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Figure 1: Our rough animation system supports the inbetweening of complex special effects with multiple topological events, here a flame splitting into smaller components. In (a), we show the input key drawings traced over a reference from Gilland’s book [Gil09], while in (b) we show their decomposition into transient embeddings. Even though we use a unique color per embedding throughout the animation for visualization, each embedding only exists between a pair of keyframes in this example. This allows the handling of topological changes, which occur at the third and fifth keyframes. In (c), we display in magenta a subset of the inbetween frames generated by our animation system in real-time. Please see the supplemental results video for the full sequence.

Abstract

Traditional 2D animation requires time and dedication since tens of thousands of frames need to be drawn by hand for a typical production. Many computer-assisted methods have been proposed to automatize the generation of inbetween frames from a set of clean line drawings, but they are all limited by a rigid workflow and a lack of artistic controls, which is in the most part due to the one-to-one stroke matching and interpolation problems they attempt to solve. In this work, we take a novel view on those problems by focusing on an earlier phase of the animation process that uses rough drawings (i.e., sketches). Our key idea is to recast the matching and interpolation problems so that they apply to transient embeddings, which are groups of strokes that only exist for a few keyframes. A transient embedding carries strokes both forward and backward in time through a sequence of transformed lattices. Forward and backward strokes are then cross-faded using their thickness to yield rough inbetweens.

As demonstrated on state-of-the-art 2D animation exercises, our system provides unprecedented artistic control through the non-linear exploration of movements and dynamics in real-time.

CCS Concepts

• Computing methodologies → Graphics systems and interfaces; Animation;

1. Introduction

Traditional 2D animation requires a lot of planning, not only at the level of storyboards, but also for the animation itself where rough drawings (i.e., sketches) are used to test out the motion of different characters or special effects (e.g., water, smoke). These tests aim at defining the trajectories of the characters or objects, as well as their dynamics (e.g., their speed and acceleration) through the timing & spacing of drawings [JT95, Wil01]. Even though the rough animation itself is not directly visible in the final movie, its impact on motion design is vividly retained, since it serves as a guide for “inbetweeners” – the artists who draw all the intermediate frames.
In this paper, we introduce a system for the design and exploitation of rough 2D animations; a problem which, to the best of our knowledge, has never been addressed in previous work. Our main contribution is in the assembly and adaptation of a set of existing techniques for the previsualization of 2D animations. The main goal is to provide real-time feedback at intermediate frames between rough key drawings, to both significantly speed up the animation process and allow artists to experiment with different creative alternatives. This is useful not only for experienced animators, who may try variations in early tests for discussions with art directors and quickly converge to final rough animations to pass down to inbetweeners; but also for animation students, who may benefit from the ability to observe interactively the look-and-feel of different animation choices. As described in supplemental material, we relied on an observational study of a professional animator at work followed by interviews to guide the design of our system. By working at the rough animation stage, we leverage the fact that drawings are sketchy and the global perception of movement is more important than the appearance of the strokes themselves that will eventually be redrawn at the cleaning stage. However, it brings two fundamental challenges. First, artists may create drawings through very different workflows such as “shift-and-trace” (drawings are traced over deformations of previous ones) or “pose-to-pose” (all key drawings are created in advance then interpolated). Second, the drawings themselves are most often composed of different numbers of strokes and routinely differ in their number of parts.

As described by Fekete et al. [FBC∗95], automated inbetweening systems can be divided in two main families: those based on templates or embeddings (e.g., [BW75]), and those relying on explicit correspondences between strokes (e.g., [MIT67]). The former family is mostly well-suited for “cut-out” animations since the movement of the embedded objects or characters is restricted by the motion of their template (e.g., skeleton, control polygon, cage) whose topology is usually fixed throughout the animation. Explicit correspondence systems are more flexible as the stroke-to-stroke mapping is transient, changing between each pair of keyframes. However they are restricted to “tight inbetweening” of clean line drawings due to the challenge (or chore) of matching complex networks of strokes. In this work, we propose transient embeddings to keep the best of both approaches, hence allowing template-based animation of rough drawings with topological changes. In practice, this requires adapting two common problems to deal with transient embeddings: the matching problem where two drawings must be registered, here with drawings having different numbers of strokes; and the interpolation problem, where the movement from one key drawing to the next must be generated while providing flexible and interactive artistic control over timing, spacing and trajectories. A key feature of our approach is to enable changes of topology at keyframes (i.e., key drawings may have different numbers of embeddings), while ensuring visual continuity through constrained trajectories that persist over multiple keyframes.

Our main contribution is a novel animation system that relies on transient embeddings to provide full non-linear artistic control at the rough animation stage, as described in Section 3. Methods for matching embeddings at keyframes are introduced in Section 4: they work with shift-and-trace and pose-to-pose workflows, or any combination of them. Methods for interpolating between embeddings are presented in Section 5, featuring non-linear control over timing & spacing and direct artistic control over trajectories between and across keyframes. Implementation details including a novel real-time ARAP registration technique for vector strokes are exposed in Section 6. We demonstrate that our system allows users to produce complex 2D animations in Section 7, by reproducing typical animation exercises [Wil01], such as walk cycles, special effects, articulated motion, and some principles of animation [JT95], such as anticipation and follow-through, or squash and stretch.

2. Related work

The design of computer-aided 2D animation systems dates back to the inception of Computer Graphics in the late ’60s and early ’70s [MIT67, Bae69, BW71]. As already observed by Catmull [Cat78], automatic inbetweening is a central problem tackled by most of such systems, and yet – more than forty years later – current commercial solutions [Ado, Too, CAC, Com] often remain too limited or time consuming for most use cases in production. In addition, by focusing on inbetweening of final clean line drawings, we believe that those systems and most previous work in academia have missed the real potential benefit of computer assistance, that is, using the words of Durand [Dur91], to “boost user creativity by allowing them to concentrate on the most interesting part of their work”: the design and exploration of motion.

The key idea of our approach is to shift focus from the animation of individual strokes to the animation of groups of strokes that are only defined between a pair of keyframes, which we call transient embeddings. Nevertheless, it requires to revisit the two main stages of explicit correspondence techniques: matching and interpolation.

