

# EASY REAL-TIME COLLISION DETECTION

J. Fabrizio

LRDE-EPITA, 14-16 rue Voltaire, Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France  
jonathan@lrde.epita.fr

## Abstract

This article presents an easy distance field-based collision detection scheme to detect collisions of an object with its environment. Through the clever use of back-face culling and z-buffering, the solution is precise and very easy to implement. Since the complete scheme relies on the graphics pipeline, the collision detection is performed by the *GPU*. It is easy to use and only requires the meshes of the object and the scene; it does not rely on special representations. It can natively handle collision with primitives emitted directly on the pipeline. Our scheme is efficient and we expose many possible variants (especially an adaptation to certain particle systems). The main limitation of our scheme is that it imposes some restrictions on the shape of the considered objects - but not on their environment. We evaluate our scheme by first, comparing with the *FCL*, second, testing a more complete scene (involving geometry shader, tessellation and compute shader) and last, illustrating with a particle system.

## keywords

Collision detection, graphics pipeline, distance field

## 1 Introduction

Collision detection is a major problem in many domains: gaming, simulation or augmented reality. We have to be able to detect when two objects collide each other to allow interaction between objects and realism in simulations and games. There are multiple formulations of this problem. It can be the collisions of an object with the environment or the collision among multiple sets of objects. Object definition (implicit surface, mesh, composition of objects, etc.) and properties of the object (rigid, articulated, deformable, etc.) lead to various kinds of solutions. Due to user interaction and scenes complexity, solutions must be efficient. The hardware used may vary: *GPU* or *CPU* with or without parallelization.

Many methods already exist and reviews are exposed in [14, 10, 16, 23]. We focus on collision detection between an object and the environment. Many works investigate other contexts (like [8] that studies collisions between multiple sets of objects) but it is out of the

scope of this article. Image-based collision detection has already been investigated [22]. To detect collisions of one object with the environment, we have to test collision of this object with all the others. To be efficient, we have to reduce the number of tests and simplify them. To reduce the number of tests, the usage of spatial partitioning representations have been used. The space is partitioned and collision of objects are tested only if they belong to the same part of the space. Many partitioning strategies have been tested [12], octree [4], BSP tree [18], kd-tree [5]. In case of animations, it is difficult to keep the partition up to date (especially for BSP tree [17]). Equally, the usage of bounding volume hierarchies have also been studied. The collision detection is sped up by quickly discarding impossible collisions by testing simpler volumes that encompass the objects. If the test fails with coarse bounding volumes, collision is not possible. If the bounding volumes intersect, objects may collide or may not. Finer bounding volumes are tested or the objects themselves. This kind of methods need to process the scene before. Many types of bounding volumes have been investigated: axis-aligned bounding box (AABB) [6], spheres [13], oriented bounding boxes (OBB) [11] and discrete-orientation polytopes (DOP) [15]. To simplify collision tests, topological methods have also been developed. A common strategy is to deduce relative position of objects by projecting them on multiple different axis like the Sweep-and-Prune algorithm does [9]. Distance field is another way to solve this problem. The idea is to compute a distance field around the object and to compare these distance fields. A solution similar to our scheme but restricted to the context of cloth simulation is presented in [21]. The specific case of clothes has received a special attention [7]. Multiple libraries are available to detect collision (Bullet [1], ODE [20], SOFA [3], FCL [2, 19]). We offer in this article an easy scheme to detect collisions between one object and the environment. Our scheme relies on the rendering pipeline to perform the detection: it is based on distance fields computed by the rendering pipeline; this detection is then performed by the *GPU* without additional development cost. Thanks to a clever usage of z-buffer and backface culling the proposed method:

- is simple (its main advantage) but precise enough,
- is easy to implement (relies on the rendering process and requires few lines of codes),




Figure 1: a. The object, b. the bounding box  $RC$ , c. the projection of the object, d. the object in its environment, e. the projection of the environment onto the rear plane. f. the object's height map  $S_o$ , g. the environment's height map  $S_e$ , h. superposition  $S_o$  and  $S_e$ .

