1 Introduction

The planar parallel manipulators (PPMs) with three identical kinematic chains are special parallel manipulators (PMs), whose motion is confined in a plane. For this type of PM, the error modeling and analysis are important for both design and control in order to utilize the PMs potential of high accuracy in applications. A number of works on accuracy analysis of parallel mechanisms can be found in the literature. Ryu and Cha derived a volumetric error model and a total error transformation matrix from a differential inverse kinematic equation, which includes possible kinematic error sources [1]. Liu et al. reported an approach of geometric error modeling for lower mobility manipulators by explicitly separating the compensatable and uncompensatable error sources affecting the pose accuracy [2]. Yu et al. reported a simple geometric approach to computing the exact local maximum position and orientation error by illustrating several different types of 3-dof planar parallel robots [3]. Briot and Bonev proposed a method based on geometric approach for detailed error analysis of a fully parallel robot with three translations and one rotation that brings valuable understanding of the error amplification problem [4].

Research focusing on the influence of joint clearances has been reported too. Lin and Chen proposed a homogeneous error transformation matrix to assess the effects of joint clearances on pose errors [5]. Ting et al. presented a simple method to identify the worst position and direction errors due to the joint clearance of linkages and manipulators, which offers a geometrical model to warranty the precision of a mechanism [6]. Fugarasy and Smith utilized the derivatives of the closure equations to obtain a first order approximation of the output error, which is called the Jacobian method [7]. Regarding the errors of universal and spherical joints due to clearances as a part of link errors, Lim et al. [8] analyzed the dynamic error of a cubic parallel mechanism by using its forward kinematics. Castelli and Venanzi applied the virtual work principle to determine the position of the end-effector when a given external load is applied [9,10]. Meng et al. proposed an error model of PMs subject to joint clearances by formulating the error prediction model as a standard convex optimization problem [11], of which the constraints are formed through a set of inequalities about the joint clearances. A general error prediction model considering joint clearances was established for serial and parallel manipulators by means of differential screw theory in Ref. [12]. It was used to analyze the kinematic sensitivity of a 3-PPR parallel manipulator to joint clearances in Ref. [13]. Wei and Simaan proposed an approach for designing inexpensive planar parallel robots with prescribed backlash-free workspace by using pre-loaded flexible joints to replace the passive joints [14]. Among the sources of errors, the influence of assembly and manufacturing errors and actuation errors can be eliminated as indicated in Refs. [5,15–17] by calibration, except joint clearances due to its low repeatability. It means that the pose errors due to joint clearances require a special consideration. Simple and valid methods of error modeling for PPMs are needed for accuracy analysis.

In this paper, the error analysis of PPMs is studied with consideration of both configuration errors and joint clearances. An error model is established, upon which the maximal error problem was transformed into an optimization problem. The distributions of global maximal pose errors in the prescribed workspace can be formulated effectively. Moreover, the error model based on the joint clearances was validated experimentally. The work was conducted for a novel 3-PPR PPM with a nonsymmetrical base [18], which has a larger workspace and the same level of motion accuracy compared to the traditional symmetrical PPMs.

This paper is organized as follows. The architecture of the manipulator under study is presented in Sec. 2. The kinematics and Cartesian workspace are analyzed in Sec. 3. The error prediction model is established in Sec. 4. Sections 5 and 6 present the experimental validation, in which measured results are compared with the simulations. The work is concluded in Sec. 7.

2 Manipulator Under Study

Figure 1 presents the Computer-Aided Design (CAD) model of the planar 3-PPR parallel manipulator with a rigid equilateral triangle-shape moving platform (MP). Here and throughout this paper, P and R stand for prismatic and revolute joints, respectively. An underlined letter indicates an actuated joint. Each leg is driven by a CAL 35 actuator, a high resolution linear motor built with an encoder of 5 μm accuracy from SMAC company [19]. A THK linear guide of model HRW17 is used as the active prismatic joint P. A linear bearing mounted on the slider of the linear guide is used as the passive prismatic joint in each leg. The ball joints in Fig. 1 are preloaded, of which joint clearance does not exist. For the built physical prototype, the end-effector can also be replaced by a disk-shape MP with ordinary revolute joints to couple the three legs, but this introduces more error sources due to the clearances between the pin and the hole of the revolute joint.
The parameterization of the 3-PPR PPM is illustrated in Fig. 2, where \( A_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \), are fixed points on the base. The x-axis of the coordinate system \( F_b \) is parallel to the segment \( A_1A_2 \). The origin \( P \) of the coordinate system \( F_p \) is located at the geometric center of the triangle \( \Delta D_i D_2 D_3 \) on the moving platform and the X-axis is parallel to the segment \( D_i D_2 \), where \( D_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \), are the centers of the revolute joints. The translational and orientational displacements of the MP are denoted by \( p \) and \( \phi \), where \( p = [x, y] \), and \( x \) and \( y \) being the Cartesian coordinates of point \( P \) in \( F_b \).

