

Fast and Robust Hexahedral Mesh Optimization via Augmented Lagrangian, L-BFGS, and Line Search

Hua Tong* Yongjie Jessica Zhang†

October 16, 2024

Abstract

We present a new software package, “HexOpt,” for improving the quality of all-hexahedral (all-hex) meshes by maximizing the minimum mixed scaled Jacobian-Jacobian energy functional, and projecting the surface points of the all-hex meshes onto the input triangular mesh. The proposed HexOpt method takes as input a surface triangular mesh and a volumetric all-hex mesh. A constrained optimization problem is formulated to improve mesh quality using a novel function that combines Jacobian and scaled Jacobian metrics which are rectified and scaled to quadratic measures, while preserving the surface geometry. This optimization problem is solved using the augmented Lagrangian (AL) method, where the Lagrangian terms enforce the constraint that surface points must remain on the triangular mesh. Specifically, corner points stay exactly at the corner, edge points are confined to the edges, and face points are free to move across the surface. To take the advantage of the Quasi-Newton method while tackling the high-dimensional variable problem, the Limited-Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (L-BFGS) algorithm is employed. The step size for each iteration is determined by the Armijo line search. Coupled with smart Laplacian smoothing, HexOpt has demonstrated robustness and efficiency, successfully applying to 3D models and hex meshes generated by different methods without requiring any manual intervention or parameter adjustment.

1 Introduction

Hexahedral (hex) mesh generation plays an important role in solving partial differential equations in multiple fields such as computer graphics, medical modeling, and engineering simulations [29]. Compared to tetrahedral meshes, hex meshes are generally preferred due to their higher accuracy, fewer element counts, and greater reliability [1, 23]. Despite these recognized benefits,

automatic generation of high-quality and conforming hex meshes remains a significant challenge [15, 28]. The generation of high-quality hexahedral meshes typically involves (1) initial mesh generation with connectivity designed to fit the input geometry; (2) vertex position modification to optimize the mesh quality and geometry fitting [15]. The initial meshes that serve as input to step 2 often contain poorly shaped and even inverted elements. On one hand, eventually all the inverted elements need to be eliminated, because even a single inverted, or non-convex element, makes a mesh unusable for simulation. On the other hand, the rigid structure of hex elements complicates local adjustment strategies, unlike the more flexible quadrilateral or tetrahedral meshes [21].

Due to the aforementioned reason, hex mesh optimization remains an active and challenging research area [8, 22, 16]. It involves improving the quality of the worst elements and aligning the quadrilateral surface with the input triangular boundary. Many algorithms have emerged to improve mesh quality. One such method, Laplacian smoothing, is both straightforward and effective, repositioning vertices to the centroid of their adjacent vertices [4]. While cost-efficient and easy to implement, this technique risks inverting neighboring elements. To mitigate this problem, optimization-based strategies are proposed to evaluate and improve the quality of elements neighboring a node [30, 31]. A hybrid approach combining Laplacian smoothing with optimization, can balance between efficiency and robustness [5, 4]. For non-manifold hex meshes in micro-structured materials, a specialized method utilizing a vertex categorization system integrated with pillowing, geometric flow, and optimization is proposed, addressing previous research limitations [18].

An untangling scheme performs single and fast local linear programming and traverses through each vertex until the quality cannot be improved any more [6]. Such method has local convergence proof, whereas it gets trapped in local minimum when the local solution space is empty, and better local solution can only be achieved

*Department of Mechanical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University.

†Department of Mechanical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University.

by simultaneously moving multiple vertices. Therefore, an edge-cone rectification method that combines local quadratic programming with global reconciliation is employed to achieve good practical performance [13]. A similar Newton-Raphson-based method that maximizes the average scaled Jacobian is proposed [20], whereas this method does not consider fitting the geometry surface.

Several other iterative techniques have been proposed to gradually shift vertices towards boundaries while avoiding local adjustments that might result in hex flipping [14, 11, 17]. These methods are straightforward but may sometimes struggle to maintain precise geometry. Conversely, a global deformation method has been shown to exhibit robust alignment of the resultant mesh with the input surface through surface mapping. The fitting process is controlled using a Hausdorff distance threshold [26]. However, this method sometimes fails to preserve exact geometry in their experimental results.

