

# Predictive Quality Control

Vinit S. Unni, Alex Joseph, Athulan Vijayraghavan

---

## Abstract

In this paper, we propose a method to infer and predict the quality parameter of a machined part thus eliminating/reducing the need for manual quality measurement of the same. We however have not proven that the model works once we perform a tool change. We start by reading the power consumption data of the manufacturing machine. In this data, we look for pre-decided patterns which would correspond to a machining cycle and characterise each part by its corresponding pattern. After finding out the relevant patterns in our power consumption data we extract features from it and use it in a polynomial regression model to get a relation between these features and the quality parameter. After running multiple experiments, we see that the proposed method lets us predict the quality parameter with an error of about 1%. We also see that these results are quite stable and repeated when we use our method for different feature extraction parameters.

*Keywords:* quality, predictive quality, polynomial regression

---

## 1. Introduction

### *1.1. How is quality measured in present time?*

Present day quality measurements are done using various metrological tools which quantify various shapes and/or form features of the part. These features are given their individual limits by the designer which help a metrologist in determining whether a part that has just been manufactured is fit to be deemed a good part or not. However, most of these tools are completely external equipments which need to be explicitly used over the part(s) to see the results. This usually calls for extra man-power and reduced throughput. So what manufacturers end up doing is that they keep an inspection frequency for non critical parts where quality checks on these parts are made at regular intervals until one sees an anomaly. How this anomaly is responded to again

The main problem with such a way of measurement is that :-

---

\*Corresponding author

\*\*Principal corresponding author

<sup>1</sup>This is the specimen author footnote.

<sup>2</sup>Another author footnote, but a little more longer.

1. We have to make a compromise between the throughput and inspection interval.
2. As the quality measurement is isolated from part manufacturing, you can't detect a bad part unless it has already been manufactured.

### *1.2. How do we propose to measure it?*

The main gist of the ideology we have applied is that, when a part is being made, the information of each cut made by the machine is reflected in some real-time aspect of the machine. It could be noise, power, vibration, loads, etc. So what we do is, we record these variables (in our case, power) real-time using appropriate tools and find a correlation between these readings and the quality of the part manufactured. This correlation can be tightened depending on the kind of accuracy one is looking for. It also has an advantage over the conventional approach in certain key aspects such as:-

1. The computational time is significantly less once a correlation model has been made. Also, buying computational time is cheaper than wasting producing time.
2. The feedback we get is near to real time and we could infact get early warnings as the part is being made.
3. The kind of investment needed for this is much lesser compared to buying precise instruments which, other than being pretty expensive, usually have only a single functionality.

## **2. Methodology**

### *2.1. Getting Quality data*

As we need to correlate between power readings during a producing cycle and quality, we are essentially trying to create a model or create a procedure to generate a model which would take the power readings as input and give the quality as output. Thus, we needed some input quality data for a training set.

For this, we monitored the Ra values of a part, which underwent turning operation using a new tool insert, at regular intervals (once in 25 parts for first 500 cycles and once in every 10 parts from there on) for 1030 parts. These measurements were made at two different faces and three different locations in each face. We observed a downward trend in the Ra values for the first 300 parts after which they were more or less constant without any particular trend (save for an anomalous jump at partt 500) till part 1000 after which they again rose up and went outside the specification limit (see Fig 1).

So we decided to use the trend evident in the first 300 parts for our model creation and verification. We created a 2 degree polynomial fit (usig least squares approach) for the first three hundred parts using 12 readings as our control points. The equation turns out to be

$$y = 3.35664 - 0.00324170.x + 0.000006684611.x^2 \quad (1)$$




Figure 1: Quality trend

Where,  $y$  is the Ra value and  $x$  is the part number. We see a maximum error of  $0.0833\mu m$  in the fit. For figure, see Fig.2 for the curve and Fig.3 for the residuals' curve.

Now this sample of 300 points was used as our quality data sample which would be used for creating the model and verifying the same.

## 2.2. Detect Cycles

For input of the model we decided to use power readings. We decided to go with power readings as one would expect a direct correlation between energy consumed and material removed. Also, it depends very little on parts of the machine which are not responsible for cutting (eg. housing) and thus we can make our system more flexible for various machines. Also, power readings can be easily obtained using conventional power meters.

