

ENTIRE: Learning-based Volume Rendering Time Prediction

Zikai Yin[✉], Hamid Gadirov[✉], Jiri Kosinka[✉], and Steffen Frey[✉]

University of Groningen, Netherlands

Abstract

We introduce *ENTIRE*, a novel deep learning-based approach for fast and accurate volume rendering time prediction. Predicting rendering time is inherently challenging due to its dependence on multiple factors, including volume data characteristics, image resolution, camera configuration, and transfer function settings. Our method addresses this by first extracting a feature vector that encodes structural volume properties relevant to rendering performance. This feature vector is then integrated with additional rendering parameters, such as image resolution, camera setup, and transfer function settings, to produce the final prediction. We evaluate *ENTIRE* across multiple rendering frameworks (CPU- and GPU-based) and configurations (with and without single-scattering) on diverse datasets. The results demonstrate that our model achieves high prediction accuracy with fast inference speed. Furthermore, we showcase *ENTIRE*'s effectiveness in two case studies, where it enables dynamic parameter adaptation for stable frame rates and load balancing.

CCS Concepts

• **Computing methodologies** → Rendering; Volumetric models; Neural networks; Machine learning approaches;

1. Introduction

The high computational demand of rendering high-resolution volumes with millions or even billions of cells in volume grid structures presents challenges across various visualization use cases, from interactive exploration on workstations [BHP15, BFE16] and clusters [TFM*17] to generating image databases for in-situ visualization [AJO*14, BLE*22]. In these scenarios, accurate rendering time prediction is crucial for adjusting rendering algorithm parameters and task distribution, enabling stable interactive frame rates or balanced workloads. A recent study [BMFE19] identifies four key factors influencing rendering performance: hardware, rendering algorithm settings, camera parameters, and volume structure. Each factor can significantly impact rendering time, making it challenging to model their combined effects [BMFE19]. For example, Fig. 1 illustrates how rendering time varies depending on the volume, camera pose, and transfer function, highlighting the complexity of performance prediction.

Several application scenarios for rendering time prediction have been discussed in prior work, with two being particularly prominent. First, in interactive volume exploration, performance prediction helps estimate how to adjust sampling parameters to achieve stable rendering performance while maintaining the highest possible quality. A key use case is adapting rendering parameters before generating a frame to meet specific constraints, such as a target frame rate [BFE16]. Second, in distributed rendering scenarios, where tasks are assigned across different compute nodes, the goal is to balance the workload so that all nodes complete their tasks in approximately the same amount of time [FE]. In both cases, establishing a time prediction model only needs to be done once, after which it can be reused (i) for fluent interaction or (ii) distributing

many rendering tasks across large clusters. Regarding the second case for instance, this can help to significantly reduce the time required for rendering tasks on high-performance computing systems and save precious compute hours on such machines [BLE*22].

While there are prior works on predicting volume rendering timings [LHK*16, BFE17, BFE16, TFM*17, BLE*22], these models generally suffer from requiring significant manual modeling effort, low flexibility for adaption to other factors (rendering methods, graphics cards) or application scenarios, and are based on assumptions on the inner workings of the rendering methods. In particular, Larsen [LHK*16] developed an analytical model to evaluate rendering performance under explicit consideration of various cost factors (the parameters in the cost model require manual tuning). Bruder *et al.* [BFE16, BFE17] focused on modeling the performance impact of early ray termination. Tkachev *et al.*'s model predicts rendering time based on hardware configurations for distributed volume raycasting [TFM*17]. For load balancing in in-situ visualization settings for creating Cinema-style image data bases, Bruder *et al.* [BLE*22] predict the rendering time of volume datasets via probing (completing a subset of rendering tasks) and from this calculate the mean value of selected samples' rendering times. This yields a (predicted) average time for each individual frame task, but no detailed information per frame to allow for higher-accuracy load balancing. While considering more rendering tasks during probing increases prediction accuracy, it increases cost and reduces the amount of work that can be flexibly distributed.

We focus on the question: *How to predict volume rendering time quickly and accurately?* Among others, one influential factor impacting volume rendering performance is the volume itself, and it is of great importance for our rendering time prediction model to con-




Figure 1: Rendering time measurements across different volumes, camera poses, and transfer functions. One representative volume was selected from each dataset used in this study. For each volume, different camera orbits were applied, with the transfer function randomized at each position. At the top of each subfigure, the corresponding rendered images (CUDA, with single-scattering) are shown.

sider the volume’s key features that contribute to its rendering time performance. While directly considering a high-resolution volume with millions to billions of cells is comparatively time-consuming, in many typical analysis scenarios the volume data does not change on a frame-to-frame basis. To account for this and achieve high prediction efficiency, our model splits the frame-time prediction procedure into two stages: (i) generation of the feature vector from the volume and (ii) time prediction. In this way, once a feature representation is extracted from a volume, time predictions can be performed even more quickly for changes to camera position, transfer function, etc. Crucially, even when considering changing volumes, our model predicts timings substantially faster than the actual rendering process. The main contributions of our work are as follows:

- We present ENTIRE (rEnderiNg Time pRediction network), a novel end-to-end model that decouples volume feature extraction (VolumeNet) and rendering time prediction (PredNet).
- ENTIRE makes no assumptions about the underlying volume rendering method, dataset characteristics, or target hardware, enabling application to different volume-visualization scenarios.
- ENTIRE’s concatenation-based framework is designed for flexible extensibility and allows for incorporating additional rendering parameters (ray step size, lighting, sampling rates, etc.) by expanding the input vector, requiring no architectural changes.
- We evaluate ENTIRE across various datasets and demonstrate its effectiveness on two use cases: steering toward stable frame rates and load balancing.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first deep learning-based approach for dynamic volume rendering time prediction. The ENTIRE code will be made publicly available.

In the remainder of the paper, we will review related work (Sec. 2), discuss ENTIRE and its design (Sec. 3), and present our experimental setup and model evaluation (Sec. 4). We then consider two use cases (Sec. 5) in detail and conclude our work (Sec. 7).

2. Related Work

2.1. Volume Visualization

There are two main approaches for classical volume visualization: indirect and direct volume rendering. The indirect method converts volume data to an intermediate representation (e.g., an isosurface), while the direct method considers the data as a semi-transparent gel with physical properties and directly uses a 3D representation of it. Seminal works of indirect methods extracting isosurfaces are

marching cubes [LC98] and marching tetrahedra [DK91]. For direct methods, the most prominently used approaches nowadays are based on raycasting [Rot82] for rendering and early ray termination (ERT) for acceleration. The rendering time of raycasting-based algorithms is highly dependent on hardware and parameter setting. This provides a good evaluation scenario for ENTIRE. Recently, works have been proposed that focus on deep learning-based volume representations and rendering, called neural rendering [TFT*20], which map a voxel to color and opacity using a neural network. However, training a neural rendering model usually requires significant computational resources and large datasets.

In the context of visualizing time-dependent volumes, several works aim to reduce costs and enhance performance. Wang *et al.* [WSS19] proposed to store data’s depth information to recover the evolution while reducing the sampling rate. Flexpath [DBE*14] reduces data movements and optimizes the data placements to save transfer costs. Frey *et al.* [FE17] introduced a method for time-step selection to reduce memory cost and speed up the rendering process. Gross *et al.* [GA21] proposed a sub-sampling algorithm for time-dependent data that enables efficient local processing and focuses on optimizing computational resource usage. Bruder *et al.* [BLE*22] introduced a hybrid in-situ approach for generating Cinema databases by dynamically distributing rendering tasks between simulation and visualization nodes using a simple prediction model.

2.2. Volume Feature Extraction

Extracting a volume’s features and representing them adequately has shown great importance in volume reconstruction and scene representation. Traditionally, a volume is represented via a large number of cells or points which explicitly store the volume and usually require a larger amount of memory. Recent works allow a volume to be stored using a neural network, i.e., using an implicit neural representation (INR). Typical works include Convolutional Occupancy Network [PNM*20], and Neural Radiance Fields (NeRF) [MST*21] as well as its variants [YYTK21, RPLG21].

More recently, 3D Gaussian Splatting (3DGS) [KKLD23] has emerged as an efficient explicit-implicit hybrid representation for high-quality scene reconstruction and rendering, and several optimized variants have been proposed [WYZ*24, FXZ*24, BWGM25]. Although these methods greatly improve rendering performance, their memory usage still scales with scene complexity and the number of Gaussian primitives.

To address this, Niemeyer *et al.* [NMOG19] introduced a network that learns deforming volumes by wrapping space and time. Weiss *et al.* [WHW22] proposed an efficient neural representation method by utilizing GPU tensorcores. Tang *et al.* [TW24] presented ECNR which uses a unified space-time partitioning strategy to adaptively represent and compresses volumetric data. Still, these methods store volumes in network weights. Gadirov *et al.* introduced FLINT [GRF25] and HyperFLINT [GWB*25], deep learning-based methods for volumetric flow estimation, density reconstruction, and ensemble exploration using convolutional neural networks and a hypernetwork, respectively. Wu *et al.* introduced HyperINR [WBCM23], where a hypernetwork generates the weights of an INR network.

In ENTIRE, capturing volume features via network weights would be possible, yet instead we opted to represent each volume as an explicit feature vector. This approach allows for a more compact representation with significantly fewer elements in the feature vector compared to the number of weights stored with implicit representations. This facilitates creating smaller, more efficient prediction networks and avoiding the dominance of volume network parameters over the other factors.