Matching. Most early methods require the user to manually identify correspondences between the strokes of consecutive keyframes and do not handle occlusions or topological changes [MIT67, Bae69, Ree81, Dur91]. More recent techniques support such features using manually populated 2.5D [DFSEVR01, RID10] or space-time [DRvdP15] data structures. Despite their appeal, these approaches require ad hoc, rather constraining drawing representations which are not suitable for rough drawings. To partially automatize the stroke correspondence process, a large body of work represents the drawings as a graph of strokes and try to match those graphs at subsequent keyframes [Kor02, WNS∗10, LCY∗11, YBS∗12, CMV17, Yan18, YSC∗18, MFXM21]. They differ by the graph matching algorithm they employ, and the way users interact with the system to guide or correct correspondences, especially when strokes appear or disappear. To resolve occlusions in a user-controllable fashion, Jiang et al. [JSL22] introduce “boundary strokes”, i.e., strokes with an occluding side that acts as occluding surfaces. However, none of these methods can handle rough drawings with an highly dissimilar number of strokes per keyframe, and despite recent advances in rough sketch cleanup [YVG20], no algorithm is currently able to produce a sequence of clean line drawings that can be automatically inbetweened.

Alternatively, some methods aim at estimating region (rather than stroke) correspondences between consecutive frames based on their appearance (color, shape, distance) [Xie95, MSG96, SBv05, dJB06, BBA09, ZHF12, LMY∗13] and motion features [ZLWH16], submitted to EUROGRAPHICS 2023.
but they are limited to polygonal shapes or cel animations (i.e., mostly flat color regions with clean line boundaries). Taking inspiration from As-Rigid-As-Possible (ARAP) shape deformation techniques [IMH05, WXXC08], Sýkora et al. [SDC09] present an image registration algorithm that decouples the matching resolution from the image complexity by embedding it into a square lattice. Noris et al. [NSC11] use this method to estimate a global warp between two drawings of an existing rough animation, abstracting the input strokes by their rasterized distance fields. Then, each stroke of the first drawing, deformed by the ARAP transformation, is matched with the most similar stroke in the second one. We also embed strokes into square lattices, but extend the registration algorithm to directly take as input vectorial strokes. Furthermore, we make the assumption that stroke-to-stroke correspondences are not required to depict motion in rough animations, which we demonstrate in our results.

Closest to our work, Xing et al. [XWSY15] present an interactive system that combines a global shape similarity metric with an embedding-free ARAP deformation model [SSP07] to match an existing drawing with a new set of hand-drawn guidelines. We discuss the benefits of our explicit embeddings in Section 8.1 and provide visual comparison in the supplemental results video.

Following the current trend in computer science, learning-based techniques [Yag17, NHA19, LZLS21, SZY*21] have also been proposed to estimate per-pixel correspondence between two raster clean line drawings. In the work of Casey et al. [CPL21], line-enclosed segments are first extracted from the two drawings, and then correspondences between segments are estimated using a combination of convolutional and transformer neural networks. Extending such approaches to rough drawings, whose style may considerably vary from one artist to another, seems extremely difficult for such data-driven approaches.

**Interpolation.** Once the key drawings have been put into correspondence, inbetween frames can be generated by interpolation. As already noted by Burtnyk et al. [BW75], linear interpolation and thus linear trajectories sampled at uniform rates do not produce natural motion in the great majority of cases.

To offer maximum artistic control, the animation system of Reeves [Ree81] allows the user to specify the trajectory and dynamics of a set of “moving points” spanning multiple keyframes. This effectively decomposes the full 2D+t space of the animation into a network of Coons patches, into which interpolation can be performed independently but with continuity at boundaries. However, heuristics are required to complete the patch network, and user manipulation of moving points in space and time may be laborious.

Kort [Kor02] models trajectories of stroke vertices by quadratic splines. The user can correct these paths when needed and specify their spacing. Since this simple interpolation scheme does not take the shape of the strokes into account, it may lead to local or global distortions. Sederberg et al. [SGWM93] introduce an intrinsic interpolation technique which minimizes shape distortion. Similar approaches [FTA05, SZGP05] attempt to preserve local differential quantities (Laplacian coordinates or edge deformation gradients). But those three methods only apply to a single polyline. Motivated by classical 2D animation books [JT95, Wil01], Whited et al. [WNS*10] present an interpolation scheme that produces trajectories for a full graph of strokes. It first computes motion paths for stroke endpoints along logarithmic spirals, and then deform the intermediate stroke vertices using intrinsic interpolation [SGWM93] followed by curve fitting and a tangent-aligning warp to ensure continuity between adjacent strokes. The trajectory of any stroke vertex can be edited, albeit without considering its dynamics. This scheme was later used by Noris et al. [NSC11] for generating smooth stroke trajectories between pairs of strokes.

An alternative solution to minimize shape distortion is to rely on ARAP interpolation [ACOL00, XZWB05] of 2D embeddings of the drawings. The interpolated trajectories can be controlled through point and vector constraints [BBA08, KHS12] or even a full skeleton [YHY19]. However, the boundary polygon of those embeddings must be compatible across keyframes and put into correspondence, and a compatible triangulation of their interior must also be built. Baxter et al. [BBA09] describe the most relevant techniques to solve this challenging problem along with their own solution. Zhu et al. [ZPBK17] extend these approaches to handle extreme shape deformations and topological changes, but it requires significant manual intervention and involves an expensive numerical optimization that prevents its use in an interactive system.

Yang [Yan18] combines the strokes deformation technique of Whited et al. [WNS*10] with a simpler embedding, called “context mesh”, that better preserves the global layout of the stroke network. He presents an automatic construction algorithm of these compatible meshes based on the matched strokes, and an edge-based rigid interpolation technique inspired by the method of Igarashi et al. [IMH05] which is robust to degenerated configurations (e.g., collapsing edges) and may be constrained to follow a given trajectory. It is however unclear how such “context meshes” could be built for rough drawings. Instead, we use even simpler lattice embeddings, which are compatible between two keyframes by construction, but do not need to extend further in time.

Dvoroznàk et al. [DLKS18] use similar embeddings to build deformable puppets, but since those are connected at fixed junctions driven by a skeleton, their results suffer from the “cut-out” look-and-feel. The animation system of Bai et al. [BPKLP16] integrates handle-based shape deformations with example-based simulations to interpolate drawings embedded into triangular meshes. This approach manages to reproduce many of the principles of animation [JT95], supports manual topological changes and local control of the dynamics, but user interaction is restricted to handles manipulation, hence once again following the “cut-out” metaphor rather than hand-drawn animation.

