# Comparative Analysis of Geometric Deviations in Contact Measuring Instruments for Control and Laser Contactless Scanning

**Borislav Georgiev** 

Faculty of mechanical and precision engineering Technical University Gabrovo, Bulgaria gborislav@gbg.bg

*Abstract.* The factors affecting the dimensional accuracy of 3D scanning using a measuring arm with an integrated scanner and a custom open source 3D printer using FDM technology are researched in this paper, with the purpose of isolating and reducing the sources of errors affecting the results. A consumer 3D printer is analyzed in terms of achieving accurate physical dimensions, consistent shapes, and predictable surface coverage.

# *Keywords: Geometric accuracy, laser scanning, tactile sensor. 3D printing Error.*

### I. INTRODUCTION

Hardly any other technical field has developed as quickly in recent years as 3D printing. It not only finds application in the commercial, technological, industrial and scientific sectors, but also in private households. Interest in 3D printing [6][9] is growing rapidly, as is the variety of 3D printers for personal use. Factors such as easy development of customized products and reduction in production costs are driving more and more industries and companies to embrace 3D printing and incorporate it into their business. FDM (Fused Deposit Modeling) or FFF (Fused Filament Fabrication) are 3D printing processes where a filament in the form of a thermoplastic thread is heated in a print head and printed on a print platform through a nozzle. In this process, the chosen model is built up layer by layer. When talking about 3D printers, most of the time it is meant FDM printers. The so-called filament is a material that is wound on a spool and processed by the printer. There are a number of different materials (PLA, PETG, ABS, PE (nylon), etc.). They differ significantly in their properties. Filaments also available in different diameters and multiple colors.

Tsanko Karadzhov

Faculty of mechanical and precision engineering Technical University Gabrovo, Bulgaria karadjov\_st@abv.bg

Since layer height depends on the 3D printer used, it is one of the most important parameters of 3D printers. In general, the lower the layer height, the finer and smoother the model surface will be. On commercially available 3D printers, the average layer height is from 0.1 mm to 0.32 mm. The height of the layer depends not only on the 3D printer used, but also on the software with which a given model is cut (so-called Slicing). Today's 3D software has almost no limitations on layer height. On the other hand, however, the constantly increasing requirements for the quality of manufactured details and elements, especially in the field of mechanical engineering, lead to the need to improve both the technological equipment and the methods and means of measurement. One of the important metrological tasks in this regard is carrying out measurements with proven accuracy of the geometrical parameters of machine-building products, including both determining the deviations from the correct geometrical shape and the mutual location of the surfaces and axes, as well as all other requirements that are set in the technical drawings of engineering products. The high level of automation and intellectualization of measuring systems nowadays expands the possibilities of applying new metrological procedures based on non-contact scanning methods.

Contactless scanning systems are entering the industry more and more every day. These systems allow a significant reduction in production costs, mainly due to a significant reduction in inspection time. They allow the acquisition of a large amount of data, which provides very good levels of quality of results. Despite the well-known advantages that these systems offer, there are also some difficulties, such as the undefined and unstandardized

Print ISSN 1691-5402 Online ISSN 2256-070X <u>https://doi.org/10.17770/etr2023vol3.7182</u> © 2023 Borislav Georgiev, Tsanko Karadzhov. Published by Rezekne Academy of Technologies. This is an open access article under the <u>Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.</u> Borislav Georgiev, et al. Comparative Analysis of Geometric Deviations in Contact Measuring Instruments for Control and Laser Contactless Scanning

accuracy compared to traditional inspection systems based on tactile sensors with touch. This is one of the reasons for the practical absence of scanning systems in metrology applications: they have not been adequately tested for accuracy to control geometric and dimensional tolerances. In fact, these systems are mainly used as reverse engineering or multimedia applications. Two different measurement systems were analyzed: by a non-contact laser scanner and a contact tactile sensor, both mounted on a seven-degree-of-freedom Romer measuring arm. A common alignment method is defined to compare the geometry generated for the two measurement systems. Finally, an analysis was performed to compare them in terms of geometric and dimensional tolerances, being accounted for the contact measurements as a benchmark. As a result, some advice is given regarding the best scanning strategies and deviations are evaluated. Control dimensions of an aluminum part were measured by both methods (contact and non-contact). Using a 3D printer, copies of the aluminum detail were made and checked for deviations of their control dimensions and deviations from geometric accuracy (flatness and parallelism).