In this paper, starting with a 3D closed manifold surface including any annotated sharp features, our method focuses on minimizing an objective function combining two widely recognized algebraic metrics, Jacobian and scaled Jacobian, which are rectified and scaled to quadratic measures. We conduct analysis of the scaled Jacobian function and effectively address its undesirable behavior in degenerate regions. To evaluate optimization performance, we compare two methods: the steepest descent with a fixed learning rate (adopted in the previous software package “HybridOctree.Hex” [25]) and L-BFGS with Armijo line search. For surface points, we compute their projection points on the triangle surface, which is the equality constraint. These equality constraints are handled using the AL method. Ultimately, we incorporate Laplacian smoothing to accelerate convergence and tackle situations where surface points get trapped in local minima. In the experiments, we eliminate self-intersections and obtain good minimum scaled Jacobians across all tested models, surpassing the current state-of-the-art results [13]. Additionally, our innovative approach excels in accurately preserving intricate curved and sharp features. To foster additional research and collaboration, we make available HexOpt source code, as well as a collection of generated meshes and their input-output data, accessible at <https://github.com/CMU-CBML/HexOpt>.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the algebraic shape quality metric, focusing on the (scaled) Jacobian for hex elements. It also explores the detailed algorithms of the AL objective function, the L-BFGS, and the Armijo line search, as well as the pipeline pseudo-code. Section 3 exhibits meshing exam-

ples, demonstrating that our proposed method creates valid meshes composed of high-quality hexes. Lastly, Section 4 concludes the paper and provides insight into potential future research directions.

2 Hex Mesh Optimization

The input is a watertight triangular mesh \mathcal{T} annotated with sharp features and its corresponding hex mesh \mathcal{H} . The surface of \mathcal{H} is denoted as $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Although $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ approximates the triangular mesh surface, it lacks accurate fitting. To address this issue, we adjust \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{H}' to ensure that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ fits \mathcal{T} while maintaining a high minimum scaled Jacobian. Figure 1 illustrates our mesh optimization process. The top left showcases the sphere-shaped surface geometry \mathcal{T} . The bottom left shows the initial core mesh \mathcal{H} in yellow and its surface $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ in blue. When the optimization begins, the gradient of the objective function measuring mesh quality and geometry fitting is calculated for each vertex in \mathcal{H}' , and the vertices are warped based on the gradient. After some iterations, the vertices on $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ first fit \mathcal{T} , and the minimum scaled Jacobian increases; see the middle picture. Subsequently, we continue to optimize both geometry fitting and mesh quality until we can no longer improve the minimum scaled Jacobian without deviating vertices on $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ from \mathcal{T} . The final optimized mesh is shown in the bottom right.

2.1 Algebraic Quality Measures for Hex Elements We adopt the scaled Jacobian to measure mesh quality [9]. Within each hex, for every corner node x , three edge vectors are defined as $e_i = x_i - x$ ($i = 0, 1, 2$). The Jacobian matrix at x is constructed as $[e_0, e_1, e_2]$, and its Jacobian, $J(x)$, is the determinant of this matrix. We obtain the Scaled Jacobian, $SJ(x)$, when e_0 , e_1 , and e_2 are normalized to $\frac{e_i}{\|e_i\|_2}$. For the scaled Jacobian $SJ(h)$, we compute at the eight corners and the body center, and the hex scaled Jacobian is the minimum of these nine values. For the body center, e_i ($i = 0, 1, 2$) is calculated using three vectors formed by pairs of opposite face centers. The scaled Jacobian value range is $[-1, 1]$.

2.2 Mixed Scaled Jacobian and Jacobian Since we want to maximize the minimum scaled Jacobian of \mathcal{H} , the straightforward idea is to use the so-called Rectified Scaled Jacobian ($ReSJ$) as the objective function:

$$(2.1) \quad \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum ReSJ(h, \Theta),$$




Figure 1: Hex mesh optimization process. The triangle surface \mathcal{T} is shown in white. The quadrilateral surface $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is shown in blue. The hex core mesh $\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is shown in yellow. The vertices are warped to minimize the objective function in Equation 2.8. The middle stage mesh \mathcal{H}' with $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ exactly fits to \mathcal{T} with the minimum scaled Jacobian of 0.01. The minimum scaled Jacobian is increased until we cannot improve anymore, and we export the final mesh at the bottom right.

where $\Theta > 0$ is the threshold for the minimum scaled Jacobian value,

$$(2.2) \quad ReSJ(h, \Theta) = \begin{cases} SJ(h), & \text{if } SJ(h) \leq \Theta \\ \Theta, & \text{if } SJ(h) > \Theta \end{cases}$$