### 3 Kinematic Modeling of the 3-PPR PPM

The kinematic modeling of the manipulator is described in this section. The workspace and singularities of the manipulator are also analyzed based on its closure equations.

From the closed-loop kinematic chains \( O - A_i - B_i - C_i - D_i - P - O \) shown in Fig. 2, the position vector of point \( P \) can be expressed in \( F_b \) as follows:

\[
p = a_i h_i + s_i u_i + d_i v_i + r_i k_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3
\]

\[\text{(1)}\]

with

\[
h_i = \begin{bmatrix} \cos z_i \\ \sin z_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad u_i = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta_i \\ \sin \beta_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad v_i = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \gamma_i \\ \sin \gamma_i \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
w_i = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta_i \\ \sin \theta_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad k_i = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\phi + \psi_i) \\ \sin(\phi + \psi_i) \end{bmatrix}
\]

and

\[
\beta_i, \gamma_i, \theta_i = z_i + \beta_i + \gamma_i + \theta_i
\]

The inverse kinematics of the manipulator can be derived from Eq. (1)

\[
s_i = (w_i^T E u_i)^{-1} w_i^T E (p - a_i h_i - d_i v_i - r_i k_i) \quad \text{(2a)}
\]

\[
l_i = (u_i^T E w_i)^{-1} u_i^T E (p - a_i h_i - d_i v_i - r_i k_i) \quad \text{(2b)}
\]

matrix \( E \) is the right angle rotation matrix defined as

\[
E = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]

Equation (1) establishes a system of six equations. The forward displacements can be solved by virtue of analytical method. The velocity expression of the manipulator can be derived from Eq. (1) as below

\[
A \begin{bmatrix} \dot{p} \\ \dot{\phi} \end{bmatrix} = B \dot{s}
\]

\[\text{(3)}\]

with

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} w_i^T E^T & -r_i w_i^T k_i \\ w_i^T E^T & -r_i w_i^T k_2 \\ w_i^T E^T & -r_i w_i^T k_3 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[\text{(4a)}\]

\[
B = \text{diag}[w_i^T E^T u_1, w_2^T E^T u_2, w_3^T E^T u_3]
\]

\[\text{(4b)}\]

\[
\dot{s} = [s_1, s_2, s_3]^T
\]

\[\text{(4c)}\]

where \( A \) and \( B \) are the forward and backward Jacobians of the manipulator, respectively. The kinematic Jacobian matrix \( J \) of the manipulator takes the form

\[
J = A^{-1} B
\]

\[\text{(5)}\]

Matrix \( A \) is singular, i.e., the manipulator reaches a parallel singularity, when \( \phi = \pm \pi/2 \). Matrix \( B \) is never singular, namely, the manipulator is free of serial singularity.

The reachable area of the moving platform with a constant orientation can be obtained geometrically by means of searching method [13,18], where the inverse kinematics model, namely, Eqs. (2a) and (2b), establish a system of 12 inequalities by virtue of the joint motion limits to formulate the motion constraints of the MP. With the parameters shown in Table 1 and \( r_i = r = 30 \text{ mm}, a_i = 192.34 \text{ mm}, i = 1, 2, 3 \), constant-orientation Cartesian workspaces for three orientations of the MP are illustrated in Fig. 3.

### 4 Error Modeling of a 3-PPR PPM

Here, a methodology introduced in Ref. [20] was used to derive the error model of the MP pose with regard to variations in the actuated and passive joints as well as in the Cartesian coordinates of points \( A_i, B_i, C_i, \) and \( D_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>The design parameters of the 3-PPR PPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( i )</td>
<td>( x_i ) (rad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where the clearance in the revolute joint between the $i$th leg and the moving platform is characterized by the small displacement between points $D_i$ and point $D'_i$ as shown in Fig. 4. Upon differentiation of Eq. (1), we obtain the positioning error of point $P$ with respect to each leg

$$\delta p = \delta a_i h_i + a_i \delta x_i E h_i + \delta y_i u_i + s_i \delta \beta_i^j E u_i + \delta d_i v_i + \delta r_i k_i + r_i (\delta \phi + \delta \psi_i) E k_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (6)$$

where

$$\delta \beta_i^j = \delta x_i + \delta \beta_i$$
$$\delta \gamma_i^j = \delta x_i + \delta \beta_i + \delta \gamma_i$$
$$\delta \delta_i^j = \delta x_i + \delta \beta_i + \delta \gamma_i + \delta \theta_i$$ \quad (7)

