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ABSTRACT

Inspired by the strengths of quadric error metrics initially designed for mesh decimation, we propose a concise mesh reconstruction approach for 3D point clouds. Our approach proceeds by clustering the input points enriched with quadric error metrics, where the generator of each cluster is the optimal 3D point for the sum of its quadric error metrics. This approach favors the placement of generators on sharp features, and tends to equidistribute the error among clusters. We reconstruct the output surface mesh from the adjacency between clusters and a constrained binary solver. We combine our clustering process with an adaptive refinement driven by the error. Compared to prior art, our method avoids dense reconstruction prior to simplification and produces immediately an optimized mesh.
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Figure 1: Variational shape reconstruction. The clustering of the points is randomly initialized, then alternates partitioning and generator updating. Some generators relocate to sharp features after one iteration. New generators are then added. The clustering converges after five iterations. A set of candidate edges is derived from the adjacency between clusters, and candidate facets (red) are generated. The output mesh is reconstructed via a constrained binary solver that selects a subset of the red facets.

1 INTRODUCTION

Mesh reconstruction consists in finding a mesh that piecewise approximates a point sampling of a 3D surface well. In addition to the inherent ill-posed nature of the reconstruction problem, several dilemmas witness the difficulty of this problem, such as interpolation vs. approximation, or greedy vs. variational approaches. In this paper, we focus on concise mesh reconstruction from 3D point clouds that are unstructured and come without oriented per-sample normal vector. In addition, we aim to produce concise surface triangle meshes through a low-memory footprint process, see Figure 1. One possible solution to the problem is to perform dense mesh reconstruction followed by mesh decimation but the transient memory consumption is large. If one seeks additional features such
as noise resilience or hole filling, one may resort to implicit reconstruction followed by isosurfacing and mesh decimation. However, this sequence adds another inconsistency since the bias induced by implicit reconstruction is unknown by the decimation step, resulting in a suboptimal complexity-distortion tradeoff. Proceeding coarse-to-fine has in general a lower memory footprint, but approaches such as greedy Delaunay refinement result in suboptimal approximations. This calls for a coarse-to-fine variational approach.

Another challenge comes from sharp features. Nothing is really sharp in the physical world when looking at fine scales. Nevertheless, a physical fillet (rounded edge) becomes sharp when zooming out at coarse scales. In a surface triangle mesh, any edge or vertex that is not flat is a sharp feature, but edges and vertices are also used to approximate smooth parts. In other words, the sharpness of a feature depends on the chosen scale or approximation tolerance error. As we wish to proceed coarse-to-fine, this rules out approaches based on early sharp feature detection. Instead, we favor a variational approach where sharp features emerge from an optimization process.

2 RELATED WORK
We first review the shape reconstruction problem, with a focus on generating concise meshes as output. We then review the pioneering work on quadric error metrics and its variants, and a few variational approaches.

2.1 Shape reconstruction
We focus next on key aspects sought after in our problem statement: conciseness and recovery of sharp features. We refer to books or surveys for a more complete review on shape reconstruction [Berger et al. 2017; Dey 2006].

Conciseness. Hoppe et al. [1994] pioneered a piecewise smooth reconstruction approach that inputs a dense reconstructed mesh, and interleaves decimation and optimization to fit a subdivision surface. Digne et al. [2014] formulate shape reconstruction as an optimal transport problem between a discrete measure (points seen as Dirac masses) and a dense simplicial complex seen as the support of a piecewise-constant measure, which is then decimated. Besides being compute-intensive, these fine-to-coarse approaches contradict our desire to proceed coarse-to-fine with low memory cost. The literature is sparser on coarse-to-fine mesh-based approaches. Sahillioğlu et al. [2010] start from the visual hull mesh of objects, and perform smoothing and restructuring operations. Delaunay refinement is another instance of coarse-to-fine paradigm [ Campos et al. 2013], but for both above approaches the meshes are too isotropic to offer the level of conciseness sought after.

