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Figure 1. Given a scene comprising a set of geometric primitives and a grid density, the uniform grid build process yields a linear array of references, each reference pointing to a sublist of geometric primitives—those that intersect the associated voxel.

Abstract

Uniform grids are a common acceleration structure used to speed up intersection queries across various rendering and physics applications. These structures are attractive because they are easy to understand and exhibit fast build and query times. Recent advances in parallel algorithms have further increased their construction speed, although they still require substantial memory allocations throughout the build process and in their final representation. To address these memory consumption issues, we introduce a novel but easy to understand approach. Although our process is general, we demonstrate its effectiveness in an example real-time ray-tracing application where we see a 28% to 38% reduction in memory allocated for optimal grid densities and a 31% to 38% reduction in their final memory footprint. As grid densities increase, savings approach 45% and higher. We also show that our process does not sacrifice performance in terms of overall frame rates.
1. Introduction

A wide variety of applications currently leverage uniform grids. To illustrate a few examples, rendering and physics simulations often use grids to accelerate collision detection [Ericson 2004; Millington 2010]. Zheng et al. [2012] use grids to carry out self-compacting concrete flow simulations and predict flow and fill behaviors in complex structures. Razavi et al. [2015] describe an educational haptics-based drilling simulation tool for dentistry. Their system, in part, employs a hashed uniform grid structure. In order to visualize millions of dynamic particles, Krone et al. [2012] utilize marching cubes over a uniform grid of density estimates; and Reda et al. [2013] embed glyphs in a similar density grid to render solid ball-and-stick surfaces and volumes for interactive visualizations of molecular boundaries. One can also use grid structures to assist with photon gathering in progressive photon mapping [Hachisuka and Jensen 2010; Pedersen 2013], map overlaps [Magalhães et al. 2015], smoothed particle hydrodynamics [Akinci et al. 2013], collision detection of polydisperse sphere packings [Weller et al. 2013], and ray tracing [Kalojanov and Slusallek 2009], as well as many others approaches. Consequently, uniform grid improvements have broad appeal given their adaptability to a wide range of problems. In this paper, we specifically deal with build process and accelerator representation inefficiencies with respect to memory utilization. The approach we take is based on our previous work [Taranta II and Pattanaik 2014], which leverages recent advances in GPU hardware to accelerate atomic operations.

To better understand the landscape, Fujimoto et al. [?] first described uniform grids as a 3D extension of raster grids for ray tracing, although at the time they called their accelerator SEADS: spatially enumerated auxiliary data structure. More than twenty years later, Kalojanov and Slusallek [2009] developed the first GPU-based parallel algorithm for uniform grid construction, which Kalojanov et al. [2011] later extended to two-level grids. One issue with both approaches is that the workload between threads is nonuniform because each thread works on a different primitive, e.g., a triangle; and since primitives vary in size, the effort required to process a primitive also varies. Liu and Rokne [2013] addressed this issue by considering primitive-cell pairs—each thread analyzes exactly one triangle-cell pair in order to evenly distribute the workload, which also leads to more precise grid definitions. We further improved the process by eliminating an expensive sorting step that remained in the build pipeline by utilizing atomic operations [Taranta II and Pattanaik 2014]. Although the state of the art is now highly optimized, the build process and accelerator still consume large amounts of memory, thereby limiting grid density and scene complexity.

As we previously saw a significant improvement in build speed using atomic functions, we now take this a step further to eliminate a subset of memory allocations that occur throughout the build process as well as to reduce the accelerator’s final memory
footprint. We achieve this reduction by employing additional atomic operations on housekeeping data and by replicating select calculations between steps, rather than storing intermediate results in cache. To evaluate our new build process, we use ray tracing as an example application; however, our approach is general and can be applied to any situation in which scene data is stored in a regular grid structure. As we demonstrate, these modifications have a slight negative impact on build time, although rendering performance improves, and so the overall frame rate remains relatively unchanged. More importantly, we also show that memory utilization in all tests is significantly reduced.