where $\delta p$ and $\delta \phi$ are the positioning and orientation errors of the moving platform expressed in $F_{pr}$, respectively. Moreover, $\delta a_i, \delta x_i, \delta y_i, \delta \beta_i, \delta \gamma_i, \delta d_i, \delta \theta_i, \delta r_i$, and $\delta \psi_i$ denote variations in the geometric parameters illustrated in Fig. 4. In addition, $\delta r_i$ is a small displacement between point $D_i$ and point $D'_i$ due to the clearance in the $i$th revolute joint and $n_i = [\cos \phi, \sin \phi]^T$, as illustrated in Fig. 5(b). Substituting Eqs. (7) into (6) and eliminating the idle variation $\delta \delta_i$ lead to

$$w_i^T E^T \delta p = \delta a_i w_i^T E^T h_i + \delta x_i [w_i^T (a_i h_i + s_i u_i + d_i v_i) + l_i]$$
$$+ \delta y_i w_i^T E^T u_i + \delta \beta_i [w_i^T (s_i u_i + d_i v_i) + l_i]$$
$$+ \delta d_i w_i^T E^T v_i + \delta \gamma_i [d_i w_i^T E^T v_i + l_i] + \delta \theta_i$$
$$+ \delta r_i w_i^T E^T k_i + r_i (\delta \phi + \delta \psi_i) w_i^T k_i \quad (8)$$

Equation (8) can be cast in vector form

$$A \begin{bmatrix} \delta x \\ \delta y \\ \delta \phi \end{bmatrix} = H_q \begin{bmatrix} \delta a_1 \\ \delta a_2 \\ \delta a_3 \end{bmatrix} + H_k \begin{bmatrix} \delta x_1 \\ \delta x_2 \\ \delta x_3 \end{bmatrix} + B \begin{bmatrix} \delta s_1 \\ \delta s_2 \\ \delta s_3 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \delta b_1 \\ \delta b_2 \\ \delta b_3 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$+ H_\theta \begin{bmatrix} \delta \theta_1 \\ \delta \theta_2 \\ \delta \theta_3 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$+ H_\phi \begin{bmatrix} \delta \phi_1 \\ \delta \phi_2 \\ \delta \phi_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

where all $H_q, q \in \{a, x, \beta, d, \gamma, \theta, r, \rho, \psi\}$, are $3 \times 3$ matrices as given in Appendix A. Moreover, assuming that $A$ is nonsingular, the multiplication of both sides of Eq. (9) by $A^{-1}$ leads to

$$J_q \begin{bmatrix} \delta x \\ \delta y \\ \delta \phi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \delta a_1 \\ \delta a_2 \\ \delta a_3 \end{bmatrix} + J_q \begin{bmatrix} \delta x_1 \\ \delta x_2 \\ \delta x_3 \end{bmatrix} + J_k \begin{bmatrix} \delta s_1 \\ \delta s_2 \\ \delta s_3 \end{bmatrix} + J_\theta \begin{bmatrix} \delta b_1 \\ \delta b_2 \\ \delta b_3 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$+ J_\phi \begin{bmatrix} \delta \phi_1 \\ \delta \phi_2 \\ \delta \phi_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

with

$$J_q = A^{-1} H_q, q \in \{a, x, \beta, d, \gamma, \theta, r, \rho, \psi\} \quad (11)$$

where $J$ and $J_q$ are the sensitivity coefficients of the MP pose of the manipulator to variations in terms of coordinates of each link [20]. It will be more useful to find the sensitivity coefficients in the coordinates of all joint positions, namely, points $A_i, B_i, C_i$, and $D_i$. By making use of

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta a_i \\ \delta a_j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos x_i & -a_i \sin x_i \\ \sin x_i & a_i \cos x_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta a_i \\ \delta a_j \end{bmatrix} \quad (12a)$$
$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta b_i \\ \delta b_j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta_i & -s_i \sin \beta_i \\ \sin \beta_i & s_i \cos \beta_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta b_i \\ \delta b_j \end{bmatrix} \quad (12b)$$
$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta c_i \\ \delta c_j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \gamma_i & -d_i \sin \gamma_i \\ \sin \gamma_i & d_i \cos \gamma_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta c_i \\ \delta c_j \end{bmatrix} \quad (12c)$$
$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta d_i \\ \delta d_j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \psi_i & -r_i \sin \psi_i \\ \sin \psi_i & r_i \cos \psi_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta d_i \\ \delta d_j \end{bmatrix} \quad (12d)$$
Equation (10) is transformed as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta p \\
\delta \phi
\end{bmatrix} = J\begin{bmatrix}
\delta x_1 \\
\delta y_1 \\
\delta z_1 \\
\delta x_2 \\
\delta y_2 \\
\delta z_2 \\
\delta x_3 \\
\delta y_3 \\
\delta z_3
\end{bmatrix} + J_p \begin{bmatrix}
\delta \rho_1 \\
\delta \rho_2 \\
\delta \rho_3
\end{bmatrix} + J_s \begin{bmatrix}
\delta a_1x \\
\delta a_2x \\
\delta a_3x \\
\delta a_1y \\
\delta a_2y \\
\delta a_3y
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
+ \begin{bmatrix}
\delta b_{1x} \\
\delta b_{1y} \\
\delta b_{2x} \\
\delta b_{2y} \\
\delta b_{3x} \\
\delta b_{3y}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\delta c_{1x} \\
\delta c_{1y} \\
\delta c_{2x} \\
\delta c_{2y} \\
\delta c_{3x} \\
\delta c_{3y}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
\delta d_{1x} \\
\delta d_{1y} \\
\delta d_{2x} \\
\delta d_{2y} \\
\delta d_{3x} \\
\delta d_{3y}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
\delta e_{1x} \\
\delta e_{1y} \\
\delta e_{2x} \\
\delta e_{2y} \\
\delta e_{3x} \\
\delta e_{3y}
\end{bmatrix} (13)
\]