For image-based approaches, interpolation turns into an image morphing (i.e., deformation and blending) problem. Many solutions have been proposed for photographs (e.g., [FZP*20, PSN20]), cartoon animations [LZLS21, SZY*21, CZZ22] and, closest to our inputs, concept sketches [ADN*17]. Yet, rough drawings have a very specific style which requires preserving the distribution, spatial continuity and color or gray-level intensity of the strokes. Previous approaches are unlikely to satisfy all three criteria. In this work, we do not attempt to solve this problem, and use simple cross-fading of stroke thicknesses that turns out to be sufficient for motion previzualization in practice.
3. Animation system

Most computer-aided 2D animation systems (e.g., [TVP, Too, Ado, CAC]) provide a timeline which displays the timing (i.e., frame number) and the layers in a simplified and systematic manner. Layers are organized in a stack defining the compositing order of the drawings on the canvas. Each layer is animated independently and populated by keyframes that may hold a drawing and be “exposed” (i.e., repeated) over multiple frames.

The design of our animation system is guided by extended discussions with a professional 2D animator and 2D animation software developers. As detailed in supplemental material, we arrived at the following conclusions and thus guidelines:

G1: Contours in rough drawings are depicted with multiple strokes which implies working with groups of strokes rather than individual elements; the artist must be able to redefine the number of groups according to the complexity of the motion.

G2: Topological changes, such as parts of the drawing appearing, disappearing, splitting or merging, are explicitly drawn at keyframes, hence do not need to be automatically in-betweened.

G3: Artists alternately use pose-to-pose and shift-and-trace workflows that must be both supported; they are used to provide indications to inbetweeners, but their creative flow should be interrupted as least as possible.

G4: Control over timing, spacing and interpolation trajectories is crucial to design motion, yet extremely complex and time-consuming since all intermediate frames must be redrawn.

Based on these guidelines, we extend the structure of a classic animation system to work on groups of strokes, which we call embeddings, as detailed in the remainder of this section. Embeddings act as units of motion (e.g., the forearm of a character), which may be refined throughout the animation process when needed (G1). Each embedding is transformed from its start keyframe to the next, carrying along its strokes so that they come into alignment with a different subpart of the next key drawing. Embeddings may thus be said to be transient in the sense that they do not last past the next keyframe, where new embeddings take over the animation process, possibly with a different topology (G2). This novel animation structure is well adapted to existing artistic workflows (G3) and grants new non-linear controls (G4), as described in Sections 4 and 5 respectively.

3.1. Transient embeddings

In its simplest form, as shown in Figure 2(a), an embedding is defined by a pair of lattices with the same topology at two keyframes. The lattice at the start keyframe holds strokes (a subset from the corresponding key drawing) that are propagated forward in time. A second set of strokes is stored in a transformed lattice at the end keyframe, which is lined up in time with the next keyframe. However, the end keyframe itself is never displayed. The transformation between the two lattices must be invertible so that strokes from the end keyframe can be propagated backward in time. The two sets of forward and backward strokes are cross-faded using stroke thickness instead of opacity. Such a representation opens up a number of possibilities. For instance, backward strokes may be obtained by copying a subset of the strokes in the next key drawing, hence avoiding popping artifacts when transitioning from one embedding to the next. But they may also differ significantly from the strokes found in the next keyframe, hence allowing topological changes to occur, as demonstrated in Section 3.3. However, in our system, topological changes never occur between keyframes.

A same embedding may be used over multiple keyframes, as shown in Figure 2(b). To make this possible, we introduce breakdown keyframes, inspired by the traditional animation technique of the same name [Wil01]. In our system, they amount to storing a new transformed lattice in the embedding, along with an additional set of strokes that is propagated both backward and forward in time.

Figure 2(c) abstracts the structure of a transient embedding with a simple sequence of symbols: a square for the start keyframe, circles for (optional) breakdown keyframes, and a crossed circle for the end keyframe. In effect, the end keyframe is a special case of breakdown that is only propagated backward in time, and is not itself displayed. Segments between symbols represent both forward and backward embedding transformations, which may be evaluated at any time step to yield cross-faded strokes.

Figure 2: A transient embedding is a sequence of transformed lattices carrying strokes between keyframes. (a) A first set of strokes (in red), stored in the start keyframe, is propagated forward via a transformation, while another set of strokes (in green), stored in the end keyframe, is propagated backward via the inverse transformation. Forward and backward strokes are cross-faded in between. (b) An additional inbetween lattice transformation may be added through a breakdown keyframe, which holds a single set of strokes (in blue) that are propagated both backward and forward in time. (c) Symbolic representation of a transient embedding: each type of keyframe is represented by a different symbol, which are connected by segments that represent lattice transformations. The regular expression notation [⋯∗] indicates that breakdowns are optional.
since there is no key drawing to rely on anymore. moved, there is no other choice than deleting the entire embedding the next breakdown or end keyframe; when a start keyframe is re- connected to the start or previous breakdown keyframe to frame of the next interval; removing a breakdown keyframe re- move a start keyframe followed by a new, automatically generated em- bedding. Removing an interval yields (b) three different types of results depending on the type of keyframe: extension of the embed- ding, removal of a breakdown, or removal of the embedding.

3.2. Animation structure

With this formal definition of a single transient embedding at hand, we must now formalize the global animation structure used in our system. This is for a non-linear animation system as we need to ensure that a valid animation structure is maintained irrespective of the order in which operations are performed on it.

The first structural constraint is that the timeline must be seg- mented into contiguous intervals, which act as containers for em- beddings. Intervals may hold zero, one or more embeddings. The keyframes of all embeddings in the same layer must be lined up in time with the first frame of an existing interval, as shown in Figure 3(a). Interval boundaries may then be modified, carrying with them all the embeddings they store, as shown in Figure 3(b). This amounts to modifying the timing of an animation, in which case embeddings must be evaluated at different time steps. An additional advantage of this structure is that removing an embedding does not affect the rest of the animation as illustrated in Figure 3(c), hence making the animation process globally non-destructive.

