{*,j,k} - \mathbf{h}_{l_{3-1,j,k}} = \mathbf{h}_{m_{0+1,j,k}} - \mathbf{h}_{*,j,k} \quad \forall j, k \in \{2, 3\} \quad (7)$$

Note that the reasoning is the same in the case of shared surfaces with fixed values of v or w .

Again, this first-order continuity condition is too restrictive, so we developed a more flexible one. In our framework, C^1 continuity can be established for each corner points of the shared surface independently (See Fig. 8).

After editing an immediate neighbor $\mathbf{h}_{l_{3-1,j,k}}$ of a shared geometric coefficient $\mathbf{h}_{*,j,k}$ it is easy to calculate the position of the corresponding coefficient $\mathbf{h}_{m_{0+1,j,k}}$ as:

$$\mathbf{h}_{m_{0+1,j,k}} = 2\mathbf{h}_{*,j,k} - \mathbf{h}_{l_{3-1,j,k}} \quad (8)$$

Note that the reasoning is the same in the case of shared surfaces with fixed values of v or w .

A heterogeneous geometric coefficient $\mathbf{h}_{ijk} = (\mathbf{p}_{ijk}, \mathbf{a}_{ijk})$ has a position in three-dimensional space and a material distribution. Let's study first-order continuity in both cases separately.

The position of a heterogeneous geometric coefficient is a point in the three-dimensional space \mathbb{R}^3 , so the result of the operation $2\mathbf{p}_{*,j,k} - \mathbf{p}_{l_{3-1,j,k}}$ is always a valid point in \mathbb{R}^3 .




Fig. 9 Our first-order continuity condition for distribution of material allows to model many interesting continuous transitions between two material, for example with shape of cylinders or spheres (left side). It is also possible to combine not continuity and first-order continuity in the same shared surface between two cells (right side)




Fig. 10 Our framework maintains C^1 continuity for material distributions between two cells in a given corner point (white point), by assigning the same material distribution to its immediate neighboring points (blue points)

However, the material distribution of a heterogeneous geometric coefficient is a point in $\mathbf{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, being n the number of significant materials for a given problem, (See Eq. 1). That means that not all points in \mathbb{R}^n can be used as material distribution.

For example, if we use a set $\mathbf{M} = \{m_0, m_1\}$ of two primary materials, $|\mathbf{M}| = 2$, only the points of \mathbb{R}^2 that lie in the line segment with endpoints $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ are valid.

Suppose $\mathbf{a}_{l_{3-1,j,k}} = (0.5, 0.5)$ and $\mathbf{a}_{*,j,k} = (0.2, 0.8)$, applying Eq. 8, $\mathbf{a}_{m_{0+1,j,k}} = (-0.1, 1.1)$ which is a not valid material distribution.

In order to maintain C^1 continuity for material distributions automatically, we developed a C^1 continuity condition for material distributions different to Eq. 7. Given the material distribution \mathbf{a} on a corner point shared by two parametric cells \mathbf{B}_l and \mathbf{B}_m , we ensure C^1 continuity in the distribution of materials around that corner point, by assigning the same material distribution \mathbf{a} to all immediate neighboring coefficients in both cells (see Fig. 10).

As can be seen in Fig. 9 this continuity condition for the distribution of material allows us to model many interesting continuous transitions between two material (for example, transitions with shape of cylinders or spheres). It is impor-

tant to realize this is not a linear interpolation between the distributions of material in each of the eight corner points of each parametric cell, but a cubic interpolation.

It is also possible to have C^1 continuity between two cells in some corner points and no continuity in other corner points shared by the same cells (See Fig. 9).

Of course, if a greater degree of accuracy in the transition between a material and another is required, continuity always can be adjusted manually.

We don't consider second-order continuity C^2 , because this type of continuity cannot be maintained locally, as it involves all geometric coefficients of both cells \mathbf{B}_l and \mathbf{B}_m , and consequently all other adjacent cells. That means that, if we establish second-order continuity between two cubic parametric cells, all adjacent cells have to be also C^2 continuous. It isn't possible to model discontinuities in the object. This makes it poorly flexible for modeling complex objects. Furthermore, second order continuity has moderate use. For example, most mechanical parts do not need it [10] (page 95).

However, if it is needed, it is possible to obtain second-order continuity between two adjacent cells by using our framework while maintaining flexibility, by increasing the degree of the Béziér blending functions.