Sharp features. The literature is abounded by methods trying to detect sharp features, but we seek for an approach that recovers sharp features by optimizing vertex locations such that sharp features are formed where they offer the best approximation. Several non-linear regression approaches have been proposed to find such optimal locations: e.g., robust implicit moving least-squares surfaces (MLS) [Öztireli et al. 2009], or robust MLS [Fleishman et al. 2005]. Another approach consists in consolidating the point clouds before reconstruction, by removing outliers, reducing noise and relocating some points onto sharp features. Avron et al. [2010] first solve a global sparse minimization problem to consolidate normal orientations, then consolidate point locations before running ball pivoting [Bernardini et al. 1999]. Xu et al. [2022] pioneered a multistage approach that removes noise, identifies feature lines via discrete optimal transport and interpolates the consolidated point cloud. Consolidating the mesh after reconstruction is also an option. Attene et al. [2003] proposed a so-called edge sharpener. Wang et al. [2013] first remove outliers and noise, before inputting the consolidated point cloud to Poisson surface reconstruction [Kazhdan et al. 2006]. Sharp features are then recovered by applying bilateral filtering to the reconstructed surface mesh. Yadav et al. [2017] proposed another two-stage mesh denoising algorithm. All these methods are powerful but operate on dense meshes. Several learning-based methods [Liu et al. 2021; Matveev et al. 2022] have been recently proposed for extracting sharp feature graphs from raw point clouds.

2.2 Quadric Error Metrics
Garland and Heckbert [1997] pioneered a mesh decimation approach that applies a sequence of edge collapse operators sorted by so-called quadric error metrics (QEM). QEMs capture weighted sums of squared errors to the supporting planes of triangle facets (see Section 3). This powerful idea has become one of the most popular approaches for mesh decimation. Hoppe [1999] extended this approach to deal with colors and textures. Deng et al. [2011] utilized quadric error metrics to build cages for shape editing. Thiery et al. [2013] defined a spherical quadric error metric in 4D for extreme shape approximation. Salinas et al. [2015] contributed a structure-aware variant that adds to the quadrads a set of plane quadrads detected from the input mesh. Legrand et al. [2019] proposed a mesh smoothing and clustering approach via filtering quadrads: a field of filtered quadrads is defined on the input mesh by diffusing quadrads via a bilateral filter made of a spatial kernel and a QEM-based range kernel. The mesh vertices are connected to form a tree structure according to a relevance score estimated from the filtered quadric field, and the final clusters are generated by pruning the branches. Trettner and Kobbelt [2020] extended the QEM approach by defining probabilistic quadrads in closed form, in order to deal with uncertainty in the input meshes and improve resilience to noise and mesh quality.

2.3 Variational approaches
Cohen-Steiner et al. [2004] introduced the variational shape approximation (VSA) approach, which formulates the task as a discrete, variational partitioning problem with planar proxies. VSA optimizes clusters of connected mesh triangles by minimizing a one-sided error metric (L^2 or L^{2,1}) formulated between triangles and planar proxies. The number of clusters is adjusted via four operators (merge, split, add, teleport). The final output is an anisotropic polygonal mesh derived from the clustering partition. Wu and Kobbelt [2005] extended VSA to deal with higher order proxies such as spheres and cylinders. Skrodzki et al. [2020] adapted VSA to 3D point sets, and added a switch operator to guarantee convergence. Yu and Lefarge [2022] devised a pliant approach for partitioning a 3D point cloud into planar parts. From an initial partition, a multi-objective
function is optimized through five types of operators (insert, exclude, transfer, merge, split) to obtain a balance between fidelity, complexity and coverage. The optimized partition is then input to a piecewise-planar reconstruction approach [Baubert and Lafarge 2020]. The above clustering approaches are powerful, but partitioning solves only half of the problem, as it remains to mesh the optimized partition which is in general composed of polygonal elements. Intersecting planes is an option, but it is numerically unstable, as already observed by Zimmer et al. [2012] for planar panelization of freeform surfaces. Meshing is also hampered by concave elements of the partition. Resorting to a volumetric partition through a kinetic-based approach is a reliable alternative, but is compute-intensive [Baubert and Lafarge 2020]. Departing from partitioning with planar elements, we adopt a dual approach that partitions with "conical" elements, i.e. vertices with their adjacent planar elements where the vertex locations are computed through integrating quadrics over clusters.

