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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

Mesh denoising is a fundamental yet open problem in geometry processing. The main challenge is to remove noise while recovering the shape of the underlying surface as accurately as possible. In this paper, we propose a novel joint bilateral filter on the face normal field. The key is to estimate a reliable guidance normal field by constructing a shape-aware consistent patch for accurately describing the local shape of each face. To this end, we first select a candidate patch for each face by using a newly defined consistent metric considering both patch flatness and face-to-patch orientation similarity. Then, spectral analysis is used in combination with \(\ell_0\) minimization to refine the candidate patches in a shape-aware manner. The refined patches do not contain any features, and therefore they can accurately describe the local shape of the underlying surface. After smoothing the face normal field, vertex positions are reconstructed to match the filtered face normals. Our mesh denoising method is theoretically rooted and practical for dealing with the meshes containing corners with low sampling rates, multi-scale features, or narrow structure regions. Extensive experimental results demonstrate that our method can significantly improve the feature preserving capability of joint normal filter and outperforms state-of-the-art methods visually and quantitatively.

© 2021 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Triangular meshes are widely used in various fields, e.g., computer graphics, 3D computer vision, urban modeling, etc. Recently, because of the rapid development of scanning devices (e.g., Microsoft Kinect, Xtion pro), the geometric modeling process has been dramatically simplified, resulting in triangular meshes acquired in quantity from the real world. However, even with high-fidelity devices, the acquired meshes are inevitably contaminated by noise introduced in capturing and reconstruction processes. The noise not only degrades the visual quality of meshes, but also causes troubles in downstream applications [1–3]. Thus, mesh denoising has become an essential and increasingly important task of geometry processing. The main challenge is to remove noise while maximally preserving geometric features. This problem gets more difficult for meshes containing corners with low sampling rates, multi-scale features, or narrow structure regions.

Mesh denoising has been studied in the last decade extensively. Researchers have proposed many remarkable methods [1,4–8] to tackle this problem. Although these state-of-the-art methods have gained success in some respects, they still have limitations when handling meshes with some special characteristics including corners with low sampling rates, multi-scale features, or narrow structure regions. For example, bilateral normal filtering [4] tends to blur sharp features, since it cannot distinguish sharp features from noise clearly; guided normal filtering [6] can preserve sharp features, but it is hard to produce desired results when handling meshes containing narrow structure regions; The sparse optimization methods [1,5] can effectively remove noise while preserving sharp features. However, these methods suffer from staircase artifacts in smoothly curved regions for their sparsity requirements. The performance of the data-driven method [7] is highly dependent on the completeness of training data. The low-rank method [8] can recover pattern similarity patches of the surface, but cannot preserve sharp features, especially in the case of high noise. The limitations of these denoising methods degrade the quality of results produced by them.
We propose a joint bilateral normal filter because of the issues mentioned above for the existing method denoising methods. The critical part of our joint bilateral filter is to estimate a reliable guidance field from the noisy mesh, which can accurately describe the shape of the underlying surface. To this end, we propose a consistent patch construction scheme including two steps, i.e., candidate patch selection followed by final patch refinement. Specifically, for each face, we select the relatively smooth patch with most faces sharing the orientations similar to the current face, via a new consistency measurement. Then, by using spectral partitioning, we refine the candidate patch (of the current face) to match the local shape of the underlying surface. As a result, the normal guidance field, estimated from the refinement patches, can accurately describe the shape of the underlying surface in the presence of noise. We validate our mesh denoising method on a variety of meshes with either synthetic or raw noise to show its effectiveness and versatility. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

• We design a simple yet effective consistency measurement, considering both patch flatness and face-to-face orientation similarity, to select a candidate patch for each face. Compared to the consistent patch created by existing methods, our candidate patch contains more faces having similar orientations with the current face, which can better describe the local shape of the current face.

• We introduce an $\ell_0$ minimization method, incorporating the spectral analysis theory, to refine a shape-aware patch for each face from its corresponding candidate patch. The refined patch can more accurately match the local shape in a manner that does not contain any geometric features.

• We conduct a variety of experiments to show that our denoising method outperforms the state-of-the-art methods on synthetic and raw scanned data.

2. Related works

As a vital tool in computer graphics, mesh denoising has been extensively studied in the past decades. There are rich mesh denoising methods in the literature, categorized into three types: filter-based methods, optimization-based methods, and data-driven methods. It is beyond our scope to review all existing work. Here, we mainly review those techniques that are closely relevant to our work.