4 Editing objects

We have specifically designed this model to make the editing process of heterogeneous objects an easier task.

4.1 Editing geometry

Because the shape of an object is directly linked to its geometric coefficients, the natural way to edit a hyperpatch is by moving its geometric coefficients. This generates immediate results.




Fig. 11 Even with a simple model, a classical mesh of geometric coefficients (center) makes it difficult to localize which points need editing to obtain the desired effect. The image on the right shows our simplified mesh, which greatly eases the task




Fig. 12 (left) Each corner point has seven contiguous coefficients in the $4 \times 4 \times 4$ grid of geometric coefficients that defines a parametric cell. (right) In general, each corner point has 26 neighboring control points arranged in a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ grid




Fig. 13 Our framework is not limited to regular grids of coefficients. In this image we can see a real mechanical part modeled with our framework, with irregular corner points

However, if the geometric coefficients are treated independently, without the framework helping to perceive and maintain the existing relations, the editing becomes very confusing and difficult for a human operator.

Fig. 11 shows that even in a very simple composite hyperpatch (only six parametric cells), the large number of coefficients makes difficult knowing which points have to be edited to generate a certain effect. We have developed a

simplified mesh of geometric coefficients where only the boundary curves and the corner points are shown.

In the Béziér case, corner points have maximum influence on the object because the blending functions interpolate them (the object passes through them); thus, they are the first level of interaction presented to the user.

When the user selects a corner point, the system shows a **grid of immediate neighbors**. Each corner point has seven contiguous coefficients in the $4 \times 4 \times 4$ grid of geometric coefficients that defines a parametric cell. The seven coefficients are the immediate neighbors of the corner point (See Fig. 12). In general, each corner point is shared by eight adjacent parametric cells and has 26 neighboring control points arranged in a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ grid. This is the second level of interaction presented to the user.

When the user moves a corner point, our framework automatically applies the same movement to all immediate neighbors, maintaining the continuity of the adjacent parametric cells on that corner point, as well as the general shape of the hyperpatch around it (See Fig. 14).

The framework also allows moving the neighboring geometric coefficients of a selected corner point, for precise adjustments of the shape of the heterogeneous composite Béziér hyperpatch on that point. If the corner point is marked as continuous, when the user moves an immediate neighbor, the system automatically compensates the position of some of the others immediate neighbors by applying Eq. 8, thus maintaining C^1 continuity. If the corner point is marked as non-continuous, when the user moves a neighbor, the system does not modify the neighboring geometric coefficients (See Fig. 14).

Our framework is not limited to regular grids in which each corner point is shared by exactly eight parametric cells, so a given corner point can have an arbitrary number of immediate neighbors. In these irregular corner points it is not possible to maintain continuity automatically; this is an unsolved problem; however, our system can integrate these points, because certain types of discontinuities are very useful for modeling complex objects (See Fig. 13).




Fig. 14 Hyperpatch editing. From left to right: a) Before editing. b) Moving a corner point. c) Moving a neighboring point with continuity activated. d) Moving three neighboring points with no continuity activated. Note that in b) and c) the framework automatically moves the neighboring points accordingly to maintain C^1 continuity




Fig. 15 Editing material distributions. If the user selects a corner point shared among several cells (left), the framework can apply a given material distribution to all cells that share the corner point (center) or to some cells (right). It depends on whether or not there are selected some cell. Thus it is possible to establish non-continuous or C^1 continuous gradations of materials among cells, if they are needed

4.2 Editing material distributions

When editing distribution of materials inside a heterogeneous composite Béziér hyperpatch our framework shows the parametric cells that compose it, and the corner points.

If the user select cells, the systems allows to apply the same material distribution to all 64 geometric coefficients of each cell. This is a uniform distribution of materials. It can be very useful to model those parts of the solid that are homogeneous.

If the user select corner points, the system allows to apply the same material distribution to the seven neighbor geometric coefficients of the corner point in each cell that share it. This is a C^1 continuous gradation of materials (See Fig. 15).

If there are some cells selected and the user select a corner point belonging to them, the system allows to apply the same material distribution to the neighboring geometric coefficient of the corner point but only in each cell selected. This is a C^1 continuous gradation of materials among the selected cells and non-continuous gradation of material among the non selected cells which also share the selected corner point (See Fig. 15).