As we plan to make an autonomous correlation model, we need to be able to correctly identify the start and end times of a production cycle. In relatively newer machines, this data can be obtained via the controller. However, the number of machines which are not capable of that are quite large. So we need to come up with a method to let the machine identify a cycle and record its start and end time. We use a simple pattern matching approach here. We are going to analyze the power readings we get as a stream of data and in it look for recognisable patterns which would indicate whether and where a cycle




Figure 2: Polynomial fit of Ra values




Figure 3: Residuals of polynomial fit for Ra values




Figure 4: Mapping of two time streams using DTW

occurred. So to start, we need a known producing cycle which we can use as a template for comparisons. Once we decide this template we use an algorithm called **Dynamic Time Warping** (DTW) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].

### 2.2.1. Dynamic Time Warping

Dynamic time warping is a method to compute the similarity between two sequences. To compare these two sequences, one can *warp* (stretch/compress) the sequences non-linearly. Originally used as a tool to detect speech patterns in *Autonomous speech recognition*, DTW is now used in many applications which need to compare one sequence to another. One can limit the amount of warping and thus ensure that realistic results are obtained.

As we can see in Fig 4, even if we have a time shift and small variations in data, the DTW algorithm maps significant features appropriately. This robustness is a result of the warping along time direction allowed. One can also limit the amount of warping permissible so that we can ensure that only physically possible cases are deemed similar. The distance between two sequences being

compared is found has sum of distances (euclidean, manhattan, etc) between these mapped points.

### *2.3. Extracting input from power consumption pattern*

Now we have the start and end times for 300 producing cycles and we can use this data to get power consumption patterns for each individual part and use it as necessary. However, we can't use these patterns directly as inputs for any machine learning algorithm as it has many inherent problems. The main reason being that small time offsets in the time series data could throw off the result by a large amount. So we basically needed to process our power pattern to extract more stable information from it. By stable, we mainly mean that we must get same information if we shift a cycle by a small amount (say 1 sec). However in the process of making it stable, we also have to make sure that we don't lose the individuality of the pattern as we depend on this individual character for our quality reading. We resolved this using two methods:-

1. Scalar extractions from pattern.
2. Cycle splitting.

#### *2.3.1. Scalar extractions from splitting*

Here we extract from our cycle a set of scalars which are stable and do not get affected due to small changes like minor time scaling, peaks, etc. These scalars could be mean, standard deviation, DTW distance, median, mode, amplitude, etc. However, as pointed out earlier, using these scalars alone would render many cycles to be same as we are wasting a lot of information. So we use, not one, but a combination of these scalars as now we get more options of variability thus giving us our desired result of stable and unique inputs. Here, we used only two of these functions:-

1. Mean
2. Standard deviation

#### *2.3.2. Cycle splitting*

This is a much more important process and increases the effectiveness of scalar extraction. What we essentially do cut the cycle into a number of parts using different methods (which will be discussed later) and apply the scalar extraction for each segment. So now we increase our number of inputs and also increase the individuality of each input in a stable way. The combination of various scalars for all splits of a cycle represent a particular cycle and all of them are used to get a final quality parameter (in our case, Ra) for each cycle. These *predicted quality metrics* can be compared against our *experimental quality metric* and we can get error associated with each part.

Much more importantly, when we later analyze our results, we can actually pinpoint which segments of the cycle are primarily responsible for the quality parameter being measured (in our case, Ra). This kind of information can




Figure 5: Uniform splitting (5 sections)

prove to be really useful as now we can know what part of the cycle is primarily responsible for which quality parameter. This can in turn help us detecting tool damages when we observe a deviation in certain quality parameter. Splitting the cycle gives us one more important advantage. Now we can calculate the quality metric of a cycle by including one split at a time, into our input set, sequentially. This can be really helpful in predicting parameter qualities before the machining is over and thus can help us in taking corrective action.

We primarily employed four different methods to split cycles. They were:-

1. **Uniform splitting:** As the name suggests, we split the cycle into equally sized sections. The number of parts would depend on how much accuracy we want and how much computation cost we can afford (Fig 5).
2. **Forward feedback splitting:** In this, we first assume the entire cycle to be a single section and run our algorithm (which is explained in 2.4 and 2.5) to select a model. Then we find the RMSE of the best available solution for the test set. Now we split the cycle into two equal halves and again run the algorithm and get a new RMSE. If the relative drop in RMSE is higher than a threshold and the timespans of newly created splits is longer than a user-defined limit, we retain the split and move to the first half which we split and continue comparing and splitting it further. However, if the improvement is not significant enough, we move on to the next available section and continue till we are done with all the sections. It is slightly biased to create more cuts in the beginning of the




Figure 6: Forward feedback splitting

cycle as we approach the limits of numerical accuracy of the model after the first few cuts (Fig 6).

