COPYRIGHT NOTICE

UB ResearchOnline
<http://researchonline.ballarat.edu.au>

This the accepted version of Calibration of an articulated CMM using stochastic approximations.

The final publication is available at link.springer.com and via

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00170-012-3898-5>

Copyright 2012 Springer Science+Business Media

Calibration of an articulated CMM using stochastic approximations

Ibrahim A. Sultan
Prajeesh Puthiyaveettil

School of Science, Information Technology and Engineering
University of Ballarat
PO Box 663,
Ballarat Victoria 3353, Australia

Abstract

A coordinate measuring machine (CMM) is meant to digitise the spatial locations of points and feed the resulting measurements to a CAD system for storing and processing. For reliable utilisation of a CMM, a calibration procedure is often undertaken to eliminate the inaccuracies which result from manufacturing, assembly and installation errors. In this paper, an Immersion digitizer coordinate measuring machine (IDCMM) has been calibrated using an accurately manufactured master cuboid fixture. This CMM has been designed as an articulated manipulator to enhance its dexterity and versatility. As such, the calibration problem is tackled with the aid of a kinematic model similar to those employed for the analysis of serial robots. In addition, a stochastic-based optimisation technique is used to identify the parameters of the kinematic model in order for the accurate performance to be achieved. The experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of this method, whereby the measuring accuracy has been improved considerably.

Introduction

In the context of this paper, positioning accuracy of a kinematic structure is the difference between its actual and calculated positions. This difference is attributed to both geometric and non geometric factors. The geometric factors are manifested by the deviation of the structure kinematic parameters from the values stored in the mathematical model. On the other hand, the non geometric factors are represented by such notions as link flexibility and sensor offsets. Positioning accuracy can be improved by proper calibration techniques, which consider both geometric and non geometric sources of error, as evident by the works of many

authors; e.g. Judd and Knasinsky (1987), Driels and Pathre (1991), Khali. and Besnard (2002) and Bai and Wang (2006).

Some methods which have been proposed in the literature to calibrate manipulators are adequately simple and efficient to be considered for application in the field of CMM. For example, Veitschegger and Wu (1987) designed and used a special tool, based on an accurately machined plate equipped with a set of precisely-located holes, to calibrate a PUMA 560 robot. Similarly, Lim and Burdekin (2002) used a precisely machined artefact for CMM calibration. This artefact was aligned precisely at 17 positions for an adequate number of data points to be collected. Also, Foulloy and Kelly (1984) report a method which employs a specially machined cube equipped with 25 precision holes and an accurate insertion tool for robot calibration. The paper by Sultan and Wager (2002) presents an approach which allowed the robotic structure to rotate about one joint-axis at a time in order for this specific axis to be individually located in space. The sequential application of this technique produced the required kinematic information for the whole structure. While suitable for robots, whose individual joints can be locked at any desired position, this method may not be applicable for CMM applications if such functionality is not provided.

In the current paper a simplified approach is presented and applied for the calibration of the Immersion digitizer manipulator-like CMM. This machine is accurate enough to be utilised in medical applications as evident by the work of Reisner et al (2007). However, over a period of time, its accuracy may be adversely affected by relocation, overuse and environmental and working conditions. The basic premise in this paper is to calibrate the device by combining an inexpensive but accurately machined fixture with a kinematic model constructed as described by the well-known Denavit-Hartenberg formulation (1955). Despite its obvious simplicity, this formulation has been shown, by authors such as Sultan and Wager (1999) and Mooring et al (1991), to be mathematically unstable if used for calibration models which feature gradient-based optimisation techniques. In fact, the model's Jacobian matrix will become singular if two consecutive joint-axes, on the kinematic structure, are parallel. On the other hand, the stochastic optimisation technique adopted in this paper does not require the use of a Jacobian matrix and as such is not expected to exhibit singular behaviour. This optimisation technique is referred to as Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation (SPSA). This approach is efficient and suited for intricate optimisation application as abundantly explained in literature, e.g. the excellent papers by Spall (1992 and 1998) and the interesting application presented by Kothandaraman and Rotea (2005).