- neither requires any knowledge on the geometry nor special representation or even preprocessing of the shapes: the meshes of the object and the environment is sufficient (and then is not memory consuming),
- is able to manage primitives generated on the pipeline (by the geometry shader of the tessellation shader) or modified (compute shader or transform feedback...), the primitives remain into the VRAM,
- is flexible and can manage reasonably some articulated/deformable objects and impose no restriction on the environment without additional cost.

The method can not manage however an object with (too many) concavities (its main restriction).

In section 2, we explain our collision detection algorithm and we show multiple variants. In section 3 we show some results. In section 4 we conclude.

## 2 Collision detection principle

The goal is to estimate the location of the surface of the object  $S_o$  and the location of the surface of the environment  $S_e$  to be able to check if  $S_e$  intersects the object or not. To estimate the location of these two surfaces, we approximate them by two height maps. To compute these two height maps, we project the object and the environment onto the same plane. During the projection, we compute the two height maps (expressed on the same plane). The comparison of these height maps allows us to check if  $S_e$  intersects the object or not. As they are both expressed in the same plane, the comparison is trivial.

The graphics pipeline provides (by design) a simple, fast and efficient way to compute these projections. We have to found a way to compute simultaneously the height maps.

**The initial algorithm:** considering the object Fig. 1.a. We want to detect collisions of the object (our x-wing) with the environment. Collision detection is restricted to a bounding volume that encompass the object; the red wire rectangular cuboid  $RC$  (Fig. 1.b). We want to compute the height map that approximate

$S_o$ . Then we project (only) the spaceship onto the rear plane (according to the blue arrow - Fig. 1.c). To do so, we render this object using an orthographic projection limited to  $RC$ . The projection, the 3D clipping, etc. are natively performed by the *GPU*. This projection does not provide the height map directly but during the rendering, the height map is automatically computed and the result is in the content of the depth buffer after the projection. However this rendering must produce a height map that approximate the exterior surface of the object to watch. We want the front part of the spaceship projected onto the rear plane and what we get is the back of the spaceship.

We then perform the rendering in a particular way. As we want the exterior surface, further from the rear plane: 1/we invert the z-buffer (to get the furthest triangles and not the nearest), 2/we invert the backface culling to compute the backface triangles. The output (the content of the depth buffer) is now the height map (Fig. 1.f) that describes  $S_o$  (the front of the spaceship). These two tricks are the keystone of the algorithm the get easily this height map.

The useful part to deduce the height map is the content of the depth buffer. The result of the rendering is useless. There is then no texture mapping, no illumination computation, no special effect, etc. Furthermore, as the projection is restricted to one object and limited to a tiny part of the space that encompass this object ( $RC$ ): the rendering is then simple and very fast.

Now, to know if our object collides with the environment, we have to study the space in  $RC$  (Fig. 1.d). To do so, we perform the rendering of the environment (without the considered object) restricted to  $RC$ , using the same image plane and the same orthographic projection (Fig. 1.e). As the environment is facing the spaceship, the z-buffer and the backface culling are used in the regular way contrary to the previous rendering. Again textures, illumination, special effect, etc. are useless and the rendering is limited to  $RC$ , it is very fast. The projection is the same: no modification are needed between the two renderings. As before, only the depth is required. The content of the depth buffer provides the height map of the environment. We get a second height map,  $S_e$ , the height map of the environment (Fig. 1.g).

The last task is to compare the two height maps to detect whether there is a collision or not (Fig. 1.h). Thanks to our previous tricks, the two distance fields have the same size and are exactly in the same coordinate space, this makes it easy to compare them very precisely. The comparison of the two depth maps consists in checking (for every *pixel*) that the value of the depth at the considered *pixel* in  $S_e$  is lower than the depth of the same *pixel* in  $S_o$ . This comparison can be performed using a compute shader to ensure that all the data remain on the *GPU* side. The fragment




Figure 2: Our method detects (a) intersection, (b) inclusion of an object from the environment but not (c) when our object is encompassed by an object of the environment (c).

shader can also perform this comparison if we provide the first height map as a texture to the used fragment shader for the second rendering.