2.3. Rendering Time Prediction

The prediction and modeling of algorithm performance have evolved as important research topics in scientific visualization. With regard to predicting rendering time in volume rendering, several models that combine empirical measurements have been developed. Sodhi *et al.* [SSX08] created performance skeletons to model program execution times on the CPU. Ipek *et al.* [IDSSM05] trained a neural network to predict the performance of large-scale application running specifically on CPUs. These approaches are CPU architecture-specific, and thus inadequate for modeling rendering performance on GPUs. Baghsorkhi *et al.* [BDP*10] statically analyze GPU kernel code. Zhang and Owen [ZO11] modeled GPU performance by conducting micro-benchmarks on the target platform. Lee *et al.* [LBdS*07] proposed an early neural network-based approach that explicitly integrates statistical methods. Wu *et al.* [WGL*15] also applied machine learning to predict the scaling of power and time consumption of an application that scales with different GPU configurations. These above-mentioned methods primarily focus on offline applications, whereas we specifically target interactive volume visualization. Overall, there are fewer existing approaches that deal with performance prediction for real-time rendering compared to offline rendering.

Wimmer *et al.* [WW03] proposed a rendering time prediction framework that primarily focuses on modeling the contributions of CPUs and GPUs. Rizzi *et al.* [RHI*14] proposed an analytical model for GPU clusters' scaling behavior for parallel rendering that explicitly accounts for and manually models each rendering stage. For in situ visualization, Larsen *et al.* [LHK*16] modeled the performance of rasterization, ray tracing, and volume rendering analytically. They analyzed application performance on a single machine and applied statistical methods to calculate model weights. After that, they further extended the model to parallel execution by utilizing a similar model for evaluating image compositing perfor-




Figure 2: Overview of the proposed prediction model. Left: Model training. Right: Inference. \mathcal{L}^{rec} and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{pred}}$ are reconstruction loss and prediction loss, respectively (see Sec. 3.5), and t^{pred} is the predicted rendering time. The details of VolumeNet and PredNet are illustrated in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, respectively. We first train VolumeNet for collecting feature vectors. Then we train PredNet for rendering time prediction based on the collected feature vectors and rendering parameters.

mance. In contrast, ENTIRE can flexibly deal with different rendering methods, hardware, and tasks without manual adjustment.

Bruder *et al.* [BFE16] further incorporated the effects of acceleration approaches (early ray termination and empty space skipping) and how this affects rendering time in interactive volume visualization. They then employed this for dynamically adjusting image resolution and load balancing. Tkachev *et al.* [TFM*17] predicted rendering time based on different hardware configurations. While they explicitly consider the inner workings of the (accelerated) ray-casting method, their model implicitly learns the interplay of application and hardware, and users do not need to manually adapt the model to a given scenario. Bruder *et al.* [BLE*22] estimated time by rendering a random selection of images from poses of an arcball-style camera and using the arithmetic mean of the obtained times as the final time prediction. While this is agnostic to inner workings of methods and hardware, it requires many images to be actually rendered before being able to make a prediction, and it cannot accurately predict the rendering time of individual frames. ENTIRE can adapt to complicated scenarios with heterogeneous render times more quickly and accurately (see Sec. 4.2 for a detailed comparison).

3. Method

We now describe ENTIRE in detail. Sec. 3.1 reviews background on volume visualization and the challenges of time prediction. Sec. 3.2 introduces our two-stage model, followed by detailed descriptions of its components in Secs. 3.3 and 3.4. Finally, Sec. 3.5 presents the loss functions.

3.1. Background

During volume rendering, as a ray traverses the volume, the scalar value at each sample s is mapped to RGB color and opacity O via a transfer function. These values are then accumulated to compute the final pixel color. To optimize performance, we account for early ray termination: once the accumulated opacity reaches a




Figure 3: VolumeNet’s architecture. VolumeNet is a symmetric autoencoder with an encoder consisting of six 3D convolutional blocks followed by a fully connected (FC) layer. Each block includes a 3D convolution, batch normalization, and SELU activation [KUMH17]. The decoder mirrors the encoder but consists of 3D transposed convolutions. The encoder compresses input data into a feature vector, while the decoder reconstructs it. Layer parameters are given as *(input channels, output channels, kernel size, stride, padding)* for convolutions, *(input channels, output channels, kernel size, stride, padding, output padding)* for transposed convolutions, and *(input channels, output channels)* for FC layers. We assume an input size of 128^3 and a feature vector of dimension 4.

predefined threshold (close to 1), further sampling along the ray is halted to save computation time. As a result, rendering time is influenced by the volume’s contents (specifically, voxel opacities), the applied transfer function, and the camera pose, which determines ray traversal lengths. Additionally, we consider single-scattering as a key factor contributing to the complexity of rendering time behavior. Single-scattering models the interaction between light and the volume by accounting for light that is scattered once. Incorporating this effect into rendering time prediction introduces additional light transport considerations, impacting the accumulated color and opacity along the ray. ENTIRE takes the volume, transfer function, and camera pose as inputs, enabling an end-to-end prediction of rendering time without explicitly modeling the internal computations of the rendering pipeline.

3.2. Architecture Design

As illustrated in Fig. 2, ENTIRE consists of two stages: feature vector extraction (VolumeNet) and rendering time prediction (PredNet). Considering that our target application scenarios require interactive operations, we designed ENTIRE’s architecture to be as lightweight as possible to achieve a low memory footprint and fast inference speed.

VolumeNet (Sec. 3.3). First, the model transforms the considered volume into a feature representation by using an autoencoder, which consists of two components: an encoder and a decoder. The encoder maps the data into a feature space, while the decoder reconstructs the data by remapping the feature space back to the original data space. In our implementation, the autoencoder leverages convolutional layers, transpose convolutional layers, and fully connected layers to enhance its feature representation capabilities (the decoder is only used for training purposes).

PredNet (Sec. 3.4). At the prediction stage, the model combines the learned volume feature with camera poses (comprising position and orientation) and the transfer function. The network con-




Figure 4: PredNet’s architecture. PredNet is a multi-layer perceptron with SELU activations after each fully connected layer that takes a concatenated feature vector and rendering parameters as input, and predicts the rendering time t^{pred} .

sists of fully-connected layers only and outputs the final rendering time prediction. The rationale behind this two-stage design is that in many scenarios, multiple renderings of a single volume are generated by varying the camera position or transfer function. By decoupling the model into VolumeNet and PredNet, the volume is processed only once, allowing subsequent camera variations to rely solely on the compact feature representation, significantly reducing computational overhead.

Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show the two parts of the ENTIRE architecture based on our architecture selection which has three steps and is mainly focused on three architectural factors that influence the final prediction accuracy: (1) the resolution of the volume as input to VolumeNet, (2) the dimensionality of the feature vector describing the volume (output of VolumeNet, input to PredNet), and (3) the number of (256, 256) layers in PredNet. We aim for a model that works well across all datasets and rendering frameworks. Accordingly, we tested models on every ‘rendering framework + dataset’ scenario and calculated the relative deviation to the lowest prediction error. We finally selected the model with the lowest mean relative deviation (MRD) as the final model (see supplementary material for details, Sec. C).

3.3. VolumeNet: Feature Vector Extraction

At this stage, we extract a single feature vector from the volume using a neural network called VolumeNet (Volume feature extraction Network, see Fig. 3). VolumeNet adopts an autoencoder architecture, where the encoder learns the volume’s feature representation, and the decoder reconstructs the volume from the learned feature. For time step i , where $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, and X_i is the feature vector of volume V_i , the encoder is formulated as

$$X_i = f_{FC}^1 \left(\bigodot_{u=1 \dots 5} \varphi^u \left(I_{\langle W_u, H_u, D_u \rangle} \right) \right), \quad (1)$$

where φ^u represents the u^{th} convolutional layer, and $I_{\langle W_u, H_u, D_u \rangle}$ denotes the input tensor to each layer with shape $\langle W_u, H_u, D_u \rangle$, where W , H , and D correspond to the width, height, and depth of the input volume, respectively. The function f_{FC}^1 is a fully connected (FC) layer that projects the output of the convolutional layers to the feature vector X_i .

The decoder’s objective is to recover the contents of the volume from the feature vector (for the sake of training the encoder). After a linear projection, the feature vector is reshaped into a 3D feature

map to match the input dimensions of the 3D transposed convolutional layer. The transposed convolutional layers then produce the final predicted scalar values.

The reconstructed volume V_i^{rec} at time step i can be described as

$$V_i^{\text{rec}} = \bigodot_{v=1,\dots,6} \sigma^v(J_{\langle W_v, H_v, D_v \rangle}), \quad (2)$$

where σ is the v^{th} transposed convolutional layer, and J is the input of each layer with shape $\langle C_v, H_v, W_v \rangle$. The input $J_{\langle W_0, H_0, D_0 \rangle}$ of the transposed convolutional layers is

$$S_{\langle W_0, H_0, D_0 \rangle} = f_{\text{FC}}^2(X_i), \quad (3)$$

where $f_{\text{FC}}^2(\cdot)$ is the FC layer that projects X_i to the dimension that σ^v can process.

Fig. 3 shows VolumeNet’s implementation details. The encoder in VolumeNet consists of several convolutional layers and a linear layer for linear projection. The VolumeNet decoder that is considered during training is symmetrical to the encoder, beginning with a linear layer followed by transposed convolutional layers. Note that we downsample volumes to a resolution of 128^3 prior to passing them into PredNet for the sake of efficiency.

3.4. PredNet: Rendering Time Prediction

Camera pose. We employ arcball camera control in our work. The camera pose is represented by η , a vector consisting of rotation angles $\mathbf{R} = (R_x, R_y)$ (in degrees) and translation distance D_z along the z-axis for zooming. Throughout this work, for the sake of simplicity but without limiting the generality of our approach, the camera view is always centered on the volume; see Sec. 4.1 for details.

