Motion Compensated LIDAR Scanning for Small Robots
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Abstract— Microrobots experience significant egomotion due to high-frequency actuation and their susceptibility to external forces such as wind. This affects onboard sensors and any control that depends on that sensing. Egomotion compensation in software is challenging because of the delay as well as the computational and energy resources required. We present a novel microelectromechanical (MEMS) mirror LIDAR system for small robots where the motion of the robot is compensated, in hardware, by an on-board IMU that drives the MEMS mirror. Additionally, our design has the potential for a small, low-power system where the massive components of the LIDAR are external to the small robot. We show the utility of our approach in simulation as well as hardware. We believe that this LiDAR, with its compact movable scanning stage, will enable simplified and more accurate algorithms for localization, mapping, object detection and others for microrobots.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, there have been significant developments in the design of miniature robots such as robotic bees [37], crawling and walking robots [10], and small UAVs [20]. In fact, they are listed as one of the ten grand challenges in science robotics [39]. Designing such robots come with various challenges including extreme size and weight constraints on sensors, limited energy budget for computing and sensing as well as stringent limitations on the computing abilities for their functionality. A typical requirement for most robots is their ability to perceive, including both proprioceptive perception, such as robot location, as well as exteroceptive perception, such as the environment. However, micro-robots place stringent restrictions on the design of the sensors as well as onboard sensing algorithms.

Challenges for micro-robotic sensor design: The primary challenge for perception on micro-robots are the severe constraints of size, weight and power on any onboard sensing. Additionally, limited baseline for stereo sensing and limited computing and memory for onboard sensor processing make it difficult to use onboard cameras. Time-of-flight (TOF) methods, such as LiDAR, are promising but existing sensors require motorized scanners equipped with stacks of lasers and detectors that are typically heavy.

A second challenge is that the egomotion of such a robot (and, correspondingly the sensor) is quite extreme and makes any sensing challenging. For example, flapping-wing robots such as the RoboBee exhibit a high frequency rocking motion (at about 120 Hz) due to the piezo-electric actuation [9]. Environmental factors such as wind affect micro-robots to a greater extent than a larger robot. There might be aerodynamic instability due ornithopter-based shock absorption [35]. While there have been software methods to correct for such effects for cameras [3] and LiDARs [21], this is often difficult to perform in real-time onboard due to the computational and energy constraints on the robot mentioned above. It would be ideal for sensors to perform such correction in hardware without requiring onboard computing help.

In this work, we propose the design of an IMU-compensated LiDAR to address this challenge.

Scanning MEMS mirrors with microrobots: Microelectromechanical (MEMS) technology provides a viable alternative for laser scanner that can minimize the weight and size of the LiDAR [31, 14, 15]. However, even with the MEMS mirror’s small size and light weight, the LiDAR is still too large and heavy because of other necessary components, like the laser, photodetector, optics, the driver circuit, and the signal processing circuitry. Furthermore, to enable real-time compensated scanning, the MEMS mirror direction must be controlled for arbitrary orientations in real-time.

We solve the twin challenges of form-factor and egomotion with the following algorithmic and design contributions:

• We present a simple, effective design, Figure 1, where the IMU measurement and laser modulation are much faster than typical robot egomotion challenges. Our design enables wide non-resonant scanning angle for arbitrary orientations. It has a fast response time (5 ms), allowing high frequency egomotion compensation (up to 200 Hz).

• We build on our prior, specially designed electrothermal MEMS mirror for this LiDAR [33]. This design enables wide non-resonant scanning angle for arbitrary orientations. It has a fast response time (5 ms), allowing high frequency egomotion compensation (up to 200 Hz).

• We show a proof-of-concept prototype combining an inertial measurement unit (IMU) with the MEMS mirror for egomotion compensation. The frequencies of the mirror modulation and IMU measurement are much higher than typical robot egomotion challenges. Our prototype IMU-based MEMS compensated scan system can perform such compensation in under 10 ms.

• We describe and geometrically characterize our sensor, showing that compensation in hardware can reduce the number of unknowns for proprioceptive and exteroceptive tasks such as Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM). In simulation, we characterize the effect of compensation delay and compensation rate to identify benefits for sensing on micro-robots.
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Our envisioned design for the use of such a LiDAR as well as an image of our prototype are shown in Figure 1.

II. RELATED WORK

Small, compact LiDAR for small robotics: MEMS mirrors have been studied to build compact LiDAR systems [31, 14, 15]. For instance, Kasturi et al. demonstrated a UV airborne LiDAR with an electrostatic MEMS mirror scanner that could fit into a small volume of 70 mm × 60 mm × 60 mm and weighed about only 50 g [14]. Kimoto et al. developed a LiDAR with an electromagnetic resonant MEMS mirror for robotic vehicles [15].