With this setting, it is expected that all hexes with a scaled Jacobian lower than Θ will be optimized, and the optimization will finish when the objective reaches $N_h \Theta$, where N_h represents the number of hexes in \mathcal{H} . However, relying solely on the scaled Jacobian in optimization presents two issues: 1) the scaled Jacobian is non-differentiable at certain points and is non-convex even when only one corner point moves. This problem is illustrated in 2D in Figure 2. In Figure 2(a), the points encircled by green circles are non-differentiable, and the regions marked by green squares represent local minima. 2) The scaled Jacobian is non-dimensional, and its derivative has an inverse proportional relationship with the hex edge length. Ideally, the derivative should be proportional (i.e., the objective function should be quadratic) to the element size so that the optimization remains invariant to scaling. Otherwise, if the mesh is highly adaptive, elements with a fine scale will have much larger gradients than elements with a coarse scale, as observed in [25].

Note that in the Jacobian plot in Figure 2(b), the

negative Jacobian region displays a much more convex and everywhere-differentiable landscape, and both the Jacobian and the scaled Jacobian are always either positive or negative. Therefore to address the first issue, we propose the improved Rectified Hybrid Jacobian ($ReHJ$). When the Jacobian is non-positive, $ReHJ$ is the Jacobian value; when the Jacobian is positive, $ReHJ$ is the scaled Jacobian value. We obtain

$$(2.3) \quad ReHJ(h, \Theta) = \begin{cases} J(h), & \text{if } J(h) \leq 0 \\ SJ(h), & \text{if } J(h) > 0, SJ(h) \leq \Theta \\ \Theta, & \text{if } SJ(h) > \Theta \end{cases}$$

To address the second issue, recall that given three edge vectors e_0, e_1, e_2 at hex element h 's corner/center x , we have

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} J(x) &= \det(e_0, e_1, e_2), \\ SJ(x) &= \det\left(\frac{e_0}{\|e_0\|_2}, \frac{e_1}{\|e_1\|_2}, \frac{e_2}{\|e_2\|_2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where h 's average edge length is denoted as \bar{e} . We scale J and SJ to quadratic measures, namely QJ and QSJ , as follows:

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} QJ(x) &= \frac{J(x)}{\bar{e}}, \\ QSJ(x) &= SJ(x)\bar{e}^2. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: ReSJ and ReHJ plots of a quadrilateral element with three points (in black) fixed at $(0,0)$, $(1,0)$, and $(0,1)$, and one point (in green) free to move within the plane. $\Theta = 0.6$ is set. (a) The contour plot of function ReSJ. Singular points are encircled with green circles, and local minimum regions are marked with green squares. (b) The contour plot of function ReHJ on the same element. The functional landscape is piecewise linear in the negative Jacobian region.

The updated objective function, called Rectified Hybrid Quadratic Jacobian (*ReHQJ*), is written as (2.6)

$$ReHQJ(h, \theta) = \begin{cases} QJ(h), & \text{if } J(h) \leq 0 \\ QSJ(h), & \text{if } J(h) > 0, SJ(h) \leq \Theta \\ \Theta, & \text{if } SJ(h) > \Theta \end{cases}$$

where it should be noted that since the function of \bar{e} is to normalize the average edge length of h and we do not want to change the landscape of J and SJ , \bar{e} is considered as a constant in Equation 2.5 and does not participate in the gradient calculation.

2.3 Constraint Setting and Augmented Lagrangian As mentioned in Section 1, the optimization of mesh quality is constrained by the requirement that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ (blue boundary in Figure 3) must be fitted to \mathcal{T} . After computing the target point to which each point in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ should project, these constraints can be formulated as N_s equalities, where N_s denotes the number of vertices in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$. The optimization problem is formulated as:

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \max \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} ReHQJ(h, \Theta) \\ & \text{subject to } x_i = x_i^t, \forall x_i \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}, \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: Three types of optimization constraints: (1) the sharp corner point x and its target position x^t in red; (2) the sharp edge point x and its target position x^t in green; and (3) the face point x and its target position x^t in blue.

where $x_i^t \in \mathcal{T}$ denotes the target point to which x_i should project. $\Theta = 0$ is set initially, representing the desire for at least an all-positive-Jacobian mesh. Similar to Equation 2.2, the optimization terminates when $\sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} ReSJ(h, \Theta) = N_h \Theta$ and all constraints are met. Subsequently, Θ is incremented by 0.01, the optimization of \mathcal{H} is repeated with the new configuration, and the previous solution \mathcal{H}' is used as the “warm start”. This iterative process continues until the optimization problem becomes infeasible.