This algorithm is easy to set up and the major part of the work is carried out by the rendering pipeline. This algorithm is then simple to develop and fast to compute. It does not require any knowledge on topology of the models but only the meshes. There are three steps: 1/ rendering the object to get the height map of  $S_o$  (with the depth buffer and the back face culling inverted). 2/ Every time collision detection is needed, rendering the environment to get the height map of  $S_e$ , 3/ compare the two height maps. If there is no deformation of the object,  $S_o$  is computed once and for all. If the object changes, the render must be done to update  $S_o$ . The collision detection is performed using just one simplified rendering. This algorithm is able to detect when the two surfaces  $S_e$  and  $s_o$  intersect or when a part of the scene is totally included into the object. On the contrary, this algorithm is not able to detect if the object is totally included in an element of the environment (Fig. 2).

**Strengths and weaknesses of the initial algorithm:** the major strength of this algorithm is its simplicity as we have a collision detection algorithm in very few lines of code but this algorithm is also competitive in term of efficiency.

This algorithm is simple because the major of the work is performed by the graphics pipeline. It does not require any additional development to be run on a *GPU* - at least to compute the two height maps. It is simple also because it only requires the meshes of the object and the environment to generate the two height maps (and no other model/representation) - no more than what we need to generate the image. It is a challenge to solve a difficult problem in so few lines of code.

It is reasonably fast because the graphics pipeline is well optimized, by design, to perform these projections. Furthermore, contrary to classical rendering, neither texture nor illumination need to be computed. It is efficient because usually, in collision detection, we try to avoid unnecessary intersection computation to save time. In the pipeline, it is implicitly and natively

carried out by many optimizations: clipping, backface culling, etc.

Another advantage is that we can manage primitives emitted directly onto the pipeline (by the geometry shader or by the tessellation stage). It can also manage modifications of the primitives performed by the graphics card (by the compute shader or by a transform feedback). This is a huge advantage because we can compute the collision detection without data transfer back to the RAM.

One can argue that the usage of the depth buffer is not precise enough but: Firstly we use a linear depth (according to the orthographic projection). Second the maximal depth of the projection is the length of  $RC$ . This length is commonly very low, the two computed distance fields have a high precision: depth buffer's precision depends on the distance between the near and far planes. As we limit the projection to the length of the object, this distance is very low (supposed much lower than the size of the scene) then we are very precise.

The major problem with this algorithm is that it is not applicable with an object that has too many concavities. You can easily manage convex objects or at least you can manage objects that have concavities in the direction of the projection, but you can not manage objects with arbitrary concavities. The chosen space-ship is a *collision detection friendly object* as only one projection is required to detect collisions and there is hardly no concavity in direction other than the direction of the projection. Not all objects are so simple.

Note that even if they are limitations on the shape of the object, there is no restriction on the shape of the environment. It can have concavities. There is also no restriction also on the evolution of the environment, you can manage moving part or deformable environment without additional cost or complexity because  $S_e$  is recomputed at each iteration.

There is a preliminary work to decide which direction(s) to use for the projection(s). It is important to select the correct one(s) to minimize the number of renderings. If you consider the car Fig. 3. The projection onto the rear plan (a) as for the spaceship is not adapted as rear collision won't be correctly managed. An idea is to compute two height maps instead of one (b). The first one to detect collisions with the front part of the car, the second one to detect collisions with the rear part of the car. In this case, at runtime, this obliges to project the environment twice. In this specific case were the two projections have the same axis, it is possible to improve the process by projecting twice the object but on the same plan (c). One to get the height map of the surface of the front of the object, the second to get the height map of the surface of the rear of the object




Figure 3: Various projections for an object.

- this provides two boundaries. The difference between the two renders is that we have to invert the backface culling and the z-buffer between them. With these two height maps, we can detect a collision by rendering the environment once and checking if  $S_e$  is encompassed between the two boundaries. In practice this solution imposes some constraints onto the environment, and it is then not easy to use. Another, solution (d) is equivalent to (b) but the size of the image plane is bigger (b). The last solution (e), which is better, is to project the car on the floor. This allows to detect collisions by performing only one projection in the direction of the floor. For all these solutions we still have a problem to detect properly collisions with the car wheels.

This example shows that incorrect direction leads to incorrect collision detection and/or to increase uselessly the number of renderings.