#### II. SEQUENCE MEASUREMENT

The measurement results show that the errors of noncontact and contact measurement methods are within the tolerance of the measuring arm. The sources of most deviations are due to the printing process of the details(Table 2). The main sources of these deviations are due to: material shrinkage and deformation challenged by residual stress or rapid cooling, machine positioning errors [3], first layer adhesion problem, material extrusion problem (over or under-extrusion). Before starting any print, it is important to check the bed level. If the bed is not properly leveled, the first layer may not stick to the slab. The bed temperature is checked while printing starts. Some materials require a heated substrate to ensure that the print will stick to the substrate. The temperature of the bed can be easily controlled by the slicing software. Nozzle height can also affect layer adhesion. This is mostly a one time adjustment where the height of the nozzle from the bed is adjusted to the optimum level. If the nozzle is too high from the bed, then the deposited layer will not stick or even fall in the desired place. If the height is too low, then the nozzle itself can scrape off the build-up material. The height of the nozzle can also affect the extrusion of material, if the nozzle is too close to the build plate, then the extruder may not be able to apply the required amount of material to the bed. Therefore, it is important to set the appropriate height of the nozzle.

The HEXAGON Absolute arm 8525-7 measuring arm with 7 degrees of freedom with integrated RS5 laser scanner and OPTIV M 4.4.3 multisensor and optical coordinate measuring machines (CMM) draw on the strength of Hexagon's Enhanced Productivity Series (EPS) were used for the research.

TABLE 1 MEASUREMENT	ACCURACY	VALUES
---------------------	----------	--------

Model	E <sub>UNI</sub>	P <sub>SIZE</sub>	L <sub>DIA</sub>	P <sub>FORM</sub>	SSA
	mm	mm	mm	mm	mm
8525-7	0.031	0.012	0.048	0.025	0.048

The certification specifies four accuracy values (see Table 1) known as  $E_{UNI}$ ,  $P_{SIZE}$ ,  $P_{FORM}$   $\mu$  L<sub>DIA</sub>. Each of these values represents a different aspect of the contact measurement accuracy of a portable measuring arm. The  $E_{UNI}$  value is the maximum allowable error for unidirectional length measurements. Therefore, it most accurately reflects most measurement needs. The  $P_{SIZE}$  value is the maximum allowable error for measuring the diameter of a sphere. Therefore, it reflects the accuracy of the feature measurements.

The value of  $P_{FORM}$  is the maximum allowable error for the shape of a sphere. This is a value that determines the accuracy of the shoulder variance.

The  $L_{DIA}$  value is the maximum allowable error for the articulation location. It therefore represents the repeatability of the arm. Scanning accuracy is the SSA [mm] value.

The results of determining the geometric deviations (length, thickness, flatness and parallelism) of the control aluminum detail and the printed copies using the laser scanner (laser scan copy LSC) and the tactile sensor (tactile probe copy TPC) were established using the high-precision multi-sensor measuring machine OPTIV M 443 for which a protocol has been created.

#### III. ALUMINUM DETAIL RESULTS

The deviations in manufacturing of the aluminum detail are:

Length = 59,9825 mm (60mm by specification), Width = 10,5073 mm (10.5mm by specification), flatness - plane 1 = 0.009 mm and plane 2 = 0.003 mm, parallelism between plane 1 and plane 2 = 0.032mm.

All deviations are within the tolerance for the accuracy requirements of the detail.

# IV. TACTILE SENSOR RESULTS

The dimensions obtained by measuring the aluminum detail using the tactile sensors (see above) were used to print this copy. Measurement errors [5] are limited mainly by the shape deviation and roughness of the sensor sphere and the overall stability of the instrument during the measurement procedure. Deviations after printing are shown below:

Length = 59,6861 mm, Width = 10,4295 mm, flatness - plane 1 = 0.093 mm and plane 2 = 0.003 mm, parallelism between plane 1 and plane 2 = 0.484mm.

# V. LASER SCANED PART RESULTS

The dimensions (fig.1) obtained from the non-contact laser scan were used to print this copy of the detail. The laser-scanned part processing program PolyWorks allows high-end point cloud inspection to produce a CAD model in STL format. Dark, shiny and transparent surfaces cannot be scanned with this method. This is because from the experiments we have done in order to obtain a quality model of the scanned object there must be a diffuse reflection of the laser beam. During the scan operation [2], the system allows the selection of different exposure times, so that a complete image of the scanned surface can be obtained even in the conditions of the existence of areas with relatively important color differences.