As illustrated in Figure 3, the calculation for x_i^t differs based on whether x_i is projected onto a corner point (red), an edge (green), or a face (blue). If x_i is projected onto a sharp corner, we set the corresponding corner point as x_i^t . If x_i is projected onto an edge, we compute the projection points on all candidate sharp edges and select the closest projection point as x_i^t . If x_i is projected onto a face, we compute the projection points on all the triangles and select the closest projection point as x_i^t .

The constrained optimization problem 2.7 can be reformulated as an unconstrained minimization problem through the AL method:

$$(2.8) \quad \min \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \mathcal{T}) = \min - \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} ReHQJ(h, \Theta) + \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}} \left[\lambda_i (x_i - x_i^t) + \frac{\rho}{2} (x_i - x_i^t)^2 \right].$$

Following each iteration, the Lagrange multipliers λ_i are updated:

$$(2.9) \quad \lambda_i = \lambda_i + \rho (x_i - x_i^t).$$

Each time the minimum scaled Jacobian reaches Θ (i.e., $\sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} ReSJ(h, \Theta) = N_h \Theta$), the barrier coefficient ρ is doubled to strengthen the boundary constraints.

2.4 L-BFGS and Line Search An optimizer is essential for determining both the search direction and the step size for \mathcal{H} to maximize \mathcal{L} . While a simple approach would be to use Gradient Descent, given the assumption that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ closely approximates \mathcal{T} , a quasi-Newton method with quadratic convergence [2] is employed to compute the search direction. In contrast, gradient descent employs the negative gradient $p_k = -\nabla_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{L}$ directly to compute the search direction. Consequently, the computational time per iteration for gradient descent is notably shorter compared to quasi-Newton methods. However, due to its first-order convergence, gradient descent needs significantly more iterations than quasi-Newton methods to achieve convergence.

Other quasi-Newton methods, including the Levenberg-Marquardt method [19], face a challenge:

the calculation of the Hessian and the inversion of sparse matrices are computationally intensive, leading to a considerable rise in computational time. This level of computational demand is not acceptable for mesh optimization tasks involving millions or more variables. A more advantageous equilibrium between the convergence rate and computational complexity is attained through the L-BFGS algorithm. L-BFGS implicitly approximates the inverse Hessian H_k^{-1} for the k -th iteration of the function $p_k = -H_k^{-1} \nabla_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{L}$ by utilizing information from the preceding m optimization iterations. For estimating the Hessian, it retains data from prior iterations, specifically $s_k = x_{k+1} - x_k$ and $y_k = \nabla_{k+1} \mathcal{L} - \nabla_k \mathcal{L}$. Although the determination of the search direction using L-BFGS is approximately twice as slow as gradient descent in experimental settings, it requires about an order of magnitude fewer iterations to reach convergence.

After determining the search direction p_k , we need to select a proper step size a_k . Consider the Taylor expansion of \mathcal{L} at x_k :

$$(2.10) \quad \mathcal{L}(x_k + a_k p_k) = \mathcal{L}(x_k) + a_k p_k^T \nabla \mathcal{L}(x_k) + \frac{1}{2} a_k^2 p_k^T \nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(x_k) p_k + \dots$$

The exact value of t remains unknown, thus we adopt the Amijo line search to numerically determine t . We introduce a small parameter $c_1 = 10^{-4} \in (0, 1)$ alongside $\nabla \mathcal{L}(x_k)$ to relax the constraint on $\mathcal{L}(x_k + a_k p_k) - \mathcal{L}(x_k)$. Initially, we set $a_k = 1$ and accept this value if $\mathcal{L}(x_k + a_k p_k) - \mathcal{L}(x_k) \leq c_1 a_k p_k^T \nabla \mathcal{L}(x_k)$. Should this condition not be met, a_k is adjusted through backtracking by multiplying it by $\eta = 0.5$. It is important to note that, theoretically, an arbitrarily small step size could satisfy the aforementioned condition; however, adopting excessively small steps markedly increases the computational time. Consequently, we terminate the backtracking process once a_k drops below 10^{-8} .