**Algorithm variations:** the main advantage of this scheme is its simplicity. You have, under certain circumstances, a simple solution - in few lines of code - to a complex problem. Another advantage is its versatility. We briefly list some of possible variants/improvements.

*Stencil buffer:* we may save time by using a stencil buffer. On Fig. 1.f, the area covered by the spaceship is very low compared to the area of the complete image. To compute  $S_e$ , we do not need to evaluate positions not covered by the spaceship. We can deduce from  $S_o$  a stencil to restrict the computation of  $S_e$ . In practice, the improvement brought by the usage of the stencil buffer may vary depending on the implementation as frequently, the stencil buffer is applied late in the pipeline.

*Deformable object:* to manage an object that changes its shape over the time, we have to update  $S_o$  at every iteration. In the case of the spaceship if, like an x-wings, the wings move (Fig. 4),  $S_o$  must be recomputed. The limit of this strategy depends on the shape of the object and the movement. We can easily recompute  $S_o$  as long as we can determine the direction of the projection and the deformation does not bring concavities. Once again, if the object is compliant with our scheme, modification on the shape of the object is simple to handle.




Figure 4: Spaceship with moving parts.

Figure 5: Projection computation for an articulated object.

*Articulated object:* most of the time, we can not handle all the parts with only one projection. A solution is to manage each part independently as in Fig. 5: a projection is computed for each part of the arm and for the hand.

*Particle system:* if the particles are in a limited part of the space and if this zone is simple enough (convex, star convex), it is possible to use our scheme to manage collisions between the particles and the environment (not between particles). In this case,  $S_e$  is computed in the direction of the propagation of the particles and all the particles share the same height map for  $S_e$ . In case of multiple directions, it is possible to compute  $S_e$  in all 6 directions of a cube centered at the centroid of all particles. As the particles share the same height map,  $S_e$  is computed only once per direction regardless of the number of particles.

Note that in every direction, you are limited to the first visible obstacle. You can manage more obstacles with depth peeling for example, but it is much more time consuming.

*Interaction:* when a collision is detected, it is useful to know additional information on the collision. With this scheme it is for example easy to detect which object of the environment collides with  $S_o$ . When computing  $S_e$ , it is possible to simultaneously store the *ID* of every object of the environment in a separate buffer. During the rendering, we keep not only the depth, but also the *ID* in a render buffer. When an object collides, we know, by querying this buffer, the *ID* of the object. Another useful information to compute interaction is the normal of the surface at the contact point. As with the *ID* recording, it is also possible to record the normal of  $S_e$ . This is very useful to compute interactions like bounce of particles (even if, it is difficult to integrate all the normals in every contact points; when the object collides with the environment, there is not a unique point of contact but a set of points with many

different normals. Moreover, it can have multiple sets of contact points). We can store other information (like force fields) to manage interactions with the environment. Used with particles, it can be very useful.

## 3 Evaluation

### 3.1 Quantitative results

**Comparison with the FCL:** Our method is very easy to use however we have to validate that the method is competitive. To do so, we compare, for the same scene, the collision detection from our method and the collision detection using *The Flexible Collision Library* [2, 19] (We have chosen the FCL because it is common, fast, easy to use, precise and popular enough). We use a sequence of 800 frames: our spaceship is flying into a tunnel with multiple obstacles. The spaceship contains 9 716 triangles and the environment contains 69 842 triangles. Table. 1 summarizes the result of the comparison.

The first important criterion is the speed. To be precise in the measurement, we measure the time to draw the scene with and without collision detection, and then we deduce the time spent to compute collision detection. The measure is averaged on the 800 frames. The time spent by the *FCL* to initialize data structures is not measured; we compare only the rendering time. The CPU used (by the *FCL*) is a 4.00GHz i7-6700K CPU. The GPU used (by our method) is a GeForce GTX 1650. The model of the spaceship and the environment is not modified during the test (no deformation/no moving part). According to table 1 on average our method is faster than the *FCL*. We check the representativeness of the comparison with a Student’s t-test and validate that the comparison is relevant. Moreover, we show that the executing time is more stable for our method compared with the *FCL* which vary depending on whether there is a collision or not.