Kinematic Description of the IDCMM

Figure 1. Photograph of the CMM under study

The photo in Figure 1 shows the manufactured structure of the IDCMM featured in this paper. The machine, which has been patented by Schena and Rosenberg (1997), is essentially a 5-axis revolute-joint (i.e. 5R) serial manipulator with a high degree of dexterity. A displacement transducer is fitted to each joint axis to report the current value of joint angle to a software package provided by the manufacturer. The intended structure of the IDCMM consists of joints whose axes are either parallel or perpendicular in order to simplify the kinematic model of the machine. However, manufacturing and assembly errors may result in

deviations from the intended kinematic structure. As such, Figure 2 is provided to demonstrate a generic kinematical representation of a 5R serial manipulator similar to the CMM under study.

Figure 2. A kinematical representation of the CMM under study

In Figure 2, the centreline of each revolute joint is defined by a spatial axis, Z_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$). The centreline of the stylus is meant to coincide with the axis Z_6 . However, the stylus tip, point P , is assumed not to fall on Z_6 in order for generality to be ensured. The relative positions of the joint-axes with respect to each others may be formulated by using the well known DH-matrices which have been described by Denavit and Hartenberg (1955). A DH-matrix is usually established to perform homogeneous transformation between two adjacent Cartesian frames as shown in Figure 3.

In kinematical analysis, the Z -axes of frames are usually made to coincide with the joint-axes and the X_i -axis is the common normal directed from Z_i to Z_{i+1} . Generally, a frame, $X_{i+1}Y_{i+1}Z_{i+1}$, can be transformed into an adjacent frame, $X_iY_iZ_i$, by the following DH-parameters:

θ_i , which is the angle from X_i to X_{i+1} , as measured in a right-hand sense about Z_i ,

α_i , which is the angle from Z_i to Z_{i+1} as measured in a right-hand sense about X_{i+1} ,

d_i , which is distance from X_i to X_{i+1} , as measured along Z_i ,

a_i , which is the distance from Z_i to Z_{i+1} , as measured along X_{i+1}

Figure 3. The DH-parameters

For each revolute joint, all the DH-parameters are constant, except θ_i , which varies with the rotational motion occurring about the joint-axis. The DH-matrix, $\mathbf{T}_{i+1}^i$, which performs the transformation from the frame number $i + 1$ to the frame number i , is given as follows;

$$\mathbf{T}_{i+1}^i = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta_i) & -\cos(\alpha_i)\sin(\theta_i) & \sin(\alpha_i)\sin(\theta_i) & a_i \cos(\theta_i) \\ \sin(\theta_i) & \cos(\alpha_i)\cos(\theta_i) & -\sin(\alpha_i)\cos(\theta_i) & a_i \sin(\theta_i) \\ 0 & \sin(\alpha_i) & \cos(\alpha_i) & d_i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

To this end, the overall matrix, $\mathbf{T}$, which expresses the stylus frame, $X_6Y_6Z_6$, with respect to the base frame, $X_1Y_1Z_1$, can be calculated as follows;

$$\mathbf{T} = \prod_{i=1}^5 \mathbf{T}_{i+1}^i \quad (2)$$

Let a unit vector, $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_6$, be aligned with the stylus axis, Z_6 . This unit vector may be expressed, with respect to the base frame, as the top three entries of the third column of the matrix $\mathbf{T}$ as follows;

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_6 = [\mathbf{T}_{02} \quad \mathbf{T}_{12} \quad \mathbf{T}_{22}]^T \quad (3)$$

Moreover, the spatial position of the stylus tip can be expressed with respect to the base frame by a vector, $\mathbf{p} = [\mathbf{p}_x, \mathbf{p}_y, \mathbf{p}_z]$, which can be calculated as follows;

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_x \\ \mathbf{p}_y \\ \mathbf{p}_z \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{T} \begin{bmatrix} h_x \\ h_y \\ h_z \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

where h_x , h_y and h_z are the x-, y- and z- coordinates of the stylus tip with respect to the frame $X_6Y_6Z_6$.