Intervals that do not contain any embedding may be safely deleted or split into two intervals. New intervals may similarly be added before or after existing ones. A more complex situation arises when the same operations are applied to an interval that con- tains one or more embeddings. When splitting an interval in two, each of its stored embeddings must also be split at the same frame to preserve the aforementioned keyframe alignment constraint. As shown in Figure 4(a), we do so by inserting a breakdown keyframe for each involved embedding. These breakdown keyframes may be converted into end keyframes if needed, which results in the automatic creation of a new embedding as shown in the second row of the figure. When removing a key interval, all the involved embed- dings must be updated according to three different rules, depending on the type of keyframe involved. This is illustrated in Figure 4(b): an end keyframe is not removed but merely extended to the start frame of the next interval; removing a breakdown keyframe re- quires reconnecting the start or previous breakdown keyframe to the next breakdown or end keyframe; when a start keyframe is re- moved, there is no other choice than deleting the entire embedding since there is no key drawing to rely on anymore.

Figure 3: In our animation system, the timeline is segmented into intervals whose boundaries are shown with tall ticks, while short ticks delimit frames. An animation is created by (a) adding transient embeddings that span one or more intervals, with their keyframes lined up at the beginning of each interval. Timing is readily modified by (b) automatically updating embeddings when inter- val boundaries are moved. Edits are local since (c) the removal of an embedding does not affect other embeddings.

Figure 4: Non-linear editing of the animation structure is made possible by special updates of the transient embeddings. Splitting an interval in two is done by (a) inserting a breakdown keyframe in all involved embeddings, which may optionally be converted into an end keyframe followed by a new, automatically generated em- bedding. Removing an interval yields (b) three different types of results depending on the type of keyframe: extension of the embed- ding, removal of a breakdown, or removal of the embedding.

3.3. A simple example

We conclude this section with a simple example animation, shown in Figure 5. It demonstrates several structural properties of our animation system: a topological change with different for- ward/backward strokes, a breakdown keyframe, and a fade out. End keyframes are shown as dashed lines since they are not displayed, but their strokes are propagated backward to be used for interpolation. We also rely on this example for illustration purposes in Sec- tions 4 and 5, and in the supplemental demo video.

Such a simple example leaves open a number of questions that we address in the next two sections. They precisely correspond to the matching and interpolation problems recast on transient embed- dings: How are embeddings deformed at keyframes so that back- ward and forward strokes are put in alignment, yielding visually continuous animations (Section 4)? How are embeddings interpo- lated between keyframes, while providing control over motion dy- namics, trajectories and smoothness (Section 5)?
4. The matching problem

Recall that an embedding in our system corresponds to a unit of motion. By default, all strokes in a key drawing are part of a single embedding, but this may be refined at any time by the user to assign different subsets of strokes to different embeddings. This choice must be made based on which strokes of the current keyframe are expected to move together to the next keyframe, i.e., based on motion complexity rather than the complexity of the drawing itself.

As shown in Figure 2, each embedding stores its strokes in a square lattice, which is built axis-aligned at the start keyframe. Recall that the lattice does not change topology throughout a transient embedding, but may undergo transformations at breakdown and end keyframes. The main goal of the matching problem is then to establish lattice transformations that put embedded strokes in alignment with strokes at the next keyframe. Such a target transformation \( T^* \) consists in a discrete vector field \( \{ T^i \} \) defined on lattice corners (see inset figure). We present two basic matching approaches, inspired by traditional animation workflows: shift-and-trace (Section 4.1), and pose-to-pose (Section 4.2).

4.1. Shift-and-trace

The main idea of the shift-and-trace workflow is to deform a lattice to the next keyframe (the “shift” step), and then to redraw a similar set of strokes over the deformed, embedded ones (the “trace” step). Any combination of tools may be used to yield the transformation \( T^* \). We have implemented classic linear transformations (translation, rotation and scaling), as well as an ARAP deformation tool similar to the “Warp tool” in TVPaint Animation [TVP].

The shift-and-trace workflow is illustrated in Figure 6. An embedding \( E_0 \) is subject by default to an identity transformation, and acts on a set of strokes, symbolized by the light blue color. The initial configuration is thus a static drawing exposed over the whole interval, similar to traditional animation systems. During the shift step, a target transformation \( T^* \) is applied to \( E_0 \), but no stroke is stored yet in its end keyframe. The trace step creates a new interval and populates it in one of the following two ways: the embedded strokes may either be duplicated to a new breakdown keyframe, thus extending \( E_0 \) in time; or a new embedding \( E_1 \) may be created, with embedded strokes separately copied to the end keyframe of \( E_0 \) and the start keyframe of \( E_1 \).

Figure 6: With the shift-and-trace workflow, an initial embedding \( E_0 \) is first manually modified through a target transformation \( T^* \) – the shift step. The embedded strokes (symbolized by the light blue color) are then copied either to a breakdown keyframe, or to a new embedding \( E_1 \) – the trace step.

4.2. Pose-to-pose

The pose-to-pose workflow instead starts from an existing sequence of drawings (i.e., “poses”), each stored in its respective keyframe, and registers subsets of strokes from one keyframe to the next. Consequently, the target transformation \( T^* \) is not manually specified by the artist but automatically inferred from a pair of drawings.

The pose-to-pose workflow is detailed in Figure 8. A sequence of two embeddings \( E_0 \) and \( E_1 \) is shown, each with an identity transformation by default, but acting on different sets of strokes symbolized by different colors. As before, the initial configuration is identical to the one found in traditional animation systems: a sequence of static drawings exposed over their whole interval. Next, a vector registration algorithm – adapting the method of
Figure 9: A subset of strokes is first selected in $E_b$ to be matched by $E_g$. Then registration automatically finds a lattice transformation for $E_g$ that aligns strokes in both embeddings, and matching strokes in the start keyframe of $E_b$ are copied to the end keyframe of $E_g$. We then partially redraw these strokes.

Sýkora et al. [SDC09] to vector drawings to yield real-time performance (see Section 6) – is used to find the target transformation $T^*$ that best aligns the strokes embedded in $E_0$ with any user-selected subset of strokes in $E_1$, which are immediately copied inside the end keyframe of $E_0$. The transformed forward strokes of $E_0$ may alternatively be copied to its end keyframe.

Once again, this process ends up with an interval in a configuration similar to the one it started with, such that registrations may be applied over and over again to match pairs of drawings over several keyframes. Shift-and-trace and pose-to-pose workflows may even be interleaved since they both end up in the same configuration. Moreover, the transformation $T^*$ found through registration may optionally be adjusted manually or semi-automatically – thanks to the real-time performance of our vector registration algorithm – at any time during that process, while the strokes in any keyframe might be redrawn as before.