Unfortunately, we use only one projection to detect collision, this means that the detection may generate a false positive if a small object is right behind the spaceship (between the spaceship and the rear plan). In practice, we counted 4 errors over the 800 frames (at always the same situation: an obstacle passing through the X-wing and when goes out at the rear of the X-wing, our algorithm detects with one frame late that the obstacle is out). We can then consider that the *FCL* is more precise (however we could have use two projections instead of one).

Using system *mstat* we have a coarse estimation of the data allocated by the *FCL*, and we measure more than 5Mo. It is much more compared to our two small height maps (less than 1Mo) stored into the GPU card.

To finish the comparison, our method is much more easy to use because it simply relies on the rendering process. For example, we can easily update the detector if the spaceship moves its wing. It is not so easy with the *FCL*. Our method is then easy to use but also competitive.

**Test in a more complex environment:** To measure the usability of our method in a real scene we test our method on a more complex and textured scene (Fig. 6.a). This environment is composed of more than 315 000 triangles. The object is still a flying X-wing (Fig. 6.b) but now with 16 792 triangles. There are various situations represented in this scene. An object of the scene is continuously moving (Fig. 6.c). To fully measure the benefit of our method, in addition to the 315K triangles of the environment, some parts of the scene are generated by a geometry shader or by a tessellation shader: the tessellation shaders generate and animate a flag (Fig. 6.d) while the geometry shader generates green plants (Fig. 6.e). These primitives remain into the graphic card. To finish, we add a firework composed of 59 000 particles (Fig. 6.f). These particles are updated (color and position) by a compute shader between two draws. Again, these primitives never go back to central memory and remain into the graphic card.

The primitives used for the scene are the triangles. However, the output of the geometry shader is a collection of lines and the particles of the firework are drawn by simple colored points. This demonstrates another advantage of the proposed solution: we can detect intersections with other primitives (lines) and even test the inclusion of another primitive in the object (if the particle hits the object).

We can not compare with the *FCL* as previously because we never store the primitives in the RAM (this is a huge advantage in favor to our method) and even we can test intersection/inclusion with different types of primitives (triangles, lines, dots). As this comparison is not possible easily, we will measure the impact of our method by measuring the average time to draw the frames of the scene, with and without our collisions detection process.

Note: in practice, as we have multiple programs to draw the objects of the scene, we link all programs again but with a simple and generic fragment shader that simply draws the depth (we have a linear depth at this point). The content of the fragment shader is very simple:

```
#version 450
layout(location=0) out vec4 output_d;

void main()
{
    float depth = (gl_FragCoord.z+1.0)/2.0;
    output_d = vec4(depth, depth, depth, 1.0);
}
```

This is for the test but in practice, we could have simply stored the ID of the object of the environment in the render buffer (instead of the depth) to be able to know which object intersects and read the depth directly from the depth buffer (this works for the intersection with one object but may fail with two intersections as the first object may hide the second one).

The scene is around 600 frames long. We use an entry level video card NVidia GT 1030 with 384 graphic cores to test the usability of our method. We measure the time to draw the scene. We average the time to draw the frames of the scene: 0,0058 second and the average time to draw and to test the collisions: 0.0064 second. As the two means are close to each other, we have applied a Z-test to validate that the comparison is relevant and the difference is statistically significant. Even so, the difference is low. To improve the speed, one could use simplified meshes or draw only some parts of the environment but these improvements are valid whatever the method you use. Finally, this test shows that:

- we can manage moving and deformable objects in the environment,
- we can manage different types of primitives in the environment (points, lines and polygons),
- we can manage primitives emitted/modified directly on the pipeline,
- the time spent to compute the collision is very low compared to the time to draw the scene,
- the time to compute the collisions is reasonable.

This test is realized on an entry level card, this demonstrates even more the usability of the method.

### 3.2 Qualitative results

We use a simple particle system to simulate fire. Particles start from a point  $S$  and go up with a perturbed motion and color variations. There are around 50 000 particles represented by point sprites with varying size. A skillet is modeled (81 920 triangles) and the fire is expected to be deflected by the skillet. To do so, the normals are computed simultaneously with  $S_e$ . When a collision is detected, a bounce is computed thanks to




Figure 6: a. The scene. b. The flying x-wings. c. A moving object. d. A flag, computed by the tessellation shaders. e. Plants, generated by the geometry shader (drawn with lines). f. Particles (dots) of the firework animated by a compute shader.

