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# 1 Background

As the demand for increasingly advanced invasive medical procedures rises with the average age of the population, it also becomes increasingly compelling to facilitate and extend the spatial awareness and dexterity of surgeons, both human and robotic. One may accomplish this by tracking an object digitally and representing its motion in a close virtual representation of the area around the incision, such as through an augmented reality platform. Several groups across a diverse range of academia and industry have competed to develop better and better methods of digitally tracking objects ***[CITATION]***. In the entertainment industry in particular, object tracking is a fundamental way of bringing life-like motion to an object represented in virtual space. The generally accepted approach is to use large, complicated, and expensive computer vision (CV) systems to yield real-time tracking ***[CITATION]***. However, this approach is not suited for medical applications; CV is limited by a strict field of view. Accurately tracking surgical instruments inside of organic tissues must then be done another way.

Of the methods investigated by others ***[CITATION]***, none are as applicable in a medical context as magnetic field sensing. Human tissues are permeable to magnetic flux, and magnetic fields are well characterized. Upon this motivation, we have constructed an inexpensive device from off-the-shelf parts that enables the tracking of a permanent magnet on a ***contoured surface*** to serve as a foundation for future work in this field.

# 2 Methods

Electromagnetic fields are characterized by fundamental principles. Given a classic magnetic dipole centered at the origin, its magnetic induction can be expressed as:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (1) |

Whereby the relationship is dependent on the orientation of the magnet and the strength of its magnetic moment vector, given by , as well as the location of the arbitrary point of interest with respect to the center of the magnet, represented by vector . Equation (1) can be modified to express the strength of the magnetic field **,** which is what an observing magnetometer normal to the level surface of the magnetic field would perceive; which may further be broken into a more convenient polar component form, given the intrinsic rotational symmetry of isofield lines about .

Based on the work of Chen *et al* ***[FINEXUS CITATION]***, expressing the location of the center of a magnet with respect to the magnetic field vectors observed by three sensors in predefined relative positions satisfies a system of equations when the magnet is in a fixed orientation ***along the sensor’s x-axis***:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (2) |
|  | (3) |
|  | (4) |

Whereby, represents a sensor in the array, is the distance to the center of the magnet for the sensor, is the relative offset from a designated origin with respect to the sensor, represents the angle made by the north pole of the magnet and the radial component of , and K represents a constant that encompasses the magnitude of the dipole moment, magnetic permeability of free space , and the relative permeability of the magnet’s material.

However, one must maintain certain minimum assumptions for a solution to converge in a numerical solver.

1. An origin must be defined with respect to the relative fixed positions and orientations of the sensors.
2. The constant value of the magnetic field strength coefficient K of an arbitrary magnet has been closely approximated, or is otherwise known.
3. The constant magnetic field source of perceivable threshold exists within range of at least three sensors in the sensor array.

In addition, to refine accuracy, certain physical restrictions facilitate these conditions.

1. Ambient magnetic fields must be mitigated; or the signal must be otherwise overcome.
2. The magnet’s form factor is minimized to yield closer adherence to presupposed principles.

To begin achieving these conditions, we designate the sensor in the bottom left corner of our array to be the origin. All sensors’ axis in the array are aligned with each other.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (5) |

Equation (5) is derived from Eqns. (3) and (4) if motion occurs along a single axis, namely, *x***.**Empirically approximating the value of K for an arbitrary dipole magnet can then be done procedurally. A proof of concept was completed by hand. We have done this precisely using a custom CNC machine. As follows:

1. The magnet is placed at a particular distance away from sensor *i* such that (*x*, y = 0, z = 0).
2. A sample of K is computed from for sensor *i*.
3. The magnet is moved to = (, y = 0, z = 0).
4. Another sample of K is computed from .
5. The process is repeated a few iterations for various values of , and for each sensor.
6. An approximated result of K yields from averaging the sampled points.

**[INSERT PICTURE OF ARRAY]**

The first device consisted of a pair of IMUs across from each other calculating the distance to the magnet and triangulating a location from there. Additional sensors were added to enable ***limited*** 3D tracking and extend the range. The array is ***finally comprised of six*** *Sparkfun LSM9DS1 IMU* *breakouts* arranged in a circular pattern around a central area. They are switched to by a *Sparkfun 74HC4051 8-channel* *multiplexer* *breakout*, and data is driven through the Arduino compatible *PJRC Teensy v3.2* via I2C. This information is then lightly manipulated and output, line by line, through Serial Bus to a capable Python script on a PC.

Sensor readings are taken by the IMUs every ***[PERIOD]***, yielding the XYZ components of with respect to the sensor orientation. Geomagnetism is partially accounted for with the IMUs’ built-in function given a local declination. To mitigate the effect of remaining ambient magnetic fields, sensor readings are averaged over 50 readings upon reset and the result is subtracted from later readings for each sensor, respectively. Drifting is observed to be minimal, yet further mitigation is left as future work. Readings henceforth start at ±20 milliGauss and range to ±16 Gauss, according to the built-in 16-bit analog to digital converter in the IMU chip. This information for each sensor is output by the *Teensy* to the PC, where it is split and sorted by the Python script.

Each sensor allows the script to assemble one possible input equation according to Eqns. (2), (3) and (4) for a total of six coupled equations. As can be observed, the constructed system of equations is non-linear and has no analytical solution, thus the need for a numerical technique to aid in the computation of the magnet’s position arises. Computation begins after the script has assembled the nonlinear system of equations and chosen the three rendered from the sensors calculated to have the largest respective to pass to a Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm (LMA) powered by the versatile *SciPy* module. The reason that only three equations are being considered during the computation process stems from the fact that *SciPy*’s implementation of the LMA lacks support for overdetermined systems of equations.

LMA was chosen for its robustness and speed of convergence. Its accessibility within *SciPy*, notwithstanding. Furthermore, since LMA combines Newton-Raphson’s algorithm and the Steepest Descent method, it converges to a solution even if the initial guess is far off the mark. Yet, to reduce computation time, the initial guess is determined as the centroid of the triangle formed by the same sensors from which the solvable system of equations are sourced.

A permanent magnet of ***[DIMENSIONS]*** is chosen as the source and assumed to have an ideal magnetic dipole field at long-distance.

Further optimization is required, especially and including the mitigation of ambient fields, the sampling rate, computation time, arbitrary orientations of the magnet, and ***[LIVE PLOT REFRESH RATE?].*** We have identified these issues and leave their resolution to future work.

# 3 Results

The Results section describes the evaluation of the design or the experimental methods.

* Examples of data plot
* Speed of the data
* Accuracy and precision
* Discuss permeability of materials to magnetic flux

# 4 Interpretation

The Interpretation section provides an interpretation of the results and conclusions of the study.

* Limitations of the approach
  + No visualization of the orientation of the magnet, yet.
  + Only one magnetic point at a time.
* Other calibration considerations
* How to improve!
  + Optimize software.
  + Improve data sampling rate.
  + Redress fundamental principles; higher abstraction models.
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