The pose-to-pose workflow is illustrated in Figure 9 on the embeddings $E_g$ and $E_b$ of Figure 5 (a similar process is used to match $E_r$ with $E_b$), with an additional redrawing step.

5. The interpolation problem

In our system, interpolation is available at all times. As shown in the demo video, after little interaction (sometimes a single click) our system provides instant interpolation results. The process is trivial for newly created embeddings since their lattice is static (e.g., $Id$ arrows in Figures 6 and 8). As soon as a target transformation $T^*$ is introduced, we must find an invertible family of transformations $T(t)$ that satisfies $T(0) = \{0\}$ and $T(1) = T^*$. We choose ARAP interpolation [ACOLO00] for $T(t)$ since it provides a natural default behavior in general, while enabling artistic control through additional constraints. This should not be mistaken with the ARAP deformation or registration tools of Section 4. Indeed, matching and interpolation are decoupled in our approach.

In practice, we use the symmetric formulation of Baxter et al. [BBA08] which is fast to evaluate, easy to implement, and offers control through linear constraints. We triangulate the axis-aligned lattice and store the initial and transformed coordinates of its corners in two matrices $V_0$ and $V_1$. By construction, we have $T^* = V_1 - V_0$, and the time-varying transformation is then defined by $T(t) = V(t) - V_0$, with $V(t)$ obtained by ARAP interpolation between $V_0$ and $V_1$ (see Appendix A for details). Similarly, the inverse transformation is $T(t)^{-1} = V(1-t) - V_1$.

With this formulation, we obtain results such as in Figure 10, where embedded strokes are transformed forward and backward according to $T$ and $T^{-1}$ respectively. A first limitation of this default interpolation behavior is that the spacing of interpolated drawings is not readily controlled. We introduce control over spacing in Section 5.1 through a formalization of the “spacing chart”, which is ubiquitous in traditional 2D animation. A second limitation is that trajectories are only defined per embedding, which may lead to velocity discontinuities across keyframes, or to dissociation of embeddings between keyframes. We address these issues in Section 5.2 by sharing trajectories across embeddings and keyframes.

5.1. Spacing charts

Providing control over spacing through interpolation is crucial to convey motion dynamics. In existing animation software (e.g., [CAC]), interpolated drawings may be manually positioned on a per-frame basis, which is inspired by charts in traditional animation [Wil01]. The process may be tedious, even though presets (e.g., “ease in / ease out”) can help. Furthermore, it does not grant non-linear control over the animation since it must be redone after each retiming. Alternatively, animation curves may be directly edited (e.g., [Ado, Too]), but this loses the intuitive appeal of spacing charts. We keep the best of both worlds by formalizing the spacing chart in a way that preserves editing through ticks, while allowing automatic updates after retiming.

A spacing chart is defined as a monotonically increasing 1D remapping function $S : [f_0, f_1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where $f_0$ and $f_1$ are natural numbers locating two contiguous keyframes on the timeline. As illustrated in Figure 11(a-b), we let users manually adjust each tick value $S(f)$ for any discrete interpolated frame $f \in \{f_0,...,f_1\} \subset \mathbb{N}$, while enforcing $S(f-1) < S(f) < S(f+1)$. In contrast, the spacing function $S$ is defined over the real range $[f_0,f_1]$. In practice, we use a monotone cubic piecewise function [FC80] for $S$. It interpolates the prescribed $S(f)$ at discrete frame values, with tangents automatically computed to ensure smoothness and monotonicity.

The main advantage of this smooth continuous representation is non-linear editing. When an interval is extended for retiming, we linearly stretch $S$ over the new $[f_0', f_1']$ range to get $S'$, which is then evaluated at discrete frame positions $f \in \{f_0',...,f_1'\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ to yield the new chart ticks $S'(f)$, as demonstrated in Figure 11(b-c). Other timeline operations, such as those depicted in Figure 4, induce straightforward operations on spacing functions, since these
are defined on frame ranges. Splitting an interval merely results in splitting a spacing function in two functions. Removal of an end keyframe results in an extension of the embedding which is equivalent to a retiming, whereas removal of a breakdown keyframe results in the merging of the two neighboring spacing functions.

The spacing function outputs a normalized time value that is used to compute \( V(S(f)) \), the interpolated lattice at frame \( f \). By construction, \( V(S(0)) = V_0 \) and \( V(S(1)) = V_1 \). Note that even a linear spacing function may not lead to a transformation that behaves exactly linearly between \( V_0 \) and \( V_1 \), even though they are close in practice. Indeed, lattice corners will not move at constant speed owing to the global optimization involved in ARAP interpolation. However, constrained trajectories may be added if a precise local control over motion speed is required, as explained next.

5.2. Constrained interpolation

Besides spacing, the default ARAP interpolation may be controlled by linear constraints, \( CV = D(t) \) (see Appendix A). The \( C \) matrix identifies which point of the embedding should be subject to a constraint through time. Any point inside the lattice may be used as a constraint (even away from drawn strokes) as it can be expressed with barycentric coordinates in a cell. The \( D(t) \) matrix provides trajectories for the identified constraints, hence locally driving lattice motion. In the formulation of Baxter et al. [BBA08], these constraints are handled by Lagrange multipliers. ARAP factorization only needs to be recomputed when constraints are added or removed (through \( C \)); whereas trajectory editing (through \( D(t) \)) works in real time.

In practice, we choose to represent a constrained trajectory with a cubic Bézier curve, which permits the reproduction of arc motions as prescribed in traditional animation guidelines (e.g., [JP95, Wi01]). We have favored this representation over logarithmic spirals [WNS*10] for two reasons: it better captures the motion generated by ARAP interpolation, and it provides intuitive direct controls through tangents. A Bézier curve is initially fit to the discrete trajectory (position and parameterization) of the selected constrained point using Schneider’s algorithm [Sch90]. In our system, we always re-parameterize the Bézier curve uniformly along arc-length after any edit. This gives a more accurate local temporal control through \( D(t) = D(S(f)) \), where \( f \) is the current frame and \( S \) the spacing function of the embedding. The geometry of the fitted trajectory may then be edited to drive lattice motion explicitly, as illustrated in Figure 12(a) on the red and green embeddings of Figure 5. Since the curve endpoints are fixed, only the tangents of the trajectory may be modified.