Motion compensated imaging and 3D perception: Software-based compensation for robot motion has been studied in great detail in SLAM algorithms [30] and in IMU-based compensation for camera shake [13]. These have also been used in particular for LIDAR [22] and sensing on flying systems [26]. In contrast to these approaches, we wish to compensate the sensor in hardware, during image capture. These ideas are closer to how point-tilt-zoom cameras track dynamic objects [16, 11] and assist with background subtraction [27]. However, compared to these approaches, we can tackle egomotion of much higher frequencies, which is a unique challenge of micro-robots. We compensate signals much closer to those seen in adaptive optics and control for camera shake [1, 33, 2]. In addition, our system is on a free moving robot, rather than a fixed viewpoint.

Motorized gimbals: Comparing to motorized image stabilization systems [12], MEMS mirrors not only have smaller size and lighter weight, but their frequency response bandwidth are better than the bulky and heavy camera stabilizer. The frequency response bandwidth of most of the MEMS mirror ranges from 80 Hz to a few kHz [36, 19, 6], so the MEMS mirror response time is less than 10 ms. The MEMS mirror response time is less than 10 ms or even less than 1 ms. The servo motor of the camera stabilizer has a bandwidth width less than 30 Hz because they are bulky and have heavy load [17, 24]. This results in a response time higher than 10 ms.

Motion compensation in displays and robotics: Motion-compensated MEMS mirror scanner has been applied for projection, [7], where hand-shake is an issue. In contrast, we deal with the vibration of much higher frequencies, and our approach is closest to adaptive optics for robotics. For example, [29, 28] change the zoom and focal lengths of cameras for SLAM. We compensate using small mirrors, utilizing a rich tradition of compensation in device characterization [18] and to improve SNR [8]. Compared to all the previous methods, we are the first to show IMU-based LiDAR compensation with a MEMS mirror in hardware.

Sensor reorientation in Active SLAM: There has been a lot of work in the area of perception-aware path planning. A basic assumption of this line of work is that the sensor is rigidly attached to the robot, and therefore, its field of view can be changed only by changing the pose of the robot. [4, 23, 5] improve SLAM accuracy by actively changing the robot trajectory to improve the field-of-view. Our sensor can simplify these works by changing the FOV in hardware without requiring additional constraints on the path planning.

III. IMU-COMPENSATED LIDAR FOR ROBOTICS

A. Basic background

A MEMS-based LIDAR scanning system consists of a laser beam reflected off a small mirror. Voltages control the mirror by physically tilting it to different angles. This allows for LIDAR depth measurements at the direction corresponding the mirror position. In the following discussion, we assume the function controlling the azimuth be \( \phi(V(t)) \) and the function controlling the elevation be \( \theta(V(t)) \), where \( V \) is the input voltage that varies with timestep \( t \).

To characterize our sensor, we use the the structure-from-motion (SFM) framework for a LiDAR. We start with the LIDAR projection matrix \( P \) from the robot’s rotation \( R \) and translation \( t \), given the intrinsic parameters \( K \).

\[
P = K R t.
\]

In our scenario, the ‘pixels’ relate to the mirror vector orientation \( (\theta(V(t)), \phi(V(t))) \) on a plane at unit distance from the mirror along the z-axis. For a static scene and sensor, these ‘pixel’ projections \( X \) of LIDAR-measured 3D points \( \mathbf{X} \) are trivial to obtain. However, doing so for dynamic scenes for LIDAR measurements at other robot poses is known as point-cloud alignment, and is harder. It requires recovering the unknown rotation and translation that minimize the following optimization,
This optimization usually happens in software, after LiDAR and IMU measurements. For real systems with noise and latency, there exist modern probabilistic models that allow for smooth, high quality reconstructions and robot pose estimation. Our key idea is that the MEMS mirror provides an opportunity to compensate or control two aspects of the projection matrix before capture, in hardware.

In this paper, we propose to control a new aspect of the SFM equation in hardware: the rotation matrix $R$. The only assumption here is that the rotation of the robot happens within the field-of-view (FOV) of the system.

An onboard IMU provides instantaneous angles, and therefore the known rotation matrix (and the intrinsic matrix) allow for a simplified post-capture translation estimation,

$$\min_{X,t} \| x - PX \|.$$

In order to systematically compensate based on IMU input, we perform some pre-processing of the IMU data. To smooth out the high angular velocity body movements, an angular moving average LiDAR stabilization algorithm is implemented. This method stores the past UAV orientations in a sliding, fixed-length queue, and reorients the mounted LiDAR towards the average of the past orientations. This helps remove the impulsive jerky movements that may be observed by the LiDAR, akin to a low-pass filter.