The SPSA Approach

SPSA stands for Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation as pointed out by Spall (1992). The approach is meant to minimise a loss function, $f(\Phi)$, which corresponds to a given design vector, Φ . This loss function can be expressed as follows;

$$f(\Phi) = L(\Phi) + \varepsilon(\Phi) \quad (5)$$

where $L(\Phi)$ is the actual value of the function and $\varepsilon(\Phi)$ is the measurement noise.

Let an iterative procedure be undertaken to find the values of the design variables which will minimise the loss function. Assume that, at the start of iteration number k , the vector of design variables has been previously estimated as $\hat{\Phi}^k$ (where, in this context, the symbol $\hat{\cdot}$ signifies estimates). To this end, the gradient, $g_q(\hat{\Phi}^k)$, of the loss function with respect to a specific design variable, Φ_q , may be approximated by the following expression;

$$g_q(\hat{\Phi}^k) = \frac{f(\hat{\Phi}^k + C_k \Delta^k) - f(\hat{\Phi}^k - C_k \Delta^k)}{2C_k \Delta_q^k} \quad (6)$$

where the entries of the vector Δ are randomly assigned the values of either +1 or -1 as generated, at every iteration, by a binary Bernoulli distribution. Mathematically, this is expressed as follows;

$$\Delta_q^k = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{with prob 0.5} \\ -1 & \text{with prob 0.5} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

As such, the value of Φ_q can be estimated, at the end of iteration k , by the following expression,

$$\hat{\Phi}_q^{k+1} = \hat{\Phi}_q^k - r_k g_q(\hat{\Phi}^k) \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{\Phi}_q^k$ is the estimated value of Φ_q at the start of iteration number k . The scalar parameters, r_k and C_k , in equations (6) and (8) are the sequence gains which are calculated at iteration number k as follows;

$$r_k = \frac{R}{(B + k)^{0.602}} \quad (9)$$

and

$$C_k = \frac{C}{k^{0.101}} \quad (10)$$

Spall (1998) suggests that the stability constant, B in equation (9), may be calculated as $0.1K$, where K is the maximum allowed number of iterations which is set at the start of the procedure. Spall also presented in the same paper, guidelines to inform the process of selecting numerical values for the constants, R and C , in equations (9) and (10). The parameter C determines the process scale and, if set equal to the standard deviation of measurement noise, produces a smooth progression toward the optimal outcome. On the other hand, R may be set such that for the specific design variable, Φ_s , whose differential variation is expected to be the smallest, $r_0 g_s(\hat{\Phi}^0) \leq b$, where b is a small number specified by the user based on their familiarity with the problem at hand. In fact, high precision is not required for the values of R and C ; and the process may boil down to a number of trial runs until reasonable values have been found to ensure smooth regression and an optimised outcome.

The Calibration Problem and Procedure

When the IDCMM is employed to measure the position of the stylus tip in space, the measured values of the joint-axes sensor readings (i.e. $\theta_i, i=1,2,...,5$) are reported to a computer-package designed to calculate the vector $\mathbf{p}$ which corresponds to the given joint angles as suggested by equation (4). Besides, the joint angles, the elements of these vector

depend on the 18 constant kinematic parameters of the structure; namely, $h_x, h_y, h_z, a_i, \alpha_i$ and d_i (where $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$). The discrepancy which results from the actual physical values of these parameters, being slightly different from their intended values, is demonstrated by the measurement errors. A calibration procedure is, therefore, undertaken to find the actual values of these parameters and use them to calculate the vector $\mathbf{p}$.

In addition to the aforementioned kinematic parameters, the work presented here considers possible error in the reading of each joint angle. For simplicity, this error is assumed to take the following linear form;

$$\gamma_i = f_i \theta_i + e_i \quad (11)$$

where γ_i replaces θ_i in the mathematical model and $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$. This implies that γ_i is regarded as the actual joint angle and θ_i is taken at the value reported by the joint sensor for this angle. In equation (11), e_i and f_i are unknown parameters which have to be found by the calibration procedure. The inclusion of e_i and f_i into the mathematical model increases the number of parameters, which are required to be found, from 18 to 28.