Constrained trajectories may be trivially chained across breakdown keyframes since the lattice topology is maintained throughout a same embedding. More interestingly, constrained trajectories may be chained across different embeddings. Consider for instance a pair of embeddings \( E_0 \) and \( E_1 \), and a constrained trajectory \( D_0(t) \) that drives the lattice of \( E_0 \) from its start to its end keyframe. In the likely case where \( D_0(1) \in E_1 \) (assuming \( E_0 \) and \( E_1 \) have been properly matched), a new constrained trajectory \( D_1(t) \) may be imposed on \( E_1 \), with \( D_1(0) = D_0(1) \) by construction. Note that the trajectories remain independent, hence removing \( E_0 \) will not affect the chained trajectories in \( E_1 \). Any chain of trajectory constraints constructed this way can be made \( G^1 \)-continuous at keyframes by aligning the tangents of adjacent constrained trajectories. This is a
notable feature of our approach, since it provides persistent control over trajectories while relying on transient embeddings. We demonstrate that feature in Figure 12(b), where the trajectories of $E_g$ and $E_f$ are chained with $G^2$ continuity to trajectories of $E_p$. This produces a visually continuous motion even in the presence of a topological change, as is best seen in the supplemental demo video where we use more in-between frames.

Trajectories might not only be used to “knit” embeddings across time but also in space. This is a useful feature when two embeddings that are visually connected at contiguous keyframes get disconnected or interpenetrate during interpolation, as shown in Figure 13(a). For a shared constraint to be added, lattices in each embedding must overlap. One of the embeddings is identified as the leader $E_l$ and the other one as the follower $E_f$. Only the constrained trajectory of $E_f$ is edited, while $E_l$ follows that same trajectory. This raises an issue when the spacing functions $S_l$ and $S_f$ of the respective embeddings are different, as $E_l$ and $E_f$ are then driven by the same trajectory but at different speeds. The issue is trivially solved by using the spacing function of the leader $S_l$ on the follower $E_f$, only at the constrained embedding point; $S_f$ is retained otherwise. Such hierarchical constraints bear a resemblance to skeletons used in cut-out animation systems, as they open up to the control of articulated structures. In particular, they may be persistent as with any other constrained trajectory, as shown in Figure 13(b). However, they may also be deactivated at any keyframe, which is useful for imposing temporary constraints, such as an object temporarily attached before being thrown away (see the supplemental results video for an example).

Constrained trajectories are easily updated after each of the time-line operations of Figure 4. When an embedding is split at a frame $t_{split}$, the lattice positions $V_{split} = V(S(t_{split}))$ are used for the breakdown keyframe and a new ARAP interpolation is recomputed on each new interval, i.e., from $V_0$ to $V_{split}$ and from $V_{split}$ to $V_1$. Bézier trajectories are split as well, and the tangents at the split points re-computed, for instance using De Casteljau’s algorithm. In all our tests, we have observed that motion before and after splitting are visually identical, even though we could not find a proof of the transitivity of ARAP interpolation. When removing a breakdown keyframe, the associated transformation and trajectories must be removed as well, which potentially leads to a simpler motion. In practice, we keep all active constraints, and fit new trajectories from the default ARAP interpolation on the new interval to preserve artistic inputs as much as possible.

6. Implementation details

Strokes & lattices. In our system, strokes are represented by polylines with stylus pressure recorded at vertices when available. As mentioned in previous sections, embeddings may apply to subsets of strokes, which consist of stroke segments. Moreover, since embeddings are transient, different subsets of strokes may be manipulated at different keyframes, as demonstrated in the last interval of Figure 17. Each new lattice is enforced to be connected and automatically initialized in an axis-aligned manner. We make only one exception: when converting a breakdown keyframe into a new embedding (see Figure 4(a)), we keep the previously transformed lattice to retain its target transformation $T^*$. This is a small limitation of the current implementation that could be solved by transferring $T^*$ to a new axis-aligned lattice. We provide an additional tool to add contiguous empty cells inside an embedding, which is particularly useful to fill in lattices (enforcing their rigidity through interpolation), or to provide support for constraints away from strokes. The size of lattice cells may also be adjusted to capture fine details.

Vector registration. The registration problem consists in finding a transformation $T^*$ that aligns the strokes in an embedding (the source) with a given subset of stroke segments in the next keyframe (the destination). Our solution relies on the image registration technique of Sýkora et al. [SDC09], which works in two phases that are iterated until convergence: a “push” phase that moves lattice corners towards locations where the source and destination are similar; and a “regularize” phase that reintroduces local rigidity.

In our approach, we adapt the push phase to work on vector strokes, while the regularize phase is left unchanged, as illustrated in Figure 14. In our push phase, we compute the optimal rigid transformations that minimizes the sum of squared distances between the stroke points in the source and their nearest neighbors in the destination, using the closed-form solution of Schaefer et al. [SMW06]. This process results in a set of disconnected transformed cells (step 1 in Figure 14). The lattice connectivity is then restored by averaging lattice corner positions (step 2). The regularize phase is similar, except we compute optimal rigid transformations that aligns the source cells with the lattice obtained at the end of the push phase (step 3), before restoring connectivity (step 4). The regularize phase is repeated $N_r$ times, with greater values of $N_r$ increasing rigidity of the lattice (we use $N_r = 10$ by default). Repetitions are crucial to prevent the lattice from collapsing due to the naive initial nearest-neighbor correspondences.

An alternative solution would have been to use the block matching approach of Sýkora et al. [SDC09] applied to rasterized strokes, or their distance transform, similarly to Noris et al. [NSC+11]. We have found in practice that a vectorial solution is much more efficient since it provides direct initial correspondences. As a result,
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Figure 14: Our vector registration algorithm matches a source
drawing (bottom strokes) with a destination drawing (top strokes)
in two phases. During the push phase, lattice cells are (1) indepen-
dently rigidly transformed to match the closest destination stroke
points (red arrows), after which (2) the lattice connectivity is re-
stored through averaging. During the regularize phase (repeated
N repetitions), the shape of the source lattice is partly restored by (3)
finding independent rigid cell transformations that match the cur-
rent target lattice before (4) restoring connectivity.

there is no need to iterate over the sequence of push and regular-
ize phases as in the raster version: both phases are only applied
once, and our vectorial registration achieves real-time performance.
Thanks to its efficiency, vectorial registration may be used interac-
tively in a semi-automatic fashion. For instance, our system allows
the user to deform the lattice using the tools mentioned in Sec-
tion 4.1 and to start the registration from this deformed configura-
tion, hence allowing plastic deformations of the lattice. Registra-
tion might even be run continuously during the deformation so that
the source strokes glide over the destination. Please see the supple-
mental demo video for a live illustration.

