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Abstract

In this work, we investigate the importance of 3D reasoning for photorealistic and controllable neural rendering. Towards this goal, we develop an approach which explicitly formulates light transport in static and dynamic 3D scenes using a neural network. In contrast to existing approaches that operate primarily in the 2D image domain, our approach reasons in both 3D and 2D space, thus enabling both global illumination effects and manipulation of 3D scene geometry. Our differentiable model can be trained jointly on multiple scenes from noisy renderings and is able to produce photorealistic renderings with accurate lighting, capturing shadows, reflections and refractions. Moreover, it compares favorably to baselines which combine path tracing and image denoising at the same computational budget.

1. Introduction

Photorealistic rendering is a core problem in graphics and vision. Algorithms which are able to reason about direct and indirect illumination of a scene (i.e., global illumination) have become an essential building block for a wide range of applications such as gaming, virtual reality, movies and others. With the advent of deep learning, synthetic data generation emerged as another important application [2, 18, 77, 14, 85] with the potential to satisfy the notorious data hunger of modern deep learning systems. However, as modern deep neural networks require large amounts of data, most existing approaches rely on approximate rendering techniques to accelerate training [18, 77, 14, 85]. Training embodied agents (i.e., using reinforcement learning) poses even stronger demands wrt. simulation time [17].

Historically, photorealistic image synthesis is achieved using sampling-based rendering techniques [64, 86] where the physics of light transport [33] is exploited to transform a geometric description of a scene into a realistic image. However, while physically based rendering yields photorealistic results, it is also notoriously slow with rendering times of up to multiple hours for a single image. This makes it difficult to use in the context of training neural networks.

On the other hand, recent advances in deep generative models (e.g., GANs [22]) enabled the generation of highly realistic images [50, 34, 35] in milliseconds on commercial GPUs. However, most existing approaches make use of rather abstract latent representations which do not allow for precise control over the 3D content. Moreover, the lack of a holistic 3D scene description limits neural rendering approaches in their ability to render images that are consistent across viewpoints or time. While several recent works [78, 3, 52, 61, 53] have shown that neural networks can produce consistent images for a given scene, these approaches usually do not explicitly reason about light transport. Consequently, they are not able to handle fine-grained geometric scene manipulation and do not explicitly integrate illumination into the 3D representation. This motivates us to seek a more explicit neural representation that reasons about how light propagates through 3D space and that is able to capture dynamic global illumination effects.

We summarize the contributions of this work as follows.

Contributions: We investigate the importance of 3D vs. 2D reasoning for efficient learning-based photorealistic rendering. Towards this goal, we present a learning-based approach (see Fig. 1 for a high-level overview) which allows for inferring photorealistic images from a point-cloud based scene representation in real time. In contrast to existing approaches, our method performs reasoning both in 3D and 2D space which allows for learning the physical light transport in a scene. This enables our method to handle scene modifications such as object translations, object removal and lighting changes. At the same time, our framework allows for learning useful heuristics (e.g., shadows that are not affected by moving objects) from the training data, enabling fast rendering without sacrificing quality. We introduce two variants of our approach: (1) a PointNet-based [66] model and (2) an extension of this model using photon sampling which improves the quality of shadows and specular reflections. We show, both theoretically and empirically, that our model can be trained without bias us-
Figure 1. **Motivation.** We learn photorealistic rendering using a 3D Light Transport Layer in combination with a 2D Image Synthesis Layer. We demonstrate that our hybrid 3D-2D approach is able to synthesize realistic images with global illumination effects in real-time.

We learn photorealistic rendering using a 3D Light Transport Layer in combination with a 2D Image Synthesis Layer. We demonstrate that our hybrid 3D-2D approach is able to synthesize realistic images with global illumination effects in real-time. We will release our code and data upon publication.

2. Related Work

**Rendering:** Physically-based rendering (PBR) is a well-studied field [86, 64] where much of the research in recent years focuses on optimizing different parts of the rendering pipeline [54, 87, 70, 68] or denoising of noisy PBR renderings [7, 48, 8]. Moreover, there is a trend of making rendering algorithms differentiable in order to estimate scene properties [4, 47, 21, 20, 56, 31, 11] or to use them for training deep neural networks [84, 60, 43, 36]. While recent approaches strive to achieve real-time photorealistic rendering [75, 74], they often require additional assumptions such as temporal smoothness and are limited by temporal accumulation of information in screen space. In this paper, we probe the suitability of neural networks for learning light transport end-to-end, with the goal of differentiable rendering of dynamic scenes with complex lighting.