Transfer function representation. We adopt a transfer function design based on Gaussian lobes [KIL*03], a widely used approach that is also the default in the yt visualization library [TSO*10]. Given a scalar volume field $s \in [0, 1]$, a transfer function with m Gaussian components yields respective opacity $O(s)$ as follows:

$$O(s) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} h_i \exp\left(-\frac{(s - c_i)^2}{w_i}\right), \quad (4)$$

where h_i controls the magnitude, c_i determines the center, and w_i defines the width of each Gaussian component.

We represent the transfer function as the parameter vector:

$$\kappa = (c_0, w_0, h_0, \dots, c_{m-1}, w_{m-1}, h_{m-1}). \quad (5)$$

This compact representation captures the essential properties of the transfer function for our model.

Rendering time prediction. Our rendering time prediction network PredNet is depicted in Fig. 4. PredNet (denoted as $\psi(\cdot)$) consists exclusively of fully connected layers with non-linear activation functions. The input to the network is the concatenation of the dataset’s feature vector and the camera pose. Then, the predicted rendering time t_i^{pred} at time step i with regard to feature vector X_i , camera pose η , and transfer function κ is formulated as

$$t_i^{\text{pred}} = \psi(X_i, \eta, \kappa). \quad (6)$$

3.5. Loss Functions

The volume reconstruction loss \mathcal{L}^{rec} for VolumeNet is calculated by measuring the voxel-wise difference between the ground-truth volume V_i and its reconstructed counterpart V_i^{rec} :

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{rec}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|V_i - V_i^{\text{rec}}\|_2^2. \quad (7)$$

Since the task of predicting rendering time is inherently a regression problem, the mean squared error (MSE) serves as the most straightforward and effective loss function.

This is also the case with the objective of minimizing the difference between predicted and actual rendering times with PredNet. We quantify prediction loss via

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{pred}} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \|t_k - t_k^{\text{pred}}\|_2^2, \quad (8)$$

with K and k representing the number of frames and frame index, respectively; t_k and t_k^{pred} denote the ground-truth and predicted rendering time. \mathcal{L}^{rec} and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{pred}}$ are applied independently in the training process of Stage 1 and Stage 2, respectively (Sec. 3.2).

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental Setup

Datasets. The three datasets we employed in this paper are listed in Tab. 1. For the interactive exploration of volume, we use MAESTROeX [FNA*19]. MAESTROeX simulates low Mach number stratified flows. More specifically, we selected the white dwarf convection problem in MAESTROeX as our dataset. For distributed visualization, we use Nyx [ABL*13] and Castro [ABB*10] to generate our dataset. Nyx is a cosmological simulation. It simulates the evolution of baryonic gas coupled with an N-body treatment of the dark matter. Castro is an astrophysical hydrodynamic simulation designed to model astrophysical reacting flows. We chose Castro’s white dwarf merger problem as our dataset. To save memory space, we normalized data values in all three datasets and stored them as unsigned byte (8 bit); prior to providing volumes as input to VolumeNet, we converted the data to float values in $[-1, 1]$.

For MAESTROeX, we randomly divided its volumes into 80% for training, 10% for validation, and 10% for evaluation. We used 6 members from Nyx for training, 1 member for validation, and 1 member for evaluation. For Castro, 8 members were used for training, 1 member for validation, and 1 member for evaluation. To ensure volume diversity in our dataset, we selected every 10^{th} volume from the time series and applied varying sparsity thresholds to generate multiple variants of each selected volume, creating a dataset where volumes exhibit distinct structural characteristics. More can be found in supplementary material (Sec. B).

Renderers. To evaluate ENTIRE’s generalizability across GPU and CPU platforms, we utilized a CUDA volume raycaster running on the GPU [NVI24], and yt (implemented in Python and executed on the CPU), which is commonly used for visualizing cosmology simulation data. The CUDA raycaster uses early ray termination (with a threshold of 0.99), 1D transfer function lookup table,

Table 1: Dataset overview with dimensions $M \times T \times W \times H \times D$, where M and T are the number of members and time steps, and W, H, D are the volume’s width, height, and depth, respectively. The columns “avgRT” reports the mean rendering time in seconds along with its standard deviation in brackets. The star (*) denotes the configuration where single-scattering was applied.

Dataset	Dimension	avgRT	
		CUDA-raycaster	yt
MAESTROeX	1×2000×512×512×512	0.0138(0.0206)	21.443(33.823)
Nyx	8×600×512×512×512	0.0170(0.0283)	21.843(35.365)
		0.3340(0.3565)*	-
Castro	10×300×512×512×512	0.0124(0.1700)	21.140(33.850)

and empty space skipping for acceleration. It employs local lighting with gradients from central differences. Optionally, we further employ single-scattering with a termination threshold of 0.25. The CUDA raycaster ran on an RTX 3060 GPU desktop, while yt was executed on a cluster node with an AMD 7763 (32 threads).

Data collection. Bruder *et al.* [BMFE19] highlighted that data sampled from a camera in an arcball-style orbit provides good coverage of rendering time distributions. We followed a similar strategy. Our camera followed the surfaces of several semi-spheres with various radii. To ensure stable time measurements, each frame was rendered multiple times, and the median rendering time was taken as the final value. This is to capture performance under real-world deployment conditions (including GPU clock variations and system-level effects) rather than idealized fixed-clock scenarios. This approach also works consistently across all platforms (GPU and CPU) without requiring hardware-specific APIs or administrative privileges. Each volume was rendered 100 times with random rendering parameters to collect training data. For validation and evaluation sets, each volume was rendered 10 times using randomly chosen rendering parameters. An overview of rendering times for each dataset is presented in Tab. 1. We conducted a study to determine the optimal number of training samples per volume by analyzing how sample count impacts prediction accuracy. Our findings indicate that collecting 100 samples per volume is sufficient for training. When using fewer samples, the model struggles to learn effectively, while increasing the number beyond this threshold leads to overfitting. More details and figures are provided in the supplementary material (Sec. D).

Baseline. We employ three different baseline models in total for comparison in different contexts. First, we adopted the rendering time prediction method by Bruder *et al.* [BLE*22] as a baseline model for model performance evaluation. As discussed in Sec. 2.3, while many models rely on manual modeling tailored to specific rendering approaches and hardware [LHK*16, BFE16], ENTIRE is designed to be independent of these factors. We selected Bruder *et al.* [BLE*22]’s method because it similarly generalizes across different rendering techniques and compute architectures without requiring manual adaptation [BLE*22]. Furthermore, their approach was developed for load balancing of a collection of rendering tasks, aligning with our goal of optimizing rendering workloads (which we further investigate below in Use Case 2 (Sec. 5.2)). Following

their methodology, the baseline selects 15% of rendering jobs from a task set and estimates the final rendering time as the arithmetic mean of the sampled times.

Second, LVRP (Low Volume Resolution-based Prediction) exploits the correlation between rendering times at different volume resolutions. The method first renders volumes at low resolution (64^3) to obtain timings, then applies a pre-computed linear scaling coefficient and a bias to predict high-resolution rendering times. To determine the scaling coefficient and bias, we render the same scenes at both low and high resolutions with identical rendering parameters and fit a linear regression model to the time relationship.

Third, for ray step size control in Use Case 1 (Sec. 5.1)—where we consider an interactive exploration scenario and with this have a temporal sequence of frames—we implemented an online-learning baseline model for rendering time prediction (called OLP). This model estimates the rendering time for the current frame by computing the average over the three preceding frames. The rationale behind this approach is that rendering performance often exhibits temporal coherence, meaning that recent frames provide a strong indication of future rendering costs. This online-learning strategy allows the system to dynamically adjust in response to variations in scene complexity and transfer function changes, making it another candidate for comparison.

Evaluation setup. To evaluate ENTIRE’s prediction accuracy, we consider the root mean square error (RMSE). In addition to accuracy, we also measured the time ENTIRE required (average time per prediction in milliseconds) during inference. We use the standard deviation (STD) of prediction errors to evaluate how rendering parameters affect prediction accuracy. The reconstruction quality of VolumeNet is evaluated in peak signal to noise ratio (PSNR) in the supplementary material.

4.2. Evaluation of Rendering Time Prediction

We evaluate ENTIRE’s performance on MAESTROeX, Nyx, and Castro for yt. For the CUDA raycaster, we conducted evaluations across two scenarios on Nyx: without/with single-scattering applied. These varied scenarios were chosen to demonstrate the effectiveness of ENTIRE across different rendering techniques. Tab. 2 presents prediction accuracy and runtime across different datasets and compares ENTIRE to baselines.

Overall, we can see from Tab. 2 that ENTIRE exhibits high prediction accuracy with fast inference speed. The standard deviation reported for avgRT in Tab. 1 indicates the high fluctuation in render times, which has already been shown by example in Fig. 1. The comparison with the baseline model in Tab. 2 shows that the RMSE of the rendering time prediction of ENTIRE is substantially lower across all cases. Note that the rendering time of (CPU-based) yt is three orders of magnitudes larger than with the (GPU-based) CUDA raycaster, which is also reflected accordingly in the RMSE.

We investigate different variants with the CUDA raycaster and the Nyx dataset. Both baseline models exhibit significantly higher prediction errors compared to ENTIRE. [BLE*22]’s method assumes homogeneous rendering time behavior, which works reasonably well when rendering parameters remain relatively stable or

Table 2: Comparison of rendering time prediction accuracy in terms of RMSE (in seconds) and inference time (in milliseconds) per sample on average. For [BLE*22], since its inference time is not applicable, we did not compare its inference time here. The star (*) denotes configurations where single-scattering was applied. The best prediction results are highlighted in bold.