Spacing & trajectories. The analytic spacing function \( S \) may be
controlled by adjusting the position of each individual tick. For in-
tervals holding many frames, this may be tedious; hence we provide
several interface tools to control multiple ticks at once. As shown
in the supplemental demo video, we provide typical “ease-in/ease-
out” controls, as well as options to place ticks on “halves”, as rou-
tinely done by 2D artists when creating spacing charts [Wil01]. To
facilitate constrained trajectory editing, besides tangents manipu-
lation, we have implemented a sketching technique that linearly
transforms a curve drawn by the user such that its endpoints match
the constrained positions at keyframes, and then fit a cubic Bézier
curve with uniform arc-length parameterization to the result. This
is also demonstrated in the supplemental demo video.

Cross-fading. Each interpolated frame is the result of cross-fading
forward and backward transformed strokes. To limit ghosting ar-
tifacts, we apply cross-fading to control the thickness of forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matching</th>
<th>10.22 ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Push phase</td>
<td>8.41ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Regularize phase</td>
<td>1.81ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpolation</td>
<td>6.67 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Factorization</td>
<td>5.55ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Solve</td>
<td>0.90ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke rendering</td>
<td>0.22ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.89 ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Performance of our single-threaded implementation in a
worst-case scenario, recorded on an i7-4790K 4GHz CPU and a
Nvidia GeForce GTX 980Ti GPU. We report timings for the second
keyframe of the fish animation (Figure 19), holding 284 strokes in
a lattice of 753 cells. We use \( N = 10 \) for regularization, while solve
and stroke rendering timings correspond to 10 rendered frames.

strokes, using a function \( c(t) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \):

\[
c(t) = \begin{cases} 
(1 - 2(t - \frac{1}{2})^2)^2 & \text{if } t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \\
1 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

For backward strokes we simply use \( c(1 - t) \). Hence at any time
\( t \), there is always one set of strokes (forward or backward) that
is displayed at full thickness. Note that cross-fading is also sub-
jected to spacing since \( t = S(f) \) for a frame \( f \). By default, we de-
activate cross-fading for embeddings whose end keyframe does not
store any stroke, so as to keep forward propagated strokes displayed
over the full interval. Cross-fading is reactivated whenever the end
keyframe is populated with strokes, or the embedding is tagged as
fading in or out. Yet, we use linear cross-fading in the latter case to
make strokes appear or disappear at the same rate as interpolation.

Performance. Our system is implemented in C++, using the Qt li-
brary for the GUI and an OpenGL Geometry Shader for the final
stroke rendering. We use the sparse LU solver of Eigen [GJ10] to
efficiently factorize and solve the linear system involved in ARAP
interpolation (Appendix A). Table 1 reports the performance of our
implementation recorded for the second keyframe of Figure 19
that uses the largest lattice from all our examples, and relies on
the more demanding pose-to-pose workflow with semi-automatic
(and thus interactive) registration. Interpolation times are also re-
ported since we display the interpolated results during matching
via an “onion skin” visualization. We obtain real-time performance
in such a worst-case scenario, as well as in all our experiments.

7. Results

In this section and the supplemental video we present complex re-
results obtained using our animation system. Note that the video does
not merely show final inbetweened results, but first and foremost
the ability of our system to enable a fast and flexible creative pro-
cess to get to those results.

Figure 1 shows the particularly complex example of a special ef-
effect animation traced from Gilland’s book [Gil09], featuring mul-
tiple topological changes made possible by the use of several tran-
sient embeddings. Figure 13 demonstrates a first Articulated arm.
animation exercise taken from Williams’ guide [Wil01], showcasing arc motions controlled through hierarchical trajectories. In Figure 15 through 18, we reproduce three other classic animation exercises. Details are provided in figure captions; we summarize the main demonstrated features below:

**Ball drop** (Figure 15): different impressions of weight are conveyed through variations in breakdowns and spacing;

**Walk cycle** (Figure 16): breakdown keyframes are used to produce drastically different animations, starting from the same pair of extreme key drawings;

**Flour sack jump** (Figure 17): plausible motion dynamics are obtained by adding anticipation and follow-through via a combination of breakdowns, deformations and spacing;

**Head turn** (Figure 18): 3D-like rotation is conveyed through several embeddings, some being tagged as fading in or out.

Note that even a simple ball drop animation (Figure 15) would require many trials-and-errors for novice 2D animators to produce a first result. Exploring alternate results afterwards would require a significant amount of work (tens of minutes, perhaps hours) since all inbetween frames must be redrawn. In contrast, our system allows the exploration of different alternatives instantly while retaining a plausible rough hand-drawn animation style.

The Head turn example (Figure 18) reveals the main limitation of our approach (see Section 8.3): even with a special treatment of the occluded embeddings (such as the ears), our system is not yet designed to let parts of embeddings appear or disappear behind other embeddings, as it would require to interpolate topological changes. The method of Zhu et al. [ZPBK17] is able to produce such inbetween frames, but the user must specify correspondences for cuts, openings and boundaries on every key drawing, and compatible embeddings must then be computed throughout the animation with a prohibitively expensive optimization.
trajectory constraints only allow to enforce G1 fault behaviors (e.g., logarithmic spirals [WNS∗10]) to refine animation. For follow-through, the last key drawing is divided into two embeddings: the red one is held fixed on screen while the blue one is slightly deformed through a shift step.

unclear how the diffusion-based interpolation could be adapted to provide control over trajectories and motion smoothness, whereas such control is direct in our system as demonstrated in Figure 19(b) and the supplemental results video.

8.2. Practical limitations

Our implementation is intended as a proof-of-concept prototype demonstrating the potential of transient embeddings. Yet our current animation system could be improved in several ways.