**Generative Models:** Recently, deep generative models such as variational autoencoders (VAEs) [26, 9, 38, 28] or (conditional) generative adversarial networks (GANs) [50, 34, 35, 6, 29] have demonstrated that neural networks are capable of generating photorealistic synthetic imagery. While some methods have addressed the problem of 3D controllable image synthesis [44, 57, 76, 58], these methods are currently restricted to a small number of comparably simple objects and do not explicitly reason about materials or global light transport.

**Scene Representations:** [3, 65, 52, 24] propose several deep models for rendering novel views from point clouds [19, 67, 93, 27]. However, existing approaches are limited to single objects or small static scenes. Moreover, they do not explicitly model light transport or consider only diffuse, homogeneous materials.

Recently, several alternative scene representations have been considered [79, 83, 51, 62, 59]. Sitzmann et al. [78] propose DeepVoxels, where a single static object-centric scene is encoded in a voxel grid of learned features. Re- matas et al. [69] present Neural Voxel Renderer, a neural rendering framework that maps a voxelized scene to an RGB image. While both methods allow for rendering a sequence of coherent images, they are limited to comparably small scenes with a single object due to the high memory requirements of voxel-based representations. In contrast, our approach exploits a point-based scene representation and therefore scales to larger scenes with multiple objects. Furthermore, neither of them reasons explicitly about materials, light transport or global illumination.

Deferred Neural Rendering [83] proposes a neural texture representation for novel view synthesis of single objects with fixed lighting. Deep Appearance Models [45] encode the facial geometry and texture of a particular person. Neural Volumes [46] encode multiple images of an object into a neural volume representation which is rendered using ray marching. While producing impressive results, these works are trained for a single object or scene and assume static lighting. Moreover, they only allow for limited editing as their main focus is on view synthesis. In contrast, the focus of our work is on representing multiple scenes with a single model, where both objects and lighting can be dynamically rearranged in real time during inference.
3. Method

Our goal is to train a deep neural network to render a photorealistic scene specified in terms of a 3D model in real time while accurately modeling light transport including reflection, refraction and global illumination. In this section, we first discuss our scene representation. Next, we describe our neural rendering architecture which is able to learn complex illumination effects by exploiting both 3D and 2D information. Finally, we describe how we train our model using noisy renderings for supervision and show that under moderate assumptions our gradient estimates are unbiased. An overview of our approach is given in Fig. 2.

Scene Representation: How should a 3D scene be represented for efficient and photorealistic rendering? Traditionally, 3D geometry is often represented in the form of textured 3D meshes. However, while meshes and texture atlases are compact and encode useful geometric properties, they are inconvenient for neural networks due to their irregular structures. In contrast, voxel-based representations can be processed conveniently using 3D convolutions, yet they are limited by their cubic memory requirements. In this work, we therefore opt for a hybrid 2D-3D representation consisting of both image-space buffers such as albedo, normal and depth maps as well as 3D information. We represent 3D information in form of an unstructured point cloud sampled from the scene’s surface with learned feature embeddings enriched by albedo and light intensity/color.

Architecture: Our neural rendering model comprises three main parts as illustrated in Fig. 2: a Light Transport Layer, a 3D-to-2D projection step and an Image Synthesis Layer. The Light Transport Layer models global illumination effects that cannot be modeled in image space: consider for example a movable lamp which is present in the scene but not visible from the current point of view. While the position, color and intensity of the lamp strongly affect the overall illumination of the scene, a purely image-based method, by definition, will fail to reason about these effects. We therefore propose to reason in both 3D and 2D space.

Our Light Transport Layer takes a set of $N_{surf}$ randomly sampled 3D surface points $\{p_j\}$ and associated attributes for each point $\{a_j\}$ as input. These attributes comprise the surface albedo and the light intensity/color emitted by the point if the point is located on a light-emitting surface. Our goal is to define an architecture that is able to model or approximate light transport in a scene sufficiently well such that illumination effects like reflections and shadows are predicted correctly.