2.5 Complete Pipeline Pseudo-Code The pseudo-code presented in Algorithm 2.1 summarizes our entire pipeline. Overall, the process of searching for x_i^t for each x_i requires iterating over all corner points/edges/faces, which introduces a marginal computational overhead. This is because confining the search to objects within a pre-defined searching box centered at x_i typically yields same \mathcal{H}' outcomes. Nevertheless, to ensure the highest possible success of the optimization, we insist to traverse global objects. The constants used in the pipeline are determined based on experimentation.

ALGORITHM 2.1. (HEXOPT) All-Hexahedral Mesh Quality Improvement

Input: Manifold, watertight triangular mesh \mathcal{T} with annotated sharp features, an all-hex mesh \mathcal{H}

Output: Warped all-hex mesh \mathcal{H}' with good mesh quality and its boundary $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ fitted to \mathcal{T}

```

1: Initialize  $N_h \leftarrow \#elem \in \mathcal{H}, \Theta \leftarrow 0, m \leftarrow 15, \lambda_i \leftarrow 0, \rho \leftarrow 10^{-8}, c_1 \leftarrow 10^{-4}$ 
2: while true do
3:   Calculate  $x_i^t, \forall x_i \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$   $\triangleright$  Update equality constraints
4:   // L-BFGS
5:    $q \leftarrow \nabla \mathcal{L}_k$ 
6:   for  $i = k-1, k-2, \dots, k-m$  do  $\triangleright$  First loop
7:      $\alpha_i \leftarrow \rho_i s_i^T q$ 
8:      $q \leftarrow q - \alpha_i y_i$ 
9:   end for
10:   $r \leftarrow H_k^0 q = \frac{s_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}}{y_{k-1}^T y_{k-1}} q$ 
11:  for  $i = k-m, k-m+1, \dots, k-1$  do  $\triangleright$  Second loop
12:     $\beta \leftarrow \rho_i y_i^T r$ 
13:     $r \leftarrow r + s_i(\alpha_i - \beta)$ 
14:  end for
15:   $s_k \leftarrow x_{k+1} - x_k$ 
16:   $y_k \leftarrow \nabla \mathcal{L}_{k+1} - \nabla \mathcal{L}_k$ 
17:  if  $y_k^T s_k == 0$  then
18:     $\rho_k \leftarrow 10^8$ 
19:  else
20:     $\rho_k \leftarrow \frac{1}{y_k^T s_k}$ 
21:  end if
22:   $\lambda_i \leftarrow \lambda_i + \rho(x_i - x_i^t)$   $\triangleright$  Update Lagrange multiplier
23:  if  $\sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} ReSJ(h, \Theta) = N_h \Theta$  then
24:     $\rho \leftarrow 2\rho$   $\triangleright$  Update penalty term
25:  end if
26:  // Armijo Line Search
27:   $a_k \leftarrow 1$ 
28:  while  $a_k > 10^{-8} \wedge \mathcal{L}(x_k + a_k r) - \mathcal{L}(x_k) > c_1 a_k r^T \nabla \mathcal{L}(x_k)$  do
29:     $a_k \leftarrow 0.9 a_k$ 
30:  end while
31:   $x_k \leftarrow x_k + a_k r$   $\triangleright$  Update variables
32:  if  $k \% 100 == 0$  then
33:    smartLaplacianSmoothing( $\mathcal{H}$ )  $\triangleright$  Smooth the mesh
34:  end if
35:   $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
36: end while
37: return  $\mathcal{H}'$ 

```

3 Results and Discussion

We evaluate our method on a range of input hexahedral meshes generated using various state-of-the-art algorithms archived in HexaLab [3] and from our group’s previous work [27, 25] on a PC equipped with a 3.6 GHz Intel i7-12700 CPU and 64GB of memory. These




Figure 4: Convergence plot on the exhibited eight models.

methods include PolyCube-based approaches [7, 27] (rkm012_1, mount2), cross-field-based techniques [10, 12] (impeller, mid2Fem), interactive methods [24, 32] (bunny, CAD4), and octree-based methods [14, 25] (anc101, isidore_horse). Some of these meshes contain inverted elements, while others have all positive Jacobians but deviated surfaces. We intentionally tangle interior vertices of all meshes to increase the difficulty of quality improvement.