2.4 Positioning and Contributions
The original QEM approach, designed for greedy mesh decimation, is fast and very effective. We observe that it may be seen as a clustering algorithm over the input mesh vertices, where the objective is to minimize the maximum (over the clusters) of the sum of squared distances from the optimal vertices to the set of planes of the clusters. This maximum is minimized in a greedy hierarchical way using a priority queue for decimation operators, and the output mesh is the dual, i.e., nerve of the clustering: one vertex per cluster, and one edge per pair of neighboring clusters.

We utilize the strengths of QEM to design a novel coarse-to-fine variational reconstruction algorithm. Our starting point is also QEM, but we replace the greedy fine-to-coarse clustering by a variational expectation-minimization (EM) approach. The objective function is no longer the maximum cluster error but rather the sum of errors over the clusters. Our method may also be seen as a form of dual to the VSA approach initially designed for mesh partitioning; instead of considering squared distances from data points to planar cluster proxies, we consider squared distances from tangent planes at data points to clusters estimated cone points. Our experiments show that, especially for extreme approximations, our approach outperforms the state-of-the-art. In addition, our method takes point clouds as input, allowing to address concise mesh reconstruction. For this harder problem, taking the nerve of the clustering as output mesh may not suffice anymore, and we output instead a mesh computed by a specific binary solver. Our main technical contributions are:

- A novel variational partitioning method designed to cluster the input points based on quadric error metrics. The generators are optimal points minimizing the sum of quadric error metrics for the clusters.
- The resulting partitioning tends to equidistribute the errors among clusters, yielding clusters with anisotropy in accordance to the local geometry.

3 BACKGROUND
We briefly review quadric error metrics (QEM) pioneered by Garland and Heckbert [1997] for mesh decimation, and some other variants such as the probabilistic QEM recently introduced by Trettner and Kobbelt [2020].

Given a triangle $t$, we consider its supporting plane $\pi$ and denote by $n$ a unit normal vector of $\pi$ and by $p$ an arbitrary point on $\pi$. The plane quadratic associated to $t$ is the $4 \times 4$ symmetric matrix

$$Q_t = \begin{bmatrix} nn^T & -p^Tnn^T \\ -n^Tn & (p^Tn)^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & -b \\ -b^T & c \end{bmatrix}.$$  

(1)

Given a query point $q \in \mathbb{R}^3$, the corresponding error function is defined as $f(Q_t, q) = q^T Q_t q$, where $q = (q^T, 1)^T$ are the homogeneous coordinates of $q$. This function captures the squared distance from point $q$ to plane $\pi$. The probabilistic QEM incorporates Gaussian noise for both the unit normal vector $n$ and the position $p$ on the plane $\pi$. In this case, $A$, $b$ and $c$ are replaced by their corresponding expectations $\mathbb{E}(A)$, $\mathbb{E}(b)$ and $\mathbb{E}(c)$.

A diffused quadric is assigned to each vertex of the input surface triangle mesh. Given a vertex $v$ of a surface mesh, its diffused quadric $Q_v$ is defined as the sum of the weighted quadrics of its 1-ring neighboring facets, i.e.

$$Q_v = \sum_{t_i \in \text{neighbors}(v)} \frac{1}{3} a_{t_i} Q_{t_i}.$$  

(2)

where $a_{t_i}$ denotes the area of triangle $t_i$. Each plane quadric is thus evenly distributed on the three vertices of its triangle. From a geometric viewpoint, summing quadrics is equivalent to taking the union of the planes. Such an initialization guarantees that the vertices are the optimal minimizers of their diffused quadrics, while it is in general not the case during decimation. Equation (2) is extended to deal with boundaries by adding quadrics corresponding to planes that are orthogonal to boundary edges.