Towards this goal, we first predict a feature embedding $f_j$ for each point $p_j$ using a PointNet-based architecture [66]. While we found that such a global representation is able to reason about global illumination to some extent, we additionally propose a more explicit model for light transport to model illumination effects more accurately. Inspired by photon mapping [32], we sample additional $N_{photon}$ photon points $\{q_k\}$ from all light sources in the scene. Photons are randomly cast into the scene and their (first) intersection with the scene geometry $\{q_k\}$ is computed. For each
photon intersection $q'_{k}$, we process the position, color and direction of the initial photon point $q_k$ with a fully connected neural network, resulting in a feature vector $f_k$ at $q'_{k}$. The photon network thus encodes information about the light color, intensity and direction which is necessary for photorealistic shading.

Next, we remove occluded points in the 3D scene using the depth map $D$ and project the remaining point features $f_j$ and photon features $f_k$ onto the image plane using perspective projection $\phi(j) = [KTP]$ where $p_j$ denotes the point location, $K$ is the camera matrix and $T$ the rigid world-to-view transformation matrix. The resulting 2D feature map $F$ is obtained by pooling the features of all points projecting onto the same pixel. Formally, we obtain $F_u$ at pixel $u$ as

$$F_u = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\phi^{-1}(u)|} \sum_{j \in \phi^{-1}(u)} f_j & \text{if } \phi^{-1}(u) \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$  (1)

where $\phi^{-1}(u) := \{j : \phi(j) = u\}$ denotes the inverse projection. We concatenate the resulting feature map $F$ with additional image-space information $A$ (i.e., a depth map, a normal map and an albedo map) which we obtain using OpenGL shaders. Note that this additional image-space information can be computed cheaply and complements the global scene representation $F$ with high-frequency albedo, normal and depth information. Additionally, we create a view ray map that encodes for each pixel a normalized vector pointing from the camera center to the pixel center in world coordinates. This information is necessary for learning specular reflection and refraction effects. The final image synthesis is performed using the Image Synthesis Layer which we implement using a conventional 2D U-Net architecture [73]. Fig. 3 provides an illustration of the various inputs and features for a bathroom scene.

**Training:** We train our model using a dataset $D = \{(X_i, \hat{I}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ which comprises pairs of 3D scene representations $X_i$ and cheap noisy renderings $\hat{I}_i$ that are obtained from a physically-based renderer which we run for few iterations. The input $X_i = (P_i, T_i, A_i)$ consists of a scene represented by a point cloud $P_i$, a view represented by a world-to-view transform $T_i$ and additional image-space information $A_i$. Let $\varphi_{\theta}(\cdot)$ denote our model with $\theta$ the parameters of the light transport and image synthesis layer. Our objective is to find a parameter vector $\theta^*$ which minimizes the mean squared error (MSE) between the image predicted by our model $\varphi_{\theta}(X_i)$ and the noisy rendering $\hat{I}_i$:

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\hat{I}_i - \varphi_{\theta}(X_i)\|^2$$  (2)

Since obtaining clean renderings is very time-consuming, we propose the use of noisy renderings from a physically-based renderer [42, 39]. One of our key insights and contributions is to demonstrate that we can exploit the unbiasedness of rendering algorithms like bidirectional path tracing [41] to obtain unbiased gradient estimates:

**Lemma 1.** Let $X$ be an input representation of a scene, $\varphi_{\theta}$ our rendering network and $\hat{I}$ a noisy rendering of $X$ following a distribution $p(\hat{I}|X)$ which depends on the chosen sampling-based rendering algorithm. Assume that the true (noise-free) rendering is given by $I(X)$. Further assume that the rendering algorithm is unbiased, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{I}|X}[\hat{I}] = I(X)$. In this case, the following equality holds, i.e., the gradient estimates are also unbiased:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{I}|X}[\nabla_\theta \|\varphi_{\theta}(X) - \hat{I}\|^2] = \nabla_\theta \|\varphi_{\theta}(X) - I(X)\|^2$$  (3)

**Proof.** See supplementary material. □
Implementation Details: For the Light Transport Layer, we use a PointNet-based architecture [66] with ResNet-blocks [23] of depth two. For the Image Synthesis Layer we use a UNet [73] with four downsampling and four upsampling blocks. The network architecture used for photon feature creation is a fully-connected ResNet [23] architecture with two residual blocks consisting of two fully-connected layers each. The input, hidden and output dimension is the same as for the PointNet architecture. For training, we use the Adam optimizer [37] with a learning rate of $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and a batch size of 128 for static scenes and 32 for dynamic scenes (see Section 4). The learning rate is decayed exponentially by multiplying it by a factor of 0.99 after every epoch. More details are provided in the supplementary.