As shown in Figure 5 and Table 1, HexOpt consistently produces inversion-free hexahedral meshes \mathcal{H}' and significantly improves the worst-scaled Jacobian. We optimize using the perturbed initial mesh, and the minimum scaled Jacobian after optimization always exceeds that of the original initial mesh. The “maxDist” value in the figure represents the maximum relative distance. This is calculated by traversing through the vertices in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$, finding the vertex with the longest distance to \mathcal{T} , and dividing this distance by the diagonal length of \mathcal{T} ’s bounding box. All the PostMaxDist are 0, representing that the optimized mesh boundary $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ remains exactly on the input surface \mathcal{T} . Our findings indicate that optimization using the L-BFGS does not yield a better minimum scaled Jacobian compared to gradient descent, despite reducing computation time by approximately 50%.

Additionally, we observe that the method performs particularly well with meshes that have an aspect ratio close to 1 (rkm012_1, mid2Fem, anc101, and isidore_horse). A plausible explanation for this phenomenon is that the scaled Jacobian of elements with large aspect ratios is highly sensitive to vertex movements along the shorter edges, making it considerably more challenging to achieve an optimal solution. From this perspective, the most suitable application for HexOpt may be as a post-optimization technique for octree-based meshes. Finally, the convergence plots of the

Table 1: Hex mesh statistics for models optimized with HexOpt.

Model	#Vert	#Elem	OriSJ	PreSJ	PostSJ	PreMaxDist	L-BFGS/GD Time (s)
rkm012.1	21,312	18,751	[0.47, 1.0][7]	[-1.0, 0.83]	[0.60, 1.0]	0.002072	25/42
mount2	7,945	6,208	[0.14, 1.0][27]	[-1.0, 0.62]	[0.37, 1.0]	0.005451	10/36
impeller	15,248	11,174	[0.18, 1.0][10]	[-1.0, 0.96]	[0.43, 1.0]	0.0009514	20/48
mid2Fem	1,590	908	[-0.15, 1.0][12]	[-1.0, 0.41]	[0.48, 1.0]	0.0002551	5/10
bunny	3,724	2,832	[-0.77, 0.98][24]	[-1.0, 0.77]	[0.12, 0.98]	0.0	8/18
CAD4	3,721	2,704	[0.069, 1.0][32]	[-1.0, 1.0]	[0.12, 1.0]	0.0	9/20
anc101	154,675	135,982	[0.017, 1.0][14]	[-1.0, 0.87]	[0.33, 1.0]	0.003714	69/198
isidore_horse	209,974	182,124	[N/A, 1.0][25]	[-1.0, 1.0]	[0.54, 1.0]	0.02702	54/171

From left to right: model name, number of vertices, number of hex elements, scaled Jacobian range of original models, scaled Jacobian range before optimization, scaled Jacobian range after optimization, maximum relative deviation from \mathcal{T} before optimization (maximum relative deviation from \mathcal{T} after optimization, PostMaxDist, are all 0), L-BFGS/gradient descent running time in seconds.

minimum scaled Jacobian for these models are shown in Figure 4. At each save node, $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is exactly fitted to \mathcal{T} . From the plots, we observe that the initial convergence typically takes some time, and the minimum scaled Jacobian is usually rapidly improved to 60%–70% of its final value. Subsequently, the rate of improvement slows down. Therefore, in practice, one can stop the optimization process once the slope of the convergence curve becomes sufficiently shallow, without necessarily waiting for complete convergence.

We evaluate the necessity of the objective function setting by substituting function 2.6 in Equation 2.8 with function 2.3. The optimization failed to converge for the models anc101 and isidore_horse due to their surface mesh adaptivity. Furthermore, when function 2.2 was used instead, the optimization failed to converge for all models.

One limitation of HexOpt is its lack of a theoretical lower bound on the minimum scaled Jacobian. We believe that establishing such a bound is a challenging problem, particularly when the shape of \mathcal{T} is also considered. Another limitation is that our initial plan to detect sharp features using path-finding algorithms proved to be unreliable for several test models with large-aspect-ratio elements near the sharp feature regions (mount2 and CAD4). Consequently, we abandoned this approach, and users now need to specify the one-to-one relationship between sharp corners/edges on \mathcal{T} and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

4 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we introduce HexOpt, a software package for improving the quality of all-hex meshes. Given a poor-quality or inexact surface-fitting hex mesh and a triangular surface onto which the hex mesh must be projected, HexOpt formulates a constrained optimization

problem that includes both mesh quality and geometry fitting terms. The algorithm then employs the AL, L-BFGS and Armijo line search methods to minimize the objective function. This approach is robust, efficient, and fully automated, making it particularly suitable for improving mesh quality for complex 3D models. Across all tested models, selected from our group’s previous work and other researchers’ archives, our algorithm consistently generates meshes of superior quality. To support further research and advancements in the field, we have made the code and meshing results publicly available at <https://github.com/CMU-CBML/HexOpt>.