	The <i>FCL</i>	Our method	Student's t-test
Average time on all frames (s)	0,0002050846275	<b>0,00010161438625</b>	p-value=2.929e-08 (significant at 1%)
Average time on frames with collision (s)	0,000139403807767	0,000103404759223	p-value= 0.09391 (non-significant)
Average time on frames without collision (s)	0,000323771021053	<b>9,8379150877193E-05</b>	p-value= 5.535e-11 (significant at 1%)
Precision on detection	+	-	
Memory usage (coarse estimation)	between 5 and 6 Mo	<b>inf to 1 Mo</b>	
Easy to use	-	+	
Can manage primitives emitted/modified by the video card	-	+	

Table 1: Comparison of the two methods (The FCL and our). Comparisons on time (with statistical hypothesis testing to check the representativeness of the difference of the two means), memory consumption, precision and usage simplicity.




Figure 7: a. From left to right: The fire surrounding the skillet and the handle, the height map used to detect collisions, the normal of the object used to compute bounces. b. The skillet is moving above the fire and the particles of the fire are deflected.

the normal at the contact point.  $S_e$  is computed from the particles' point of view, i.e. from the point  $S$ , to the sky direction. A unique  $S_e$  is computed for all the particles at each iteration. The result is illustrated Fig. 7.a: the fire is well deflected by the object. In this figure the height map and the normals are exposed. These two images are provided to the compute shader that updates the particles to compute deflection. A sequence of motion is shown Fig. 7.b. The collision detection in mean takes around 2ms with a  $1024 \times 1024$  height map. These times prove the usability of the method. They vary depending on the complexity of the scene and the dimension of the height map (a speed/precision trade off). This test shows also the versatility of our method.

## 4 Conclusion

We have presented an easy collision detection scheme. This scheme is able to manage collision detection between one object and its environment. The scheme can detect if the surfaces collide or if an element of the environment is included in the object but not if the object is included in an element of the environment. The main part of the work is performed by the graphics pipeline. It relies on a clever usage of the backface culling and the z-buffer (in an uncommon way). We have exposed multiple variants/improvements to show that the scheme is versatile, and we have illustrated it on a particle system.

The main advantage of this scheme is its simplicity.

It does not require anything else but the meshes. This means that any modification of the meshes is managed without nearly any additional cost. We can handle easily modifications in the model of the environment (moving parts, deformations) as well as modifications in the object. Even if our method is certainly not the fastest one, our method is efficient, thanks to the usage of the graphics pipeline. A simple *POC* shows that our method is not only easy to use but consumes few time on an entry level video card, is precise enough and very efficient in terms of memory consumption. With the comparison against the FCL, we validate that the solution is competitive.

Another strong advantage is that the algorithm can handle primitives used for the environment, emitted directly by the pipeline (geometry shader, tessellation process) or modified by the video card (compute shader, transform feedback). This is a strong advantage because we do not need to transfer all these primitives from the VRAM to the RAM to test the collision with our object. There are a lot of elements computed directly on the graphic card (the terrain by tessellation, details by particles...), and we are able to handle natively all these primitives.

The main limitation is that it imposes strong restrictions on the shape of the object to test. The object mustn't have concavities in directions different from the projection direction (but we are not limited to convex object). There are plenty of non-compliant objects, but we have illustrated our process with a car, an X-Wing, a particle system: it still remains many handled objects. With representative examples we have shown that even with restrictions many objects can be handled.

There is no restriction on the environment for collision detection with a fully compliant objects. The surface of the environment is projected no matter its shape (even with concavities) and perfectly handled.

We rely on the depth buffer. The precision of the depth buffer depends on the distance between the near and far planes. As we limit the projection to the length of the considered object, this distance is usually very low (much lower than the size of the scene) then usually, we are very precise (we handle perfectly the asteroid Fig.1 in the bounding box).

If applicable, the proposed algorithm is a strong solution - a simple fast precise solution for compliant objects (or with slight imprecision for near compliant objects). You have, in very few lines of code, a competitive and simple solution to a complex problem. We have presented the advantages but also the limitations to help the reader to know if applicable in its situation.

