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## introduction

- let be given an orientable, smooth parametric surface: $\mathbf{S}(u, v),(u, v) \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2}$,
and an ordered set of points:
$\mathcal{I}=\left\{\mathbf{I}_{i}=\mathbf{S}\left(u_{i}, v_{i}\right),\left(u_{i}, v_{i}\right) \in \Omega, i=0,1, \ldots, n\right\}$ on it.
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$\mathcal{I}=\left\{\mathbf{I}_{i}=\mathbf{S}\left(u_{i}, v_{i}\right),\left(u_{i}, v_{i}\right) \in \Omega, i=0,1, \ldots, n\right\}$ on it.
- we aim to set up a methodology for constructing smooth curves $\mathbf{c}(t), t \in\left[t_{0}, t_{n}\right]$, that lie on $\mathbf{S}(u, v)$, interpolate the given points, $\mathbf{c}\left(t_{i}\right)=\mathbf{I}_{i}$ on it, with $t_{i}$ being user-specified parameters in $\left[t_{0}, t_{n}\right]$, and are shape preserving in an appropriately defined sense.


## a criterion for shape-preserving interpolation (spi)

- to introduce a notion of shape-preserving interpolation on a surface, we appeal to the composite curve $\Gamma$ consisting of the geodesic segments
$\gamma_{i}(\tau), \tau \in[0,1], \tau=\left(t-t_{i}\right) / h_{i}, h_{i}=t_{i+1}-t_{i}$,
that connect each consecutive pair of interpolation points:
$\gamma_{i}(0)=\mathbf{l}_{i}, \gamma_{i}(1)=\mathbf{l}_{i+1}, i=0,1, \ldots, n-1$.
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- to introduce a notion of shape-preserving interpolation on a surface, we appeal to the composite curve $\Gamma$ consisting of the geodesic segments
$\gamma_{i}(\tau), \tau \in[0,1], \tau=\left(t-t_{i}\right) / h_{i}, h_{i}=t_{i+1}-t_{i}$, that connect each consecutive pair of interpolation points: $\gamma_{i}(0)=\mathbf{I}_{i}, \gamma_{i}(1)=\mathbf{I}_{i+1}, i=0,1, \ldots, n-1$.
- the geodesic curvature $\kappa_{g}$ of a regular curve $\mathbf{c}(t)$ on $\mathbf{S}(u, v)$, is defined as:

$$
\kappa_{g}(t ; \mathbf{c})=\frac{(\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t), \ddot{\mathbf{c}}(t), \mathbf{n}(t))}{\|\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)\|^{3}}
$$

## generalised convexity indicator

- in analogy to the notion of convexity indicators $P_{\text {planar }, i}$ used for shape-preserving interpolation on the plane

$$
P_{\text {planar }, i}=\frac{\left(\mathbf{L}_{i-1}, \mathbf{L}_{i}, \mathbf{e}_{3}\right)}{\left\|\mathbf{L}_{i-1} \times{ }_{2 D} \mathbf{L}_{i}\right\|},
$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{3}$ is the unit normal on the plane, $\mathbf{L}_{i}=\mathbf{I}_{i+1}-\mathbf{I}_{i}$.
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- we introduce the notion of generalized convexity indicators $P_{i}$ at the vertices $\mathbf{I}_{i}$ of the composite geodesic $\Gamma$ on $\mathbf{S}(u, v)$

$$
P_{i}=\frac{\left(\dot{\gamma}_{i-1}(1), \dot{\gamma}_{i}(0), \mathbf{n}\left(t_{i}\right)\right)}{\left\|\dot{\gamma}_{i-1}(1) \times \dot{\gamma}_{i}(0)\right\|}
$$

## the proposed spi criterion

(i) convexity: If $P_{m} P_{m+1}>0$ then

$$
\kappa_{g}(t ; \mathbf{c}) P_{n}>0, \quad t \in\left[t_{m}, t_{m+1}\right], n=m \text { or } m+1
$$
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(ii) minimum variation: If $P_{m} P_{m+1}<0$ then
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\kappa_{g}(t ; \mathbf{c}) P_{n}>0, \quad t \in\left[t_{m}, t_{m+1}\right], n=m \text { or } m+1
$$