Framework	Dataset	ENTIRE	Bruder [BLE*22]	LVRP
		RMSE ↓ / $T_{\text{infer}}^{\text{pred}} ↓$	RMSE ↓	RMSE ↓ / $T_{\text{infer}}^{\text{pred}} ↓$
CUDA-raycaster	MAESTROeX	0.0054 / 0.275	0.0208	0.0474 / 27.595
	Nyx	0.0045 / 0.274	0.0271	0.0190 / 8.9078
	Nyx*	0.1042 / 0.270	0.3351	0.3014 / 21.375
	Castro	0.0037 / 0.271	0.0173	0.0075 / 9.3684
yt	MAESTROeX	4.337 / 0.274	34.182	20.63 / 2924.67
	Nyx	2.553 / 0.285	34.159	8.974 / 2611.74
	Castro	3.541 / 0.285	34.645	19.35 / 2755.18

when jointly considering batches of rendering tasks (as in their targeted in situ visualization scenario), but the substantial variability across individual frames (see Fig. 1) cannot be adequately captured. On the other hand, LVRP also shows significantly worse performance. Volume downsampling inherently discards fine-scale structural features that significantly influence rendering performance during raycasting. This loss is particularly severe for our cosmology simulation datasets, leading to limited predictive capability.

Our yt results in Tab. 2 show that with a different renderer and compute architecture, different characteristics can be observed. For MAESTROeX, the RMSE is slightly higher than that of Nyx and Castro, not only for ENTIRE but also the baseline model (although to a lesser extent; to some degree this is also the case with the CUDA raycaster). This indicates more complex timing behavior with this data (see Sec. E in supplementary material for details).

Notably, ENTIRE’s inference both concerning VolumeNet and PredNet induces only a small computational footprint: $T_{\text{infer}}^{\text{vol}} < 10\text{ms}$ (see supplemental material Sec. C) and $T_{\text{infer}}^{\text{pred}} < 0.5\text{ms}$, respectively. With this, they are substantially faster than generating an image using either renderer (avgRT in Tab. 1). Furthermore, an advantage of our two-stage design is that VolumeNet needs to run only once per volume and can be reused for different camera poses. In summary, our experiments show that ENTIRE consistently achieves high accuracy and fast inference across different raycasting methods and both GPU and CPU environments.

4.3. Impact of Rendering Parameters and Ablation Study

To evaluate how each rendering parameter affects prediction accuracy, we designed four controlled experiments on the Nyx dataset using the CUDA raycaster.

Quantitative analysis (Tab. 3a). Each experiment varies one rendering parameter while fixing the rest, and compares a reduced of ENTIRE not explicitly considering this parameter without against standard ENTIRE. Overall, the results demonstrate that ENTIRE consistently achieves higher accuracy than the ablated models across all parameter variations. Volume variations produce the most significant results, with prediction accuracy decreasing approximately 40× when volume feature vectors are removed. This indicates that ENTIRE’s autoencoder successfully en-

Table 3: Quantitative comparison and ablation study on the Nyx dataset using the CUDA raycaster (no single-scattering). For each pair of rows of (a), models were evaluated with one target rendering parameter varied; for (b), all rendering parameters were varied.

Model	RMSE↓	STD↓
ENTIRE	0.0010	0.0001
w/o feature vector	0.0427	0.0027
ENTIRE	0.0056	0.0001
w/o image resolution	0.021	0.0009
ENTIRE	0.0197	0.0020
w/o transfer function	0.0398	0.0040
ENTIRE	0.0146	0.0005
w/o camera pose	0.0366	0.0028

(a) Quantitative comparison

(b) Ablation study

codes volume-specific structural properties into compact 1D feature representations that are essential for distinguishing rendering performance characteristics across different volumes. As we can see from the image resolution experiments, the prediction accuracy decreased by 4× when resolution information is removed. This performance degradation confirms that image resolution is an essential factor that fundamentally determines rendering cost and cannot be omitted from accurate time prediction models. Different transfer functions can produce vastly different rendering times for the same volume and camera configuration, depending on how they map scalar values to opacity. ENTIRE’s learned transfer function representation successfully captures these non-linear effects, maintaining stable predictions. Camera pose is another critical factor for rendering time prediction. With camera pose ablated, ENTIRE showed nearly 3× degradation of prediction accuracy. Note that these experiments were designed to emphasize the impact of these parameters, and the performance impact in practical scenarios would be different (also see the ablation study below).

Qualitative analysis (Fig. 5). When only the volume varies, rendering times show substantial variation (Fig. 5a). The close alignment between predicted and ground-truth (GT) curves demonstrates that VolumeNet’s learned feature representations effectively capture the timing-relevant properties of volumes. When varying only the image resolution (Fig. 5b), ENTIRE demonstrates highly accurate predictions for low image resolution, but we observed slightly higher prediction with higher image resolution. Varying only the transfer function (Fig. 5c) or camera pose (Fig. 5d) reveals more complex timing behavior. Fig. 5c and Fig. 5d shows significant variation in timings, reflecting the transfer function and camera pose’s impact on early ray termination. Transfer functions that produce higher opacity values lead to earlier termination and faster rendering, while lower opacity settings require longer ray traversal. Similarly, camera pose determines ray traversal paths through the volume, which creates complex rendering time behavior. ENTIRE accurately accounts for these variations, including sharp peaks, demonstrating its ability to model the non-linear relationship between transfer function/camera pose and rendering performance.

Across all four parameter variations, ENTIRE consistently demonstrates accurate prediction with small errors ($< 0.02\text{s}$), validating that the model has learned meaningful relationships between




Figure 5: Performance of ENTIRE and LVRP on different scenarios. For (a), (c), and (d), the frame index is indicated on x axis. For (b), x axis indicates the image resolution.

each input factor and rendering time. However, we observe a small systematic bias: ENTIRE tends to underpredict when GT rendering times are comparably large (≈ 0.15 s). We attribute this to imbalance in the training data, where high-cost rendering scenarios comprise only a small fraction ($< 10\%$) of collected samples, which further leads to the underestimation of rare peak rendering times.

Ablation Study (Tab. 3b). To further evaluate the individual contribution of each rendering parameter to prediction accuracy, we performed ablation experiments on the Nyx dataset using the CUDA raycaster. Specifically, we evaluated ENTIRE and ablated models with all rendering parameters varied. The ablation study reveals that image resolution is the dominant factor influencing rendering time prediction (as indicated by significantly increased RMSE). The impact of the remaining parameters of (volume) feature vector, transfer function and camera pose are smaller yet still substantial. This confirms that accurate rendering time prediction requires the integration of all considered parameters.

5. Use Cases

We now discuss two use cases of ENTIRE: ray step size control (Sec. 5.1) and load balancing (Sec. 5.2). Note that in Sec. 5.1 the prediction and ray step size control are conducted on-the-fly while the evaluation in Sec. 5.2 considers rendering times collected a priori. Here we tested our use cases without single-scattering.

5.1. Steering Ray Step Size for Interactive Frame Rates

Achieving interactive frame rates reliably is essential to enable fluent exploration for many visualization tasks. In this use case, our goal is to render frames while not exceeding a certain timing bound t^{target} . The means to achieve this is by controlling the ray step size, δ , on the basis of predicted rendering time t^{pred} . For this, we experimentally determine a function $G(\cdot)$ that models the relative impact that ray step size has on rendering times. This is done by sampling rendering times of different volumes from different poses first, and normalizing them with respect to what is achieved with reference step size δ^{ref} , yielding t^{norm} (see Sec. F in supplementary material for details).

With this, controlling the step size for each frame works as presented in Alg. 1: for each *pose* along the path, obtain a time prediction from ENTIRE (which can be done in less than 0.3ms as

discussed above), and then using G we determine what adjustment to make from δ^{ref} to δ^{adapt} to eventually reach the target rendering time when rendering.

The experiments in this use case employ the CUDA raycaster and MAESTROeX. Here, we utilized the ENTIRE model trained with randomly varied transfer function configurations and without single-scattering (refer to line 1 in Tab. 2). Our study depicts a scenario where the transfer function is modified while the camera orbits around the volume. The target rendering time is set to 25 ms, corresponding to a frame rate of 40 FPS.

Results for ray step size steering based on this approach are shown in Fig. 6. ENTIRE achieves more stable frame rates compared to the baseline that employs online learning (see Sec. 4.1). As evident in Fig. 6a, ENTIRE’s rendering time prediction generally keeps the actual rendering time aligned with the target time, only barely underestimating it in few points along the sequence. In contrast, the online-learning baseline model frequently produces underestimated and inaccurate predictions, resulting in inadequate adjustments to the ray step size parameter. Critically, with Alg. 1, underestimating the induced cost by a frame results in determining a ray step size that is too small, yielding too large a rendering time. In the sequence reported in Fig. 6 this appears as pronounced peaks with rendering times that are several times longer than the target time (i.e., a practical application would experience slowdowns). Nonetheless, our conservative adaptation strategy is beneficial in most practical scenarios. Please find more details in Sec. F a demonstration video showcasing this use case in the supplementary material.

Algorithm 1: Steering ray step size. In our evaluation, we consider a camera *path* with a duration of T .