3. **Reverse feedback splitting:** This is almost like the Forward Feedback Splitting but instead of biasing cuts to the start, this one biases cuts to the end as one moves to the latter half after a succesful split has been made and moves to preceding sections in case of unsuccessful (which are either very short or don't give significant improvemetn in RMSE) splits (7).
4. **Phase dependent splits:** These are cuts which signify a change in process in the machining. Theoretically, these should be the most optimum cuts as they point towards specific process. However, finding them out autonomously can be tricky if wanted for all situations thus these cuts have to be entered manually (Fig 8).

Now, after splitting the cycle appropriately and using scalar extraction for each split, we have a bunch of variables for a cycle which we will later use to get a wider set of data.

#### 2.4. Model Selection

There are a plethora of machine learning algorithms which we could use to establish a relation between our input and output. We decided to try the very simple models and thus decided to use *Polynomial Regression*. However, as our number of variables were bound to be high, we decided to keep the model






Figure 7: Reverse Feedback splitting




Figure 8: Phase dependent split

complexity to a minimum and thus decided to go forward with *Regularised Polynomial Regression* [6, 7, 8, 9].

#### 2.4.1. Regularised Regression

Say we try to create a linear relation between input variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n$  and output variable  $y$ . As it is linear, we can assume our equation to be

$$y = a_0 + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 + \dots + a_nx_n \quad (2)$$

Where  $a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n$  are the coefficients which we have to find.

Let us define input variable  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  as

$$\mathbf{X}_i = (x_1^i, x_2^i, x_3^i, \dots, x_n^i) \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{A} = (a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n) \quad (4)$$

where  $x_j^i$  is the  $i^{th}$  instance of the  $j^{th}$  variable. Thus, we get

$$y_i = a_0 + a_1x_1^i + a_2x_2^i + a_3x_3^i + \dots + a_nx_n^i \quad (5)$$

Now, say we have the  $p$  values of  $\mathbf{X}_i$  and its corresponding output which we denote by  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ . So to find the best approximation of  $\mathbf{A}$ , we minimize the difference between  $\mathbf{Y}_i$  and  $y_i$ . Let our final coefficients' set be  $\mathbf{A}_{LS}$ . Using least square method, we get

$$\mathbf{A}_{LS} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{A}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^p (y_i - \mathbf{Y}_i)^2 \right) \quad (6)$$

which can be re-written as

$$\mathbf{A}_{LS} = \arg \min \left( \sum_{i=1}^p (\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{Y}_i)^2 \right) \quad (7)$$

Thus as a result of linear regression, we finally get

$$y = \mathbf{A}_{LS}^T \mathbf{X} \quad (8)$$

when  $x_j$  are polynomial forms of each other, this is called polynomial regression. However, when the number of variables are high, i.e, when  $n$  is large, we tend to get highly complex models with high values of  $a_i$  which tend to overfit  $y$  as a function of  $\mathbf{X}$ . To remedy this, we include a regularization parameter  $\lambda$ , such that,  $\lambda > 0$  and

$$\mathbf{A}_{LS} = \arg \min \left( \sum_{i=1}^p (\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{Y}_i)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2 \right) \quad (9)$$

Thus, now we can control, via  $\lambda$ , how complex a system we want. Too high a  $\lambda$  gives us an overfit solution while too low a  $\lambda$  gives us an underfit one.

### 2.5. Model Creation

To implement *Regularised Polynomial Regression*, we first need to use our present variable set (which we got after extracting scalars from split sections of a cycle) to form polynomial variables. Firstly we divide our 300 cycles into two sets, a *training set* and a *testing set*. each cycle is assigned to one of these sets randomly and the ratio between the number of elements in the two sets can be decided by us. we chose a 1:1 ratio. Now, in the training set, for each variable (scalar from a split section), we have 150 other instances of the same corresponding to 150 cycles. This gives us a vector of that corresponding variable. This way we have a vector corresponding to all the variables. These vectors will be used to create the polynomial variables which will eventually be used as inputs into the *Regularised Linear Regression*. This we do in two ways:-

1. **Orthogonal polynomials-** We create new vectors which are orthonormal to each of the vector of variables we have. The degree of these orthogonal variables were varied to see which would yield reasonable results. We used the R function `poly {stats}` to find out the orthogonal polynomials for our purpose [10, 11].
2. **Mixed polynomials-** Here we create new vectors using the old variable vectors (denoted as  $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n$ ) which can be shown asllll

$$x_{new}(i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots, i_n) = \prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{i_j}; \quad (10)$$

where

$$i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots, i_n = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots; \quad (11)$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^n i_j \leq p; \quad (12)$$

Where  $p$  is the maximum degree which we vary to get optimum results. As expected, we get more number of variables using this method instead of the orthogonal polynomials one. However, it helps us know if there are any meaningful interactions within the variables.