Filter-based methods for mesh denoising. The filter-based methods, divided into isotropic and anisotropic ones, have dominated mesh denoising for a long time. The key idea is to filter each mesh vertex or face normal with its local neighborhood, which is straightforward and efficient. However, isotropic methods [9, 10] tend to over-smooth geometric features while removing noise. Thus, many anisotropic methods [4, 11–14] have been proposed to tackle this problem, which can preserve geometric features well when suppressing noise. However, if meshes are corrupted by large-scale noise, these methods may blur features more or less, especially for those sharp features. In order to improve this situation, [6] presents a guided normal filter, which adapts reliable guidance instead of the original signal in the range kernel of the bilateral filter; [15] presents a high-fidelity method by utilizing Tukey’s bi-weight function instead of Gaussian function in the range kernel of the bilateral filter. These two approaches preserve sharp features and suppress large-scale noise effectively. But, the former is sensitive to surface sampling, and the latter over-smoothes fine details. Besides, [16, 17] study the bilateral filter with proper guidance signals for more geometry applications, such as geometric texture removal and editing.

Optimization-based methods for mesh denoising. Optimization methods have been introduced for feature-preserving mesh denoising with priors about underlying surfaces. These methods formulate the denoising process as an optimization problem to find the solutions that satisfy the given priors. For example, the sparsity prior has been widely used in methods [1, 5, 18–22], due to its excellent edge-preserving property [23, 24]. As we know, methods [1, 5, 18, 19, 22] can recover sharp features, but suffer from undesired staircase effects on smooth features due to the sparsity requirements. To address this issue, [20, 25] present a high order regularizer that can preserve both sharp and smooth features; [21] combines total variation and anisotropic Laplacian regularizations. However, these two methods cannot handle large-scale noise effectively. Besides the sparsity prior, the nonlocal similarity prior has been recently explored for mesh denoising [8, 26]. The method [8] can effectively remove noise while recovering fine details. But it is limited to handle meshes with sharp features. In contrast, the method [26] can keep sharp features. But it is time-consuming for large-scale models. Besides, [27, 28] apply low-rank recovery for point cloud denoising and mesh texture smoothing.

Data-driven methods for mesh denoising. Recently, data-driven approaches have been applied to mesh denoising [7, 29–34]. [7] presents a cascade normal regression method that can learn the mapping from noisy inputs to their corresponding ground truth. [30] proposes a two-step method that avoids blurring fine details. [32] presents a deep neural network for smoothing face normals. Besides, [29, 31, 33, 34] adopt convolutional neural networks for mesh denoising. In short, without any assumptions about underlying features and noise patterns, these methods can remove noise effectively while recovering features well. However, the performance of these data-driven methods relies on the completeness of the training dataset.

Graph spectral methods for geometry processing. Due to the success of spectral graph in image processing [35, 36], it has been extended to 3D data in [37–39]. For example, in the task of mesh denoising, [39] exploits the fact that sharp features reside in a low dimensional structure hidden in the noisy meshes, by cutting off higher frequencies and attenuating frequencies of the spectrum of a graph. [38] transforms feature detection into a graph-cut problem, and iteratively applies the normalized cut (NCut) algorithm to dependent patches according to those detected features; in the task of mesh segmentation, [37] applies a spectral analysis framework on the mesh to obtain a coarse segmentation result. Inspired by [37], we also adopt spectral partitioning with the Fiedler vector for patch refinement. Our method is based on the observation that, the ordered Fiedler vector can be optimized into a piecewise constant solution, where the coordinate values indicate the segmentation result, and the discontinuities match the underlying geometric features. Fig. 1 shows such examples.

3. Preliminaries

3.1. Joint bilateral normal filtering framework

Our mesh normal filtering method is designed based on the well-known joint bilateral mesh normal filter, which has been frequently used in geometry processing problems [6, 16, 17, 38, 40], for its simplicity and effectiveness. Specifically, this framework is an iterative scheme, where each iteration consists of two stages: normal filtering followed by vertex updating. Here, we introduce these two stages in detail as follows:

(i) Normal filtering. Given the two variables, $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{G}$, as the face normal field and guidance face normal field, the joint bilateral normal filtering framework first update $\mathbf{N}$ based on the following formula:

$$
\mathbf{N}_{i} = \mathbf{F} \left( \sum_{j \in D(i)} a_{ij} W_{d}(\|G_{i} - G_{j}\|) W_{c}(\|G_{i} - G_{j}\|) \mathbf{N}_{j} \right).
$$

\[\text{(1)}\]
where $f(\cdot)$ is the normalization operator, $D[i]$ is the 1-ring neighbors of the face $i$, $q_i$ is the area of face $j$, $c_i$, $c_j$ are centroids of faces $i$ and $j$, and $W_{ij}$, $W_i$ are two Gaussian functions with kernel sizes $\sigma_i$ and $\sigma_j$, respectively.

