















So why is it that not even hardware acceleration can make Java run as fast as native code? Some reasons are listed on this slide.

First we have things like array bounds checking, dynamic type checking, garbage collection. These are built-in features of Java that you can't avoid.

Then we have expensive native calls. I should mention that you can't even have native code in your own app, but the built-in libraries often need to call native functions.

One important thing is that you get no access to SIMD instructions and other special CPU features. When you're working in native code, you can get a big performance boost by writing some of your critical routines in assembly and using the ARM equivalents of Intel's MMX and SSE.

Then finally, there's the problem Java bytecode has a stack-based execution model, whereas all CPUs are using registers. It's hard for the VM to compile stack-based code into fast register-based code, and that's probably one of the reasons why the HotSpot VM performs so badly. But there are other reasons, too.

So the bottom line is that Java will remain slower than native code, and we just have to live with that fact. The performance gap will become smaller, but it will not go away.











Here are some more design issues that we had to keep in mind.

Number four, minimize engine complexity. This meant that a commercial implementation should be doable in 150k, including the rasterizer.

Number five, minimize fragmentation. This means that we wanted to have a tight spec, so that you don't have to query the availability of each and every feature. There are no optional parts or extensions in the API, although some quality hints were left optional. For instance, perspective correction.

And finally, we wanted to have a compact API that can be deployed right away, but so that adding more features in the future won't cause ugly legacy.



Okay, so why did we have to define yet another API, why not just pick an existing one?

OpenGL ES would be the obvious choice, but it didn't fit the Java space very well, because you'd need a lot of that slow Java code to get anything on the screen. Also, you'd have to do animation yourself, and keep all your scene data on the Java side. Basically you'd spend more time writing your code, and yet the code would run slower in the end. That might change in the future, when Java VMs become faster, but don't hold your breath.

The other choice that we had was Java 3D. At first it seemed to match our requirements, and we gave it a serious try. But then it turned out that the structure of Java 3D was simply too bloated, and we just couldn't simplify it enough to fit out target devices. Besides, even though the Java 3D is something like a hundred times larger than M3G, it still lacks crucial things like a file format and skinning. It's also too damn difficult to use.



















VertexBu	iffer ly		SIGGRAPH200				
	8-bit	16-bit	32-bit	Float	2D	3D	4D
Vertices			×	x	×	✓	×
Texcoords	✓	 ✓ 	×	×	\checkmark	 ✓ 	×
Normals	✓	 Image: A start of the start of	×	×		\checkmark	
Colors	✓		×	×		\checkmark	 Image: A start of the start of

Floating point vertex arrays were excluded for performance and code size reasons. To compensate, there are floating point scale and bias terms for vertex and texcoord arrays. They cause no overhead, since they can be implemented with the modelview or texture matrix.

Homogeneous 4D coordinates were dropped to get rid of nasty special cases in the scene graph, and to speed up skinning, morphing, lighting and vertex transformations in general.

ndexBuff	er Typ)es	SIGGRAPH2			
	8-bit	16-bit	implicit	Strip	Fan	List
Triangles	×	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	×	×
Lines	×	×	×	×	×	×
Points	×	×	×			×
Point sprites	×	×	×			×

The set of rendering primitives was reduced to a minimum: triangle strips with 16-bit indices (equivalent to glDrawElements) or implicit indices (glDrawArrays).

Point sprites are missing for a good reason: The M3G spec had been publicly available for almost a year until point sprites were added into OpenGL ES, and even then, only as an extension.





So how should you implement a particle system, given that points and point sprites are not supported?

The first idea that comes to mind is to use Sprite3D. However, that would make every particle an independent object, each with its own modelview matrix, texture, and other rendering state. This implies a separate OpenGL draw call and lots of overhead for each particle.

It is more efficient to represent particles as textured quads, all glued into one big triangle strip that can be drawn in a single call. To make the particles face the viewer, set up automatic node alignment for the Mesh that encloses the particle system.

At run time, just update the particles' x, y, z coordinates and colors in their respective VertexArrays.



Functionally related blocks of rendering state are grouped together. Appearances as well as individual Appearance components can be shared by arbitrary number of meshes.

This saves memory space, reduces garbage collection, and allows implementations to quickly sort objects based on their rendering state.





Most OpenGL ES performance tips given by Ville in the previous presentation apply also for M3G applications. A few of the most important and universally applicable tips are repeated here.

M3G engines generally perform shader state sorting and view frustum culling in retained mode. However, any culling done by the engine is very conservative. The engine does not know which polygon mesh is a wall that's going to stay where it is, for instance. If you have a scene that could be efficiently represented as a BSP tree, you can't expect the engine to figure that out. You need to construct the tree yourself, and keep it in the application side.



M3G Overview



Design principles

Getting started

Low-level features

The scene graph

Deforming meshes

Keyframe animation

Summary & demos



Scene graph nodes can't have more than one parent, so the scene graph is actually just a tree.

Even though nodes can't be instanced, their component objects can. Textures, vertices, and all other substantial data is in the components, and only referenced by the nodes.







Since the modelview matrix of each tile will be unique, small rounding errors in the vertex pipeline may cause cracks between tiles. A simple solution is to make the tiles overlap each other a bit.


M3G Overview



Design principles

Getting started

Low-level features

The scene graph

Deforming meshes

Keyframe animation

Summary & demos









In the equation,

- v is the vertex position in the SkinnedMesh node's coordinates
- \mathbf{B}_{i} is the fixed at-rest transformation from SkinnedMesh to bone \mathbf{N}_{i}
- \mathbf{M}_{i} is the dynamic transformation from bone \mathbf{N}_{i} to SkinnedMesh
- \mathbf{w}_i is the weight of bone \mathbf{N}_i (the weights are normalized)
- $0 \le i \le N$, where N is the number of bones associated with v
- v' is the final position in the SkinnedMesh coordinate system





The empty dots show where the vertex would end up if it were associated with just one of the bones, respectively.

As the vertex is weighted equally by bones A and B, the final interpolated vertex lies in between the empty dots.



M3G Overview



Design principles

Getting started

Low-level features

The scene graph

Deforming meshes

Keyframe animation

Summary & demos

















Almost any property in the API can be targeted by keyframe animation. Once you have called animate(), you can read back the updated values with the usual get() methods.

If you need to do interpolation with floating point quantities elsewhere in your application, you can use the M3G animation engine for that. Set up your keyframes and a dummy object as the animation target, animate it, and read out the result.

Then what if you have a large array with N elements that you need to interpolate? There is only one animation target that can take keyframes with more than four components, and that's the MorphingMesh weights array. So, you need to set up a dummy MorphingMesh with N morph targets, and target your animation to that.

Although that's inconvenient and somewhat ridiculous, it doesn't really cost you that much in terms of memory. The size of the dummy mesh will be a few dozen bytes per morph target. You will probably run out of CPU cycles – doing floating point interpolation – before you run out of memory.

M3G Overview



Design principles

Getting started

Low-level features

The scene graph

Deforming meshes

Keyframe animation

Summary & demos