Object positioning during scanning can also be a source of errors. Correct positioning must be done to avoid object surfaces being parallel to the incident beam. If this cannot be avoided, the scan will be performed in several reference positions. That is how views are obtained in which the surfaces are with sufficiently wide angles versus the incident beam to avoid gaps in the point cloud. Although non-contact scanning allows a faster point cloud, a larger number of points, and access to narrower channels or holes than contact scanning, there are situations where areas of the detail cannot be reached [12]. These surfaces are of the type of holes or narrow channels, the deep areas of which are shaded by their walls.

Sometimes it is possible to inspect them by choosing a convenient position on the detail, but there are cases when

they cannot be reached, necessitating physically cutting the piece or giving the inspection to the relevant areas.

The results after printing the model thus obtained are shown below:

Length = 59.9825 mm, Width = 10.5073 mm, flatness - plane 1 = 0.259 mm and plane 2 = 0.324 mm, parallelism between plane 1 and plane 2 = 0.267 mm.



Fig.1 Laser-scanned part dimensions.

Borislav Georgiev, et al. Comparative Analysis of Geometric Deviations in Contact Measuring Instruments for Control and Laser Contactless Scanning

TABLE 2 MEAUSERMENT PROTOCOL

Image: Permander:    SERNAMMER:    STATS COUNT:    I      ZZ    MM    RATI - PLNI    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    RAT2 - PLN2    -    -    OUTTOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      MM    RAT2 - PLN2    -    -    OUTTOL    -    OUTTOL      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    -    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.032    0.032    0.022      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      A    0.037    0.010    0.001    0.037    0.000    0.0170      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.010		De	PART NAME : latvia			февруари 02, 2023 11:12				
Д/2    MM    RAT1 - PLN1      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    - TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.009    0.000    0.000      Z/7    MM    RAT2 - PLN2      -		PC	REVIN	REV NUMBER :		SER NUMBER :		STATS COUNT : 1		
MX    NOMINAL    +TOL    TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    -0.000    0.010    0.000    0.009    0.009    0.000      Z/7    MM    RAT2 - PLN2    - <th></th> <th>MM</th> <th>FLAT1 - PLN1</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>		MM	FLAT1 - PLN1							
M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.009    0.009    0.000      L <sup>2</sup> MM    RAT2 - PLN2	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
□□    MM    RAT2 - PLN2      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    - TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUITOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.003    0.003    0.000      //    MM    PARLI - PLN1 TO PLN2	м		0.000	0.010	0.000	0.009	0.009	0.000	an antana an an 🖿	
AX  NOMINAL  +TOL  .TOL  MEAS  DEV  OUTTOL    M  PARLI -PLNI TO PLN2		MM	FLAT2 - PLN2							
M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.003    0.003    0.000      //    MM    PARLI -PLNI TO PLN2      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.032    0.032    0.022      A    DEG    ANGLI -PLN2 TO PLNI    .	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
//    MM    PARLI - PLN1 TO PUV2      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    - TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.032    0.032    0.022      AX    DEG    ANGLI - PLAZ TO PLN1	м		0.000	0.010	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.000		
AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.032    0.032    0.022    Image: Constrained in the constrained	11	MM	PARL1 - PLN1 T	O PLN2						
M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.032    0.032    0.032    0.022      ▲    DEG    ANGL1 - PLNZ TO PLN1      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    - TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      A    0.037    0.010    -0.010    0.037    0.000    0.000      L    MM    RAT3 - PLN3	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
A    DEG    ANGL1 - PLN2 TO PLN1      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      A    0.037    0.010    -0.010    0.037    0.000    0.000      Image: Angle of the plane	м		0.000	0.010	0.000	0.032	0.032	0.022		
AX  NOMINAL  + TOL  - TOL  MEAS  DEV  OUTTOL    A  0.037  0.010  -0.010  0.037  0.000  0.000    IZI  MM  FAT3 - PLN3	⊿	DEG	ANGL1 - PLN2 T	O PLN1						
A  0.037  0.010  -0.010  0.037  0.000  0.000    Image: Ima	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
Image: Constraint of the second of	A		0.037	0.010	-0.010	0.037	0.000	0.000	a na lili e la a l	
AX  NOMINAL  +TOL  -TOL  MEAS  DEV  OUTTOL    M  0.000  0.010  0.000  0.093  0.093  0.083    //  MM  PARL2 - PLIN2 TO PLIN3		MM	FLAT3 - PLN3							