In the experiment, the UAV performs three back-and-forth lateral flights between two way points. During the alternation of way points, the UAV reaches 130 degrees/s in the X body.
axis. The mounted LiDAR is configured at 16 channels, 360
degree horizontal FOV, 30°vertical FOV and with 150,000
Hz sample rate, akin to commercially available LIDARs.

To quantify performance, we calculate odometry error, the
difference between the ground truth UAV positions and those
positions estimated by LOAM. Figure 3 and Figure 4 show
the results from our simulations for the Blocks scene and
Mountains scene respectively. We set the compensation rate
to five different values - uncompensated, 5Hz, 10 Hz, 30 Hz,
and 55 Hz. We set the compensation delay to five values -
no delay (0 ms), 30 ms, 90 ms and 150 ms.

Both the position error and angular error are high when
the compensation rate is uncompensated or 5 Hz. It is
very low for 10 Hz, 30 Hz and 55 Hz. This shows that
smaller rates of compensation as performed by a mechanical
gimbal or a PTZ camera are far less effective than a faster
compensation mechanism such as the one proposed by us.
Similarly, the error in position as well as orientation is low
when the compensation delay is either 0ms or 30 ms. For
larger compensation delays such as 90ms and 150 ms, the
error is several times that of when the compensation delay is
30 ms. This shows that as the compensation delay is higher,
as it could be with software-based compensation on low-
power embedded systems, it is far less effective and leads to
greater error in trajectory estimation. This further argues for
a system such as ours that is able to perform compensation
in hardware, and therefore at a higher rate.

This proof-of-concept set of simulations encouraged us to
build our proposed system.

IV. NOVEL LiDAR SYSTEM DESIGN

We propose a simple and effective design, shown in Fig. 5
where the MEMS mirror, IMU and photodetector are placed
on a movable head. A LiDAR engine and accompanying
electronics are tethered to this device, which can be light
and small enough for micro-robots, as shown in Fig. 5.

A. MEMS mirror shock robustness

All the compensation effects and size advantages described
so far will be nullified if the MEMS mirror cannot survive
the shock, vibration and shake associate with small micro-
robots. Here we analyze the robustness of the MEMS mirror
device for such platforms.

Most MEMS mirrors rely on high-quality factor resonant
scanning to achieve wide field-of-view (FoV), which leads
to heavy ringing effects and overshoot with sudden changes
of direction [19, 34]. A suitable MEMS mirror with motion-
compensated scanning capability should have a wide non-
resonant scanning angle and smooth and fast step responses.

We used our prior MEMS mirror fabrication [35] (Fig. 6)
in our design. It has a maximum actuation voltage of 5 V
and a scanning FoV of −4.8° to +5.2° in the horizontal axis
and −3.8° to +4.3° in the vertical axis. The voltage to
MEMS tilting angle response is approximately linear. The
MEMS mirror can perform non-resonant arbitrary scanning
or pointing according to the control signal. The piston
resonant mode is found at f1=1.07kHz and the tip-tilting
resonant modes are at f2 =1.63 kHz and f3 = 1.69 kHz.

We now show expressions for the acceleration and forces
generated by a MEMS mirror scan. The small-angle tip-tilt
scanning stiffness kT is

\[ k_T = I (2\pi f_r)^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where \( f_r \) is the resonant frequency of the tip-tilting modes
\( f_2, f_3 \); I is the moment of inertia of the mirror plate alone
its tip-tilting axis,

\[ I = \frac{1}{12} m_{\text{plate}} (t^2 + d^2) \] \hspace{1cm} (6)

where \( t \) is the thickness of the mirror plate, and \( d \) is the
length of the mirror plate. The rotation stiffness \( k_T = 2.16e-6 \) N·m/rad. With an external angular acceleration of \( \ddot{\theta} \) alone
on the mirror rotation axis, the excited mirror rotation \( \theta \) is

\[ \theta = -\frac{I \ddot{\theta}}{k_T} = -1e-8 \cdot \ddot{\theta}. \] \hspace{1cm} (7)
The MEMS mirror is actuated by 15 kHz modulated PWM signals and has a non-resonant pointing accuracy of 0.25° in the worst case. Take the 0.25° as the maximum tolerance of the excited mirror plate rotation, the tolerable external angular acceleration is $\dot{\theta} = 44000$ rad/s$^2$. The maximum angular acceleration of a commercialized robot is usually less than 1000 rad/s$^2$, and the excited MEMS mirror rotation is less than 6e-4° which can be ignored. Since this MEMS mirror has four identical actuators and the difference on the two axes alone are small, the excited MEMS mirror rotation under robot vibration can be ignored.