(ii) minimum variation: If $P_{m} P_{m+1}<0$ then
$\kappa_{g}(t ; \mathbf{c}) P_{m} \geq 0, t \in\left[t_{m}, t_{m, m+1}\right], \kappa_{g}(t ; \mathbf{c}) P_{m+1} \geq 0, t \in\left[t_{m, m+1}, t_{m+1}\right]$,
for some $t_{m, m+1} \in\left(t_{m}, t_{m+1}\right)$.
(iii) co-geodesity: If $P_{m}=0$ and $P_{m-1} P_{m+1} \neq 0$ then

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\|\kappa_{g}(t ; \mathbf{c})\right\|<\epsilon, t \in \eta_{m}, \kappa_{g}(t ; \mathbf{c}) P_{m-1} \geq 0, t \in\left[t_{m-1}, t_{m}\right] \backslash \eta_{m} \\
\kappa_{g}(t ; \mathbf{c}) P_{m+1} \geq 0, t \in\left[t_{m}, t_{m+1}\right] \backslash \eta_{m}
\end{gathered}
$$

where $\epsilon$ is a user-specified small positive number in $(0,1]$ and $\eta_{m}$ is a closed subinterval of $\left(t_{m-1}, t_{m+1}\right)$ that includes $t_{m}$ as an interior point.

## geodesic-based variable-degree splines (vd-splines)

the members $\mathbf{c}(t)$ of this family are defined by composing $\mathbf{S}(u, v)$ with a family of planar curves, $\mathbf{q}(t)$, which combine:

- the shape-preserving interpolation properties of the so-called variable-degree polynomial splines, with
- the pre-images, $\mathbf{g}_{i}(t)=\mathbf{S}^{-1}\left(\gamma_{i}(t)\right)$, of the geodesic arcs $\gamma_{i}(\tau)$ :
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the members $\mathbf{c}(t)$ of this family are defined by composing $\mathbf{S}(u, v)$ with a family of planar curves, $\mathbf{q}(t)$, which combine:

- the shape-preserving interpolation properties of the so-called variable-degree polynomial splines, with
- the pre-images, $\mathbf{g}_{i}(t)=\mathbf{S}^{-1}\left(\gamma_{i}(t)\right)$, of the geodesic arcs $\gamma_{i}(\tau)$ :

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{c}(t)=(\mathbf{S} \circ \mathbf{q})(t), \\
\mathbf{q}(t)=\mathbf{g}_{i}(\tau)+h_{i}^{2}\left(\ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{i}-\ddot{\mathbf{g}}_{i}\left(t_{i}\right)\right) F_{i}(1-\tau)+h_{i}^{2}\left(\ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1}-\ddot{\mathbf{g}}_{i}\left(t_{i+1}\right)\right) F_{i}(\tau) \\
t \in\left[t_{i}, t_{i+1}\right], \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{i}:=d^{2} \mathbf{q}\left(t_{i}\right) / d t^{2} \\
F_{i}(\tau)=\frac{\tau^{k_{i}}-\tau}{k_{i}\left(k_{i}-1\right)}, \quad 3 \leq k_{i} \in \mathbb{N}, \\
\tau=\frac{t-t_{i}}{h_{i}} \in[0,1], \quad h_{i}=t_{i+1}-t_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n-1
\end{gathered}
$$