It is also possible to apply a material distribution to each coefficient of a parametric cell manually. This way the user has a very precise control of the gradation of materials. However, this manual process is only necessary in a few cases.

In all cases the framework checks automatically the validity of the material distribution ensuring that all elements of the applied material distribution are the coefficients of a convex combination on the set of primary materials (see Eq. 1).

5 Creating new objects

A heterogeneous composite Béziér hyperpatch is constructed by adding parametric cells to it. This way of working simplifies the creation of new objects. When a user adds a new cell, our framework automatically performs the following tasks:

- It checks if the added parametric cell is injective (valid).
- It checks that the new cell doesn't intersects any existing cell, or that both cells only share a corner point, a boundary isoparametric curve, or a boundary isoparametric surface.




Fig. 16 Extrusion along the normal of three parametric cells from one of their boundary isoparametric surfaces to generate a more complex geometry




Fig. 17 Blending of two parametric cells. The blended cell is C^1 continuous both for the geometry as for the distribution of materials

- If the new cell shares a boundary isoparametric surface with any other cell in the heterogeneous composite Béziér hyperpatch, our framework checks whether there is C^1 continuity in each of the four corner points shared, and if so, it classifies the point as continuous.

Incorporating new cells can be done using several intuitive methods like:

- **Blending** of two parametric cells. The new blended cell can be C^1 continuous both for the geometry as for the distribution of materials if needed (See Fig. 17).

- **Extrusion** of existing cells (See Fig. 16).
- **Revolution** of a Béziér surface around an axis of revolution.
- **Lofting** of a Béziér surface along a Béziér path.
- **Addition from a library** of predefined cell structures (See Fig. 18).
- **Addition from a file** containing a previously saved model. This allows to merge together several objects.

In all cases our framework ensures the validity of the generated heterogeneous composite Béziér hyperpatch. A new parametric cell is only added to the model if it is valid.




Fig. 18 Creating a heterogeneous object in eight steps. From left to right, and from top to bottom: 1) Adding two rings from a library of predefined cell structures. 2 and 3) Extrusion of the rings to obtain a wider structure. 4) Non-continuous blending of two groups of two cells to connect both rings. 5) Subdivision of the two blended cells. 6) Editing of the external cells of the rings in order to obtain a more rounded shape. 7 and 8) Setting a C^1 continuous gradation of materials among selected cells




Fig. 19 Example 1: Mechanical part modeled from scratch using the computer application based on our framework

6 Examples

We developed a computer application to test if the framework can accurately represent real objects. Using our application we have modeled several objects.

We modeled a mechanical part (See Fig. 19) composed of four materials (light grey, dark grey, blue and red in the figure). In some zones of the object, the transition among the materials is a C^1 continuous gradation. The number of parametric cells needed to accurately model the part is low.

The most interesting heterogeneous object we have modeled is a motorcycle tire (See Figs. 20 and 22). We followed the exact blueprints of a patented tire [11]. The whole modeling process of the shown tire only took six hours.

An interesting feature of the framework is that the whole tire, including all its components (tread, body ply, belt, sidewall, etc.) is **modeled as a single object**, which is very convenient for simulations. This is possible due to the ability of the framework to model discontinuities in material distributions in the various parametric cells that make up the object.




Fig. 20 Example 2: Heterogeneous motorcycle tire modeled following precisely the blueprints included in the patent [11]

7 Conclusions

In this work, we have presented a comprehensive framework that allows representing heterogeneous objects in a simple and efficient way. The framework is based on Béziér hyperpatches and solves the main problems of this well-known formulation.

Validity of the represented objects is kept automatically by checking relative positions of geometric coefficient in each parametric cell. Our validity condition not only rejects non-valid cells, it rejects also cells with interior points not well distributed. This is very useful when modeling heterogeneous objects.

In addition, we have presented a simplified mesh of geometric coefficients that allows a human operator to focus on the main structure of the object and adjust the fine details in a very simple and intuitive way. The editing is performed by movements of geometric coefficients in a process assisted by the system. The framework simplifies the editing process by automatically maintaining continuity (both in the geometry as in the distribution of materials) at the corner points that require it. Furthermore, our framework can also manage irregular non-continuous corner points, for modeling complex objects that require discontinuities.