(ii) **Vertex updating.** This stage needs to reconstruct vertex positions to match the filtered face normals. Researchers have proposed many vertex updating methods using the orthogonality between the face and its corresponding normal direction \([21]\), or by minimizing the difference between the orientation of the face and its corresponding normal direction \([41,42]\),\(\sigma\) proposed many vertex updating methods using the orthogonality properties of graph $G$ can describe valuable eigenvectors. Note that each indicator vector corresponds to one subgraph, and the eigenspace of $\lambda$ is spanned by indicator vectors.

To compute information of graph $G$, spectral related methods need to define its adjacency matrix $A_G$ as $A_G(i,j) = w(i,j)$, its diagonal degree matrix $D$ as $D = \sum_{j \in V} A_G(i,j)$, and its Laplacian matrix $L_G$ as $L_G = A_G - D_G$. As well known Laplacian matrix $L_G$ is symmetric and positive semi-definite. Assume the spectrum of $L_G$ is denoted by $0 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{|W|}$. Then, the eigenvector corresponding to the smallest nonzero eigenvalue (the second smallest eigenvalue) $\lambda_2$ is called the Fiedler vector. The eigensystem of $L_G$ can describe valuable properties of graph $G$ \([43]\). Some results are given as follows.

**Proposition 1** \([43]\). The multiplicity $k$ of eigenvalue $\lambda_1$ (i.e., 0) equals the number of connected components $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k$ in $G$. Besides, the eigenspace of $\lambda_1$ is spanned by indicator vectors $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k$ of those components. Formally, the indicator vectors are written as $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}$ and $v_i | v_i \rangle = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if vertex } j \in G_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

In our task, we first construct a graph for each candidate patch, then segment the graph into several subgraphs according to the indicator vectors. Note that each indicator vector corresponds to one subgraph, which can be seen as a connected component.

Suppose that graph $G$ is segmented into $k$ subgraphs $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k$, and its vertices are ordered in accordance with the connected components they belong to. Let $L_{G_i}$ be the Laplacian matrix of $G_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. Suppose that $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^k G_i$. Then the Laplacian matrix of $G$ is $L_G = \text{diag}(L_{G_1}, L_{G_2}, \ldots, L_{G_k})$. Since graph $G$ is derived from graph $\tilde{G}$ by removing the edges with small weights, we can regard the above Laplacian matrix $L_G$ as a perturbation of matrix $L_{\tilde{G}}$, i.e.,

$$L_G = L_{\tilde{G}} + P,$$

where $P$ is the perturbation matrix. Then, we know that the eigenspace corresponding to the $k$ smallest eigenvalues of $L_G$ is very close to the eigenspace corresponding to the $k$ smallest eigenvalues of $L_{\tilde{G}}$ when the perturbation $\|P\|$ is small (i.e., the

---

**Fig. 1.** Shape-aware patch refining via $\ell_2$ minimization on the Fiedler vector. All the Fiedler vectors are sorted in increasing order, and each point colored in red represents the central face of the corresponding patch. In the first row, we give the top (T) and bottom (B) side views of the patch for better visualization. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
eigenvalue $\lambda_1$ with multiplicity $k$). Therefore, by using Davis–Kahan Theorem [43], we can represent the Fiedler vector of Laplacian matrix $L_c$, called $u_0$, as

$$u_0 = c_1I_1 + c_2I_2 + \cdots + c_kI_k + e \equiv u + e,$$

(2)

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a linear combination of the indicator vectors $I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_k$, $c_i$'s are values defined on subgraphs, and $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a small error vector (a residual vector). Since $u$ is the linear combination of the indicator vectors, it is a piecewise constant vector. Therefore, if $u$ can be decomposed from $u_0$, we can segment graph $G$ by checking the entry values of $u$. Specifically, for $v_j \in V$, we have

$$j \in G_i \iff u_j = c_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, k.$$ 

The aforementioned prior knowledge of the Fiedler vector has been proved helpful for mesh segmentation, even in the presence of noise [37]. Inspired by that, we segment each candidate patch into a refined shape-aware patch, which can accurately describe the local shape of the underlying surface.

4. Guided normal filtering via shape-aware patches

Following works [6, 17, 40, 44], we compute each guidance face normal based on a properly constructed patch. For example, given a well-constructed patch $P_i$ of face $i$, its guidance normal can be computed as:

$$G_i = \Gamma^i \left( \sum_{j \in P_i} a_j N_j \right),$$

where $a_j$ is the area of face $j$. As can be seen, guidance normals are computed based on the constructed patches. Hence, the guidance normal needs to be computed for each face by building a consistent local patch around the face, which does not contain any geometric features. However, how to build a consistent patch for each face in the presence of noise is difficult, because the mesh may contain corners with low sampling rates, multiple-scale features, or narrow structure regions. To address these issues, we propose a two-stage consistent patch construction method. In the first stage, we can select a candidate patch for each face by introducing a novel patch consistency measurement. In the second stage, based on spectral analysis theory, we optimize these candidate patches to generate refined patches in a shape-aware manner for estimating more robust guidance normals. Note that, for each face, its candidate patch would be not only as flat as possible, but also have the orientation most similar to it.