Now that we have our input vectors' set created, we just use *Regularised Linear Regression* to get a list of possible relations between our input quality. In the next section we discuss how we select the right parameters from this given list.

### 2.6. Parameter comparison and selection

The output of the *regularised polynomial regression* is a list of solutions. Each solution contains a collection of coefficients which we use for a weighted summation of our newly calculated variable vectors. To compare between these various

solutions, we use them and predict quality parameter values for our test set and then we compare these predicted values against our polynomial fit values (from 2.1 ) and find out the *root mean square error*( $RMSE$ ), where we assume that the polynomial fit values are the true values. We use this  $RMSE$  as a metric to compare between the solutions and pick the solution with minimum  $RMSE$  [6].

### 3. Results and Conclusion

In this section we will show the results we obtained for various cases by changing the degree of our polynomial variable, the method of polynomial creation (see 2.5) and mode of splitting (see 2.3.2) .

#### 3.1. Uniform Splitting

Like explained in 2.3.2, we split each detected cycle into equal sized sections before running our algorithms. Here we use a table to denote the performance characteristics of a table which would help us take a decision about how good/bad a method is. A table denotes to a method which splits a cycle into a fixed number of equal-sized segments and uses a particular method for polynomial variable generation. The first column shows the maximum degree used for polynomial variable formation. The second number shows the degree of freedom of the model which in our case is the number of variables with non-zero coefficients. The third and fourth columns show the *root mean square error* ( $RMSE$ ) of the best solution available for that degree (see 2.6) for the test set and training set respectively. Finally, the last two columns denote the maximum error for of the best solution for both the test set and the training set respectively.

##### 3.1.1. One section

As the name suggests, here the entire cycle is a single section. Thus the cycle without splits would look like Fig 9.

The results have been summarised in Table 1 for orthonormal variables and in Table 2 for mixed polynomial variable.

##### 3.1.2. Two sections

Here, the cycle is split into two sections. Thus the cycle without splits would look like Fig 10.

The results have been summarised in Table 3 for orthonormal variables and in Table 4 for mixed polynomial variable.

##### 3.1.3. Three sections

Here, the cycle is split into three sections. Thus the cycle without splits would look like Fig 11 and the results have been summarised in Table 5 for orthonormal polynomial variable and Table 6 for mixed polynomial variable.




Figure 9: Uniform split single section,

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 8                 | 0.0990                        | 0.0986                            | 0.3566                                 | 0.3472                                     |
| 3      | 12                | 0.0986                        | 0.0983                            | 0.3467                                 | 0.3430                                     |
| 4      | 15                | 0.0997                        | 0.0953                            | 0.3002                                 | 0.3392                                     |
| 5      | 19                | 0.0957                        | 0.0929                            | 0.2809                                 | 0.3437                                     |

Table 1: Single section uniform splitting, orthonormal polynomial variables

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 8                 | 0.0975                        | 0.1007                            | 0.3416                                 | 0.3480                                     |
| 3      | 6                 | 0.0976                        | 0.1005                            | 0.3443                                 | 0.3472                                     |
| 4      | 12                | 0.0976                        | 0.1006                            | 0.3441                                 | 0.3466                                     |
| 5      | 13                | 0.0976                        | 0.1004                            | 0.3390                                 | 0.3464                                     |

Table 2: Single section uniform split, mixed polynomial variables.




Figure 10: Uniform split- Two sections

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 8                 | 0.0668                        | 0.0586                            | 0.4173                                 | 0.1650                                     |
| 3      | 12                | 0.0645                        | 0.0564                            | 0.4235                                 | 0.1685                                     |
| 4      | 15                | 0.0674                        | 0.0564                            | 0.4358                                 | 0.1777                                     |
| 5      | 18                | 0.0685                        | 0.0551                            | 0.4072                                 | 0.1686                                     |

Table 3: Uniform splitting-two sections, orthonormal variables

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 9                 | 0.0696                        | 0.0581                            | 0.4444                                 | 0.1523                                     |
| 3      | 9                 | 0.0689                        | 0.0580                            | 0.4405                                 | 0.1534                                     |
| 4      | 13                | 0.0683                        | 0.0576                            | 0.4382                                 | 0.1550                                     |
| 5      | 13                | 0.0677                        | 0.0579                            | 0.4287                                 | 0.1572                                     |