## on surface interpolation problem

## theorem

- Let be given a surface $\mathbf{S}(u, v),(u, v) \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2}$, along with a set $\mathcal{I}=\left\{\mathbf{I}_{0}, \ldots, \mathbf{I}_{n}\right\}$ of points on it, a user-specified knot sequence $\mathcal{T}=\left\{t_{i}: t_{i}<t_{i+1}, i=0,1, \ldots, n-1\right\}$ and a set $\mathcal{K}=\left\{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n-1}\right\}, 3 \leq k_{i} \in \mathbb{N}, i=1, \ldots, n-1$.
- then, under appropriate boundary conditions $\mathcal{B}$, there exists a unique $C^{2}\left(\left[t_{0}, t_{n}\right]\right)$ curve $\mathbf{c}(t)$, represented as in (1), which lies on $\mathbf{S}(u, v)$ and interpolates $\mathcal{I}$ in conformity with the knot sequence $\mathcal{T}$


## local asymptotic behaviour

## theorem

- If $k_{i-1}, k_{i}$ increase in compatibility with:

$$
\lim _{k_{i-1}, k_{i} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k_{i-1}}{k_{i}}=\lambda_{i-1, i}
$$

where $\lambda_{i-1, i}$ is a non-zero positive constant,

- then, for sufficiently large degrees $k_{i-1}$ and $k_{i}$, the sign of the geodesic curvature of $\mathbf{c}(t)$ at $t=t_{i}$ is equal to the sign of the quantity

$$
\dot{\mathbf{g}}_{i-1}\left(t_{i}\right) \times{ }_{2 D} \dot{\mathbf{g}}_{i}\left(t_{i}\right)\left(\mathbf{S}_{u}\left(\mathbf{I}_{i}\right), \mathbf{S}_{v}\left(\mathbf{I}_{i}\right), \mathbf{n}\left(\mathbf{I}_{i}\right)\right),
$$

where the factor $\left(\mathbf{S}_{u}\left(\mathbf{I}_{i}\right), \mathbf{S}_{v}\left(\mathbf{I}_{i}\right), \mathbf{n}\left(\mathbf{I}_{i}\right)\right)$ has constant sign for the orientable surface $\mathbf{S}(u, v)$

## geodesic-based $\nu$-splines

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{c}(t)=(\mathbf{S} \circ \mathbf{q})(t), \\
\tau=\frac{t-t_{i}}{h_{i}} \in[0,1], h_{i}=t_{i+1}-t_{i}, i=0, \ldots, n-1, \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{i}:=d \mathbf{q}\left(t_{i}\right) / d t \\
H_{3}^{3}(\tau)=B_{2}^{3}(\tau)+B_{3}^{3}(\tau) \\
H_{1}^{3}(\tau)=\frac{1}{3} B_{1}^{3}(\tau), H_{2}^{3}(\tau)=-\frac{1}{3} B_{2}^{3}(\tau)
\end{gathered}
$$

$G^{2}$-continuity conditions

$$
\ddot{\mathbf{q}}\left(t_{i}+\right)-\ddot{\mathbf{q}}\left(t_{i}-\right)=\nu_{i} \mathbf{q}_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n-1
$$

## example-1: spi on cylinder



Figure 1:
initial: $\nu$ 's $\rightarrow\{0,0,0,0,0\}$

## example-1: spi on cylinder



Figure 1:
spi: $\nu$ 's $\rightarrow\{0,2,4,4,4\}$

## example-2: spi on sphere



Figure 2:
initial: $\nu$ 's $\rightarrow\{0,0,0,0,0\}$

## example-2: spi on sphere



Figure 2:
spi: $\nu$ 's $\rightarrow\{0,22,22,22,1\}$

## example-3: spi on a free-form surface




Figure 3:
initial: $\nu$ 's $\rightarrow\{0,0,0,0,0\}$

## example-3: spi on a free-form surface



Figure 3:
spi: $\nu$ 's $\rightarrow\{0,4,4,4,0\}$

## future work

## spi \& shape optimization

- local asymptotic behaviour for geodesic-based $\nu$-splines (in the neighborhood of interpolation points)
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## future work

## spi \& shape optimization

- local asymptotic behaviour for geodesic-based $\nu$-splines (in the neighborhood of interpolation points)
- global asymptotic behaviour for geodesic-based vd- \& nu-splines (along closed parametric intervals between knots)
- optimal degrees or $\nu$-parameters against fairness criteria
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