4. Experiments

In our experiments, we investigate the importance of 3D reasoning for learning photorealistic rendering from noisy observations. We conduct two types of experiments: In our first set of experiments, we analyze the importance of 3D information and the influence of the different components of the Image Synthesis Layer. To analyze these properties independently of light transport, we first run our approach on a static scene observed from varying viewpoints. Our second set of experiments addresses dynamic scenes (moving objects and light sources) using our complete pipeline including the Light Transport Layer.

Datasets: For our experiments on static scenes, we evaluate our approach on a simple static indoor scene containing a table, two light sources and a glass egg [86]. Our experiments on dynamic scenes are based on four realistic indoor scenes from [5]. We use Mitsuba [30] for both rendering and point sampling. Renderings are created using bidirectional path tracing, a modification of path tracing that is unbiased and converges faster [86]. For each scene, we create a training set of 100,000 images at a resolution of $256 \times 256$ pixels, varying the camera pose for each training sample. We sample 10,000 surface points for each scene. For our experiments on dynamic scenes, we randomly translate or remove objects in addition to varying the camera pose.

Baselines: For our main experiment on dynamic scenes we use three baseline methods: (1) a 2D CNN baseline which predicts images from the image-space input $A_i$ alone, (2) a simple denoising approach similar to the model of Lehtinen et al. [42], which learns to predict smooth renderings using noisy renderings as input and (3) a simple feature projection approach similar to Aliev et al. [3] without Light Transport Layer. For the denoising approach we trade off accuracy with run-time by adapting the number of pixels for which we run the bidirectional path tracer. We report results for $1/1, 1/4, 1/16$ and $1/64$ of the total number of image pixels with four samples per pixel, setting all other pixels to black. For fair comparison, we use the same light-weight 2D convolutional architecture for all baselines and our image synthesis layer. We remark that the primary focus of our experiments is not on improving the state-of-the-art in image denoising, but to demonstrate the efficacy of joint 2D and 3D reasoning for learning-based neural rendering. Both, our model as well as the denoising baselines, would benefit from more powerful (but slower) backbones.

Metrics: For quantitative comparison, we evaluate mean squared error (MSE) and mean structural similarity index (MSSIM) [89] with a window size of $7 \times 7$ pixels. MSE and MSSIM measure mostly low-level similarity. To also measure perceptual similarity, we compute the FID [25] and a Feature-L1 distance [62] between predicted and ground truth images. For both the FID and Feature-L1 distance, we use the features of the final average pooling layer of an Inception v3 network [80, 81] trained on ImageNet [13].

4.1. Ablation Study on Static Scene

For our ablation study, we first conduct experiments on a single static scene that does not contain moving objects or light sources. Our primary goal is to investigate the influence of the different elements of the Image Synthesis Layer as well as the importance of 3D information.

We compare the performance of our model without Light Transport Layer for different input modalities. Fig. 4 shows the different configurations which are evaluated against each other. We choose a subset of 6 (out of $2^4 = 16$) representative configurations to highlight the importance of each input. While configuration 1, 2 and 3 use only 3D information (but no image space information), configuration 4 and 5 rely solely on image space information. Finally, configuration 6 combines both 3D and image space information.