4.1. Candidate patch selection

We compute candidate patches under the assumption: the underlying surface of a noisy mesh consists of many piecewise smooth regions, and each feature lies at the intersection of multiple smooth regions. Furthermore, the faces belonging to the same smooth region tend to have similar orientations. With these prior knowledge, we first decompose the input mesh into many overlapping small patches, then select a patch from those as the candidate patch for each face. Details are elaborated as follows.

First, we define the patch as a union of one face with its 1-ring neighbor faces that share vertices with it. Based on this definition, for each face $i$, we can collect a set of nearby patches $C(i) = \{ P_j \mid P_j \in P_i \}$. We can observe that, if patch $P_i$ does not contain any geometric features, all the faces of $P_i$ have similar orientations with face $i$. Thus, for face $i$, we compute its candidate patch by selecting one patch from $C(i)$ which is as flat as possible. To meet these requirements, we perform a patch-shift procedure on patch set $C(i)$ with the newly defined patch consistency measurement $R(P_i)$, which is written as

$$R(P_i) = \mathcal{T}(P_i) \cdot \mathcal{S}(P_i),$$

(3)

where $\mathcal{T}(P_i)$ is the flatness term used to estimate surface variations within patch $P_i$, $\mathcal{S}(P_i)$ is the similarity term for measuring face-to-patch orientation similarity between the current face and patch $P_i$.

**Flatness term $\mathcal{T}(P_i)$**: The flatness term $\mathcal{T}(P_i)$, taking both local and global surface variations within patch $P_i$ into account, is designed as:

**Orientation similarity term $\mathcal{S}(P_i)$**: We further measure the orientation similarity between face $i$ and patch $P_i$ using a newly defined metric $\mathcal{S}(P_i)$, which is called face-to-patch similarity:

$$F(P_i) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{e \in E(P_i)} l_e \| N_{e.1} - N_{e.2} \|_2,$$

where $E(P_i)$ is the set of edges contained in patch $P_i$, $N_{e.1}$ and $N_{e.2}$ are normals of two faces sharing the common edge $e$, and $l_e$ is the length of edge $e$. The value of $F(P_i)$ can be used to describe the local flatness of patch $P_i$. Furthermore, considering the accumulation of surface variances, we define global flatness $F_G(P_i)$ as the maximum normal difference between two faces:

$$F_G(P_i) = \max_{j,k \in P_i} \| N_j - N_k \|_2.$$

As a result, a small value of $F(P_i)$ indicates that the patch is smooth and does not contain features, while a large value implies the patch may contain extra features.

**Orientation similarity term $\mathcal{S}(P_i)$**: We further measure the orientation similarity between face $i$ and patch $P_i$ using a newly defined metric $\mathcal{S}(P_i)$, which is called face-to-patch similarity:

$$\mathcal{S}(P_i) = S_{\parallel}(P_i) \cdot S_{\perp}(P_i),$$

(5)

where $S_{\parallel}(P_i)$ and $S_{\perp}(P_i)$ are used to describe the local and global orientation similarity between face $i$ and the other faces contained in patch $P_i$. Specifically, $S_{\parallel}(P_i)$ measures the local similarity, which directly computes the sum of variations between face $i$ and the other faces. We formulate $S_{\parallel}(P_i)$ as:

$$S_{\parallel}(P_i) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E(P_i)} a_{e} \sum_{k \neq i} a_k \| N_k - N_i \|_2.$$ 

A smaller value of $S_{\parallel}(P_i)$ means that more faces have orientations similar to face $i$. Ideally, when $S_{\parallel}(P_i) = 0$, all the other faces of $P_i$ have the same orientation as face $i$. That also means patch $P_i$ is a flat region. However, when the $S_{\parallel}(P_i)$ value is slightly greater than zero, patch $P_i$ may contain small-scale noise or shadow features. Thus, this metric cannot clearly distinguish the above two surface variations. To address this ambiguity, we further introduce metric $S_{\perp}(P_i)$ to measure the global similarity, which is written as:

$$S_{\perp}(P_i) = \frac{1}{2} \| N_i - \overline{N}_i \|_2,$$

where $\overline{N}_i$ is the area-weighted average normal of patch $P_i$. A lower $S_{\perp}(P_i)$ value is likely to indicate the patch with a more similar orientation to face $i$. Thus, the global similarity amplifies the difference between these two types of patches, which can solve the above ambiguity problem. As a result, by using the similarity term, we can identify the patch with more faces having orientation similar to the current face, and be capable of distinguishing shadow edges from small-scale noise.
Remark. By combining flatness term $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ and orientation similar term $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$, the proposed patch consistency measurement $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ can be used to select the candidate patch with the smallest value of $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$. The selected patch contains as few geometric features as possible. Compared to the patch consistency measurement $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ proposed in [6], our measurement is more robust in handling meshes with complicated geometric features. The reasons are as follows. Although $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ can estimate the global flatness of a patch, it cannot fully measure the local flatness. The reason is that $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ computes the maximum edge saliency instead of the sum of the local surface variations. A comparison of selecting the candidate patch using these two metrics is demonstrated in Fig. 2.