Input: *path*, T , t^{target} , G , ENTIRE, *volume*

```

1 timer.start();
2 while timer < T do
3   pose = path(timer);
4    $t^{\text{predict}} = \text{ENTIRE}(\text{volume}, \text{pose});$ 
5    $\delta^{\text{adapt}} = \delta^{\text{ref}} G^{-1}\left(\frac{t^{\text{target}}}{t^{\text{predict}}}\right);$ 
6   renderer(volume, pose,  $\delta^{\text{adapt}}$ );
7 end
```




Figure 6: Rendering time prediction, adapted ray step size δ^{adapt} , and rendering times for one time step of MAESTROeX. (a) Top: The rendering time prediction from the online learning baseline (OLP) and ENTIRE. Middle: The adapted ray step size determined by OLP and ENTIRE. Bottom: The measured rendering time. (b) Selected rendered frames. For each frame, its frame index is indicated (bottom left).




Figure 7: Load balancing use case. Boxplots show the distribution of total rendering times ($\sum_{v \in A(n)} t(v)$) across nodes $n \in N$. Lines highlight the maximum render time that determines the runtime until completion of all tasks. All rendering times are normalized with respect to the GT runtime.

5.2. Load Balancing

We now present a distributed volume rendering use case involving the CUDA renderer and the Nyx dataset. In this scenario, we generate a database of images spanning six time steps, each with 64 different camera poses along an orbit, resulting in a total of $6 \times 64 = 384$ visualization tasks. The objective is to distribute these rendering tasks across $|N|$ identical machines such that the maximum completion time across all machines (or nodes) $n \in N$ is minimized. An optimal assignment should also balance the workload evenly. Mathematically, the goal is to determine an assignment $A : N \rightarrow V$ that maps nodes N to visualization tasks V , optimizing:

$$\min_{A: N \rightarrow V} \left(\max_{n \in N} \left(\sum_{v \in A(n)} t(v) \right) \right), \quad (9)$$

where $t : v \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ provides an estimate of the anticipated rendering time for each task $v \in V$.

This problem is NP-hard, even under the assumption of identical machines. To address it, we employ the Longest Processing Time First (LPT) algorithm, a well-established greedy approach with a tight error bound [Gra69]. LPT assigns rendering tasks in descending order of cost—here, based on predicted rendering times $t(\cdot)$,—iteratively distributing them to nodes in a way that minimizes the maximum load after each step.

We compare three approaches for estimating the rendering time $t(\cdot)$ used in Eq (9): **GT**: Measured ground truth rendering times, assuming perfect predictions; **ENTIRE**: Rendering times predicted by ENTIRE; **Uniform**: All tasks are assumed to have the same (uniform) rendering time. With the Uniform approach, LPT assigns tasks in a random order, resulting in a balanced task count but potentially suboptimal scheduling.

Fig. 7 presents the results for varying numbers of nodes $|N|$, where rendering times are normalized relative to the slowest node in the GT case (i.e., the theoretical optimum from Eq (9)). Each node count $|N|$ is associated with three boxplots representing GT, ENTIRE, and Uniform, showing the distribution of total rendering times $\sum_{v \in A(n)} t(v)$ across nodes $n \in N$. The boxplots reveal that as $|N|$ increases, load imbalance grows for both ENTIRE and Uniform relative to the GT baseline. The three curves overlaid on the boxplots in Fig. 7 represent the maximum render time for each method, directly reflecting the objective value in Eq (9).

The relative difference from GT increases with $|N|$ for both ENTIRE and Uniform. While ENTIRE incurs less than 4% of additional cost compared to GT even for large $|N|$ due to its high prediction accuracy, Uniform suffers a significantly higher overhead, nearing 20%. Overall, these results highlight the effectiveness of ENTIRE in large-scale volume visualization, closely approximat-

ing the theoretical optimum while significantly reducing computational overhead.

6. Discussion

Multi-dimensional performance analysis. The evaluation in Sec. 4.2 shows that various factors influence not only the rendering time but also the prediction quality as they introduce complexity in timing behavior. Additionally, the comparison across different datasets, such as the Nyx dataset and the MAESTROeX dataset, highlights that the rendering method and dataset-specific characteristics play a significant role in rendering performance. The results obtained using the CUDA raycaster and yt show that while comparable prediction accuracy can generally be achieved, there are noticeable differences, especially in the case of the MAESTROeX dataset that require further investigation. An extended, adaptive performance assessment effort could help to account for this in future work. Specifically, we plan to incorporate ENTIRE with [BMFE19]’s method for performance assessment.

Generalization. Sec. 4.2 has demonstrated that ENTIRE can generalize without specific architecture adjustment across various configurations: different rendering codes and hardware (CUDA-raycaster on the GPU and yt on the CPU), raycasting variants (with/without single scattering), different transfer function configurations, and datasets. Furthermore, ENTIRE’s concatenation-based framework enables flexible extension of the model to the target application scenario by simply adding required input parameters. However, while ENTIRE’s design remained fixed, we trained separate models (both VolumeNet and PredNet) for the different configurations throughout this paper. Furthermore, extending to other kinds of volumes would require retraining with appropriate datasets. However, when the user is working with certain kinds of simulations where the volume data is structurally similar (e.g., when conducting parameter studies with the same simulation code), we expect the trained model to transfer with adequate prediction accuracy. The degree to which trained models generalize to other data remains to be investigated in future work.

Training efficiency. Although ENTIRE achieves accurate rendering time prediction on-the-fly, the collection of training data remains a computationally expensive process. Even with acceleration techniques such as early ray termination, and empty space skipping, collecting rendering times for Nyx’s training set required over 18 hours on the GPU. This represents a practical obstacle for users seeking to apply ENTIRE to new datasets immediately. Inspired by [HPT*21], a promising direction for future work is to train ENTIRE via online learning. Specifically, ENTIRE is trained incrementally as users render frames during exploration. Once ENTIRE reaches sufficient prediction accuracy (e.g., below a target threshold), the training process terminates. This approach combines data collection and model training, eliminating the need for dedicated upfront data collection and enabling users to apply ENTIRE to new datasets immediately. Currently, VolumeNet and PredNet are trained separately. We aim to investigate joint training strategies, which could potentially improve performance by allowing the two components to learn more cohesive representations. However, this also introduces challenges, particularly increased memory consumption and training complexity, which we plan to address.

Architecture improvements. The selected ENTIRE architecture was optimized based on performance across three scientific simulation datasets (MAESTROeX, Nyx, Castro) and two rendering platforms (CUDA, yt). For significantly different rendering setups, the ENTIRE architecture potentially might benefit from adaption, e.g., by conducting a new hyperparameter selection study. We aim to explore this in future work.

Ray Step Size Adaptation (Use Case 1). As shown in Sec. 5.1, the rendering times achieved by ENTIRE are generally slightly slower than the target times due to the simple approach how we adapt the ray step size with G . A more general and direct solution is to extend ENTIRE to additionally take the ray step size δ as an input. While this increases the model complexity and the amount and variation of training data required, this would also be the most flexible method that could further capture complex interdependencies between δ and other influence factors [BMFE19].

Load balancing (Use case 2). Sec. 5.2 shows the effectiveness of ENTIRE’s timing predictions in load-balancing in a distributed rendering scenario by demonstrating only small inefficiency in comparison to a hypothetical perfect prediction model (GT). To be able to make this comparison, we relied on measurements conducted a priori. In future work we plan to implement ENTIRE load balancing in existing distributed rendering frameworks. In doing so, we further aim to extend the investigation of ENTIRE’s utility for different use cases in parallel volume rendering [MCEF94]—especially sort-last approaches—and also evaluate them with practical experiments on clusters and large-scale compute infrastructures. Related to our targeted generalization efforts described above, we also aim to experiment with applying ENTIRE to other timing predictions tasks, e.g., with the compositing step required for sort-last methods.

Future application. We plan to explore the application and extension of ENTIRE to predict rendering quality/error alongside rendering time for given renderer parameters. With both predictions, the system could select parameter combinations (e.g., ray step size and image resolution) that lie on the Pareto frontier, achieving optimal quality within a specified time budget.

7. Conclusion

We introduced ENTIRE, a novel ML-based approach for predicting volume rendering time without requiring manual adjustments for specific rendering methods, hardware, or datasets. Our approach follows a two-stage design: (1) encoding the volume into a feature vector (VolumeNet), and (2) leveraging this representation, along with rendering parameters to predict rendering time (PredNet). We demonstrated that ENTIRE achieves both high accuracy and fast inference across diverse datasets, computing environments, and rendering techniques (even in the presence of complex interactions in single-scattering scenarios). Furthermore, we demonstrated its practical utility in two key scenarios: (1) dynamically adapting rendering parameters to optimize computational cost while maintaining performance targets, and (2) balancing workloads in distributed rendering setups to ensure efficient resource utilization.