The calibration procedure proposed in this paper employs a fixture which consists of a high precision cuboid with two wire-cut through holes of diameter 5.08 mm, located 40.05 mm apart. Figure (4) shows the measuring cuboid, as located next to a ruler, with the stylus inserted in one of its two holes.

The procedure involves moving the cuboid to a number of random locations in the measurement space whereby at each location, j , the stylus is inserted into the two holes in order for a zero-valued error function, $E_j(\Theta)$, to be calculated as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} E_j(\Theta) = & w_1 \left(D - \left| \mathbf{p}_j^0 - \mathbf{p}_j^1 \right| \right)^2 + w_2 \left(1 - \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^0 \circ \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^1 \right)^2 + w_3 \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^0 \times \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^1 \right)_x \right)^2 \\ & + w_4 \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^0 \times \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^1 \right)_y \right)^2 + w_5 \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^0 \times \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^1 \right)_z \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $| \cdot |$ is the Euclidian norm and the superscripts, 0 and 1, refer to the two holes, on the measuring cuboid, which are separated by the distance D . In equation (12), w_l ($l = 1, 2, \dots, 5$) refer to weighting values assigned to the various terms of the error function. To account for possible manufacturing errors, the distance D was included in the analysis as an unknown

parameter, which resulted in calibrating the measuring artefact itself. As such the vector of unknown parameters, Θ in equation (12), now holds 29 (rather than 28) entries.

Figure 4. The calibration cuboid with the stylus inserted.

In the error function shown by equation (12), the term $\left(D - \left|\mathbf{p}_j^0 - \mathbf{p}_j^1\right|\right)^2$ signifies the fact that the measured positions of the two cuboid holes, at any location number j , should be separated by a constant distance, D . Any deviation from that is a system error which the term endeavours to quantify. The remaining terms in equation (12) assert that the two axes $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^0$ and $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{6j}^1$ should be parallel at any location number j and endeavour to quantify deviations from parallelism (i.e. the dot product should be equal to 1 and the cross product should yield a zero vector).

Mathematically, the optimisation procedure involves the minimisation of a cost function, $F(\Theta)$, given as follows;

$$F(\Theta) = \sum_1^M E_j(\Theta) \quad (13)$$

where M is the total number of measuring events. As such, the problem is posed as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Minimize: } F(\Theta) \\ &\text{Subject to: } \Omega_{\min} \leq \Omega \leq \Omega_{\max} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where Ω is a sub-vector of Θ . The entries of Ω are those design variables whose values have to be constrained as prescribed by the corresponding vectors $\Omega_{\min}$ and $\Omega_{\max}$.

Applying the approach of SPSA to the calibration problem at hand, the updated values of the design variable, Θ_q^{k+1} , which occupies position number q (where $q = 0, 1, \dots, 28$) in the design vector is calculated at the end of iteration step number k by;

$$\Theta_q^{k+1} = \Theta_q^k - r_k \frac{F(\Theta^k + C_k \Delta^k) - F(\Theta^k - C_k \Delta^k)}{2C_k \Delta_q^k} \quad (15)$$

To find an estimate for the parameter C , the cuboid was fixed at a given position and the distance, separating the two holes, was measured 16 times. Every time the CMM was returned to a home position before the arm was extended to take the measurement. The value of C was then set equal to the standard deviation of the repeatability error. On the other hand, after a number of trial runs, R has been set equal to 0.000002.

If Θ_q is an entry of Ω , the constraints imposed on its value (i.e. $\Theta_q|_{\max}$ and $\Theta_q|_{\min}$) are incorporated in the procedure, as suggested by Kothandaraman and Rotea (2005), as follows;

$$\Theta_q^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \Theta_q|_{\max} & \text{if } \Theta_q^{k+1} > \Theta_q|_{\max} \\ \Theta_q|_{\min} & \text{if } \Theta_q^{k+1} < \Theta_q|_{\min} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

In the present analysis, only the distance D was constrained to remain within the range of 39.80 mm to 40.20 mm. The manufacturer had previously indicated that the actual value of this distance was 40.05 mm and this was the value confirmed by the optimisation procedure. The fact that the solution obtained is fully interior suggests that the optimality condition has not been violated as a result of applying the approach shown in equation (16).