On the matching side, we could improve the registration tool with an automatic global non-rigid registration prior to our more local ARAP registration; or we could give artists the option to pin some correspondences to guide the local alignment process. Such pinned points should be related to interpolation constraints (any constraint should be a pin), but they should not be equivalent since artists may not need to control the trajectory of all pinned points. As mentioned in Section 8.1, we would also like to adapt stroke auto-completion [XWSY15] to guide the matching of embeddings. Working with lattices may allow us to alleviate the influence of drawing order on prediction, which may prove especially problematic for rough drawings.

On the interpolation side, we have identified three directions of improvements. First, we would like to explicitly model the rigid component of a transform T through a pivot transform, such that the non-rigid component may be handled by ARAP interpolation relative to that pivot. This would simplify the control of a whole embedding motion through the trajectory of its pivot (e.g., a bouncing ball moving along an arc), which could exhibit interesting default behaviors (e.g., logarithmic spirals [WNS∗10]). Second, our trajectory constraints only allow to enforce G1 continuity across keyframes due to potential discontinuities of the spacing functions S. We would like to investigate ways to ensure full C1 continuity by giving the option to adjust S on both sides of abutting constraints. Finally, we have focused on hard constraints for the control of trajectories; but other solutions could be devised. Soft constraints could be introduced [BBA08] to mimic external forces (such as wind); or constraints may be allowed to slide inside an embedding to precisely control motion at articulations. This latter improvement should be more computationally-demanding as it would a priori require a new ARAP factorization at each interpolated frame.

8.3. Future work

We have chosen to rely on ARAP interpolation to implement transformations between embeddings, as it produces natural results by default, and may be further controlled efficiently through constrained trajectories. However, it does not appear to be the most suitable solution in some cases. For instance, ARAP interpolation is not well adapted to animations that are expected to follow an underlying path, such as roots growing in a soil as shown in the supplementary results video. More generally, 3D-like motions (e.g., rotations out of the canvas plane) remain hard to reproduce with our approach. A solution might be again to rely on an underlying guide during interpolation, this time a 3D proxy surface.

3D-like animations raise another, more difficult problem: the handling of occlusions. As shown in Figure 18, occluded embeddings simply fade in or out during interpolation in our current system. Even though cross-fading is enough in most cases, it is inadequate in the case of occlusions: parts of strokes should be revealed or hidden during interpolation, which requires the handling of depth order relationships between embeddings and the interpolation of topological changes at interactive rates with minimal user intervention. Extending our system to handle occlusions while retaining non-linear editing abilities is a challenging and exciting direction of future work.
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This head turn animation is generated from only three key drawings whose embeddings are color-coded – the last keyframe is made of a single embedding (in black). To make the ears appear or disappear, we must draw and/or deform them occluded (blue and magenta dashed lines) and tag them for fading in or out.

Figure 18: This head turn animation is generated from only three key drawings whose embeddings are color-coded – the last keyframe is made of a single embedding (in black). To make the ears appear or disappear, we must draw and/or deform them occluded (blue and magenta dashed lines) and tag them for fading in or out.

Figure 19: We traced three keyframes (in black) from the fish example in the supplemental video of [XWSY15], and matched them using a pose-to-pose workflow. In (a), we show the interpolated drawings produced by default by our method: as highlighted by the dashed line, the trajectories are discontinuous at the middle keyframe. In (b), we constrained the trajectory depicted in solid red to follow a smooth arc. Notice how this constraint is propagating to neighbor trajectories (e.g., the whiskers, see the dashed red curves).
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Aside from the focus on cartoon animation reusing, Xu et al. [XZWB05] do not offer any control over motion trajectories. Baxter et al. [BBA08] introduce such controls through linear constraints thanks to their reformulation of the problem in terms of normal equations. Katji et al. [KHS*12] present an even more generic mathematical framework, but since we do not need such a generalization, we choose the method of Baxter et al. [BBA08] whose implementation is simpler and very efficient.

More precisely, to compute the interpolated positions of the lattice corners at time \( t \in [0, 1] \), we use Equation 5 in their paper:

\[
V(t) = \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} P^T W P & C & 0 \\ 0 & C & 0 \\ \end{array} \right]^{-1} \left[ \begin{array}{c} P^T \mathbf{A}(t) \\ \mathbf{D}(t) \end{array} \right],
\]

where the sparse matrix \( P \) encodes the triangulated lattice connectivity, the matrix \( \mathbf{A}(t) \) stores the target affine triangle deformations, the diagonal matrix \( W \) allows to specify a weight per triangle (we use its area), the matrix \( C \) expresses hard linear constraints defined on lattice vertices, and the matrix \( \mathbf{D}(t) \) stores the constrained driven positions. When no constraint is provided by the user, we compel the mean position of the lattice to follow a linear and uniform trajectory in order to have a unique solution. This implies setting \( C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1/N \end{bmatrix} \), with \( N \) the number of lattice triangles, and set \( \mathbf{D}(t) \) to the linearly interpolated position of the lattice barycenter. Otherwise, each constrained point \( \mathbf{p} \) maps to a row \( \mathbf{C}_p \) in \( C \) with four non-zero values, one for each barycentric coordinate relative to its cell corners. Denoting \( \{i,j,k,l\} \) the indices of these corners, enumerated in clockwise order starting from top-left, yields:

\[
\mathbf{C}_p = \begin{bmatrix} i \cdots (1-u)(1-v) \cdots u(1-v) \cdots uv \cdots (1-u)v \cdots \end{bmatrix},
\]

with \((u,v)\) the coordinates of \( p \) in the quad cell obtained by inverse bilinear interpolation [Qui10]. The corresponding row in \( \mathbf{D}(t) \) stores the position along the trajectory curve evaluated at \( t \).

Note that matrix inversion, which is the most computationally expensive part of the method, needs to be performed in only two cases: when a lattice is created or its topology changed, since \( P \) is modified; or when a linear constraint is added to \( C \). The matrix \( \mathbf{A}(t) \) is updated whenever matching is modified, whereas \( \mathbf{D}(t) \) is updated whenever a constrained trajectory is edited.

With this formulation, the inverse lattice transformation \( T(t)^{-1} = V(1-t) - V_t \) might result in a non-symmetric behavior, which is obviously problematic for strokes cross-fading. We thus use the symmetric formulation of Baxter et al. [BBA08] which is slightly more complex but equally fast to compute. We refer the interested reader to their paper for details.