2. Build Process

Uniform grids are a spatial subdivision structure that partitions a scene into equally sized, axis-aligned rectangular cuboids called voxels. Common approaches enumerate these voxels and put them into one-to-one correspondence with a linear array. Namely, each occupied voxel in the accelerator contains a reference to a list of primitives that intersect it. In a ray-tracing application, to resolve ray-primitive collision queries, one can use a 3D-DDA [Amanatides and Woo 1987] to incrementally march a ray through the scene one voxel at a time. Upon passing through an occupied cell, the ray is cast against its associated geometry to test if the ray intersects any of the voxel’s primitives. Given a scene comprising a set of geometric primitives and a specified grid density, our goal is to efficiently construct a uniform grid accelerator using a GPU (see Figure 1).

As an overview, the construction process is made up of three phases: Compute-Coarse-Pairs, Evaluate-Coarse-Pairs, and Extract-Grid. The first phase determines the maximum number of possible triangle-voxel overlaps that may exist in the scene by inspecting the axis-aligned bounding box (AABB) of each triangle. Since the AABB of a triangle often overlaps more voxels than the triangle itself, phase two evaluates each individual triangle-voxel coarse pair to determine if a true overlap exists. Finally, the last phase constructs the acceleration structure using key information collected in the prior phases. In what follows, we first detail the new construction process and then highlight how our approach differs from the state of the art.

As discussed, the Compute-Coarse-Pairs phase determines the maximum number of triangle-voxel overlaps that may exist in the current geometric configuration; see Figure 2 and Algorithm 1. We first allocate and zero-initialize the coarse pairs count array in order to store the overlap count upper bound for each triangle. The process then calculates the AABB of each triangle in parallel and stores each AABB’s voxel occupancy count in the coarse pairs count array. Next, we cache the last coarse pairs count element and perform an in-place exclusive scan [Sengupta et al. 2007] to convert the array into a set of indices. Finally, we add the last element of the indices array
with the cached count to yield the total coarse pairs count. Note that “pair” refers to a single AABB-voxel overlap, which may or may not represent a real triangle-voxel overlap.

With all coarse pairs now identified, the Evaluate-Coarse-Pairs phase extracts all real triangle-voxel overlaps from the candidate overlaps; see Figures 3 and 4 as well as Algorithm 2. First, the process allocates a zero-initialized array equal in size to the total coarse pairs count. We refer to this as the tags array, and for each value stored in the indices array, we set the corresponding tag element to one, except element zero which remains zero. Next, we perform an in-place inclusive scan [Sengupta et al. 2007] on the tags array so that each element becomes a valid triangle ID. Once this transformation is complete, we refer to the tags array as the coarse pairs array, and there is still one entry for every AABB-triangle overlap.

We can now determine the precise overlaps. We start by allocating the overlap counts array, which is equal in size to the number of voxels in the scene and is used to track the number of real overlaps that exist per voxel. Next, we evaluate each coarse pair in parallel. Since each parallel task receives a unique task ID, we use this ID to determine which coarse pair to evaluate. That is, we use the task ID to select a
triangle ID from the coarse pairs array. Then with a triangle selected, we look up its starting position from the indices array. The difference between the task ID and the starting position gives us a voxel ID to process relative to the triangle’s AABB—we treat the triangle’s AABB as a region that is subdivided and enumerated into its own voxel set. For example, in Figure 3, task ID 8 processes the third voxel of triangle 1’s AABB. Based on the indices array, triangle 1’s starting position in the coarse pairs array is 6. Therefore, the task processes voxel ID 2 of triangle 1’s AABB, i.e., 8-6=2. Thereafter, we convert the relative voxel ID into an exact grid voxel ID, from which we then calculate the grid voxel’s AABB. Using the grid voxel’s bounding box, we are able to perform a fast triangle-box overlap test [Akenine-Möller 2002] to determine if the triangle and grid voxel actually overlap. If an overlap is found, we set the most significant bit of the coarse pairs element to indicate that an overlap was identified. At the same time, we also atomically increment the corresponding count in the overlap counts array (see Figure 4). There is also a global overlap counter, not shown in the figure, that we atomically increment every time a real overlap is found. This can be done efficiently by synchronizing parallel tasks. In CUDA [Nickolls et al. 2008], for
Algorithm 2. Evaluate-Coarse-Pairs ( )