As can be seen, the candidate patch selected using $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ contains fewer features than the patch selected by $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$. On the other hand, due to the proposed face-to-patch similarity $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$, we select the candidate patch containing as many faces as possible that have orientations similar to the current face. Thus, by using $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$, the selected candidate patch can provide more faces to compute the guidance normal, making the guidance normal to be more accurate.

4.2. Shape-aware patch refinement

Due to the worse-case mesh quality or topology, although we have obtained the candidate patch for each face, some of these patches still contain geometric features that need to be preserved; see Fig. 2 for example. As a result, the guidance signal, directly estimated from these patches, may blur features or even destroy geometric structures. To circumvent this limitation, we further present a shape-aware patch refinement method using the spectral analysis framework. The key idea is that, for each face $i$, we cut its candidate patch into multiple sub-patches according to the shape of the underlying surface, and choose the sub-patch containing face $i$ as its shape-aware patch that does not contain any geometric features. The pipeline of our spectral analysis framework is shown in Fig. 3. Details of each module in the pipeline are elaborated as follows.

Algorithm 1: Fiedler vector optimization

Input: Fiedler vector $\hat{x}$;
Output: Optimized Fiedler vector $\hat{x}$;
Initialization: $\beta = 10^{-3}$;
repeat
\[\hat{x} \leftarrow \hat{x} + \beta \nabla \hat{x},\] 
\[\hat{x} \leftarrow \hat{x} + \beta \nabla \hat{x} \] 
\[\beta \leftarrow 2 \times \beta,\]
until $\beta \geq 10^3$;

Spectral decomposition. We perform spectral analysis on each selected candidate patch. We first build a proper Laplacian matrix of each patch reflecting its local geometric and topological attributes, and then generate the refined patch by optimizing the Fiedler vector of the Laplacian matrix. In the following, we elaborate on spectral analysis of each candidate patch.

Now we construct the Laplacian matrix, which serves as the primary tool for spectral analysis. First, we construct dual graph $G_d = (V_d, E_d)$, where vertex set $V_d$ is the face set of patch $P$, and $E_d$ is the set of dual edges, i.e., every pair of adjacent faces in patch $P$ corresponds to an edge of $G_d$. Note that, we build the Laplacian matrix based on faces instead of vertices, since first-order face normal variations can better describe surface variations than vertex position variations [2]. Then, we construct the Laplacian matrix of $G_d$. The key is to define the weights associated with edges $E_d$. To do that, we measure the difference between a pair of adjacent faces $i, j$ as

\[d(i, j) = \frac{\xi}{2} \| N_i - N_j \|^2,\]

where $N_i$ and $N_j$ are two normals of faces $i$ and $j$, $\xi$ is a positive weight. In this work, we typically set $\xi = 1.0$, if $\langle N_i, N_j \rangle \geq \sigma_\theta$; otherwise, $\xi = 0.1$. $\sigma_\theta$ is a user-specified angle threshold for recognizing features from noise. Let $d$ be the average value of all the differences. Let $e$ be the common edge of a pair of adjacent faces $i, j$. We define the weight associated with edge $e$ as

\[w(i, j) = \frac{\xi}{2} \exp(-d(i, j)/d).\]

After obtaining all the weights, we further compute Laplacian matrix $L_{G_d}$ of graph $G_d$, by the way introduced in Section 3.2. By performing eigen-decomposition on Laplacian matrix $L_{G_d}$, we can obtain its spectrum, i.e., eigenvalues.

Fiedler vector optimization. Let the Fiedler vector of Laplacian matrix $L_{G_d}$ be $x = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{|P|}\}$, where $|P|$ is the number of faces of $P$.