where \(\delta a_{1x}, \delta a_{2x}, \delta a_{3x}, \delta a_{1y}, \delta a_{2y}, \delta a_{3y}\) are the positioning errors of point \(A_i\) \((B_i, C_i, \text{resp.}), i = 1, 2, 3\), along \(x\)- and \(y\)-axes, namely, the variations in the Cartesian coordinates. Notice that \(\delta d_{1x}\) and \(\delta d_{1y}\) denote the positioning errors of points \(D_t\) along \(X\)- and \(Y\)-axes, namely, the variations in the Cartesian coordinates of \(D_t\). The \(3 \times 6\) matrices \(J_A, J_B, J_C, \text{and } J_D\) can be found in Appendix A. Equation (13) can be written in the following form:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta p \\
\delta \phi
\end{bmatrix} = J_{err} \delta_{var}
\]

where

\[
J_{err} = \begin{bmatrix}
J & J_\theta & J_p & J_A & J_B & J_C & J_D
\end{bmatrix} (15a)
\]

\[
\delta_{var} = \begin{bmatrix}
\delta s^T \\
\delta \theta^T \\
\delta \rho^T \\
\delta a^T \\
\delta b^T \\
\delta c^T \\
\delta d^T
\end{bmatrix}^T (15b)
\]

with

\[
\delta s = \begin{bmatrix}
\delta s_1 \\
\delta s_2 \\
\delta s_3
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \delta \theta = \begin{bmatrix}
\delta \theta_1 \\
\delta \theta_2 \\
\delta \theta_3
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \delta \rho = \begin{bmatrix}
\delta \rho_1 \\
\delta \rho_2 \\
\delta \rho_3
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \delta e = \begin{bmatrix}
\delta e_1 \\
\delta e_2 \\
\delta e_3
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\delta e_i = [\delta e_{ix}, \delta e_{iy}]^T, \quad e \in \{a, b, c, d\}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3
\]

where \(\delta_{var}\) is a vector containing all variations. For a given posture, all submatrices except \(J_p\) are known.

4.2 Modeling the Joint Clearances. Figure 5 illustrates the assembly errors and clearances in the prismatic and revolute joints. \(\delta d_{1i}, \delta \theta_i, \delta \rho_i, \text{and } \delta \rho_{i1}, \text{resp.} \), are the assembly errors while \(\delta d_{1i}\) and \(\delta \theta_i\) correspond to the manufacturing errors. Moreover, \(\Delta \sigma_{gi}, \Delta \gamma_i, \Delta \tau_{bi}\) and \(\Delta \rho_i\) are the displacements due to joint clearances. Then, we have

\[
\delta d_i = \delta d_{1i} + \Delta \sigma_{gi}, \quad \delta \gamma_i = \delta \gamma_{1i} + \Delta \gamma_{gi}, \quad \delta \theta_i = \delta \theta_{1i} + \Delta \tau_{bi}
\]

The errors due to the clearances in the linear guides are characterized by the following constraints [11]:

\[
\begin{align}
-2e_{gi} & \leq L_g \Delta \tau_{gi} + 2\Delta \sigma_{gi} \leq 2e_{gi} \quad (16a) \\
-2e_{gi} & \leq -L_g \Delta \tau_{gi} + 2\Delta \sigma_{gi} \leq 2e_{gi} \quad (16b)
\end{align}
\]

where \(e_{gi}\) specifies the lateral clearance and \(L_g\) is the length of the linear guide block. Alternatively, the errors in the linear bearing are constrained by the following condition:
that the three maximum errors are subject to the same constraints, and the maximum orientation error of the moving platform. Note respectively the maximum positioning errors along the x-axis, y-axis, and z-axis, the maximum orientation error of the moving platform, namely, $\delta_{\text{max}}$, $\gamma_{\text{max}}$, and $\phi_{\text{max}}$, can be obtained by solving the following optimization problem:

$$ -\varepsilon_{yi} \leq \Delta \rho_i \leq \varepsilon_{yi} \quad (17) $$

where $\varepsilon_{yi}$ is the upper bound of $\Delta \rho_i$. Figure 5(a) demonstrates the tolerances of the linear guides and bearing. The clearances in the three revolute joints meet the following constraint:

$$ 0 \leq \Delta \rho_i \leq \varepsilon_{yi}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (18) $$

where $\varepsilon_{yi}$ is the range of variations $\Delta \rho_i$ due to the joint clearance shown in Fig. 5(b).