// Part I (Figure 3)
IntArray tags[totalCoarsePairs] = {0}
foreach triangleId ∈ [1, triangleCount − 1] in parallel
    tags[indices[triangleId]] = 1
coursePairs ← INCLUSIVE-SCAN(tags)

// Part II (Figure 4)
int flags ← AllocRequiredBitFlag + AllocInProgBitFlag
IntArray overlapCounts[gridSize] = {flags}
int totalOverlapCnt ← 0
foreach coarsePairsIdx ∈ [0, totalCoarsePairs − 1] in parallel
    int triangleId ← coarsePairs[coarsePairsIdx]
    int triAabbVoxId ← coarsePairsIdx − indices[triangleId]
    int gridVoxId ←_CONVERT-TO-GRID-VOX(triangleId, triAabbVoxId)
    if OVERLAP(triangleId, gridVoxId) then
        coarsePairs[coarsePairsIdx] ← triangleId + OverlapDetectedBitFlag
        ATOMIC-INCREMENT(overlapCounts[gridVoxId])
        ATOMIC-INCREMENT(totalOverlapCount[gridVoxId])

example, one can use a warp-wide reduction to coalesce up to thirty-two updates into
a single atomic write.

With all of the true overlaps identified, we now enter the Extract-Grid phase as
shown in Figure 5 and Algorithm 3. Based on the global overlaps count found in the
previous step, we allocate the triangle list array, which will ultimately store the indi-
vidual overlapping triangle list for each voxel. By the end of this phase, we will have
converted the overlap counts array into the grid array, and each occupied voxel will
have a reference into the triangle list where the overlapping triangle IDs are stored.
Now to begin extraction, we again evaluate each coarse pair element in parallel. This
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Figure 5. Extract-grid. Overlaps counts are converted into triangle list indices as the triangle list is filled in. Sublists for some grid voxels are highlighted though none of the additional flags (i.e., allocation required, etc.) are shown.
Algorithm 3. Extract-Grid ( )

```c
int triangleListIdx ← 0
grid ← overlapCounts // alias
foreach coarsePairIdx ∈ [0, totalCoarsePairs − 1] in parallel
  int triangleId ← coarsePairs[coarsePairIdx]
  if NOT-BIT-SET(triangleId, OverlapDetectedBitFlag) then
    return
    triangleId ← triangleId − OverlapDetectedBitFlag
  int triAabbVoxId ← coarsePairsIdx − indices[triangleId]
  int gridVoxId ← CONVERT-TO-GRID-VOX(triangleId, triAabbVoxId)
  int terminateTriSubList ← 0
  int oldValue ← ATOMIC-CLEAR(grid[gridVoxId], AllocRequiredBitFlag)
  if BIT-SET(oldValue, AllocRequiredBitFlag) then
    int cnt ← oldValue − (AllocRequiredBitFlag + AllocInProgBitFlag)
    int start ← ATOMIC-ADD(triangleListIdx, cnt)
    int idx ← start + cnt − 1
    ATOMIC-WRITE(grid[gridVoxId], idx)
    terminateTriSubList ← TerminateBitFlag
  else
    while BIT-SET(oldValue, AllocInProgBitFlag) do
      oldValue ← ATOMIC-READ(grid[gridVoxId])
      int oldIdx ← ATOMIC-DECREMENT(grid[gridVoxId])
      int idx ← oldIdx − 1
  triangleList[idx] ← triangle + terminateTriSubList
```

time, if the most significant bit of the coarse pairs element is set, then the overlap is valid and we save this information into the grid and triangle list arrays. Note that we convert the task ID into a grid voxel ID using the same technique as before. However, not discussed previously, is that we also set the two most significant bits of each element in the overlap counts array. We use these two bits as flags to help synchronize construction of the uniform grid, where one bit is the allocation required flag and the other is the allocation in progress flag. When a coarse pairs element contains a true overlap, the process reads the corresponding overlap counts element and simultaneously clears the allocation required flag; for example, in CUDA we use an atomic-and operation to simultaneously read the current value and clear the allocation required flag. From here, depending on the state of the flags, we take one of three actions:

1. **Allocation required.** If the allocation required flag is set, the process needs to reserve enough space in the triangle list to store the sublist of triangle IDs overlapping the associated grid voxel. For this condition, we use a zero-initialized global counter called triangle list index. Let $n$ denote the associated overlap count for the voxel, minus the upper bit flags. Further, let $i$ denote the current
triangle list index value. When an allocation is required, we first atomically increment the triangle list index by \( n \), thereby reserving space in the triangle list array at locations \([i, i + n - 1]\). Next, we write the triangle ID into the triangle list array at position \( i + n - 1 \). We also write \( i + n - 1 \) into the overlap counts element, thus converting the counter into a grid array element—a reference into the triangle list. Note that this update also clears the allocation in progress flag.