References

- [ABB*10] ALMGREN A. S., BECKNER V. E., BELL J. B., DAY M., HOWELL L. H., JOGGERST C., LIJEWSKI M., NONAKA A., SINGER M., ZINGALE M.: Castro: A new compressible astrophysical solver. i. hydrodynamics and self-gravity. *The Astrophysical Journal* 715, 2 (2010), 1221. 5
- [ABL*13] ALMGREN A. S., BELL J. B., LIJEWSKI M. J., LUKIĆ Z., VAN ANDEL E.: Nyx: A massively parallel amr code for computational cosmology. *The Astrophysical Journal* 765, 1 (2013), 39. 5
- [AJO*14] AHRENS J., JOURDAIN S., O'LEARY P., PATCHETT J., ROGERS D. H., PETERSEN M.: An image-based approach to extreme scale in situ visualization and analysis. In *SC'14: Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis* (2014), IEEE, pp. 424–434. 1
- [BDP*10] BAGHSORKHI S. S., DELAHAYE M., PATEL S. J., GROPP W. D., HWU W.-M. W.: An adaptive performance modeling tool for GPU architectures. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGPLAN symposium on Principles and practice of parallel programming* (2010), pp. 105–114. 3
- [BFE16] BRUDER V., FREY S., ERTL T.: Real-time performance prediction and tuning for interactive volume raycasting. In *SIGGRAPH ASIA 2016 Symposium on Visualization* (2016), pp. 1–8. 1, 3, 6
- [BFE17] BRUDER V., FREY S., ERTL T.: Prediction-based load balancing and resolution tuning for interactive volume raycasting. *Visual Informatics* 1, 2 (June 2017), 106–117. 1
- [BHP15] BEYER J., HADWIGER M., PFISTER H.: State-of-the-art in GPU-based large-scale volume visualization. In *Computer Graphics Forum* (2015), vol. 34, Wiley Online Library, pp. 13–37. 1
- [BLE*22] BRUDER V., LARSEN M., ERTL T., CHILDS H., FREY S.: A hybrid in situ approach for cost efficient image database generation. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* (2022). 1, 2, 3, 6, 7
- [BMFE19] BRUDER V., MÜLLER C., FREY S., ERTL T.: On evaluating runtime performance of interactive visualizations. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* 26, 9 (2019), 2848–2862. 1, 6, 10
- [BWGM25] BAUER D., WU Q., GADIROV H., MA K.-L.: GSCache: Real-Time Radiance Caching for Volume Path Tracing using 3D Gaussian Splatting. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* (Nov. 2025). doi:10.1109/TVCG.2025.3634634. 2
- [DBE*14] DAYAL J., BRATCHER D., EISENHAEUER G., SCHWAN K., WOLF M., ZHANG X., ABBASI H., KLASKY S., PODHORSZKI N.: Flexpath: Type-based publish/subscribe system for large-scale science analytics. In *2014 14th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing* (2014), IEEE, pp. 246–255. 2
- [DK91] DOI A., KOIDE A.: An efficient method of triangulating equi-valued surfaces by using tetrahedral cells. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems* 74, 1 (1991), 214–224. 2
- [FE] FREY S., ERTL T.: Load balancing utilizing data redundancy in distributed volume rendering. In *Proceedings of the 11th Eurographics conference on Parallel Graphics and Visualization*, EGPGV '11, Eurographics Association, pp. 51–60. 1
- [FE17] FREY S., ERTL T.: Flow-based temporal selection for interactive volume visualization. In *Computer Graphics Forum* (2017), vol. 36, pp. 153–165. 2, 17
- [FNA*19] FAN D., NONAKA A., ALMGREN A. S., HARPOLE A., ZINGALE M.: Maestroex: A massively parallel low mach number astrophysical solver. *The Astrophysical Journal* 887, 2 (2019), 212. 5
- [FXZ*24] FEI B., XU J., ZHANG R., ZHOU Q., YANG W., HE Y.: 3d gaussian splatting as new era: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* (2024). 2
- [GA21] GROSSET P., AHRENS J.: Lightweight interface for in situ analysis and visualization of particle data. In *ISAV'21: In Situ Infrastructures for Enabling Extreme-Scale Analysis and Visualization*. 2021, pp. 12–17. 2
- [Gra69] GRAHAM R. L.: Bounds on multiprocessing timing anomalies. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 17, 2 (1969), 416–429. arXiv: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0117039>. 9
- [GRF25] GADIROV H., ROERDINK J. B. T. M., FREY S.: FLINT: Learning-based flow estimation and temporal interpolation for scientific ensemble visualization. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* (2025). 3
- [GWB*25] GADIROV H., WU Q., BAUER D., MA K.-L., ROERDINK J. B. T. M., FREY S.: HyperFLINT: Hypernetwork-based flow estimation and temporal interpolation for scientific ensemble visualization. *Computer Graphics Forum* 43, 3 (2025). 3
- [HCX*22] HE K., CHEN X., XIE S., LI Y., DOLLÁR P., GIRSHICK R.: Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (2022), pp. 16000–16009. 17
- [HPT*21] HERVEAU K., PFAFFE P., TILLMANN M., TICHY W. F., DACHSBACHER C.: Analysis of acceleration structure parameters and hybrid autotuning for ray tracing. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 29, 2 (2021), 1345–1356. 10
- [IDSSM05] IPEK E., DE SUPINSKI B. R., SCHULZ M., MCKEE S. A.: An approach to performance prediction for parallel applications. In *Euro-Par 2005 Parallel Processing: 11th International Euro-Par Conference, Lisbon, Portugal, August 30-September 2, 2005. Proceedings 11* (2005), Springer, pp. 196–205. 3
- [KB15] KINGMA D., BA J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (San Diego, CA, USA, 2015). 13
- [KIL*03] KNISS J., IKITS M., LEFOHN A., HANSEN C., PRAUN E., ET AL.: Gaussian transfer functions for multi-field volume visualization. In *IEEE Visualization, 2003. VIS 2003.* (2003), IEEE, pp. 497–504. 5
- [KKLD23] KERBL B., KOPANAS G., LEIMKÜHLER T., DRETTAKIS G.: 3d gaussian splatting for real-time radiance field rendering. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 42, 4 (2023), 139–1. 2
- [KUMH17] KLAMBAUER G., UNTERTHINER T., MAYR A., HOCHREITER S.: Self-normalizing neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017). 4
- [LBdS*07] LEE B. C., BROOKS D. M., DE SUPINSKI B. R., SCHULZ M., SINGH K., MCKEE S. A.: Methods of inference and learning for performance modeling of parallel applications. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGPLAN symposium on Principles and practice of parallel programming* (2007), pp. 249–258. 3
- [LC98] LORENSEN W. E., CLINE H. E.: Marching cubes: A high resolution 3d surface construction algorithm. In *Seminal graphics: pioneering efforts that shaped the field*. 1998, pp. 347–353. 2
- [LH17] LOSHCILOV I., HUTTER F.: SGDR: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. In *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2017). 13
- [LHK*16] LARSEN M., HARRISON C., KRESS J., PUGMIRE D., MEREDITH J. S., CHILDS H.: Performance modeling of in situ rendering. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis* (2016), pp. 1–12. 1, 3, 6
- [MCEF94] MOLNAR S., COX M., ELLSWORTH D., FUCHS H.: A sorting classification of parallel rendering. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* 14, 4 (1994), 23–32. doi:10.1109/38.291528. 10
- [MST*21] MILDENHALL B., SRINIVASAN P. P., TANCIC M., BARRON J. T., RAMAMOORTHY R., NG R.: NeRF: Representing scenes as neural radiance fields for view synthesis. *Communications of the ACM* 65, 1 (2021), 99–106. 2
- [NMOG19] NIEMEYER M., MESCHERER L., OECHSLE M., GEIGER A.: Occupancy flow: 4d reconstruction by learning particle dynamics. In *International Conference on Computer Vision* (Oct. 2019). 3
- [NVI24] NVIDIA: Cuda samples, 2024. Accessed: 2024-10-03. URL: <https://github.com/NVIDIA/cuda-samples>. 5
- [PNM*20] PENG S., NIEMEYER M., MESCHERER L., POLLEFEYS M., GEIGER A.: Convolutional occupancy networks. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part III* 16 (2020), Springer, pp. 523–540. 2

- [PXvO*19] PORTER W. P., XING Y., VON OHLEN B. R., HAN J., WANG C.: A deep learning approach to selecting representative time steps for time-varying multivariate data. In *2019 IEEE Visualization Conference (VIS)* (2019), IEEE, pp. 1–5. [17](#)
- [RHI*14] RIZZI S., HERELD M., INSLEY J., PAPKA M. E., URAM T., VISHWANATH V.: Performance modeling of vl3 volume rendering on GPU-based clusters. In *Proceedings of the 14th Eurographics Symposium on Parallel Graphics and Visualization* (2014), pp. 65–72. [3](#)
- [Rot82] ROTH S. D.: Ray casting for modeling solids. *Computer graphics and image processing* 18, 2 (1982), 109–144. [2](#)
- [RPLG21] REISER C., PENG S., LIAO Y., GEIGER A.: KiloNeRF: Speeding up neural radiance fields with thousands of tiny MLPs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision* (2021), pp. 14335–14345. [2](#)
- [SSX08] SODHI S., SUBHLOK J., XU Q.: Performance prediction with skeletons. *Cluster Computing* 11 (2008), 151–165. [3](#)
- [TFM*17] TKACHEV G., FREY S., MÜLLER C., BRUDER V., ERTL T.: Prediction of distributed volume visualization performance to support render hardware acquisition. In *EGPGV@ EuroVis* (2017), pp. 11–20. [1](#), [3](#)
- [TFT*20] TEWARI A., FRIED O., THIES J., SITZMANN V., LOMBARDI S., SUNKAVALLI K., MARTIN-BRUALLA R., SIMON T., SARAGIH J., NIESSNER M., ET AL.: State of the art on neural rendering. In *Computer Graphics Forum* (2020), vol. 39, Wiley Online Library, pp. 701–727. [2](#)
- [TSO*10] TURK M. J., SMITH B. D., OISHI J. S., SKORY S., SKILLMAN S. W., ABEL T., NORMAN M. L.: yt: A multi-code analysis toolkit for astrophysical simulation data. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* 192, 1 (2010), 9. [5](#), [13](#)
- [TW24] TANG K., WANG C.: Ecnr: Efficient compressive neural representation of time-varying volumetric datasets. In *2024 IEEE 17th Pacific Visualization Conference (PacificVis)* (2024), IEEE Computer Society, pp. 72–81. [3](#)
- [WBCM23] WU Q., BAUER D., CHEN Y., MA K.-L.: Hyperinr: A fast and predictive hypernetwork for implicit neural representations via knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04188* (2023). [3](#)
- [WGL*15] WU G., GREATHOUSE J. L., LYASHEVSKY A., JAYASENA N., CHIOU D.: GPGPU performance and power estimation using machine learning. In *2015 IEEE 21st international symposium on high performance computer architecture (HPCA)* (2015), IEEE, pp. 564–576. [3](#)
- [WHW22] WEISS S., HERMÜLLER P., WESTERMANN R.: Fast neural representations for direct volume rendering. In *Computer Graphics Forum* (2022), vol. 41, Wiley Online Library, pp. 196–211. [3](#)
- [WW03] WIMMER M., WONKA P.: Rendering time estimation for real-time rendering. In *Rendering Techniques* (2003), pp. 118–129. [3](#)
- [WSS19] WANG K.-C., WEI T.-H., SHAREEF N., SHEN H.-W.: Ray-based exploration of large time-varying volume data using per-ray proxy distributions. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 26, 11 (2019), 3299–3313. [2](#)
- [WYZ*24] WU T., YUAN Y.-J., ZHANG L.-X., YANG J., CAO Y.-P., YAN L.-Q., GAO L.: Recent advances in 3d gaussian splatting. *Computational Visual Media* 10, 4 (2024), 613–642. [2](#)
- [YYTK21] YU A., YE V., TANCIK M., KANAZAWA A.: pixelNeRF: Neural radiance fields from one or few images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (2021), pp. 4578–4587. [2](#)
- [ZO11] ZHANG Y., OWENS J. D.: A quantitative performance analysis model for GPU architectures. In *2011 IEEE 17th international symposium on high performance computer architecture* (2011), IEEE, pp. 382–393. [3](#)