$$ J_{err}^c = [J_\theta \ J_d \ J_y \ J_p]_{3 \times 12} = [J_{err,x} \ J_{err,y} \ J_{err,\phi}] $$

$$ \delta_{\text{var}} = [\Delta \tau_{b1} \ \Delta \tau_{b2} \ \Delta \tau_{b3} \ \Delta \sigma_{g1} \ \Delta \sigma_{g2} \ \Delta \sigma_{g3} \ \Delta \sigma_{h1} \ \Delta \sigma_{h2} \ \Delta \sigma_{h3} \ \Delta \rho_1 \ \Delta \rho_2 \ \Delta \rho_3]^T $$

where $J_{err,x}^c$, $J_{err,y}^c$, $J_{err,\phi}^c$ are three $1 \times 12$ submatrices corresponding to the first, the second, and the third rows of $J_{err}$. The maximum positioning error along x-axis, y-axis, and z-axis, and the maximum orientation error of the MP, namely, $\delta_{\text{max}}$, $\gamma_{\text{max}}$, and $\phi_{\text{max}}$, can be obtained by solving the following optimization problem:

$$ \delta_{\text{max}}^2 \equiv \max \left( J_{err,x}^c \delta_{\text{var}} \right)^T J_{err,x}^c \delta_{\text{var}} \quad \text{for } x, y, \phi \in \Omega \quad (21) $$

where $\Omega$ denotes the Cartesian workspace of the manipulator defined in Sec. 3. Optimization problem of Eq. (21) aims at finding separately the maximum positioning errors along the x-axis and y-axis and the maximum orientation error of the moving platform. Note that the three maximum errors are subject to the same constraints, hence, the optimization problems are written in a generalized form.

The maximum positioning error $\delta_{\text{max}}$ is obtained by solving the following optimization problem:

$$ \delta_{\text{max}}^2 \equiv \max \left( J_{err,x}^c \delta_{\text{var}} \right)^T J_{err,x}^c \delta_{\text{var}} \quad \text{for } x, y, \phi \in \Omega \quad (22) $$

where $J_{\text{err},x}^c = [J_{\text{err},x}^c \ J_{\text{err},y}^c \ J_{\text{err},\phi}^c]^T$. The foregoing optimization problems are solved using the MATLAB fmincon function. According to the product catalogues, the clearance in the lateral direction of the linear guide is equal to $3\mu m$, namely, $2\varepsilon_{yi} = 2\varepsilon_{yi} = 3\mu m$. As a consequence, the errors due to the linear guides are negligible. $\delta_{\tau_{b1}}$ and $\delta_{\tau_{b2}}$ are set to zero too. Finally, the maximum position error and the maximum orientation error of the MP can be evaluated from Eqs. (21) and (22) for any configuration of the manipulator by known joint clearances and geometric tolerances.

### 5 Experimental Setup and Measurement Errors

A main purpose of the work is to experimentally validate the error model developed. To this end, experiments have been conducted in which the position and orientation of the MP were measured with a vision-based system composed of a single Charge-Coupled Device (CCD) camera. The experimental setup is shown in Fig. 6(a) and its specifications are given hereafter:

- DVT 554c smart camera with $1280 \times 1024$ pixel resolution ($7.4\mu m \times 7.4\mu m$ pixels) from Cognex [21] was fixed right above the MP for pose measurements.
- INTELLECT 1.5.1, a vision software from Cognex [22], was used to establish the communication with the camera via data cable as shown in Fig. 6(b). The Blobs are used to locate markers on the MP.

With this system, the position and orientation measurement accuracies are $0.01 \text{ mm}$ and $0.01 \text{ deg}$, respectively.

#### 5.1 Measurements

Before the measurements, the system was calibrated. A standard calibration paper with markers of $2 \text{ cm}$ spacing from Cognex was used to establish the reference frame. The calibration method is described in the INTELLACT 1.5 Guide [22].