2. Allocation in progress. In this case, a different task cleared the allocation required flag, but the actual allocation work is not complete. Therefore, the thread “spins” by continuing to read the overlap counts element until the allocation in progress flag clears. Once both flags are clear, the process continues into the allocation complete state.

3. Allocation complete. In this state, both flags are clear and the overlap counter contains a triangle list reference. The process atomically then decrements the reference stored in the grid element and stores the associated triangle ID in the triangle list at the specified location. After all of the overlaps are processed, the grid array element will hold the value \( i \), where the triangle ID sublist starts.

For traversals through a uniform grid to work, the ray-tracing process must know which grid voxels are occupied and where each triangle sublist terminates. To address the former, if the allocation in progress flag is still set, then the voxel is empty. To address the latter, when an allocation occurs, we also set the most significant bit of the triangle ID written into position \( i + n - 1 \). Therefore, when the ray-tracing process hits an occupied voxel, it can walk through the triangle sublist until it encounters this bit flag.

2.1. Summary of Modifications

The previous approach differs from our new build process in two ways. First, the previous approach stores true voxel overlaps in a separate array, and so in the Extract-Grid phase, no additional work is required to calculate the associated voxel IDs. Our method, however, eliminates this extra storage by using bit flags in the coarse pairs array, but, as a consequence, we also have to later recalculate voxel IDs. Second, the previous approach stores a triangle list start and end reference per voxel, whereas our method only requires a single reference. This optimization, however, comes at the cost of some additional atomic operations to synchronize access to the triangle list during the extract-grid phase. Although these changes result in additional work, we show in our evaluation that differences in performance are minor, especially when considering the reduction in memory usage.
3. Evaluation and Results

To evaluate our new build algorithms, we developed a ray-tracing application and tested twelve different scenes of varying complexity over a wide range of grid resolutions. The scene complexity ranged between 261, 978 and 10, 500, 549 triangles. Following recommendations from prior work [Cleary et al. 1983; Wald et al. 2006], we defined the grid density $\lambda$ parameter as

$$
N_x = d_x \sqrt[3]{\frac{\lambda N}{V}}, \quad N_y = d_y \sqrt[3]{\frac{\lambda N}{V}}, \quad N_z = d_z \sqrt[3]{\frac{\lambda N}{V}},
$$

where vector $\vec{d}$ is the extent of the scene’s bounding box, $V$ is its volume, and $N$ is the number of primitives. Further, we rendered all scenes at 1920 x 1280 using primary ray tracing and dot-normal shading. We made this decision to verify that our uniform grid modifications did not impact traversal performance, since coherent rays are most likely to experience performance degradation due to changes to the underlying accelerator. Further, we also rendered each scene 1000 times with the camera position and orientation randomized in each iteration, where the camera position is selected from anywhere within the scene’s AABB. This randomization ensures that open views, obstructed views, and combinations thereof are evaluated across both conditions (with and without our accelerator modifications). The test system was a 3.2 GHz Quad-Core Intel Xeon Mac Pro with 6 GiB of 1066 MHz DDR3 memory, and an SSD; and the GPU was an NVIDIA GeForce GTX 680 GPU with 2048 MiB of memory.