Fig. 2. Comparison of the selected candidate patch using consistency measurement $\mathcal{R}$ in [6] and $\mathcal{R}$ proposed in this paper. The current face is colored in red. For each patch of current face, we calculate its corresponding two measurement values of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{R}$. The patch bounded with a blue box is the candidate patch identified using the measurement $\mathcal{H}$, while the patch bounded with a red box is the candidate patch selected using our consistency measurement $\mathcal{R}$ (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Fig. 3. The pipeline of the proposed spectral analysis framework.
faces contained in patch $P$. According to (2), we have
\[
x' = x + e_{\text{p}},
\]
where $x, e_p \in \mathbb{R}^{|P|}$ are piecewise constant vector and error (residual) vector. In order to recover $x$ from $x'$, we optimize $x'$ using $\ell_0$ minimization. However, it is time-consuming to directly solve $\ell_0$ minimization problem over the mesh. Thus, for better efficiency, we use one approximation strategy as follows. First, we sort the elements of the Fiedler vector $x'$ in increasing order, and denote the sorted vector as
\[
\hat{x} = [\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_{|P|}].
\]
Then $\hat{x}$ is a 1-dimensional vector, where similar values have been grouped together. Then, we induce the sparsity on $\hat{x}$, and formulate the problem as
\[
\min_{\hat{x}} \frac{1}{2} \| \hat{x} - \tilde{x} \|^2_2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{|P|-1} |\tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i|_0,
\]
where $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \ldots, \tilde{x}_{|P|})^T$. The first term of (6) is a fidelity term minimizing the approximation error between $\hat{x}$ and $\tilde{x}$, the second term is a regularization term measuring the sparsity of the vector, and $\lambda$ is a positive parameter balancing these two terms.

Due to the nondifferentiability of problem (6), it is challenging to directly solve it. The studies [1,23] show that variable-splitting and alternating optimization solver have achieved great success in solving $\ell_0$ related problem. Here, we first introduce auxiliary variable $z = [z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{|P|-1}]$, and reformulate (6) as
\[
\min_{x, z} \frac{1}{2} \| \hat{x} - \tilde{x} \|^2_2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{|P|-1} |z_i|_0 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{|P|-1} |\tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i - z_i|_2.
\]

The above problem can be solved using alternating optimization. First, we fix $\hat{x}$ constant and perform minimizing for $z$ as
\[
\min_{z} \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{|P|-1} |z_i|_0 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{|P|-1} |\tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i - z_i|_2.
\]

This problem is easy to solve since (8) can be spatially separated, where the minimization problem with respect to each first-order variation is performed individually. Thus, for each $z_i$, we just need to solve the following problem
\[
\min_{z_i} \lambda |z_i|_0 + \beta |\tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i - z_i|_2.
\]
In this minimization, each entry $z_i$ will either be 0 or $\tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i$. When $\frac{\lambda}{\beta} > \tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i$, $z_i = 0$; otherwise $z_i = \tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i$. Next, we hold $z$ fixed and optimize $\hat{x}$ by solving the following problem
\[
\min_{x} \frac{1}{2} \| \hat{x} - \tilde{x} \|^2_2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{|P|-1} |\tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i - z_i|_2.
\]
This is a quadratic problem, which can be solved by existing sparse linear solvers, such as MKL and Taucs. The two optimizations (8) and (10) alternate until convergence, and parameter $\beta$ is multiplied by 2 in each iteration to eventually force $z_i$ to match $\tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{x}_i$. The whole procedure is outlined in Algorithm 1.

**Shape-aware patch cutting.** The solution $\hat{x}$ is a piecewise constant vector due to its sparsity prior. We segment each candidate patch into some sub-patches according to the entry value of $\hat{x}$, and then select the sub-patch that contains the current face as the refined patch; see Fig. 1 for example.
Fig. 6. Denoising results of Chair ($\sigma = 0.2\bar{l}$). The zoomed views highlight that our method is more effective in keeping corners with low sampling rates and narrow structure regions.

5.2. Qualitative comparisons

First of all, we compare our method with the mentioned state-of-the-arts on CAD and nonCAD meshes as well as raw scanned meshes. We carefully tune the parameters of each method for producing visually appealing results.

Fig. 6 demonstrates results on Chair containing corners with low sampling rates and narrow structure regions. As can be seen, all the methods can remove noise effectively. However, LBF, RHM and CNR blur the sharp features in vary degrees, due to that these methods are designed based on the bilateral filter, which cannot predict the desired features at corners and narrow structure regions well as seen in Figs. 6b, 6d and 6f. Similarly, LRNF also fails to keep sharp features at narrow structure regions, because it uses a simple average conversion between vertex normals and face normals; see Fig. 6c. GNF also blurs these sharp features as Fig. 6g shows. The reason is that, GNF uses fixed-size patches, which leads to failure in the estimation of the reliable guidance normals at corners with low sampling rates and narrow structure regions. Unlike the above methods, L0 and ours can keep all the sharp features; see Figs. 6c and 6h. This is because that L0 benefits from the edge-preserving property of sparsity norms, and our method uses shape-aware guidance normals. However, from quantitative comparison in the next subsection, we can see that the error of our method is smaller than that of L0.