##### 5.1.1 Assembly Errors

In measuring configuration error, the first linear guide was used as the y-axis of the reference frame, which means $\delta_{\rho_1} = 0$. The measurement is illustrated in Fig. 7. Four holes on each linear guide were used as the markers. $\delta_{\rho_2}$ and $\delta_{\rho_3}$ can be obtained by means of the INTELLACT software. Similarly, a perfect regular component with four uniformly distributed holes was used to measure the assembly errors $\delta_{ij}$ and $\delta_{ij}$ by means of face to face alignments. The measured assembly errors are listed in Table 2.

##### 5.1.2 Joint Clearances

Figure 8 illustrates the method used to measure the clearance in the linear bearing. Pushing the right end of the shaft back and forth and measuring the difference of the two counts $\delta_{ij}$, the value of $\delta_{ij}$ was adopted as the bound of angular clearance. For the revolute joint clearances, the diameters of the joint pin and the cylinder were measured, respectively. The half value of the difference of the two measurements was adopted as the clearance bound. The bounds of the joint clearances were found as
\[ \varepsilon_{\beta_1} = \varepsilon_{\gamma_1} = 0.0012 \text{ rad}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \]
\[ \varepsilon_1 = 0.039 \text{ mm}, \quad \varepsilon_2 = 0.036 \text{ mm}, \quad \varepsilon_3 = 0.037 \text{ mm} \]

5.2 Pose Errors of MP. The measurements were conducted with two cases:

- Case 1: a case with only clearances in the passive prismatic joints
- Case 2: a case with clearances in both passive prismatic and revolute joints

The two cases were physically implemented with two different shapes for the moving platform in Sec. 2, respectively, namely, the equilateral triangle MP (Δ-shape MP) and the disk-shape MP (○-shape MP), which are associated with Cases 1 and 2. We first fixed on the MP a calibration paper with 2×2 marks of 2 cm separation in case 1. Then, \( i \times j \) uniformly distributed points were measured throughout the Cartesian workspace of the manipulator.
During the measurements, the actuators were locked to eliminate the errors in the actuators. At the \((i, j)\) point, the MP was slightly pushed bidirectionally along the \(x\)-axis, \(y\)-axis, and rotated about the \(z\)-axis, respectively. The corresponding readings were noted as \(\delta x_{ij} \), \(\delta y_{ij} \), \(\delta \theta_{zij} \), \(\delta \phi_i \) and \(\delta \phi_j \) respectively. The measured positioning and orientation errors at the \((i, j)\) point are defined as:

\[
\delta x_{ij} = \max \{ x_{ij}^u, x_{ij}^l \} - \min \{ x_{ij}^u, x_{ij}^l \} \tag{23a}
\]

\[
\delta y_{ij} = \max \{ y_{ij}^u, y_{ij}^l \} - \min \{ y_{ij}^u, y_{ij}^l \} \tag{23b}
\]

\[
\delta \phi_{ij} = \max \{ \phi_{ij}^u, \phi_{ij}^l \} - \min \{ \phi_{ij}^u, \phi_{ij}^l \} \tag{23c}
\]

\[
\delta \phi_j = \max \{ \delta \phi_j^u, \delta \phi_j^l \}, \quad \delta \phi = \sqrt{ (\delta x_{ij} - x_{ij}^u)^2 + (\delta y_{ij} - y_{ij}^u)^2} \tag{23d}
\]

6 Results and Discussion

In this section, the predicted maximum pose errors from the model and measured errors from the experiments are presented and compared.

6.1 Error Distributions for Case 1. Figure 6 represents the error distribution of the moving platform for a given orientation \(\phi = 0\). Figure 9(a) shows that the simulated \(\delta x_{\text{max}}\) is constant for a given \(y\)-coordinate and decreases slightly with the \(y\)-coordinate. \(\delta x_{\text{max}}\) is bounded between 0.196 mm and 0.256 mm, while \(\delta y_{\text{max}}\) and \(\delta \phi_{\text{max}}\) are both constant, their values being equal to 0.100 mm and 0.221 deg, respectively. The \(y\)-coordinate of point \(P\), the geometric center of the MP, and the orientation of the MP depend only on the first and second prismatic actuators because of the partial motion decoupling of the manipulator. Therefore, the maximum position error of the MP along the \(y\)-axis and its maximum rotation error occur when \(D_{s1}, i = 1, 2\) reach their lower or upper bounds. As a result, both \(\delta y_{\text{max}}\) and \(\delta \phi_{\text{max}}\) remain constant throughout the Cartesian workspace of the manipulator. From Fig. 9(c), it is apparent that the maximum positioning error \(\delta p_{\text{max}}\) of the MP is symmetrical with respect to the \(x\)-axis. The root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) values between the simulations and measurements are equal to 50 \(\mu\)m, 30 \(\mu\)m, 51 \(\mu\)m, and 0.057 deg, for \(\delta x\), \(\delta y\), \(\delta \phi\), and \(\delta \phi\) respectively. From Fig. 6, it is noteworthy that there is a good correlation between the measured positioning errors and the simulated ones. On the other hand, the differences between the measured orientation errors of the MP and the
Fig. 10  Comparison of error distributions for case 1 with a constant orientation $\phi = \pi/6$

Fig. 11  Comparison of error distributions for case 2 with a constant orientation $\phi = 0$

Fig. 12  Comparison of error distributions for case 2 with a constant orientation $\phi = \pi/6$
simulated ones are noticeable. To some extent, this is due to the reason that angular measurement is more sensitive to the random error and influence of environments, etc., than the positional measurement.