Table 4: Uniform splitting-two sections, mixed polynomial variables




Figure 11: Uniform split, Three sections

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 12                | 0.0448                        | 0.0413                            | 0.1421                                 | 0.1679                                     |
| 3      | 13                | 0.0480                        | 0.0405                            | 0.1483                                 | 0.1436                                     |
| 4      | 13                | 0.0495                        | 0.0416                            | 0.1407                                 | 0.1336                                     |
| 5      | 20                | 0.0522                        | 0.0354                            | 0.2816                                 | 0.1209                                     |

Table 5: Uniform splitting-three sections, orthonormal variables

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 14                | 0.0431                        | 0.0426                            | 0.1399                                 | 0.2375                                     |
| 3      | 9                 | 0.0427                        | 0.0454                            | 0.1423                                 | 0.2728                                     |
| 4      | 7                 | 0.0427                        | 0.0477                            | 0.1417                                 | 0.2746                                     |
| 5      | 9                 | 0.0420                        | 0.0466                            | 0.1303                                 | 0.2706                                     |

Table 6: Uniform splitting-three sections, orthonormal variables




Figure 12: Uniform splitting-Five sections

#### 3.1.4. Five sections

Here, the cycle is split into five sections. Thus the cycle without splits would look like Fig 12 and the results have been summarised in Table 7 for orthonormal variables and Table 8 for mixed polynomial variable.

#### 3.1.5. Six sections

Here, the cycle is split into six sections. Thus the cycle without splits would look like Fig 13 and the results have been summarised in Table 9 for orthonormal variables and Table 10 for mixed polynomial variable.

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 20                | 0.0561                        | 0.0285                            | 0.4086                                 | 0.0835                                     |
| 3      | 10                | 0.0647                        | 0.0357                            | 0.6190                                 | 0.1278                                     |
| 4      | 10                | 0.0647                        | 0.0357                            | 0.6190                                 | 0.1278                                     |
| 5      | 2                 | 0.1156                        | 0.0341                            | 0.8198                                 | 0.2196                                     |

Table 7: Uniform splits, Five sections-Orthonormal variable polynomial



| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 11                | 0.0850                        | 0.0315                            | 0.8171                                 | 0.0984                                     |
| 3      | 11                | 0.0881                        | 0.0315                            | 0.8564                                 | 0.0986                                     |
| 4      | 14                | 0.0931                        | 0.0316                            | 0.9168                                 | 0.1009                                     |
| 5      | 5                 | 0.0977                        | 0.0383                            | 0.8786                                 | 0.1595                                     |

Table 8: Uniform splits, Five sections-mixed polynomial variable




Figure 13: Uniform splitting-Six sections

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 23                | 0.0367                        | 0.0226                            | 0.2078                                 | 0.0797                                     |
| 3      | 34                | 0.0409                        | 0.0207                            | 0.2424                                 | 0.0728                                     |
| 4      | 44                | 0.0397                        | 0.0200                            | 0.2355                                 | 0.0750                                     |
| 5      | 28                | 0.0502                        | 0.0242                            | 0.3099                                 | 0.0731                                     |

Table 9: Uniform splits, Six sections-Orthonormal variables

| Degree | Degree of Freedom | RMSE for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | RMSE for training set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for test set ( $\mu m$ ) | Maximum error for training set ( $\mu m$ ) |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2      | 75                | 0.0382                        | 0.0215                            | 0.1901                                 | 0.0855                                     |
| 3      | 11                | 0.0395                        | 0.0279                            | 0.1959                                 | 0.0914                                     |
| 4      | 13                | 0.0383                        | 0.0265                            | 0.1980                                 | 0.0902                                     |
| 5      | 17                | 0.0373                        | 0.0256                            | 0.1973                                 | 0.0960                                     |

Table 10: Uniform splits, Six sections - mixed polynomial variable

### 3.1.6. Discussion

Here we are primarily concerned with the RMSE value of each solution. As we can see from the tables:-

1. Usually, the orthonormal and mixed polynomials offer outputs usually have more or less similar values of RMSE. However, the time taken to implement the 'mixed polynomial variable' method increases much more rapidly than the 'orthonormal variables method' as we increase the degree and number of splits.
2. For higher degree orthonormal variables' method, we may get high RMSE due to usually just ONE extremely high error value which indicates .
3. For most of the cases, the RMSE remains more or less the same as we change the degree keeping other factors constant.
4. Usually, as we increase the number of splits, the RMSE value keeps on dropping until we reach five sections where we see the RMSE shoot up after which the RMSE goes back down. Although this may seem to be an anomaly in the beginning, there is a perfectly reasonable explanation for which becomes evident when we have a look at the way the splits are made. In all the splits, save for 5 splits, the significant spike which occurs in the range of 30-35 seconds is untouched and the entire feature falls into one section. However, this is not the case for 5 splits. The split midway the feature masks the contribution of the pattern as a whole. This is not surprising as the quality parameter we are measuring (Ra) would depend heavily on the finishing cut of the tool which takes place near the end of the cycle.