We now consider robot crash scenarios. The MEMS mirror can also survive most of the extreme vibration or mechanical shock without failure. The stiffness of the MEMS mirror under shock $k_p$ is:

$$k_p = m_{plate}(2\pi f_1)^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $m_{plate}$ is the mass of the mirror plate. Thus, the stiffness the MEMS mirror in piston motion is $k_p = 3.2$ N/m. The maximum allowable piston displacement of the mirror plate without failure is $d_{max} = 200$ µm. The maximum tolerable acceleration in the direction perpendicular to the mirror plate is $a_{max}$ is

$$a_{max} = \frac{k_p d_{max}}{m_{plate}} = 5500 \text{m/s}^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

For most commercial robots, maximum tolerable shock is under 1000 m/s$^2$. So the MEMS mirror can survive most of the mechanical shock and vibration of the robot. External vibration around the resonant frequency will excite large MEMS mirror vibration or even damage the mirror. To avoid the resonance effect, the MEMS mirror should avoid being actuated around the resonant frequency ($f_1, f_2, f_3$).

V. MEMS MIRROR COMPENSATION ALGORITHM

In the previous sections, we saw the advantages of MEMS mirror-based compensation and the feasibility for application on small robotic systems. Here we focus on the details of the simple, hardware-based rotation compensation using both IMU and MEMS mirror scanning LiDAR.

Assume the initial position of the LiDAR and the origin of the LiDAR point cloud are at the same point. At time zero, the LiDAR is at location $[lx_0 = 0, ly_0 = 0, lz_0 = 0]$ with pose $[rx_0, ry_0, rz_0]$. We combine these location and states as $L_0 = [lx_0, ly_0, lz_0, rx_0, ry_0, rz_0]$.

The MEMS mirror scanner scans the scene at different angles, given by its azimuth and elevation $[\theta_0, \phi_0]$. At each scanned angle, a LiDAR engine reflects a modulated beam and processes it to get a time-of-flight distance $r_0$. This measurement data $M_0 = [\theta_0, \phi_0, r_0]$ is converted to Cartesian coordinate system $P_0 = [lx_0, ly_0, lz_0]$ in the LiDAR local coordinate. This local location $P_0$ has a corresponding world coordinate at $P_t$.

Now we model the robot shake and jitter. At time $t$, let this shake move the LiDAR by $\Delta L_t = [\Delta lx_t, \Delta ly_t, \Delta lz_t, \Delta rx_t, \Delta ry_t, \Delta rz_t]$ according to the IMU measurement, where $L_t = L_0 + \Delta L_t$. The LiDAR needs to update the MEMS scanning direction to $(\theta_t, \phi_t)$ so that the laser beam can still scan at the object. This is the goal of compensation, and our contribution here is to achieve it in hardware, for MEMS scanning LiDAR, for the first time.

The target object position $P_t$ is transferred to $P_t'$ in the coordinate system of LiDAR-based on the LiDAR motion changes $\Delta L_t$.

$$P_t = R(P_0' - T),$$ \hspace{1cm} (10)

where $R$ is the rotation matrix, and $T$ is the translation matrix, $R = R_x R_y R_z$, where

$$R_x = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\Delta rx) & -\sin(\Delta rx) & 0 \\ 0 & \sin(\Delta rx) & \cos(\Delta rx) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$ \hspace{1cm} (11)

$$R_y = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\Delta ry) & 0 & \sin(\Delta ry) & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sin(\Delta ry) & 0 & \cos(\Delta ry) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$ \hspace{1cm} (12)

$$R_z = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\Delta rz) & -\sin(\Delta rz) & 0 & 0 \\ \sin(\Delta rz) & \cos(\Delta rz) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$ \hspace{1cm} (13)

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta lx_t \\ \Delta ly_t \\ \Delta lz_t \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$ \hspace{1cm} (14)

The desired MEMS mirror angle that compensates for this motion is $(\theta_t, \phi_t)$, and it can be calculated as

$$\theta_t = \arccos \frac{z_t}{x_t^2 + y_t^2 + z_t^2},$$ \hspace{1cm} (15)

and

$$\phi_t = \arctan \frac{y_t}{x_t}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (16)

The point clouds at different time frames can be stitched together, in software, using the world coordinates $P_0$ and the post-capture estimation discussed in Eq. [4].
Fig. 7: (a) The target object "+" placed 22 cm from the LiDAR, along with (b), its initial point cloud scan. (c) and (d) show uncompensated vs. compensated scanning. Uncompensated shake range was $X : [-1.7^\circ, +1.4^\circ], Y : [-3.3^\circ, +2.6^\circ]$ and compensated shake range was $X : [-1.3^\circ, +1.3^\circ], Y : [-2.6^\circ, +3.0^\circ]$. (Please see supplementary video).