While HexOpt has demonstrated promising results in rapid, robust, and high-quality all-hex mesh optimization for industrial applications, there is still room for future research. Specifically, establishing theoretical proofs to guarantee optimization performance remains an open challenge. Although some previous methods have proven convergence by optimizing only one vertex at a time to decompose the global optimization problem into local sub-problems [6], or by iteratively moving surface points closer to target points while maintaining positive Jacobians after each step [11], these methods only guarantee that mesh quality improves monotonically. These methods do not provide a lower bound on mesh quality. In practice, they often perform poorly because they impose excessive constraints on the optimization process. Our future efforts will focus on formulating theoretical proofs for the lower bound of mesh quality from a surface mapping perspective.

Acknowledgements

Redacted for anonymity.

References




Figure 5: Optimization results for eight models. The target surface is displayed translucently. For each model, the left/right figure shows the mesh before/after optimization. Inverted elements are highlighted in red, and non-inverted elements are shown in blue. The mesh interior is shown in yellow with some elements removed. The maximum relative distance and the scaled Jacobian histogram before and after optimization are provided. In the histograms, purple bars are intersected for better visualization due to their high frequency.

- [1] S. E. BENZLEY, E. PERRY, K. MERKLEY, B. CLARK, AND G. SJAARDAMA, *A comparison of all hexagonal and all tetrahedral finite element meshes for elastic and elasto-plastic analysis*, in 4th International Meshing Roundtable, 1995, pp. 179–191.
- [2] D. P. BERTSEKAS, *Constrained optimization and Lagrange multiplier methods*, Academic Press, 2014.
- [3] M. BRACCI, M. TARINI, N. PIETRONI, M. LIVESU, AND P. CIGNONI, *Hexalab. net: An online viewer for hexahedral meshes*, Computer-Aided Design, 110 (2019), pp. 24–36.
- [4] S. A. CANANN, J. R. TRISTANO, M. L. STATEN, ET AL., *An approach to combined Laplacian and optimization-based smoothing for triangular, quadrilateral, and quad-dominant meshes*, International Meshing Roundtable, 1 (1998), pp. 479–94.
- [5] L. A. FREITAG, *On combining Laplacian and optimization-based mesh smoothing techniques*, Technical Report, Argonne National Lab, (1997).
- [6] L. A. FREITAG AND P. PLASSMANN, *Local optimization-based simplicial mesh untangling and improvement*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 49 (2000), pp. 109–125.
- [7] H. X. GUO, X. LIU, D.-M. YAN, AND Y. LIU,