When an edge $e$ connecting $v_1$ and $v_2$ is collapsed, the quadric of the new vertex $v_e$ is computed as $Q_{v_e} = Q_{v_1} + Q_{v_2}$, i.e., the collapsed vertex receives the contribution from all weighted planes of the input mesh adjacent to $v_1$ and $v_2$. The optimal location of $v_e$ is computed by solving for point $p_e$ that minimizes QEM $f(Q_{v_e}, p_e)$, i.e. the point which realizes the smallest sum of squared distances to all assigned planes. If all planes are similar then all points on the plane minimize $f(Q_{v_e}, p_e)$; if all planes intersect in a line, all points on this line minimize $f(Q_{v_e}, p_e)$, and the intersection point is the only minimizer of $f(Q_{v_e}, p_e)$. In other words, QEM has the virtue of placing points onto sharp creases or corners, while an infinite number of optimal point locations exist for planes or for linear sharp creases. Such an ill-posed problem is solved via singular value decomposition (SVD) [Lindstrom 2000], which computes the closest point in the optimal set from a given point - commonly the collapsed edge midpoint. There is thus an intrinsic relation between incremental decimation via QEM and fine-to-coarse vertex clustering. After initialization, each vertex is considered as an individual cluster. An edge collapse operation merges two clusters into a new cluster associated with the new optimal vertex. During decimation, the evolution of clusters can be tracked with a tree structure.

4 APPROACH
Figure 2 provides an overview of our approach. The input is a 3D point cloud sampled on a closed surface, and the output is a surface triangle mesh. A QEM is first estimated for each point.
The original QEM approach designed for mesh decimation utilizes via region growing with updating the generators, until a maximum available as input, e.g. information on sharp features via multiple take into account additional geometric information that would be a smooth surface. The initialization step is flexible and can also areas, curved creases and corners.

Each ellipsoid represents a quadric error isosurface, that is the locus of points with equal errors. The center of the quadric realizes the minimum error. Intuitively, we can classify ellipsoids into three main types: pancakes, cigars and balls, corresponding to smooth.

local plane quadrics. However, the strength of our method is to avoid the ill-posed detection step, and yet to recover sharp creases even when using diffused quadrics that mollify the sharp features existing in the sampled physical object.

4.2 Initialization
Clustering of the input points is initialized by randomly selecting a handful of input points as initial cluster generators \( \{c_i | 1 \leq i \leq m\} \). The generators coincide with the input points after initialization, but this is no longer the case later as they will be updated as optimal QEM 3D points.

4.3 Clustering
The clustering step operates by alternating partitioning with the generator updating until the clusters stabilize or a maximum number of iterations is reached.

The clustering step operates by alternating partitioning with the generator updating until the clusters stabilize or a maximum number of iterations is reached.

\( E(p_i, l_j) = |c_j| \sum a_{p_j} Q_{a_{p_j}} + \lambda \sum \|p_i - c_j\|^2 \),

where \( c_j \) denotes the current generator of cluster \( l_j \) and \( \lambda \) denotes a coefficient for regularizing region growing on planar areas. \( \lambda \) is set by default to a small value such that the coarse-to-fine refinement focuses mainly on minimizing the QEM error. There are three reasons for using such a Euclidean distance term: 1) to regularize partitioning of flat or straight areas by competing growing fronts, so that we obtain a Voronoi-like partition instead of noisy adjacency frontiers, 2) to obtain evenly distributed vertices on flat areas or along straight creases, when these areas are densely populated by generators, and 3) to provide enough edge candidates for meshing.
point in cluster $l_j$. Only the optimal points $c^*$ are later used for constructing the output surface triangle mesh. Clustering terminates when there is no change between the old and new set of generators, or when a user-selected maximum number of iterations is reached.