VI. Experiments with Hardware Prototype

**Hardware specifics:** Our prototype (Fig. 1) uses an avalanche photodiode module (APD, Hamamatsu C12702-04). A fiber with a length of 30 cm delivers the laser from the laser source to the scanner head. The laser is collimated and reflected by the MEMS mirror. The X-axis of the IMU (VectorNav, VN-100) is parallel to the neutral scanning direction of the MEMS mirror. The accuracies of the IMU measurements are 0.5° in the pitch and roll directions and 2° in the yaw direction, respectively. The scanner head sits on a tripod so that it can be rotated in the yaw and pitch directions. In the LiDAR base, an Arduino microcontroller is used to process the ToF signals, sample the IMU signals and control the MEMS mirror scanning direction. The data are sent to a PC for post-processing and visualization.

Since we focus on proximity detection for small robots (for landing or docking), our maximum detection distance is 35 cm with a 80% albedo object and the minimal resolvable distance is 1 cm. A more advanced LiDAR could be swapped in, and the rest of our contributions would still remain.

The maximum ToF measurement rate is 200 points/sec, and the IMU is sampled at every ToF measurement. According to the compensation algorithm described in the previous section, the MEMS mirror scanning direction is updated with every IMU measurement. We now describe our experiments. Please see the accompanying video for better viewing.

**Compensation experiments with zero translation:** We place the prototype on a tripod so it can be rotated freely, as shown in Figure 1. A paper-cut figure is placed 22 cm away from the LiDAR and at the center of the FoV, as shown in Figure 7a. The MEMS mirror performs a raster scanning pattern with an initial FoV of $-2^\circ, +2^\circ$ in both axes to leave the room for compensation. Each frame has 10 by 10 pixels, and the frame refresh rate is 2 fps. To mimic robot vibration, the tripod is rotated randomly in the directions of yaw (Z-axis) and pitch (Y-axis), and the point clouds are shown in Figures 7b. Despite the motion of the LiDAR head, the point clouds are quite stable. The differences among all of the point clouds are generally less than 1 pixel in either axis, caused by measurement noise. Even with a continuous rotation with a frequency of 1.5 Hz, the point cloud still remains stable, as shown in the 3rd figure in Figure 7b.

Figures 7d shows the point clouds without compensated scanning, where the relative positions of the target object in the point clouds keep changing. The target object may come out of the MEMS scanning FoV without compensation. With a continuous rotation of 1.5 Hz in the Y-axis, the same structure may appear in multiple positions in the same frame of the point cloud, as shown in the 3rd figure of Figure 7d. In order to creating the mapping point cloud from stitching the point cloud from different view, the MEMS mirror scanning direction should compensated the disturbance in motion.

**Compensation experiments with translation:** Here, we performed point-cloud stitching as that sensor moves along an object. The target scanning area is along the horizontal paper-cut figure shown in the highlighted area in the Figure 8 (a). The blue line is an example of the true motion with disturbance only existing in the vertical direction. As the LiDAR rotates from from the horizontal direction from left to right, it is expected to collect the best point cloud covering the highlight area of the object only. The result of compensated scanning and uncompensated scanning are shown in Figures 8 (b) and (c) on the right side, with their measured motions on the left side.

VII. Conclusions and Limitations

We believe that ours is the first IMU-compensated MEMS mirror scanning LiDAR. Through simulation and a proof-of-concept implementation we realize our design shown in Fig 1. This design separates the sensor into two components - a small, lighter part that can be mounted on the robot connected to the heavier part using a tether. Although removing the tether restriction is left to future work, we believe that our design is capable of advancing sensing in microrobots significantly, and will help our community in designing microrobots in the future.
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Fig. 8: Compensated point cloud stitching and experiment and its results. (a) The target scene placed at 22 cm from the LiDAR. The red line is the ideal motion, the blue line qualitatively depicts the type of experiment we performed, with vertical disturbances only. The graphs show the actual, measured disturbances. (b) With compensated scanning, the recorded motion and the generated point cloud show sharper depth edges than that with (c) with uncompensated scanning.
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