- Cut-enhanced polycube-maps for feature-aware all-hex meshing*, ACM Transactions on Graphics, 39 (2020), pp. 106–1.
- [8] P. M. KNUPP, *Hexahedral and tetrahedral mesh untangling*, Engineering with Computers, 17 (2001), pp. 261–268.
- [9] P. M. KNUPP, C. ERNST, D. C. THOMPSON, C. STIMPSON, AND P. P. PEBAY, *The verdict geometric quality library*, tech. rep., Sandia National Laboratories, 2006.
- [10] Y. LI, Y. LIU, W. XU, W. WANG, AND B. GUO, *All-hex meshing using singularity-restricted field*, ACM Transactions on Graphics, 31 (2012), pp. 1–11.
- [11] H. LIN, S. JIN, H. LIAO, AND Q. JIAN, *Quality guaranteed all-hex mesh generation by a constrained volume iterative fitting algorithm*, Computer-Aided Design, 67 (2015), pp. 107–117.
- [12] M. LIVESU, N. PIETRONI, E. PUPPO, A. SHEFFER, AND P. CIGNONI, *Loopycuts: practical feature-preserving block decomposition for strongly hex-dominant meshing.*, ACM Transactions on Graphics, 39 (2020), p. 121.
- [13] M. LIVESU, A. SHEFFER, N. VINING, AND M. TARINI, *Practical hex-mesh optimization via edge-cone rectification*, ACM Transactions on Graphics, 34 (2015), pp. 1–11.
- [14] L. MARÉCHAL, *Advances in octree-based all-hexahedral mesh generation: Handling sharp features*, in 18th International Meshing Roundtable, 2009, pp. 65–84.
- [15] S. J. OWEN, *A survey of unstructured mesh generation technology.*, International Meshing Roundtable, 239 (1998), p. 15.
- [16] N. PIETRONI, M. CAMPEN, A. SHEFFER, G. CHERCHI, D. BOMMES, X. GAO, R. SCATENI, F. LEDOUX, J. REMACLE, AND M. LIVESU, *Hex-mesh generation and processing: A survey*, ACM Transactions on Graphics, 42 (2022), pp. 1–44.
- [17] J. QIAN AND Y. ZHANG, *Automatic unstructured all-hexahedral mesh generation from B-Reps for non-manifold CAD assemblies*, Engineering with Computers, 28 (2012), pp. 345–359.
- [18] J. QIAN, Y. ZHANG, W. WANG, A. C. LEWIS, M. S. QIDWAI, AND A. B. GELTMACHER, *Quality improvement of non-manifold hexahedral meshes for critical feature determination of microstructure materials*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 82 (2010), pp. 1406–1423.
- [19] S. ROWEIS, *Levenberg-Marquardt optimization*, Notes, University of Toronto, 52 (1996).
- [20] E. RUIZ-GIRONÉS, X. ROCA, J. SARRATE, R. MONTENEGRO, AND J. M. ESCOBAR, *Simultaneous untangling and smoothing of quadrilateral and hexahedral meshes using an object-oriented framework*, Advances in Engineering Software, 80 (2015), pp. 12–24.
- [21] R. SCHNEIDERS, *Algorithms for quadrilateral and hexahedral mesh generation*, Proceedings of the VKI Lecture Series on Computational Fluid Dynamic, (2000).
- [22] J. F. SHEPHERD AND C. R. JOHNSON, *Hexahedral mesh generation constraints*, Engineering with Computers, 24 (2008), pp. 195–213.
- [23] J. F. SHEPHERD, C. J. TUTTLE, C. SILVA, AND Y. ZHANG, *Quality improvement and feature capture in hexahedral meshes*, Technical Report UUSCI-2006-029, The University of Utah, (2006).
- [24] K. TAKAYAMA, *Dual sheet meshing: An interactive approach to robust hexahedralization*, Computer graphics forum, 38 (2019), pp. 37–48.
- [25] H. TONG, E. HALILAJ, AND Y. J. ZHANG, *HybridOctree_Hex: Hybrid octree-based adaptive all-hexahedral mesh generation with Jacobian control*, Journal of Computational Science, 78 (2024), p. 102278.
- [26] K. XU, X. GAO, AND G. CHEN, *Hexahedral mesh quality improvement via edge-angle optimization*, Computers & Graphics, 70 (2018), pp. 17–27.
- [27] Y. YU, X. WEI, A. LI, J. G. LIU, J. HE, AND Y. J. ZHANG, *HexGen and Hex2Spline: Polycube-based hexahedral mesh generation and spline modeling for isogeometric analysis applications in LS-DYNA*, in Geometric Challenges in Isogeometric Analysis, Springer, 2022, pp. 333–363.
- [28] Y. ZHANG, *Challenges and advances in image-based geometric modeling and mesh generation*, Image-Based Geometric Modeling and Mesh Generation, (2013), pp. 1–10.
- [29] Y. ZHANG, *Geometric Modeling and Mesh Generation from Scanned Images*, CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, 2016.
- [30] Y. ZHANG AND C. BAJAJ, *Adaptive and quality quadrilateral/hexahedral meshing from volumetric data*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 195 (2006), pp. 942–960.
- [31] Y. ZHANG, C. BAJAJ, AND G. XU, *Surface smoothing and quality improvement of quadrilateral/hexahedral meshes with geometric flow*, Communications in Numerical Methods in Engineering, 25 (2009), pp. 1–18.
- [32] F. ZOCCHEDDU, E. GOBBETTI, M. LIVESU, N. PIETRONI, AND G. CHERCHI, *Hexbox: interactive box modeling of hexahedral meshes*, Computer Graphics Forum, 42 (2023), p. e14899.