Fig. 7 demonstrates results on Table and Casting, both of which contain narrow structure regions and smooth features. Obviously, RHM, LBF, LRNF and CNR recover smooth features well. However, they blur sharp features in various degrees; see Figs. 7b, 7d, 7e and 7f. The reasons are as follows. RHM, LBF, and CNR are based on the bilateral filter, which cannot accurately predict the geometric features of underlying surfaces. This situation is more serious in the case of large noise. Though RHM adopts a robust statistics framework for preserving sharp features, it is hard to recover all the features with a hard threshold. Besides, from zoomed view in Fig. 7g, GNF destroys some sharp features, because it hardly estimates reliable guidance normals at narrow structure regions. On the contrary, though L0 keeps sharp features well, it generates obvious staircase effects on smooth features, because of its highest sparsity requirements; see Fig. 7c. Different from the above methods, our method can not only restore sharp features at narrow structure regions, but also keep smooth features well as seen in Fig. 7h.

Fig. 8 shows results on Fandisk containing corners with low sampling rates and complicated narrow structure regions. As can be seen that all methods can effectively remove noise. Similarly to the previous examples, LBF, LRNF, and CNR blur features at corners or narrow structure regions; see Figs. 8b, 8e, and 8f. On the contrary, L0 and RHM can keep sharp features. Nevertheless, L0 inevitably produces staircase effects in smooth features, and RHM suffers from relatively large shape distortions; see Figs. 8c and 8d. Besides, although GNF can keep sharp features at narrow structure regions well, it blurs corners; see Fig. 8g. Compared to these methods, our method produces the visually best result with all the sharp features well preserved; see Fig. 8h.

Fig. 9 shows results on Gargoyle and Lion, both of which contain multi-scale features. As can be seen, LBF over-smoothes all the features; see the zoomed view in Fig. 9b. In contrary, L0 sharpens small-scale features, and generates staircase effects in large-scale features; see Fig. 9c. Though RHM, LRNF, and CNR recover large-scale features well, they over-smooth small-scale features; see Figs. 9d, 9e, and 9f. Besides, GNF sharpens these small-scale features; see Fig. 9g. Compared to the above methods, our method keeps both large-scale and small-scale features well; see Fig. 9h.

Fig. 10 shows results on Max-planck with irregular sampling rates. As we can see that, most methods can remove noise effectively, except the CNR which remains some noise on its denoising result. For other methods, LBF, RHM, LRNF, and GNF blur features in vary degrees; see Figs. 10b, 10d, 10e, and 10f. Besides, L0 generates staircase effects on smooth features; see Fig. 10c. Compared to these methods, our method produces the best results with most features preserved; see Fig. 10h.

Moreover, in Fig. 11, we show results on Hand acquired by Laser scanners. As can be seen that, all the methods can eliminate noise effectively. Similarly, LBF, RHM, and CNR over-smooth fine details in varying degrees; see Figs. 11b, 11d, and 11f. L0 sharpens the geometric details; see Fig. 11c. Besides, LRNF and GNF as well as our method can preserve fine details, especially our method recovers the shadow edge better; see Figs. 11e, 11g, and 11h. Thus, for laser-scanned meshes, our method also produces the more appealing result compared to the other methods.

Recently, lots of meshes have been acquired using consumer-grade scanner devices, e.g., Microsoft Kinect. So we also compare our method with the state-of-the-arts on this type of data, and show the results in Fig. 12. From these results, we can observe that some bumps still exist on the results of LBF, RHM, LRNF, and CNR; see Figs. 12b, 12d, 12e, and 12f. Compared to these results, the results of L0, GNF and our method are more smooth; see Figs. 12c, 12g, and 12h. However, L0 suffers the staircase effects on smooth features. Besides, both GNF and our method can generate visually satisfactory results with well-recovered smooth features; see Figs. 12g and 12h. However, from the quantitative comparison in the next subsection, we can find that the error of our method is small than that of GNF. Thus, this example shows the effectiveness of our method in dealing with Kinect-scanned meshes.

In the next two paragraphs, we demonstrate the performances of our method against different levels of noise and two kinds
Fig. 7. Denoising results of Table ($\sigma = 0.25\bar{l}$) and Casting ($\sigma = 0.2\bar{l}$). The zoomed views highlight that our method better keeps sharp features at narrow structure regions as well as smooth features.

Fig. 8. Denoising results of Fandisk ($\sigma = 0.3\bar{l}$). The zoomed views highlight that our method is faithfully able to preserve sharp features at corners and complicated narrow structure regions.

Fig. 9. Denoising results of Gargoyle ($\sigma = 0.35\bar{l}$) and Chinese lion ($\sigma = 0.3\bar{l}$). The zoomed views highlight that our method better keeps multi-scale features.

Fig. 10. Denoising results of Max-planck ($\sigma = 0.3\bar{l}$). The zoomed views highlight that our method better handles the mesh with irregular sampling rates.

of noise including impulsive noise and mix Gaussian-impulsive noise.