The distributions of measured errors with constant orientation $\phi = \pi/6$ are shown in Fig. 10. The simulated $d_{\max}$, as shown in Fig. 10(a), varying from 0.224 mm to 0.253 mm, has a distribution similar to that corresponding to $\phi = 0$, while $d_{\max}$ is constant along $y$-axis and increases gradually with the $x$-coordinate (see Fig. 10(b)), from 0.103 mm to 0.123 mm. In Fig. 10(d), the simulated orientation error $d_{\max}$ is constant and is equal to 0.264 deg. The positioning error $d_{p_{\max}}$ varying from 0.226 mm to 0.268 mm, increases when the measuring point moves from the upper left corner to the lower right corner throughout the workspace as displayed in Fig. 10(c). The RMSD values between the simulations and measurements of $d_x$, $d_y$, $d_p$, and $d_\phi$ are equal to 47 $\mu$m, 34 $\mu$m, 34 $\mu$m, and 0.103 deg, respectively. Therefore, the measurements have a good correlation with the simulations.

6.2 Error Distributions for Case 2. In case 2, both prismatic and revolute joint clearances are considered. The distributions of the maximum pose errors are shown in Figs. 11 and 12.

By comparing Figs. 11 to 6, it can be found that the differences between the simulation results and measurements really depend on the orientation of the MP. For $\phi = 0$, the RMSD values between the simulations and measurements are equal to 77 $\mu$m, 62 $\mu$m, 81 $\mu$m, and 0.086 deg, for $d_x$, $d_y$, $d_p$, and $d_\phi$, respectively. Although the difference between the simulations and experiments in Fig. 11(b) under the given scale and unit seems larger than the other results, however, the maximum value is around 0.5 deg and the statistical analysis also shows that the difference is acceptable.

![Fig. 13 Boxplot of the measurements for cases 1 and 2. Nos. 1 and 2 of horizontal axes stand for the measurements with constant orientations $\phi = 0$ and $\phi = \pi/6$, respectively.](image-url)
For $\phi = \pi/6$, the RMSD values between the simulations and measurements of $\delta x, \delta y, \delta p$ and $\delta \phi$, are equal to 26 $\mu$m, 36 $\mu$m, 34 $\mu$m, and 0.063 deg, respectively. Note that the correlation between the simulation results and the measurements is better with $\phi = \pi/6$ than $\phi = 0$.

6.3 Discussion on Measurement Results. As shown in Fig. 13, both for cases 1 and 2, the measurement errors with $\phi = \pi/6$ are larger than that of $\phi = 0$, which agrees with the distributions obtained from simulations. Moreover, the sample standard deviations (SSD) of the measured orientation errors are equal to 0.052, 0.029, 0.086, and 0.034 deg, respectively. This means that the measured orientation errors have very small fluctuations among the discrete points. The positioning performance of the robot, namely, their accuracy, is defined in accordance to ISO 9283: 1998 [23] as

$$ AP_p = \delta p, AP_\phi = \delta \phi $$

where $\delta p$ and $\delta \phi$ are the measured pose errors defined in Sec. 5.2. Figure 14 shows the accuracy of the manipulator, where the measured points covering the maximum workspace are demonstrated in Fig. 12(a). The position accuracy in measured points is 0.2 – 0.35mm, while the orientation accuracy is 0.2 – 0.45deg.

![Fig. 14 Position and orientation accuracies at five poses](image)

![Fig. 15 Comparison between the measurements and simulation results for case 2 with a constant orientation $\phi = \pi/6$](image)
The experiments show that most of the measurements line along the boundaries established with the mathematical model, with a few exceptions. In order to evaluate the comparison between the simulations and measurements, we made a statistical regression analysis [24], as shown in Fig. 15 for case 2 with a constant orientation $\phi = \pi/6$. Most of the simulation results are distributed in the measured error bands $\delta_{\text{meas}} = 2\delta_{\text{true}}$, except for the orientation errors, where $\delta_{\text{true}}$ is the measurement error defined in Sec. 5.2 and $\delta_{\text{meas}}$ is the accuracy of the measurement system in Sec. 5. The deviations in the simulation results are equal to 0.02 mm and 0.023 deg, respectively, as derived from the measurements of joint clearances. Although the simulated $\delta \phi$ are located beyond the measured error bands for some points, the maximum difference between the two error bands is 0.086 deg, which means that the simulation results are quite close to the measurements. The possible reasons which cause disagreement between the simulations and measurements are random and systematic errors, the influence of the MP inclination and elastic deflection, etc.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, the pose error of a planar parallel manipulator was studied. A new error model was developed for PPMs with due considerations of both configuration errors and joint clearances. With the model, the pose error estimation problem was formulated as an optimization problem, which can estimate maximum pose errors. The error analysis method was described in detail. This method can also be applied to planar serial mechanisms.

