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## Motivation

- Want to find fast, correct method for ordering polygons in the Painters algorithm
- Avoid the five checks of painters algorithm
- Preprocessing to determine the split planes
- Create a binary tree that partitions space.
- Can use it to find ordering for drawing polygons.
- Will be $\ll \mathrm{n}^{\wedge} 2$ for rendering
- Technique used in Doom, Quake, Descent, ...


## Assumptions

- Examples will be 2D but this generalizes to 3D
- Works best for static information
- Good for map structures and even monster structure
- Gets tricky if topography can change a lot
- Can require significant space at runtime
- Must be managed efficiently to avoid cache problems


## General Idea

- Recursively divide space into pairs of regions
- Stop when regions are "atomic"
- Doesn't matter which order walls are drawn no matter where you are in the space: convex

- Builds up a binary tree

- When rendering, traverse tree depth-first, always first rendering region that you are not in
- This does the right thing!


## BSP Tree Dividing Issues

- Want to maintain a balanced tree if possible
- Want to minimize splits of existing walls
- If divider crosses wall, wall must be split into two walls
- Keep dividers orthogonal to principle axes
- Simplifies math with splits being more likely to be integer values.


## Picking a Divider: Key Question

- Pick on coincident with a wall
- Less likely to split walls
- Pick $1 \%$ of existing walls, but at least 10
- Evaluate based on simple calculation and pick best \# unbalanced walls +
15 * \# splits +
5 if not on principle axis



## Example: Step 1



## Example: Step 2



## Example: Step 3



## Rendering

- To start with, all we care about ordering of rendering
- Not going to worry about line of sight or orientation of viewer
- Depth-first traversal, always visiting nodes on opposite side of divisor from current node.
- Render space when atomic


## Rendering

- Go to node 2 (because C is right of divider 1)
- Go to A (because C is right of 2 )
- Render A
- Render B
- Go to 3
- Go to D
- Render D
- Render C



## Observations

- Will work very well with walls that are on $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}$ axes.
- Might be worthwhile to have as basis for room dividers
- Other angles can be used to fill in outside of rooms.
- Depth will be related to $\log$ of \# of concave areas



## Inverted Painters: Front-to-Back

- Problem with Back-to-Front is lots of "over-draw"
- Set same pixel over and over
- Expensive because of lighting and texture calculations
- Front-to-back can avoid this
- First draw front rooms first
- Keep track of which pixels are filled in
- Only draw pixels in back rooms that haven't been filled in
- Stop completely when all pixels are filled in
- Dynamically cuts off processing of rooms far away.



## Front-to-Back: Field of View

- Don't traverse a node if field of view completely on other side of divider.



## Front-to-back Data Structure

- To hold data on filled in pixels: use linked list
- Holds ranged of filled in horizontal lines



## Dynamic Modification of BSP

- Extremely expensive to dynamically recalculate BSP if topology of game can arbitrarily change
- Can have pre-stored variants and swap in as world changes
- Blow holes in walls - open doors
- Add subtree
- Different atomic regions
- Swap in



## 3D Objects in BSP Trees

- Same idea, but render "outside" of object, not "inside".
- Can just drop in to existing BSP tree at the bottom as a child of the atomic region it is in
- As 3D object moves, it changes where it is in BSP tree


## Conclusion

- Even with Z-buffers, BSP Trees are an important tool for rendering static structures
- With front-to-back rendering, can eliminate overdraw and greatly reduce polygons considered.