Experimental Results

The initial values assigned to the model parameters have been acquired from the data provided by the manufacturer. These values are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Initial values of the model parameters

$a_1 = 24.13 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_1 = 89.8956^\circ$	$d_1 = 210.82 \text{ mm}$	$e_1 = 0$	$f_1 = 1$
$a_2 = 260.579 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_2 = 358.8682^\circ$	$d_2 = -22.301 \text{ mm}$	$e_2 = 0$	$f_2 = 1$
$a_3 = 13.716 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_3 = 90.0824^\circ$	$d_3 = 0.0762 \text{ mm}$	$e_3 = 0$	$f_3 = 1$
$a_4 = -10.16 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_4 = 269.8956^\circ$	$d_4 = 235.102 \text{ mm}$	$e_4 = 0$	$f_4 = 1$
$a_5 = 10.16 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_5 = 270.088^\circ$	$d_5 = 8.1026 \text{ mm}$	$e_5 = 0$	$f_5 = 1$
$h_x = 0 \text{ mm}$	$h_y = 0 \text{ mm}$	$h_z = 133.985 \text{ mm}$	$D = 40.05 \text{ mm}$	

The calibration region was constrained to a horizontal base plate in the work volume of the CMM. The cuboid was fixed, at random planar orientations, to a total of 45 positions (i.e. $M = 45$ as per equation 13) whereby, at each location, the stylus was inserted into the two holes to calculate the error function, $E_j(\Theta)$. The reported sensor readings, θ_i , have been noted and used in the mathematical procedure. Even though 700 iterations were allowed for the stochastic optimisation procedure, convergence was realised long before this number was reached. The resulting values for the systems parameters are given in Table 2 and the values calculated for the cost function during the course of the procedure are given in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Reduction of the cost function during iterations.

The calibrated system parameters obtained in this analysis have been substituted in the CMM mathematical model, and the machine was then used to measure the distance between the two cuboid holes at 15 new fixture locations situated in the measuring space. The error values produced by these 15 measurements are depicted in Figure 6 together with the corresponding error values obtained by the uncalibrated kinematic model. The figure asserts the considerable accuracy improvement produced by the adopted procedure. The mean measurement error has been reduced from 0.1182mm to 0.0297mm, and the standard deviation of error has been reduced from 0.04mm to 0.026mm.

Table 2. Calculated values of the model parameters

$a_1 = 24.357 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_1 = 90.05^\circ$	$d_1 = 211.240 \text{ mm}$	$e_1 = -0.123^\circ$	$f_1 = 0.999$
$a_2 = 260.242 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_2 = 359.885^\circ$	$d_2 = -22.256 \text{ mm}$	$e_2 = 0.214^\circ$	$f_2 = 1.009$
$a_3 = 13.600 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_3 = 90.299^\circ$	$d_3 = -0.0762 \text{ mm}$	$e_3 = 0.107^\circ$	$f_3 = 1.001$
$a_4 = -10.309 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_4 = 270.172^\circ$	$d_4 = 234.86 \text{ mm}$	$e_4 = 0.917^\circ$	$f_4 = 1.001$
$a_5 = 10.139 \text{ mm}$	$\alpha_5 = 270.459^\circ$	$d_5 = 8.094 \text{ mm}$	$e_5 = 0.080^\circ$	$f_5 = 0.993$
$h_x = 0.0008 \text{ mm}$	$h_y = 0.0012 \text{ mm}$	$h_z = 133.985 \text{ mm}$	$D = 40.05 \text{ mm}$

Figure 6. Measurement error before and after calibration

Conclusions

In this paper, a simple method for the calibration of a serial manipulator-like CMM has been proposed and demonstrated experimentally. The method does not require the use of expensive measuring equipment to collect position data. The mathematical model employed for the analysis utilises the well known DH-parameters combined with a stochastic optimisation approach. In the model, sensor offsets have also been accounted for by a linear expression which relates the actual joint angle to its reported value. The calibration procedure presented in this paper considerably improves the accuracy, of an already accurate device, which proves the validity of the proposed approach and its suitability for the discussed application.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the information received from the Immersion Corporation staff, Mr Bill Hoverter and Mr. Nemer Velasquez.