Another contribution lies in the experimental validation of the error model. Experiments were conducted to obtain the distribution of pose errors throughout the workspace, the results being compared with the errors estimated by the error model. It turns out that there is a good correlation between the pose error simulations and measurements. Moreover, the simulations show that the angular clearances in the passive prismatic joints have much more influence on the pose errors of the moving platform than the revolute joint clearances. This is associated with the experiments, in which the angular clearances in the linear bearings reach their tolerance bounds as much as possible. This suggests that one possible approach to eliminate the errors due to joint clearances is to preload the joint. The validated work can be used for error analysis and compensation in future work. Moreover, other error sources such as manufacturing errors will be considered.

### Appendix

The matrices in Eq. (9) are given below

$$H_a = \text{diag} \left[ w_1^T E_1^T h_1 \quad w_2^T E_1^T h_2 \quad w_3^T E_1^T h_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1a)

$$H_x = \text{diag} \left[ w_1^T (a_1 h_1 + s_1 u_1 + d_1 v_1) + l_1 w_2^T (a_2 h_2 + s_2 u_2 + d_2 v_2) + l_2 w_3^T (a_3 h_3 + s_3 u_3 + d_3 v_3) + l_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1b)

$$H_y = \text{diag} \left[ w_1^T (s_1 u_1 + d_1 v_1) + l_1 w_2^T (s_2 u_2 + d_2 v_2) + l_2 w_3^T (s_3 u_3 + d_3 v_3) + l_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1c)

$$H_d = \text{diag} \left[ w_1^T E_1^T v_1 \quad w_2^T E_1^T v_2 \quad w_3^T E_1^T v_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1d)

$$H_r = \text{diag} \left[ d_1 w_1^T v_1 + l_1 \quad d_2 w_2^T v_2 + l_2 \quad d_3 w_3^T v_3 + l_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1e)

$$H_b = \text{diag} \left[ l_1 \quad l_2 \quad l_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1f)

$$H_p = \text{diag} \left[ w_1^T E_2^T n_1 \quad w_2^T E_2^T n_2 \quad w_3^T E_2^T n_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1g)

$$H_k = \text{diag} \left[ w_1^T E_2^T k_1 \quad w_2^T E_2^T k_2 \quad w_3^T E_2^T k_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1h)

$$H_b = \text{diag} \left[ r_1 w_1^T k_1 \quad r_2 w_2^T k_2 \quad r_3 w_3^T k_3 \right]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A1i)

The matrices $J_4$, $J_B$, $J_C$, and $J_D$ in Eq. (13) are expressed as

$$J_4 = \begin{bmatrix} J_a & J_a \end{bmatrix} A_d \begin{bmatrix} A_3 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} A_b = \text{diag} \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & h_3 \end{bmatrix}, A_d = \text{diag} \begin{bmatrix} a_1 E h_1 & a_2 E h_2 & a_3 E h_3 \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A2a)

$$J_B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{\beta} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_{\alpha} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \text{diag} \begin{bmatrix} u_1' & u_2' & u_3' \end{bmatrix}, B_{\alpha} = \text{diag} \begin{bmatrix} s_1 E d u_1 & s_2 E d u_2 & s_3 E d u_3 \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (A2b)
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{J}_e &= [\mathbf{J}_d \quad \mathbf{J}_r] [C_d \quad C_r]^{-1} \mathbf{C}_d = \text{diag} [v_1' \quad v_2' \quad v_3'] \quad \mathbf{C}_r = \text{diag} [d_1E'v_1' \quad d_2E'v_2' \quad d_3E'v_3'] \\
\mathbf{J}_o &= [\mathbf{J}_r \quad \mathbf{J}_\phi] [D_r \quad D_\phi]^{-1} \mathbf{D}_r = \text{diag} [k_1' \quad k_2' \quad k_3'] \quad \mathbf{D}_\phi = \text{diag} [r_1E_k'1 \quad r_2E_k'2 \quad r_3E_k'3]
\end{align*}
\]
with
\[
\mathbf{u}' = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta_i \\ \sin \beta_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{v}' = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \gamma_i \\ \sin \gamma_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{k}' = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \psi_i \\ \sin \psi_i \end{bmatrix}
\]
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