We present memory usage in Figure 6 for the Conference Room and Matinee scenes, and build time and rendering performance for the same test scenes in Figure 7. Note, however, that these trends are identical for all test scenes. For all practical grid densities, our method improved memory usage. Even for the Conference Room scene at its lowest density ($\lambda = .5$), our approach reduced the maximum amount of memory consumed during the build process by 25%, and these savings increase rapidly, appearing to hit an asymptote near 48%. Our method also improved the final accelerator’s memory footprint in a similar way for all scenes. While ray-tracing applications using a standard uniform grid are unlikely to select such high grid densities, applications that build hierarchal data structures upon uniform grids or utilize grids in a different fashion may benefit from these additional savings. In the Matinee scene, improvements start near 20%, rise rapidly, and level off near 47%, which again is similar for all scenes. With respect to speed, our approach slightly improves rendering time in milliseconds for all grid resolutions, whereas the build time suffers slightly. These differences balance out in such a way that the aggregate time spent building and rendering each frame remains relatively constant; see the speedup curve in Figure 7.
Figure 6. Memory usage for the Conference Room and Matinee scenes with varying grid densities, using the state-of-the-art build process and our memory optimized build process, shown as standard and optimized, respectively. Shown are both the maximum memory consumed during construction and the final memory required: build and final. The curves shown here are similar to those in all of our test scenes, where memory savings start above 20% with \( \lambda = 0.75 \) and quickly approach an asymptote of a better than 45% reduction in memory utilization. Further, note that the standard (final) memory requirement is greater than the optimized (build) requirement for medium and larger densities.
Figure 7. Rendering and build times for the Conference Room and Matinee scenes with varying grid densities, using the state-of-the-art build process and our memory optimized build process, shown as standard and optimized, respectively. The curves shown here are similar to those of most of our test scenes (exceptions are noted in the discussion, Section 4). In test scenes with lots of open space such as Cyrtek, The Bedroom, and those above, there is a noticeable difference in rendering time as the density increases, where our approach is faster.
Table 1. Maximum and final MiB memory allocations using the standard build process and our memory optimized process. The grid densities (λ) selected are those that maximize combined build and render performance. Note that in some cases the memory optimized density is larger and, therefore, the percentage reduction result compares two different densities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Memory Optimized</th>
<th>Percentage Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>Max Build Render</td>
<td>λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crytek Sponza</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Room</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bedroom</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Shop Girls</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Fiction</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matinee</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistry</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairball</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Dragon</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Speed comparison of the state-of-the-art build process and our memory optimized build process for each test scene, shown as standard and memory optimized, respectively. The grid densities (λ) selected are those that maximize combined build and render performance. All times are in milliseconds. The combined speedup compares the best standard to the best memory optimized performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Standard Build Render</th>
<th>Memory Optimized Build Render</th>
<th>Combined Speedup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crytek Sponza</td>
<td>3.5 2.85 7.63</td>
<td>3.5 2.83 7.41</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Room</td>
<td>3.0 2.39 19.34</td>
<td>4.0 2.53 18.55</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bedroom</td>
<td>3.0 3.25 17.56</td>
<td>3.0 3.26 17.02</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Shop Girls</td>
<td>3.5 3.12 20.67</td>
<td>3.5 3.20 20.29</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Fiction</td>
<td>1.5 3.17 13.82</td>
<td>1.5 3.35 13.27</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matinee</td>
<td>1.75 4.40 16.21</td>
<td>1.75 4.62 15.78</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>2.0 5.57 18.20</td>
<td>2.5 6.53 17.34</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistry</td>
<td>2.5 7.01 29.65</td>
<td>2.5 7.44 29.26</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History</td>
<td>2.0 7.60 16.60</td>
<td>2.0 8.30 16.22</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairball</td>
<td>0.75 27.99 45.78</td>
<td>0.75 31.53 45.96</td>
<td>0.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>0.5 23.36 27.02</td>
<td>0.75 28.31 25.67</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Dragon</td>
<td>2.5 19.40 60.00</td>
<td>3.0 22.68 57.00</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 lists memory consumption results for the state-of-the-art build process alongside our memory optimized build process for the various test scenes. We selected those results that gave the best combined build and rendertime performance. In all cases, our new build process improves memory usage, even in situations where the optimal grid density is larger using the new process, such as with the San Miguel scene. For scenes having an equal optimal density, maximum memory usage drops by 28–37% and the final output size also drops by 13–34%. In Table 2, we show build and render millisecond time performance for the same conditions. As is consistent with the previously discussed results, our process marginally impacts build performance, though we are able to render the scenes slightly faster. In the end, the overall difference in combined speed is negligible—less than 2%. Two notable exceptions are the Hairball and San Miguel scenes, which we discuss further in the next section.