### 3.2. Feedback Splitting

As seen in 2.3.2, in this we first hypothesize a split and run our algorithm to obtain a solution. If this solution provides significant improvement, we retain the split and move on to make further splits. We have two ways to make these successive splits. We could approach this splitting either from start of the cycle (**Forward feedback splitting**) or the end of the cycle (**Reverse feedback splitting**). Here we will show the various cases where we vary the direction of




Figure 14: Mixed polynomial forward feedback splits with 5% threshold for relative change in RMSE- Cycle splits

splitting, the threshold of relative difference of error and type of method used for variable creation (mixed polynomial or orthogonal polynomial). The results will be shown as two graphs where one will represent the splits in the cycle and the other the trend in the RMSE. We will also be showing the final RMSE value that we obtain using the method.

### 3.2.1. Forward feedback splits-Mixed polynomial-5% relative change of RMSE threshold

The emergent splits are shown in Fig 14 and the RMSE trend can be seen in Fig 15. The final RMSE value was  $0.0332\mu m$ .

### 3.2.2. Forward feedback splits- Orthonormal variables-5% relative change of RMSE threshold

The emergent splits are shown in Fig 16 and the RMSE trend can be seen in Fig 17. The final RMSE value is  $0.0365\mu m$ .

### 3.2.3. Forward feedback splits- Mixed polynomial-1% relative change of RMSE threshold

The emergent splits are shown in Fig 18 and the RMSE trend can be seen in Fig 19. The final RMSE value is  $0.0330\mu m$ .




Figure 15: Mixed polynomial forward feedback splits with 5% threshold for relative change in RMSE- RMSE trends




Figure 16: Forward feedback splits-Orthonormal variables-5% relative change of RMSE threshold -Cycle splits




Figure 17: Forward feedback splits-Orthonormal variables-5% relative change of RMSE threshold - RMSE trend




Figure 18: Mixed polynomial forward feedback splits with 1% threshold for relative change in RMSE- Cycle splits




Figure 19: Mixed polynomial forward feedback splits with 1% threshold for relative change in RMSE- RMSE trend

#### 3.2.4. Forward feedback splits- Orthonormal variables-1% relative change of RMSE threshold

The emergent splits are shown in Fig 20 and the RMSE trend can be seen in Fig 21. The final RMSE value is  $0.0330\mu m$ .

#### 3.2.5. Reverse feedback splits-Mixed polynomial-5% relative change of RMSE threshold

The emergent splits are shown in Fig 20 and the RMSE trend can be seen in Fig 21. The final RMSE value is  $0.0332\mu m$ .

#### 3.2.6. Reverse feedback splits-Orthonormal variable-5% relative change of RMSE threshold

The emergent splits are shown in Fig 24 and the RMSE trend can be seen in Fig 25. The final RMSE value is  $0.0299\mu m$ .

#### 3.2.7. Reverse feedback splits- Mixed polynomial-1% relative change of RMSE threshold

The emergent splits are shown in Fig 26 and the RMSE trend can be seen in Fig 27. The final RMSE value is  $0.0334\mu m$ .




Figure 20: Forward feedback splits-Orthonormal variables-1% relative change of RMSE threshold-Cycle splits




Figure 21: Forward feedback splits-Orthonormal variables-1% relative change of RMSE threshold-RMSE trend




Figure 22: Mixed polynomial reverse feedback splits with 5% threshold for relative change in RMSE- Cycle splits




Figure 23: Mixed polynomial reverse feedback splits with 5% threshold for relative change in RMSE- RMSE trend






Figure 24: Reverse feedback splits-Orthonormal variables-5% relative change of RMSE threshold - Cycle splits




Figure 25: Reverse feedback splits-Orthonormal variables-5% relative change of RMSE threshold - RMSE trend




Figure 26: Mixed polynomial reverse feedback splits with 1% threshold for relative change in RMSE- Cycle splits




Figure 27: Mixed polynomial reverse feedback splits with 1% threshold for relative change in RMSE- RMSE trend




Figure 28: Reverse feedback splits-Orthonormal variables-1% relative change of RMSE threshold- Cycle splits




Figure 29: Reverse feedback splits-Orthonormal variables-1% relative change of RMSE threshold- RMSE trend

### 3.2.8. Reverse feedback splits- Orthonormal variable-1% relative change of RMSE threshold

The emergent splits are shown in Fig 28 and the RMSE trend can be seen in Fig 29. The final RMSE value is  $0.0299\mu m$ .