References

1. Bai, Y. and Wang, D. (2006). Fuzzy logic for robots calibration – using fuzzy interpolation technique in modelless robot calibration. In *Advanced Fuzzy Logic Technologies in Industrial Applications*, Edited by: Bai, Y., Zhuang H. and Wang, D., Springer-Verlag, London.
2. Denavit, J. and Hartenberg, R. S. (1955). A kinematic notation for low pair mechanisms based on matrices. *ASME J. Appl. Mechanics*, Vol. 22, pp. 215-221.
3. Driels, M.R. and Pathre, U.S. 1991. Vision based automatic theodolite for robot calibration. *IEEE trans. on Robotics automation*, Vol. 7(3).
4. Foulloy, L.P. and Kelly, R.B. (1984). Improving the precision of a robot. In *proc. IEEE conf. Robotics*, pp. 62-67
5. Judd, R. P and Knasinsky, A. B. (1987). A technique to calibrate industrial robots with experimental verification. In *proc. IEEE conf. Robotics*, April, pp. 351-357,
6. Khalil, W. and Besnard, S. (2002). geometric calibration of robots with flexible joints and links. *Journal of intelligent and robotic systems* 34, pp. 357-359,
7. Kothandaraman, G. and Rotea, M.A., (2005). Simultaneous-perturbation stochastic-approximation algorithm for parachute parameter estimation. *J. Aircraft*, Vol. 42(5), pp. 1229-1235.
8. Lim, C. and M Burdekin, M. (2002). Rapid volumetric calibration of coordinate measuring machines using a hole bar artefact. *Instn. Mech. Engrs. Vol 216 Part B: J Engineering Manufacturer*, pp. 1083-1093
9. MicroScribe 3D Desktop Digitizing Systems: User's Guide & Set-Up Instructions (2000). Immersion Corporation San Jose, CA
10. MicroScribe API 2.2 User Reference (2004) Immersion Corporation San Jose, CA
11. Mooring, B. W., Roth, Z. S. and Driels, M. R. (1991). *Fundamentals of manipulator calibration*. John Wiley & Sons, New York..
12. Reisner, L.A., King, B.W., Klein, M.D., Auner, G.W., and Pandya, A.K. (2007). A prototype biosensor-integrated image-guided surgery system. *Int. J. Medical Robotics and Computer Assisted Surgery*, Vol 3(1), pp. 82-88.
13. Schena, B.M. and Rosenberg, L.B. (1997). Mechanical digitising arm used to input three dimensional data into a computer. US Patent No. Des.337,932.

14. Spall, J.C. (1992). Multivariate stochastic approximation using a simultaneous perturbation gradient approximation. IEEE Trans. Automation and Control Vol. 37(3), pp. 332-340.
15. Spall, J.C. (1998), Implementation of the simultaneous perturbation algorithm for stochastic optimization , IEEE Trans. Aerospace and Electronic Sys, Vol. 34(3), pp. 817-823
16. Sultan, I.A. and Wager, J.G. (1999). User-controlled kinematic modelling. Int. J. Advanced Robotics, Vol. 12(6), pp 663-677.
17. Sultan, I.A. and Wager, J.G. (2001). A technique for the independent-axis calibration of robot manipulators with experimental verification. Int. J. of Computer Integrated Manufacturing, Vol. 14(4).
18. Veitschegger, W.K. and Wu, C.H. (1987). A method for calibrating and compensating robot kinematic errors. In proc. IEEE conf. Robotics automation, April, pp. 39-44.