Results: Configurations 1, 2, 3 and 5 show similar performance in terms of MSE, while configuration 5, which does not receive any projected point cloud information as input, clearly outperforms the other three configurations in terms of MSSIM and Fréchet inception distance (FID). However, surface normal information only yields good results if supplemented by viewpoint information, as becomes evident when comparing configurations 4 and 5. The most important insight is that all inputs in combination (configuration 6), outperform the other configurations for all metrics by a large margin. This result supports our initial hypothesis that reasoning in both 3D and 2D is crucial for this task. Fig. 4 (top) shows qualitative results. While configurations 1, 2 and 3 achieve reasonable qualitative results, they also contain several artifacts (e.g., the table) which do not occur in configuration 6. Configurations 4 and 5 do not exploit 3D information, thus severely degrading visual fidelity. This highlights the importance of 3D information for learning-based rendering. Configuration 6 which uses both 2D as
well as 3D information yields the best results. Moreover, it is remarkable that our model predicts images that are significantly less noisy than the images used for training.

4.2. Results on Dynamic Scenes

To investigate the utility of 3D reasoning, we now turn our attention to dynamic scenes where objects (and light sources) are modified.

4.2.1 Dynamic Objects and Fixed Lights

We first train our network on a set of four scenes where objects are randomly removed or translated in the scene, but keep all light sources fixed.

Results: Fig. 5 shows qualitative and quantitative results for our approach and the baselines. We clearly see that our full model which uses both the Light Transport and the Image Synthesis Layers outperforms the other real-time approaches (lower section of the table), both qualitatively and quantitatively in terms of MSE, MSSIM, FID and Feature-L1 distance. While the non-real-time denoising approach “Denoising (1/1)” achieves the best results, the real-time denoising approach that uses much fewer samples performs the worst. We further analyze this behavior by plotting the MSSIM as a function of rendering time in Fig. 6. While denoising approaches are able to achieve compelling results, the proposed neural rendering approach provides a better accuracy/runtime trade-off while being fully differentiable.
Figure 5. **Dynamic Objects and Fixed Lights.** Results on dynamic scenes where objects are modified but light sources kept fixed. We show the non-real-time denoising baseline “Denoising (1/1)” for reference. Additional results are provided in the supplementary material.

Figure 6. **Dynamic Objects and Fixed Lights.** Quantitative comparison of our approach to the denoising baseline, varying the sample density. Reconstruction accuracy in terms of MSSIM and FID over inference time. Numbers refer to the ratio of dropped pixels.

As evident from Fig. 5, our simple feature projection baseline performs only slightly weaker than our variant without photon mapping. We attribute this to the fact that most of the light field in the scene can be encoded in local features and only dynamic parts like sharp shadows have to be learned. This highlights the capability of neural rendering approaches to learn useful heuristics from the training data. As in the previous experiment, our full architecture with photon mapping (which reasons more explicitly about light transport) achieves the best quantitative results.

### 4.2.2 Dynamic Objects and Dynamic Lights

In the previous experiment, both the feature projection and our approach without photons were able to handle shadows and other illumination effects well. The reason for this is that the light sources were assumed static, making it possible to encode viewpoint-dependent light properties into the point features. However, by design the feature projection baseline is unable to acquire an understanding of illumination effects in the presence of movable light sources that are not present in the current view. To see this effect, we augment the dataset from the previous experiment by turning all static light sources off and replacing them with a rectangular area light at the ceiling, which we move randomly.

**Results:** Results from our method with photons, our approach without photons and the feature projection baseline are shown in Fig. 7. We observe that the feature projection baseline produces considerable artifacts while our approach with photons leads to much sharper shadows and more consistent global illumination. This is also evident from the error maps in Fig. 7. The last row shows a failure case of our approach which does not accurately recover the mirror reflection due to the limited number of samples. We provide a full quantitative evaluation in the supplementary material.

### 5. Conclusion

In this work, we conducted a systematic investigation of the importance of 3D vs. 2D reasoning for learning-based photorealistic neural rendering. Our experiments demonstrated that neural rendering benefits from joint 3D-2D reasoning. This also confirms our initial hypothesis that reasoning in 3D is indeed helpful in the presence of moving objects and light sources. In contrast to denoising methods which rely on outputs from a sampling-based renderer, the presented approach is fully differentiable and can be used for training deep models using differentiable rendering while faithfully capturing global illumination effects.
Figure 7. **Dynamic Objects and Dynamic Lights.** We show the output of the feature projection baseline and our network’s predictions with and without photons alongside the corresponding error maps for moving light sources. The last row shows a failure case of our approach which in this case is not able to accurately recover the mirror reflection due to the limited number of reflected samples.
References