Supplementary Material

A. Implementation

ENTIRE is implemented in PyTorch. We employed the Adam optimizer [KB15] and trained our model using the cosine annealing learning rate decay strategy [LH17]. Adam’s momentum settings are $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$. To prevent overfitting, early stopping was applied to halt the training process once the validation loss ceased to decrease. Additionally, we applied gradient clipping with a maximum norm of 1.0 to avoid gradient explosion. VolumeNet was trained for 200 epochs and evaluated on an Nvidia A100 GPU, with batch size of 16 and decreasing learning rate in range $[10^{-3}, 10^{-5}]$. PredNet was trained for 200 epochs and tested on an Nvidia RTX 3060 GPU. We set PredNet’s decreasing learning rate to $[10^{-4}, 10^{-6}]$. Training VolumeNet required approximately 2.5 hours, while it only took a few minutes for PredNet.

B. Scientific Dataset

Examples from the employed datasets can be found in Fig. 8. For MAESTROeX, the volume exhibits significant changes during the early stages, then stabilizes in the middle and late phases. Nyx shows relatively consistent evolution throughout all time steps. In Castro, sharp changes occur initially, particularly during the merger of two white dwarfs; then the volume enters an oscillatory phase. We provide three videos for each dataset to illustrate their evolution over time. Fig. 9 presents the datasets used in this study, rendered by CUDA raycaster and yt [TSO*10].

C. Architecture Selection

Here, we describe how we selected the final ENTIRE architecture.

To develop a model that generalizes effectively across all three datasets, we trained ENTIRE on the combined data from MAESTROeX, Nyx, and Castro. The architecture selection followed a two-stage process: First, we evaluated VolumeNet architectures by comparing volume reconstruction quality (measured by PSNR) and the dimension of feature vectors for the best rendering time prediction accuracy. Second, we determined the optimal number of fully-connected layers for PredNet through the evaluation of prediction performance. Below, we refer to architecture variants in a shorthand form, such as $128^3F16 \rightarrow 5C256$, where:

F is used to indicate the resolution of the input volume and the dimensionality of the volume feature vector. For instance, 128^3F16 indicates a volume of dimension 128^3 encoded into a feature vector of length 16.

C depicts fully-connected layers. It is preceded by the number of layers, and followed by the number of channels of the first layer; the number of channels repeats for each following layer. For instance, $16C256$ denotes 16 repeated fully-connected layers, with the input and output size of 256; see Fig. 4. Note that PredNet’s rest layers are not explicitly represented in this notation. Each layer’s dimension is halved with respect to its previous layer.

\rightarrow denotes the transition between a feature vector and fully-connected layers.

Accordingly, $128^3F16 \rightarrow 5C256$ means that VolumeNet considers volumes with a resolution of 128^3 and the output feature

vector’s dimension is 16. The corresponding PredNet has 5 fully-connected layers as described above.

(1) Volume resolution. We tested with volume resolutions 64^3 and 128^3 . Training VolumeNet on volumes with higher resolutions took more than 15 hours, which we consider to be impracticable in our target application scenarios. Note that all volumes for training and testing here were downsampled from the original full volumes, and that this downsampling only applies to VolumeNet input (i.e., in order to obtain the feature vector describing the volume). The rendering time measurements used to train PredNet are captured with the original volume size. We experimented with five different feature vector sizes $\{16, 32, 64, 128, 256\}$ and four $C256$ layers.

For VolumeNet, increasing the input volume resolution consistently led to improved volume reconstruction quality. Interestingly, a higher input volume resolution to VolumeNet does not necessarily lead to a higher prediction accuracy. Tab. 4 indicates for CUDA raycaster and yt that ENTIRE showed its best performance with 128^3 . From Tab. 4, we observe that prediction accuracy is jointly influenced by both input volume resolution and feature vector dimensionality. When the input resolution is high but the feature vector dimension is low, the resulting feature vector may fail to capture sufficient structural information, thus reducing prediction accuracy. Moreover, higher input resolution significantly increases training cost—up to a $5\times$ increase for 128^3 volumes.

(2) Feature vector dimension. From Tab. 4, we see that for the CUDA raycaster, ENTIRE’s best volume resolution and feature vector dimension combinations are 128^3F16 . For yt, the best combinations is 64^3F32 .

The final prediction accuracy decreased as F grew from 16 for CUDA-raycaster and 32 for yt. To further explore the feature vector dimension’s effect on prediction accuracy, we took the models from Tab. 4 which have the best performance and used them as the baseline model. If F in the baseline model is 16, then we decreased it until ENTIRE’s prediction accuracy showed a downward trend. The results are presented in Tab. 5. Note that, as the optimal configuration of volume resolution and feature vector dimension for yt has already been identified as 64^3F32 , we did not include further experiments for this setting in Tab. 5. Surprisingly, reducing feature vector dimensionality yielded higher prediction accuracy. We decreased feature dimension from 16 to 2, finding that each reduction improved performance. Although further reduction to $F = 1$ was theoretically possible, a single scalar cannot adequately represent the complex structural variations across volumes, so we set $F = 2$ as the minimum viable dimension.

Overall, the best input volume size and feature vector dimension for the CUDA raycaster are 128^3F4 , 64^3F16 , and 128^3F16 for MAESTROeX, Nyx, and Castro. For yt, the best input volume size and feature vector dimension are 64^3F32 . On the one hand, if F is too low, it fails to adequately encode the volume features.

When the feature vector dimension F becomes very high, it may include volume features that are less relevant or redundant with respect to rendering time. This can introduce noise or shift the model’s focus away from features that are more predictive, such as camera pose or specific volume regions influencing ray traversal. Consequently, the model’s ability to generalize across varying




Figure 8: Examples for MAESTROeX (top row), Nyx (middle row), and Castro (bottom row).

Table 4: PSNR and inference time (T_{infer}^{vol}) of VolumeNet and Prediction RMSE values of PredNet. Best prediction results are highlighted in bold.

Res	F=16			F=32			F=64			F=128			F=256		
	PSNR \uparrow / T_{infer}^{vol} \downarrow	RMSE \downarrow		PSNR \uparrow / T_{infer}^{vol} \downarrow	RMSE \downarrow		PSNR \uparrow / T_{infer}^{vol} \downarrow	RMSE \downarrow		PSNR \uparrow / T_{infer}^{vol} \downarrow	RMSE \downarrow		PSNR \uparrow	RMSE \downarrow	
		CUDA-raycaster	yt		CUDA-raycaster	yt		CUDA-raycaster	yt		CUDA-raycaster	yt		CUDA-raycaster	yt
64x64x64	27.85/1.994	0.0080	3.879	28.07/1.987	0.0081	3.823	28.37/1.835	0.0083	3.885	28.44 /1.983	0.0086	3.911	28.40/1.880	0.0088	3.928
128x128x128	27.28/9.733	0.0071	3.853	27.42/5.769	0.0080	3.868	27.62/5.786	0.0078	3.931	27.74/6.410	0.0084	3.922	27.75/5.710	0.0086	3.890




Figure 9: Example renderings with the CUDA raycaster (top) and yt (bottom) of datasets employed in this paper.

camera configurations may diminish, leading to reduced prediction accuracy. This suggests that it is not simply the size of the feature vector, but the relevance and quality of the extracted features that determine overall performance. A qualitative comparison of VolumeNet is shown in Fig. 10.

(3) **PredNet architecture selection.** We now aim to determine a




Figure 10: Comparison of GT (top row) and VolumeNet's reconstruction (bottom row).

good balance between the final prediction accuracy and PredNet's inference speed by considering the number of C256 layers in PredNet. We started without C256 layers, and continued increasing the

Table 5: Further investigation of feature vector dimension. We highlighted the best prediction results in bold.