M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.093    0.093    0.093    0.083      //    MM    PARL2 - PLN2 TO PLN3         OUTTOL       AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.484    0.484    0.474    •      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      AX    0.449    0.010    -0.010    0.449    0.000    0.000      IZO    MM    FLAT4 - PLN4    -    -    OUTOL    OUTTOL    M      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    PARL3 - PLN4 TO PLN5    -    -    OUTTOL    -    O.000 <td>AX</td> <td></td> <td>NOMINAL</td> <td>+TOL</td> <td>-TOL</td> <td>MEAS</td> <td>DEV</td> <td>OUTTOL</td> <td></td>	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
//    MM    PARL2 - PLN2 TO PLN3      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.484    0.484    0.474      M    DEG    ANGL3 - PLN2 TO PLN3	м		0.000	0.010	0.000	0.093	0.093	0.083		
AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.484    0.484    0.474    Image: Constrained of the state of the	11	MM	PARL2 - PLN2 TO PLN3							
M  0.000  0.010  0.000  0.484  0.484  0.474    △  DEG  ANGL3 - PLN2 TO PLN3     AX  NOMINAL  + TOL  TOL  MEAS  DEV  OUTTOL    A  0.449  0.010  -0.010  0.449  0.000  0.000    Image: Comparison of the participation of the partipation of the partipation	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
∠A    DEG    ANGL3 - PLN2 TO PLN3      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    - TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      A    0.449    0.010    -0.010    0.449    0.000    0.000      AX    MM    FLAT4 - PLN4    -    -    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    - TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    - TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      MY    FLAT5 - PLN5	м		0.000	0.010	0.000	0.484	0.484	0.474		
AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      A    0.449    0.010    -0.010    0.449    0.000    0.000      Image: Constrained and the second an	⊿	DEG	ANGL3 - PLN2 TO PLN3							
A    0.449    0.010    -0.010    0.449    0.000    0.000      Image: Constraint of the straint of the strain	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
Image: MM    FLAT4 - PLN4      AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.259    0.259    0.249      M    FLAT5 - PLN5	A		0.449	0.010	-0.010	0.449	0.000	0.000		
AX  NOMINAL  +TOL  -TOL  MEAS  DEV  OUTTOL    M  0.000  0.010  0.000  0.259  0.259  0.249    Image: Constrained and the state of the		MM	FLAT4 - PLN4							
M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.259    0.249      Image: MM    FLATS - PLNS    AX    NOMINAL    + TOL    - TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.324    0.324    0.314    -      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.324    0.324    0.314    -      M    PARL3 - PLN4 TO PLNS    -	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
Image: MM    FLATS - PLNS      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.324    0.324    0.314    Image: MM      MM    PARL3 - PLN4 TO PLN5 <t< td=""><td>М</td><td></td><td>0.000</td><td>0.010</td><td>0.000</td><td>0.259</td><td>0.259</td><td>0.249</td><td></td></t<>	М		0.000	0.010	0.000	0.259	0.259	0.249		
AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.324    0.314    0.314    0.011    0.001      //    MM    PARL3 - PLN4 TO PLN5        0.000    0.010    0.000    0.267    0.267    0.257          MA    DEG    ANGL5 - PLN4 TO PLN5          0.000    0.267    0.267    0.257   <		MM	FLAT5 - PLN5							
M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.324    0.324    0.314      //    MM    PARL3 - PLN4 TO PLN5	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
MM    PARL3 - PLN4 TO PLN5      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.267    0.257    1 </td <td>м</td> <td></td> <td>0.000</td> <td>0.010</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>0.324</td> <td>0.324</td> <td>0.314</td> <td>Nanananananan</td>	м		0.000	0.010	0.000	0.324	0.324	0.314	Nanananananan	
AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.267    0.257    0.257      M    DEG    ANGL5 - PLN4 TO PLN5    EV    OUTTOL      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      AX    180.044    0.010    -0.010    180.044    0.000    0.000	11	MM	PARL3 - PLN4 T	O PLN5						
M    0.000    0.010    0.000    0.267    0.267    0.257    1    1    1      M    DEG    ANGL5 - PLN4 TO PLN5    V    V    V    V    OUTTOL    M      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL    OUTTOL	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
DEG    ANGL5 - PLN4 TO PLN5      AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      A    180.044    0.010    -0.010    180.044    0.000    0.000	м		0.000	0.010	0.000	0.267	0.267	0.257		
AX    NOMINAL    +TOL    -TOL    MEAS    DEV    OUTTOL      A    180.044    0.010    -0.010    180.044    0.000    0.000	⊿	DEG	ANGL5 - PLN4 T	O PLN5						
A 180.044 0.010 -0.010 180.044 0.000 0.000	AX		NOMINAL	+TOL	-TOL	MEAS	DEV	OUTTOL		
	A		180.044	0.010	-0.010	180.044	0.000	0.000	av frami	