### 4.4 Batch splitting

The maximum QEM error is monitored for all points of a cluster, once clustering terminates. We operate a splitting operator that inserts a new generator in the cluster realizing the maximum error. More specifically, for each cluster $l_j$, we find the point labeled $j$ that maximizes $Q_{c_j}$, i.e.

$$p_{\text{max}}(l_j) = \arg \max_{p_i \in e_l} [p_i, 1]^T \cdot Q_{c_j} \cdot [p_i, 1].$$  

(9)

If the corresponding QEM exceeds a maximum user-defined tolerance, then $p_{\text{max}}(l_j)$ is added as a new candidate for cluster splitting. We then greedily compute an independent set of clusters to be split, enforcing that two adjacent clusters cannot be split in the same splitting batch to avoid over-refining. As it is not intuitive to define a meaningful QEM tolerance, we take a Euclidean distance tolerance parameter and convert it to a QEM scale according to the relationship between these two metrics (see Section 3). Alternating between partitioning and batch splitting stops when all clusters satisfy the user-defined tolerance error or when a maximum number of iterations is reached.

### 4.5 Meshing

The current partition of clusters yields a set of vertices that are optimal in the QEM sense. It remains to connect these vertices by finding a set of triangle facets. We first derive a graph of edges from the adjacency between clusters, from which we compute facet candidates and then solve a constrained binary program (CBP) to extract the output surface triangle mesh.

**Facet candidates.** Given the above edge graph, we search for 3-cycles in the graph by selecting all triplets of vertices that are mutually connected by an edge. This yields a set of triangle facet candidates, possibly overlapping in some areas. It remains to select a subset of these facets.

**Mesh extraction.** From the set of facet candidates, we wish to keep the ones that fit well, cover well the input 3D point cloud and favor a 2-manifold mesh. Building upon the PolyFit approach [Nan and Wonka 2017], we minimize an objective function rewarding a data fitting term $F_f$ and a data coverage term $F_c$, under a 2-manifold constraint. More specifically, we assign a binary label $b_{f_i}$ for each facet candidate $f_i$ and a binary label $b_{e_i}$ for each edge $e_i$. Label one indicates that the facet or edge is kept for the final mesh, and label zero indicates that it is discarded. We then minimize:

$$\max_{(b_{f_i}, \ldots, b_{f_n})} \sum_{i=1}^n b_{f_i} \cdot \left(F_f(f_i) + F_c(f_i)\right)$$  

(10)

subject to:

$$2b_{e_i} - \sum_{f_i \text{ around } e_i} b_{f_i} = 0, \quad \forall e_i.$$  

(11)
Figure 2 (right) illustrates facet filtering: some quads overly covered by four red facets are later triangulated with two triangles in the output mesh. When the 2-manifold property is not sought after, we can deactivate the constraints and search instead for a balance between high fitting, high coverage and low complexity of output. We can then reconstruct non-manifold meshes with boundaries (see Figure 13) by simply selecting facets such that $F_f(f_i) + F_c(f_i) - 1 > 0$.

**Fitting term.** For each facet candidate, we find all input points whose distance to the triangle facet is smaller than a tolerance error $\epsilon$ and compute the fitting term as:

$$F_f(f_i) = \sum_{p_j|d(p_j,f_i) < \epsilon} \left(1 - \frac{d(p_j,f_i)}{\epsilon}\right).$$

(12)

**Coverage term.** Coverage prevents large triangles from covering empty areas. For each facet candidate, the $\epsilon$-selected input points are projected onto its supporting plane. We then construct a 2D alpha shape with alpha set to $s$ times the average spacing of $P$ and compute the ratio between the total area of the triangles of the alpha shape, and the area of the facet. $s$ is by default set to 5.

$$F_c(f_i) = \min\left(1, \frac{\text{area}(\{(p_j|d(p_j,f_i) < \epsilon)\})}{\text{area}(f_i)}\right).$$

(13)

**Manifold constraint.** To favor 2-manifold output meshes, a constraint is added for each edge $e_i$ such that if it is kept by the solver ($e_i = 1$), then exactly two triangles adjacent to $e_i$ must be kept, and zero adjacent triangles otherwise (Equation (11)).

5 EXPERIMENTS

We implemented our approach in C++, using several libraries: CGAL [The CGAL Project 2021] for geometric computations, Eigen [Guennebaud et al. 2010] for linear algebra and SCIP [Bestuzheva et al. 2021] for solving binary linear problems. All experiments are conducted on a MacBook Pro with a 2.9GHz Quad-Core Intel i7 CPU and 16GB memory, running on a single core.