Model	PSNR \uparrow /T $_{\text{infer}}^{\text{vol}}$ \downarrow	RMSE \uparrow
		CUDA-raycaster
128 ³ F2	26.14/5.670	0.0049
128 ³ F4	26.82/5.700	0.0051
128 ³ F8	27.03/5.776	0.0070
128 ³ F16	27.27 /9.733	0.0071

Table 6: Comparison of RMSE of different PredNet architectures and inference time T $_{\text{infer}}^{\text{pred}}$. Best predictions are in bold.

PredNet	RMSE \downarrow /T $_{\text{infer}}^{\text{pred}}$ \downarrow	
	CUDA-raycaster	yt
18C256	0.0045/0.364	-
16C256	0.0046/0.324	-
14C256	0.0045/0.308	-
12C256	0.0045 /0.276	-
10C256	0.0046/0.244	3.917/0.244
8C256	0.0046/0.219	3.925/0.222
6C256	0.0047/0.190	3.949/0.190
4C256	0.0048/0.163	3.823 /0.165
2C256	0.0054/0.133	3.956/0.133
0C256	0.0078/0.104	4.086/0.107

count until PredNet stopped improving (see Tab. 6). The overall trend is that as PredNet gets deeper, the prediction accuracy increases and reaches its peak. Then, the prediction accuracy of PredNet stopped increasing and started to decline due to overfitting.

For the CUDA raycaster, the optimal ENTIRE architectures are 128³F2 \rightarrow 12C256. For yt, the optimal ENTIRE architectures are 64³F32 \rightarrow 4C256. As expected, the model with the least number of layers has the fastest inference speed.

Final model selection. We have two “optimal” models in total (one for each renderer). To select one model that performs well across all scenarios and datasets, we trained these two model architectures for both the CUDA raycaster and yt rendering scenarios on all datasets. Then, we compared the prediction accuracy of each model with the best performance by calculating relative deviations. The model with the lowest mean relative deviation was selected as our final model. As shown in Tab. 7, the optimal model is 128³F2 \rightarrow 12C256.

Overall, our model architecture selection shows that good performance can be achieved across a range of considered model configurations and scenarios.

D. Study on the Number of Training Samples

We examined the effect of training sample size on prediction accuracy and demonstrated that collecting 100 rendering time measurements per volume is sufficient for training ENTIRE. For this study, we used the Nyx dataset with the CUDA-raycaster renderer. ENTIRE was evaluated under two scenarios: (1) without single-scattering, and (2) with single-scattering applied. Their results are

Table 7: Comparison of RMSE of different PredNet architectures and inference time T $_{\text{infer}}^{\text{pred}}$. They are separated by “/”. “ \diamond ” indicates that the results were from the baseline model. RD denotes relative deviation from the best prediction and MRD is each model’s mean value of relative deviations. We highlighted the best prediction accuracy and MRD in bold.

Renderer	RMSE \downarrow /T $_{\text{infer}}^{\text{pred}}$ \downarrow /RD \downarrow	
	128 ³ F2 \rightarrow 12C256	64F32 \rightarrow 4C256
CUDA-raycaster	\diamond 0.0045 /0.276/0%	0.0079/0.163/74.7%
yt	3.869/0.291/1.2%	\diamond 3.823 /0.165/0%
MRD	0.6%	37.4%




Figure 11: RMSE evaluated with varying numbers of training samples. For each number of training samples, the experiment was conducted five times. The experiments demonstrated that the collected training samples are sufficient for training PredNet.

presented in Fig. 11. For all scenarios, ENTIRE was trained on a subset by selecting fewer samples from the full training set. The ratio of samples used in comparison to the full set (γ) ranged from 10% to 90%. Accordingly, $\gamma = 100\%$ means the full set was employed for training PredNet. Each experiment was conducted five times, with randomly selecting samples from the full training set at the same number of training samples.

For the scenarios with and without single-scattering, we observed that the RMSE decreased more slowly once the sampling ratio reached 0.6. This suggests that increasing the number of training samples beyond this point yields diminishing returns in prediction accuracy, even in the more complex case where single-scattering is applied. Thus, we demonstrate that collecting 100 samples per volume is sufficient to effectively train PredNet.

E. Prediction Error Distribution Analysis

In this section, we analyze the prediction error distribution of ENTIRE. Fig. 12 presents both the rendering time distributions (top) and squared prediction error distributions (bottom) across all datasets for the CUDA raycaster and yt renderer. For the CUDA raycaster without single-scattering, all datasets exhibit tight, consistent distributions with minimal outliers, indicating stable and predictable GPU rendering performance. However, once single-scattering was applied (Nyx*), we observed significantly increased




Figure 12: Prediction error distribution. (a) CUDA raycaster. (b) yt. * indicates single-scattering was applied. Note the logarithmic scales.

diversity in timing behavior, with a broader distribution and more frequent outliers extending to higher rendering times. This increased variability makes the prediction task considerably more challenging.

For yt, all three datasets display similar rendering time distributions, which aligns with the comparable prediction errors reported in Tab. 2. We observed that some outliers reach extremely high values (>400 s), which can be attributed to our yt rendering being executed on a shared cluster where computational resources are occasionally overloaded due to concurrent jobs. We deliberately retain these outliers in our training data, as such performance variability represents realistic conditions when executing massive rendering tasks on supercomputers and HPC systems.

The squared error distributions (bottom row) quantify ENTIRE’s prediction accuracy. For CUDA raycaster, MAESTROeX, Nyx, and Castro achieve low squared errors with tight distributions. Nyx with single-scattering exhibits elevated squared errors. While single-scattering shows numerically larger prediction errors due to more diverse timing distributions (similar to how CPU-based yt rendering shows wider distributions than GPU), ENTIRE maintains comparable prediction quality across all scenarios. The higher absolute RMSE for single-scattering reflects the increased variability in the underlying rendering times rather than degraded model performance. For yt, all three datasets show similar error distributions. Overall, the distribution of prediction errors aligns well with the rendering time behavior and the quantitative results reported in Tab. 2.

F. More Results for Use Case 1

In Fig. 13a, we present all measured curves; the curve G that we use for final ray step size adaptation results from their median value at each ray step size. Notably, while the absolute rendering times vary, the overall trends remain consistent across all curves. In our implementation, we access G via a lookup table using linear interpolation (see Fig. 13b). Fig. 14 shows three example poses for acquiring the look up table.




Figure 13: Our proposed ray step size adaption method. (a) Sampled δ -norm curves. Time step and sample index pairs are denoted in the form of (time step, sample index) in the legend. (b) Linear interpolation on $G(\delta)$; G' depicts the theoretical GT curve.




Figure 14: Three poses for obtaining $G(\cdot)$.

We developed an interactive widget for Use Case 1 based on the CUDA-raycaster. The widget comprises two primary components: a panel for transfer function adjustment and a rendering window that supports interactive volume exploration. The measured frame rate is displayed in real time for each rendered frame.

Fig. 15 presents the user interface designed for interactive volume exploration while maintaining a target frame rate. The user can manipulate the volume in real time and adjust the transfer function using the slider in the control panel. The resulting frame rate is displayed at the bottom of the interface, providing immediate feedback on performance. A respective demonstration of user interaction with and without ray step size adjustment is included in the accompanying video.

G. Further Discussion of Limitations and Future Work

Sec. 4 demonstrates that ENTIRE generally exhibits high prediction accuracy with fast inference speed for the challenging render time prediction problem across different rendering codes and compute platforms, transfer function representations, datasets, and rendering methods (no / single scattering); Sec. 5 then showcases the utility of ENTIRE by means of two use cases. Here, we would like to extend upon our discussion of limitations and future work from Sec. 6.

Generalization. Besides what has been discussed in Sec. 6, in future work, we aim to further investigate the implications of training a single combined model across these variations that is able to exploit commonalities across different variants. This could significantly facilitate the deployment of ENTIRE in practical scenarios such that no dedicated training is required but in a way the pre-trained weights can be used to achieve usable results already. While with our data feature vector we can account for different volume




Figure 15: Screenshot of the widget for use case 1. The panel for transfer function adjustment and rendering time prediction model selection is placed at the top-left. The measured frame rate is displayed the bottom of the panel. The rendered volume is shown at the center of the window.

data, similar means would be necessary to represent the other influence factors in such a generic model. For example, for taking into account different compute hardware, we plan to capture relevant characteristics using micro-benchmarks; data resolution and ray step sizes could further be supplemented via additional model parameters. Note, however, that this spans an increasingly high-dimensional parameter space that needs to be sampled adequately for efficient training (see the training efficiency discussion below). Another, complementary effort regarding generalization involves investigating the effectiveness of ENTIRE in predicting timings from other kinds of (rendering) methods in the context of computer graphics—i.e., for mesh-based data, potentially including global illumination approaches—or parallel volume rendering (see the discussion below on load balancing).

Training Efficiency. In time series data such as used in this work, consecutive volumes often exhibit a high degree of similarity, leading to redundancy in our training dataset. To address this, we plan to explore time step selection algorithms as a promising direction (e.g., [FE17, PXvO*19]). Finally, we considered one example of using fewer training samples in Sec. 4.2, and we aim to further systematically investigate the impact of the number of training samples on prediction accuracy (see Section D for initial results).

Architecture Improvements. We also aim to enhance VolumeNet’s feature representation by leveraging recent advances in autoencoder architectures. For instance, Kaiming *et al.* [HCX*22] demonstrated the effectiveness of an asymmetric autoencoder with a reduced decoder, trained on randomly masked images. Investigating similar architectures could further refine the volume encoding process and improve the overall predictive accuracy of ENTIRE.