### 3.2.9. Discussion

As we can see from the results above, there isn't a lot of variation in the final RMSE value which we find using various combinations of split direction, threshold and variable type. They more or less fall around  $0.03\mu m$ . However, there are certain other aspects that interesting.

1. Firstly, as mentioned before, when performing cuts from the start of the cycle, we tend to get more and closer cuts near the start and lesser towards the end and the the other way around when we start splitting from the end of the cycle.
2. Another important thing that we notice is that we get lesser number of splits when we split from the end of the cycle. This indicates that we can get better correlation by sampling the end of the cycle. This inference as mentioned in Section 3.1.6 is not surprising as the finishing operation is done near the end of the cycle.
3. As we can see in all the split figures, the significant pattern in 30-35 seconds is considered as section in all of them. In fact, in reverse splits, better splitting in this region is the reason why we approach the minimum error region with lesser number of overall splits.

### 3.3. Incremental calculation

As we would expect while running the algorithm for manually drawn cuts (ref Section 2.3.2), the final RMSE values are more or less the same. However, we tried incremental sectionwise calculation here. In this, we first include only the first section as input and find a solution and store the resultant RMSE. Then we take the first two sections and find a solution and store the RMSE. We keep on including subsequent sections and find the correspond RMSE's. This way we can try to find out the quality of a product before the part has been finished making. The future applications of such a capability are immense. Especially for parts which take a lot of time to be machined.

The splits we used for this have been chosen manually as in Fig 30.

As evident from all the previous examples, we don't find significant variation in the results after using either mixed polynomials or orthogonal polynomials as our variables. So here we only present the *mixed polynomial variable* scenario. Also, this scenario will help us in finding out which sections contribute more to the equation.

In Table 11 we show the RMSE values we get after using various number of sections from the splits as shown in Fig 30 for each degree of the polynomial variable (mixed polynomial variable). Interestingly we come very close to to the




Figure 30: Manually Chosen splits

final RMSE value in the 7th section which ends about 13s before the end of our cycle (cycle time is 33 sec).

Table 12 shows a particular solutions' (Degree 5 polynomial with 10 sections) statistics. The middle column shows the list of coefficients in the equation we get. Columns 1 and 3 show the minimum and maximum value of the variables that we get using the test set for that corresponding variable. When we look at the coefficients we find that the 14th coefficient is the highest. Infact the order of magnitude of the product of fourteenth variable with it's corresponding coefficient is the highest too. Thus, clearly, these variables can be told to be the most important variables. If we denote this variable as  $x_{imp}$ , it turns out that this variable is given as;

$$x_{imp} = sd(sec_9) * sd(sec_{10})$$

where  $sd()$  is the standard deviation function and  $sec_x$  denotes section number  $x$ . Thus we again see that the end of the cycle is the region which gives us the most important information.

- [1] S. Cassidy, Dynamic time warping (2002).  
URL <http://web.science.mq.edu.au/~cassidy/comp449/html/ch11s02.html>
- [2] E. Tsiporkova, Dynamic time warping algorithm for gene expression time series.  
URL [www.psb.ugent.be/cbd/papers/gentxwarper/DTWAlgorithm.ppt](http://www.psb.ugent.be/cbd/papers/gentxwarper/DTWAlgorithm.ppt)

|                        | After<br>1 sec-<br>tion | After<br>2 sec-<br>tions | After<br>3 sec-<br>tions | After<br>4 sec-<br>tions | After<br>5 sec-<br>tions | After<br>6 sec-<br>tions | After<br>7 sec-<br>tions | After<br>8 sec-<br>tions | After<br>9 sec-<br>tions | After<br>10<br>sec-<br>tions |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Degree 2<br>polynomial | 0.1126                  | 0.1125                   | 0.0947                   | 0.0668                   | 0.0608                   | 0.0542                   | 0.0332                   | 0.0329                   | 0.0329                   | 0.0321                       |
| Degree 3<br>polynomial | 0.1132                  | 0.1120                   | 0.0902                   | 0.0665                   | 0.0603                   | 0.0570                   | 0.0338                   | 0.0315                   | 0.0318                   | 0.0317                       |
| Degree 4<br>polynomial | 0.1264                  | 0.1274                   | 0.0901                   | 0.0678                   | 0.0606                   | 0.0563                   | 0.0329                   | 0.0304                   | 0.0282                   | 0.0301                       |
| Degree 5<br>polynomial | 0.1251                  | 2.1440                   | 0.0942                   | 0.0661                   | 0.0600                   | 0.0533                   | 0.0320                   | 0.0291                   | 0.0285                   | 0.0283                       |