Figure 5 validates our concise reconstruction approach on a 3D point set sampled on a capsule made up of an open cylinder and two half-spheres. The clustering algorithm generates elongated clusters on parabolic areas and isotropic clusters on the spherical areas, that translate into skinny and isotropic triangles, respectively.

Figure 6 shows three concise reconstructions from a point cloud sampled on a mechanical part. See our supplementary videos.

Figure 7 highlights the difference between variational clustering approach tends to equidistribute the errors among clusters where possible, translating into evenly placed vertices along the creases. Figure 6 shows three concise reconstructions from a point cloud sampled on a mechanical part. See our supplementary videos.

Figure 8 shows our method at work on more diverse sharp features, including sharp creases subtending small angles. The variational clustering approach tends to equidistribute the errors among clusters where possible, translating into evenly placed vertices along the creases. Figure 6 shows three concise reconstructions from a point cloud sampled on a mechanical part. See our supplementary videos.

Figure 9 plots timings and peak memory consumption against number of input points or complexity of the output mesh. The
Table 1: Maximum distances from 3D point clouds to output meshes. P+Q: Poisson followed by QEM-based decimation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Capsule</th>
<th>Cone (#v:5)</th>
<th>Cone (#v:7)</th>
<th>Cone (#v:15)</th>
<th>Cone (#v:58)</th>
<th>Cone (#v:113)</th>
<th>Hilbert</th>
<th>Hilbert (0.5%)</th>
<th>Hilbert (1%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max (P+Q)</td>
<td>0.07489</td>
<td>0.38316</td>
<td>0.1078</td>
<td>0.06092</td>
<td>0.01455</td>
<td>0.088757</td>
<td>1.6725</td>
<td>1.7233</td>
<td>1.5873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max (Ours)</td>
<td>0.00328</td>
<td>0.2414</td>
<td>0.01345</td>
<td>0.04299</td>
<td>0.01088</td>
<td>0.4591</td>
<td>1.3958</td>
<td>0.062321</td>
<td>0.001147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Timing and peak memory. Top: the number of input points increases from 732 to 1M, while the complexity of the output mesh is constant (150 vertices). Bottom: the number of input points is constant (73k points) while the complexity of the reconstructed mesh increases.

input point cloud is uniformly sampled on a sphere. The memory consumption is only relative, as our current implementation is interactive and the rendering part consumes a large memory fraction of the whole program.

Table 1 reports maximum Euclidean distances from 3D point clouds to output meshes, for comparing with Poisson followed by QEM-based decimation. Blue cells indicates smaller values.

Figure 17 and 18 show visual comparisons. We compare our method with Poisson reconstruction, Poisson followed by QEM-based decimation and VSA, kinetic shape reconstruction [Bauchet and Lafarge 2020], partitioning followed by kinetic shape reconstruction [Yu and Lafarge 2022], an interpolant Delaunay-based approach [Rakotosaona et al. 2021], a recent feature-aware shape reconstruction RFPEPS [Xu et al. 2022], and RFPEPS followed by QEM-based decimation and VSA. Note that the last two approaches and our approach make no assumption about normal orientation, while the others require oriented normals. We can match the exact same mesh complexity only for Poisson followed by QEM decimation, as the other methods deal with planar shapes before meshing. For the Stanford bunny, the differences between the two meshes with the same complexity are subtle but noticeable by comparing the shading of the triangles with the one of the dense Poisson reconstruction (e.g., nose, crease of the neck and tail). The ear is discretized differently, with a vertex located on a saddle point.

Figure 10 evaluates robustness to noise on dense point clouds sampled on a CAD model, altered with random uniform noise with different magnitude—up to 3% of the bounding box diagonal. We measure: (1) the average distance from a densely sampled reconstructed mesh to the ground truth, (2) the average distance from densely sampled ground truth sharp creases to the reconstructed mesh and (3) the manifoldness of the output mesh. Figure 16 illustrates robustness to noise on a genus 120 model: reconstruction degrades gracefully when noise increases. Figure 11 compares our method with kinetic shape reconstruction [Bauchet and Lafarge 2020], and with Poisson reconstruction followed by QEM decimation, on a piecewise-planar Hilbert cube with increasing random uniform noise. Figure 12 shows results on a point cloud generated by photogrammetry, with a large amount of noise and outliers.