## VI. CONCLUSION

Despite the rapid growth of 3D printers in many fields of technique and household, the factors that affect the accuracy of 3D printed models have not been thoroughly studied. It is often necessary to create models by laser scanning, which are then to be printed on a 3D printer. According the results obtained in the paper, it can be concluded, that current scanning technologies allow the creation of 3D models with accuracy within tolerances, this is not always achieved when printing the model in practice. Inaccuracies are due to errors occurring during the 3D printing itself. Understanding and researching the factors that affect the accuracy of a 3D printed model and the metrics used to measure that accuracy is key in creating methodologies leading to the reduction of these errors and the corresponding increase in the accuracy of printed models.

# REFERENCES

- W.-K. Chen, Linear Networks and Systems. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1993, pp. 123-135.
- [2] Z. Sheb, Tang., O. Kanaan, and Y. Cho, As-Built Error Modeling for Effective 3D Laser Scanning on Construction Sites, Proceedings of the 2013 ASCE International Workshop on

Computing in Civil Engineering, June 23-25, Univ. of Southern California, LA, California. pp. 533-540.

- [3] D. Dichev, I. Zhelezarov, N. Madzharov. System for Measuring the Attitude of Moving Objects, using a Kalman Filter and MEMS Sensors. Comptes rendus de l'Academie bulgare des Sciences, Volume 72, Issue 11, pp. 1527-1536, 2019, DOI: 10.7546/CRABS.2019.11.10
- [4] D. Hernandez, Factors Affecting Dimensional Precision of Consumer 3D Printing. International Journal of Aviation, Aeronautics, and Aerospace, 2(4), 2015. https://doi.org/10.15394/ijaaa.2015.1085
- [5] D. Dichev, F. Kogia, H. Nikolova, D. Diakov. A Mathematical Model of the Error of Measuring Instruments for Investigating the Dynamic Characteristics. Journal of Engineering Science and Technology Review. Volume 11, Issue 6, 2018, pp. 14-19, DOI: 10.25103/jestr.116.03
- [6] M. Jadayel and F. Khameneifar, Improving Geometric Accuracy of 3D Printed Parts Using 3D Metrology Feedback and Mesh Morphing, J. Manuf. Mater. Process. 2020, 4, 112; doi:10.3390/jmmp4040112
- [7] E. Sachs, M. Cima, P. Williams, D. Brancazio, J. Cornie, Three Dimensional Printing: Rapid Tooling and Prototypes Directly from a CAD Model. J. Eng. Ind. 1992, 114, 481–488.

- [8] Ts. Zlateva-Petltova, The necessity of organizational learning and its relation to knowledge management, IV International conference "Economics and management – based on the new technologies", EMoNT 2014, 12-15 June 2014. Vrnjachka Banja. Serbia, pp. 376-384, ISBN 978-86-6075-045-9
- [9] Z. Lianghua, Z. Xinfeng, Error Analysis and Experimental Research on 3D Printing, IOP Conf. Series: Materials Science and Engineering 592 012150, 2019, doi:10.1088/1757-899X/592/1/012150.
- [10] Ts. Zlateva-Petkova, Planning and forecasting future demand for employees, VI International Conference "Economics and management – based on new technologies", EMONT 2016, 16-19 June 2016, Vrnjacka Banja, Serbia, pp. 401-406, ISBN: 978-86-6075-059-6
- [11] H. Wang, J. Wang, Q. Zhou, Q. Xiong, Z. Wei 2017 Comprehensive Error Compensation Method of Numerical Control Machine Based on BP Neural Network. Journal of Xi'an Jiaotong University 6:138~145
- [12] T. Pencheva, D. Pulov, B. Gyoch, M. Nenkov Design of CCD Optical System for Thermal IR Spectral Region. In pr. 29-th International Spring Seminar fn Electronics Technology, St. Marienthal, Germany, Verlag Dr. Markus A. Detert, 2006, pp. 413-418, ISBN 3-934142-23-0.