The presented framework can also create new object models in an interactive manner with the aid of techniques such as extrusion, sweeping, or revolution of existing parametric cells while maintaining a relatively low number of parametric cells.




Fig. 21 Detailed view of the mechanical part showing its heterogeneous internal structure

Finally, we have presented several complex objects shaped with a computer application using our framework. The application allows testing the ability of the model to accurately represent real objects.

7.1 Future work

Our framework can be extended to represent **Porous materials** as it is possible to use the emptiness as a primary material. This is perfectly coherent with the methods used for layered manufacturing (LM), in which a special material is used to fill in the empty spaces during the manufacturing process and later this special material is removed leaving a gap.

Modeling internal microstructures on several scale levels inside the object is also possible. Each parametric cell is the mapping of a unit cube into three-dimensional space, so we can define the microstructure in this unit domain.

Acknowledgements This work has been partially funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness through grants TIN2014-58218-R and TIN2014-60956-R with FEDER funds.

References

1. Casale, M., Stanton, E.: An overview of analytic solid modeling. *IEEE Comput. Graph. Appl.* **5**(2), 45–56 (1985). DOI 10.1109/MCG.1985.276402
2. Conde Rodríguez F.A. & Torres Cantero, J.: A simple validity condition for b-spline hyperpatches. In: *Proceedings of Eurographics, 2001, short presentations* (2001)
3. Hua, J., He, Y., Qin, H.: Multiresolution heterogeneous solid modeling and visualization using trivariate simplex splines. In: *ACM Symposium on Solid Modeling and Applications, SM*, pp. 47–58 (2004)
4. Hua, J., He, Y., Qin, H.: Trivariate simplex splines for inhomogeneous solid modeling in engineering design. *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering* **5**(2), 149–157 (2005). DOI DOI: 10.1115/1.1881352
5. Jackson, T., Liu, H., Patrikalakis, N., Sachs, E., Cima, M.: Modeling and designing functionally graded material components for fabrication with local composition control. *Materials and Design* **20**(2-3), 63–75 (1999). DOI 10.1016/S0261-3069(99)00011-4
6. Kou, X., Tan, S.: Heterogeneous object modeling: A review. *CAD Computer Aided Design* **39**(4), 284–301 (2007). DOI 10.1016/j.cad.2006.12.007
7. Kumar, V., Dutta, D.: An approach to modeling & representation of heterogeneous objects. In: *Journal of Mechanical Design, Transactions of the ASME*, vol. 120, pp. 659–667 (1998). DOI 10.1115/1.2829329
8. Lasser, D.: Bernstein-bézier representation of volumes. *Computer Aided Geometric Design* **2**(1–3), 145 – 149 (1985). DOI [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-8396\(85\)90018-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-8396(85)90018-4)
9. Mantyla, M.: *An Introduction to Solid Modeling*. Computer Science Press, College Park, MD (1988)
10. Mortenson, M.E.: *Geometric Modeling*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA (1985)
11. Ochiai, K.: Tire for motorcycle. Sumitomo Rubber Industries, Ltd., Kobeshi (JP), assignee (2007). US Patent 7,201,198
12. Qian, X., Dutta, D.: Physics-based modeling for heterogeneous objects. *Journal of Mechanical Design, Transactions of the ASME* **125**(3), 416–427 (2003). DOI 10.1115/1.1582877
13. Requicha, A.G.: Representations for rigid solids: Theory, methods, and systems. *ACM Computing Surveys* **12**(4), 437–464 (1980). DOI 10.1145 / 356827.356833
14. Schmitt, B., Pasko, A., Schlick, C.: Constructive sculpting of heterogeneous volumetric objects using trivariate b-splines. *The Visual Computer* **20**(2-3), 130–148 (2004). DOI 10.1007/s00371-003-0236-9
15. Warkhedkar, R., Bhatt, A.: Material-solid modeling of human body: A heterogeneous b-spline based approach. *CAD Computer Aided Design* **41**(8), 586–597 (2009). DOI 10.1016/j.cad.2008.10.016
16. Yang, P., Qian, X.: A b-spline-based approach to heterogeneous objects design and analysis. *CAD Computer Aided Design* **39**(2), 95–111 (2007). DOI 10.1016/j.cad.2006.10.005




Fig. 22 Detailed view of the heterogeneous tire. The tread is composed by a continuous combination of three materials