4. Discussion

Based on the results shown in Figure 6, we were able to significantly improve memory utilization for both the build process and final output. As an example, the previous method requires 232 MiB to construct the accelerator for the Natural History scene at its optimal grid density ($\lambda = 2.0$), whereas with our method, memory consumption is now down to 163 MiB, a 37% reduction in memory usage. The size of the uniform grid itself also dropped from 34 to 23 MiB, a 32% improvement, which is similar for most scenes. An additional benefit of our approach is that for medium to large grid densities, our process’s maximum memory consumption is less than the size of the accelerator generated by the previous process. Therefore, our approach allows one to reach higher grid densities where insufficient memory resources previously posed a problem; this will benefit a variety of practical applications. We observed this benefit in some of our own test scenes. Specifically, the maximum density of the Hairball scene was 12 and 30 for the previous and new processes, respectively. Similarly, Asian Dragon peaked at 14 and 18, and San Miguel at 4 and 10.

In Table 2 we see that the combined rendering and build performance is mostly unaffected. In general, our approach slightly impacts build performance, but marginally improves rendering performance. This effect on build performance is likely due to the repeated work required to calculate coarse pair voxels in the extract-grid step (see Algorithm 3) and because of the additional atomic operations, which falls in line with the slight decline observed in performance as the scenes become more complex. With respect to the speedup in rendering performance, this is likely due to the fact that for each voxel through which a ray passes, we only access one triangle list reference; whereas, the previous approach accesses two references, so scenes with vast amounts of empty space benefit from our optimization. We expect other applications utilizing uniform grids for collision queries to experience this same boost in perfor-
mance. However, given scenes such as Hairball and San Miguel that are both dense and complex, improvements in rendering performance are not enough to compensate for the degradation in build performance. Another limitation of our method is that large non-axis aligned triangles can still generate significant overhead and consume large amounts of memory due to its mostly empty AABB. One can circumvent this issue by decomposing triangles into smaller pieces in a preprocessing step.

It is worth noting that we can further optimize the build process by introducing some risk. In Algorithm 3 (EXTRACT-GRID), the process spins while waiting for an allocation to complete by repeatedly reading the associated grid array element. Once the allocation in progress flag clears, we then acquire the triangle list index via an atomic decrement operation. Rather than using an atomic read, however, we can instead use an atomic decrement operation so that as soon as the allocation in progress flag clears, the next access acquires the triangle index position, thereby eliminating one atomic operation. This modification requires that we initialize the grid element with a third high bit set, so that the decrement does not clear the allocation in progress flag. Although we did not experience any issue with this approach, we cannot guarantee that the allocation will complete before the count rolls under and unintentionally clears the allocation in progress flag. With this modification, build performance is indeed faster and a bit closer to the original build performance, but because of this potential race condition, we do not formally report our results.

5. Conclusion
We have presented a new uniform grid build procedure designed to reduce memory consumption during the build process and in the final grid representation. Further, we used a ray-tracing application to evaluate our approach, using scenes of varying complexity, and in all cases we were able to demonstrate a significant improvement in memory consumption. Under practical conditions, our method uses 28% to 38% less memory during the build process as compared to the state of the art and similarly, our method requires 31% to 38% less memory to store the accelerator. For large grid densities, these savings jump up to approximately 45%. Our evaluation also shows little to no loss in the combined build and render time performance and in some cases, the possibility of a small gain in rendering performance. We expect that the optimizations discussed and demonstrated will also extend to other applications using uniform grids.
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A. Test Scenes

Figure 9 contains information about our twelve test scenes, including the scene name, a screen capture, the triangle count, and acknowledgments.

Figure 9. Test scenes used to validate our memory optimized build process.
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Included in our supplemental material (http://www.jcgt.org/published/0005/03/04/source.zip) is a fully commented CUDA implementation of the build process described in this paper, build_mem_optimized.cu. Also included is the state-of-the-art variant, build_standard.cu from [Taranta II and Pattanaik 2014] for reference and comparison. The last item, build_helpers.cu, contains some utility functions used by both.
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