Figure 15 illustrates the stability of the clustering step and approximation errors with respect to four different random initializations. Some salient features such as the saddle in the palm are present in the four reconstructions.

5.1 Limitations

Over-refinement. Batch splitting steps may over-refine some areas, despite the independent set, so that some straight creases may be overly discretized. A richer set of operators (e.g., join or switch) may help but can lead to looping between refinement and coarsening of the partitioning. We leave this for future work.

Fold-overs. The constraints of the binary solver guarantee that each edge is adjacent to either 0 or 2 facets, making the output mesh orientable and free of non-manifold edges. Nevertheless, it does not prevent from having two selected faces around an edge nearly co-planar with opposite orientations (see inset figure - the output mesh contains a fold-over). A larger value for $\lambda$ parameter (distance for region growing) helps to reduce the problem but does not solve it entirely. In addition, we cannot get rid of non-manifold vertices.

Boundaries. Clustering does not place generators on boundary curves, unless boundary points are first detected and orthogonal quadrics are added there. This contradicts our initial desire to avoid resorting to a detection step. Our approach is designed to deal only with point clouds sampled on closed objects. The solver can fill some holes via the 2-manifold constraints, but only when there are enough candidate facets filling these holes. Deactivating the
constraints is feasible (see Figure 13) but the 2-manifold property is no longer favored.

6 CONCLUSION

We proposed a variational shape reconstruction method leveraging the strengths of two concepts: quadric error metrics (QEM) and variational partitioning. Our approach can deal with unoriented 3D point clouds as input and is designed for the reconstruction of concise triangle meshes. Most previous variational approaches optimize planar elements before determining vertices and then a connectivity to form triangles or polygons. As the optimized errors often refer to infinite planes and the elements may be concave, determining vertices and meshing is difficult. We adopt a dual approach and optimize the placement of optimal cone points of clusters, that are later connected to form the output triangle mesh. Intuitively, this brings us one step closer to the final discretization, with improved consistency that translates into lower approximation errors and better recovery of sharp features and symmetries.

In future work, we plan to extend our approach so that it can discover open boundaries during clustering, while favoring the 2-manifold property. We will also explore alternative solvers for the final mesh extraction steps, so that users can better trade complexity for distortion, or balance with other objectives such as the shape of the mesh elements. Finally, we will extend this approach in order to reconstruct piecewise-smooth surfaces with curved Bézier triangles.
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7 GALLERY

Figure 11: Robustness to noise on the Hilbert cube. Top: our method. Middle: output of kinetic shape reconstruction. Bottom: output of Poisson reconstruction followed by QEM-based mesh decimation. 
#f: number of faces.

Figure 12: Left: point cloud generated by photogrammetry, with noise and outliers. We estimated point normals on the 100 nearest neighbors in order to smooth the normal field. Middle: facet candidates deduced from clustering. Right: reconstructed mesh.

Figure 13: Non-manifold mesh reconstruction. By replacing the manifold constraint in the mesh solver by an objective function which rewards only low complexity of the output mesh, we can reconstruct meshes with boundaries and non-manifold edges. The output is a triangle soup.

Figure 14: Meshes reconstructed with two resolutions. #p: number of points. #f: number of faces. #v: number of vertices. From top to bottom: Elephant, Mother, Rocker arm, Sharp sphere.

Figure 15: Meshes reconstructed from four different initializations.
Figure 16: Robustness to noise on a genus 120 hex pen pot (taken from Thingi10K [Zhou and Jacobson 2016]).

Figure 17: Comparisons on the bunny. KSR: Kinetic shape reconstruction [Bauchet and Lafarge 2020]. DSE: Delaunay surface elements [Rakotosona et al. 2021]. GoCoPP: Good configurations of planar primitives [Yu and Lafarge 2022].

Figure 18: Comparisons on a mechanical part (point cloud taken from RFEPS [Xu et al. 2022]).