Figs. 13 and 14 show the robustness of our method and the state-of-the-arts against impulsive noise and mixed Gaussian-impulsive noise. Our method can effectively suppress impulsive noise and mixed Gaussian-impulsive noise, which demonstrates the capacity of our method for dealing with different kinds of noise. Our method can simultaneously recover sharp and smooth features while the other competing methods cannot; see Fig. 13. Moreover, as shown in Fig. 14, our method can recover the most geometric details of the underlying surface, while the other competing methods blur these geometric details in varying degrees.

Fig. 15 shows the performances of our method against different levels of noise. As can be seen in Figs. 15a, 15b, and 15c, our method effectively removes noise while preserving sharp features. However, when the noise level is too high, our method
cannot faithfully produce a satisfactory result; see Fig. 15d for example.

It is worthwhile to compare our method with GGNF proposed by Zhao et al. [38]. Their method consists of two stages: graph-based feature detection and feature-aware guided normal filtering. Specifically, their method first needs to iteratively perform normalized cut algorithm on patches to detect features. Although their method can detect the geometric features of the underlying surface effectively, it is computational expensive. Besides, in Fig. 16, we visually compare the denoising results of our
method has the smallest MSAE values on the most examples except for Fandisk, where the MSAE value of our method is closest to the best one. Similarly, for most cases, the $E_{v,2}$ values of our method are smaller than the compared state-of-the-arts. Thus, these quantitative comparisons show that, our method still outperforms the compared state-of-the-art methods.

Additionally, we list the mesh sizes and runtime for all the testing methods in Table 1. Moreover, note that the guidance normal construction processes of different faces are separable, hence it can be parallel processed on multiple cores for further speed up, we also implement a fast version of our method and list its runtime in the last column. As can be seen, LBF is always faster than other methods, due to its simplicity. Since our method need to iteratively decompose Laplacian matrices and solve $\ell_0$ minimization problems, the cost of our method is relatively higher than the other methods. Fortunately, the fast version of our method is not only able to achieve 3–4 times speed up than the original version, but also faster than most of the other methods. Nevertheless, the computational time of our method is acceptable.

5.4. Comparisons of several patch construction strategies

As we known that, the performance of joint bilateral filter is limited by guidance signals, which should accurately indicate the geometric features of the underlying surface of the noisy mesh. Many researchers have computed guidance signals using patch-based strategies [6,17,40]. These strategies are designed by combining the patch-shift scheme and some novel patch consistency measurement. For example, Zhang et al. [6] propose the well-known patch construction strategy which combines the patch-shift algorithm with the modified relative total variation (mRTV). Different from the existing strategies, for each face, the proposed patch construction strategy first computes a candidate patch based on the patch-shift algorithm and a newly proposed patch consistency measurement, then refines the candidate patch by a shape-aware operation. Here, we discuss the effectiveness of the proposed patch construction strategy.

Fig. 17 demonstrates a comparison of denoising results, which are generated by applying the joint bilateral filter with multiple guidance signals estimated using three types of patch, including the candidate patch, the patch generated by algorithm in [6], and the proposed shape-aware patch. For brevity, we denote these types of patch as CAP, TVP, and SAP. Note that, for a fair comparison, we also refine the TVP patches using the proposed shape-aware operation. As can be seen that, the sharp features of the result, obtained based on the CAP patches, are blurred a lot; see Fig. 17b. This means, due to the irregular sampling of the input mesh, some CAP patches still contain one or more features. As a result, the guidance signals estimated based on CAP patches cannot clearly indicate the geometric features on the irregular sampled regions of the underlying surface. Fig. 17c shows the denoising results generated based on the TVP patches. Obviously, the sharp features are blurred too. This is because that, after the shape-aware operation, some TVP patches cannot provides sufficient number of triangles for robust estimation of the guidance signals. Compared to the above two results, the result computed using the proposed SAP patches preserves all the sharp features well as seen in Fig. 17d.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we present a shape-aware mesh denoising approach based on the joint bilateral filtering framework, which applies a bilateral filter to smooth face normals, followed by vertex reconstruction to match the filtered face normals. Because
the performance of joint bilateral filter highly depends on the quality of the guidance signal, we propose a novel patch construction strategy for producing a shape-aware guidance normal field. Our guidance normal field can robustly indicate the underlying surface features in the presence of noise, even for the meshes containing corners with low sampling rates, multi-scale features, or narrow structure regions. As demonstrated in extensive experimental results, our method outperforms the state-of-the-art approaches in preserving sharp and multi-scale features. For future research, we plan to extend our work to handle more comprehensive problems, such as bas-relief modeling, point cloud denoising, and urban modeling.
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