We do not provide any algorithm for projections selection. We can choose the correct direction manually during object modeling, but it would be interesting, in the future, to investigate to find an automatic algorithm. This is required solely for the considered object, not the environment, but it would be a good improvement, especially for deformable objects during animations.

## References

- [1] Bullet. [pybullet.org](http://pybullet.org).
- [2] The flexible collision library. <https://github.com/flexible-collision-library/fcl>.
- [3] SOFA. [www.sofa-framework.org](http://www.sofa-framework.org).
- [4] S. Bandi and D. Thalmann. An adaptive spatial subdivision of the object space for fast collision detection of animated rigid bodies. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, volume 14, pages 259–270. Wiley Online Library, 1995.
- [5] J. L. Bentley and J. H. Friedman. Data structures for range searching. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 11(4):397–409, 1979.
- [6] G. v. d. Bergen. Efficient collision detection of complex deformable models using aabb trees. *Journal of graphics tools*, 2(4):1–13, 1997.
- [7] T. Buffet, D. Rohmer, L. Barthe, L. Boissieux, and M.-P. Cani. Implicit untangling: a robust solution for modeling layered clothing. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 38(4):1–12, 2019.
- [8] J. Charlton, L. R. M. Gonzalez, S. Maddock, and P. Richmond. Fast simulation of crowd collision avoidance. In *36th Computer Graphics International Conference (CGI 2019)*, pages 266–277, June 2019.
- [9] J. D. Cohen, M. C. Lin, D. Manocha, and M. Ponamgi. I-collide: An interactive and exact collision detection system for large-scale environments. In *Proceedings of the 1995 symposium on Interactive 3D graphics*, pages 189–198, 1995.
- [10] M. Figueiredo, L. Marcelino, and T. Fernando. A survey on collision detection techniques for virtual environments. In *Proceeding of V Symposium in Virtual Reality*, pages 285–307, 2002.
- [11] S. Gottschalk, M. C. Lin, and D. Manocha. Obb-tree: A hierarchical structure for rapid interference detection. In *Proceedings of the 23rd annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*, pages 171–180, 1996.
- [12] M. Held, J. T. Klosowski, and J. S. Mitchell. Evaluation of collision detection methods for virtual reality fly-throughs. In *Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry*, pages 205–210, 1995.
- [13] P. M. Hubbard. Approximating polyhedra with spheres for time-critical collision detection. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 15(3):179–210, 1996.
- [14] P. Jimenez, F. Thomas, and C. Torras. 3d collision detection: A survey. *Computers & Graphics*, 25:269–285, 04 2001.
- [15] J. T. Klosowski, M. Held, J. S. Mitchell, H. Sowizral, and K. Zikan. Efficient collision detection using bounding volume hierarchies of k-dops. *IEEE transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 4(1):21–36, 1998.
- [16] S. Kockara, T. Halic, K. Iqbal, C. Bayrak, and R. Rowe. Collision detection: A survey. In *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, pages 4046 – 4051, 11 2007.
- [17] S. Kumar, D. Manocha, W. Garrett, and M. Lin. Hierarchical back-face computation. *Computers & Graphics*, 23(5):681–692, 1999.
- [18] B. F. Naylor. Interactive solid geometry via partitioning trees. In *Proc. Graphics Interface*, volume 92, pages 11–18, 1992.
- [19] J. Pan, S. Chitta, and D. Manocha. Fcl: A general purpose library for collision and proximity queries. In *2012 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 3859–3866, 2012.
- [20] R. Smith. Open Dynamics Engine. [www.ode.org](http://www.ode.org).
- [21] T. Vassilev, B. Spanlang, and Y. Chrysanthou. Fast cloth animation on walking avatars. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, volume 20, pages 260–267. Wiley Online Library, 2001.
- [22] B. Wang, F. Faure, and D. K. Pai. Adaptive image-based intersection volume. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 31(4):1–9, 2012.
- [23] R. Weller. *New Geometric Data Structures for Collision Detection*. PhD thesis, University of Bremen, Germany, october 2012.