Table 11: RMSE values (in  $\mu m$ ) for Incremental error calculation

- [3] M. Müller, Information Retrieval for Music and Motion, Springer, 2007.
- [4] T. Giorgino, Computing and visualizing dynamic time warping alignments in r: The dtw package, Journal of Statistical Software Volume 31 (2009) 24.
- [5] S. C. Hiroake Sakoe, Dynamic programming algorithm optimization for spoken word recognition, IEEE ASSP Magazine 26 (1978) 7.
- [6] J. M. W. Drew Conway, Machine Learning for Hackers, O'Reilly, 2012.
- [7] R. T. Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, Package 'glmnet', r documentation. URL <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/glmnet/glmnet.pdf>
- [8] A. Ng, Machine learning (2010). URL <http://openclassroom.stanford.edu/MainFolder/CoursePage.php?course=MachineLearning>
- [9] M. Viberg, Regularisation in linear regression problems (2004). URL [http://www.signal.uu.se/Research/PCCWIP/Visbyrefs/Viberg\\_Visby04.pdf](http://www.signal.uu.se/Research/PCCWIP/Visbyrefs/Viberg_Visby04.pdf)
- [10] R. C. Team, contributors worldwide, Compute orthogonal polynomials, r documentation. URL <http://stat.ethz.ch/R-manual/R-patched/library/stats/html/poly.html>
- [11] C. effort, Classical orthogonal polynomials. URL [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical\\_orthogonal\\_polynomials](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical_orthogonal_polynomials)

| Minimum<br>value of<br>variable | Value of<br>coefficient | Maximum<br>value of<br>variable |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1.00E-15                        | 3.08E+15                | 1.00E-15                        |
| 4.78E-03                        | 4.81E-09                | 1.62E+03                        |
| 1.96E-09                        | 4.16E-04                | 2.81E-04                        |
| 7.01E-06                        | 6.26E-04                | 1.72E-01                        |
| 5.72E-04                        | 1.10E-03                | 2.90E+01                        |
| 1.30E+02                        | 1.93E-04                | 3.37E+02                        |
| 3.65E-12                        | 6.87E-05                | 4.43E-12                        |
| 2.05E+02                        | 6.74E-08                | 7.01E+02                        |
| 1.31E+02                        | 1.02E-03                | 3.11E+02                        |
| 9.70E+02                        | 9.51E-05                | 4.54E+03                        |
| 1.90E+02                        | 1.21E-04                | 7.02E+02                        |
| 1.33E+02                        | 2.43E-03                | 2.90E+02                        |
| 1.77E+02                        | 7.68E-09                | 7.03E+02                        |
| 1.04E-09                        | -1.81E+10               | 1.58E-08                        |
| 3.91E-06                        | -7.74E+05               | 6.12E-05                        |
| 1.47E-02                        | -1.45E+02               | 2.37E-01                        |
| 5.53E+01                        | -3.07E-02               | 9.20E+02                        |
| 4.45E-12                        | -6.99E-06               | 5.40E-12                        |
| 4.50E+01                        | -2.31E-03               | 9.93E+01                        |
| 8.42E-03                        | -7.55E-04               | 2.02E-02                        |
| 3.23E+01                        | -3.00E-06               | 7.83E+01                        |
| 1.10E+02                        | -8.88E-05               | 2.96E+03                        |
| 1.48E+01                        | -5.65E-04               | 8.07E+01                        |
| 2.01E+01                        | -1.10E-04               | 5.77E+02                        |
| 1.05E+02                        | -1.72E-05               | 7.06E+02                        |
| 2.59E-09                        | 7.60E-06                | 5.86E-09                        |
| 8.88E-05                        | 2.24E-02                | 2.15E-04                        |
| 1.08E-05                        | 5.80E-06                | 2.40E-05                        |
| 1.09E-05                        | 5.62E-09                | 2.36E-05                        |
| 2.62E-08                        | 1.09E-05                | 5.20E-08                        |
| 2.23E-08                        | -2.28E-01               | 5.07E-07                        |
| 5.51E+01                        | -3.50E-06               | 1.87E+04                        |
| 7.52E+02                        | -1.26E-05               | 4.35E+03                        |
| 1.70E-05                        | 2.78E-04                | 3.79E-04                        |
| 4.60E+01                        | -5.29E-04               | 1.00E+02                        |
| 3.57E+01                        | -2.49E-03               | 7.77E+01                        |
| 5.53E-06                        | 2.93E-06                | 1.12E-05                        |

Table 12: Table of coefficients for Incremental error calculation