



Faculty of Electrical Engineering

**LOCAL THRESHOLD IDENTIFICATION AND GRAY LEVEL
CLASSIFICATION OF BUTT JOINT WELDING IMPERFECTIONS
USING ROBOT VISION SYSTEM**

Hairol Nizam bin Mohd Shah

Doctor of Philosophy

2018

**LOCAL THRESHOLD IDENTIFICATION AND GRAY LEVEL
CLASSIFICATION OF BUTT JOINT WELDING IMPERFECTIONS USING
ROBOT VISION SYSTEM**

HAIROL NIZAM BIN MOHD SHAH

**A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

Faculty of Electrical Engineering

UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA

2018

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis entitled “Local Threshold Identification and Gray Level Classification of Butt Joint Welding Imperfections Using Robot Vision System” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

Signature :

Name : Hairol Nizam Bin Mohd Shah

Date :

APPROVAL

I hereby declare that I have read this thesis and in my opinion this thesis is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signature :

Supervisor Name : Prof. Ir. Dr. Marizan Bin Sulaiman

Date :

DEDICATION

Dear Allah

I devoted my life and death to You, Allah. May my life is within Your guidance.

Dear My Parent

Thank you for your sacrifice and love. No such compensate except from Allah.

Dear My Beloved Wife

Your support, patience and encouragement give me strength. May Allah bless us.

Dear Teachers

Thank you for all the knowledge. May your knowledge are useful for all humanity.

Dear My Siblings

Thank you for your support and love. May Allah forgive us.

Dear My Children

May Allah guide and protect us to be good Muslims.

ABSTRACT

This research is carried out to be able to automatically identify the joint position and classify the quality level of imperfections for butt welding joint based on background subtraction, local thresholding and gray level approaches without any prior knowledge of the joint shapes. The background subtraction and local thresholding approaches consist of image pre-processing, noise reduction and butt welding representation algorithms. The approaches can automatically recognize and locate the butt joint position of the starting, middle, auxiliary and ending point according to the three different joint shapes; straight line, tooth saw and curved joint shapes. The welding process was done by implemented an automatic coordinate conversion between camera (pixels) and KUKA welding robot coordinate (millimeters) from the KUKA welding robot and camera coordinate ratio. The ratio was determined by a camera and three reference point (origin, x-direction and y-direction) taken around workpiece. Hence, the quality level of imperfection for butt welding joint was classified using Gaussian Mix Model (GMM), Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) and Support Vector Machine (SVM) classifiers according to their class of imperfection categories; good welds, excess welds, insufficient welds and no weld in each welding joint shape. These classifiers introduced 72 characteristics of feature values of gray pixels taken from co-occurrence matrix. The feature values consist of energy, correlation, homogeneity and contrast combine with gray absolute histogram of edge amplitude including additional characteristic features with scaled image factor by 0.5. The proposed approaches were validated through experiments with a KUKA welding robot in a realistic workshop environment. The results show that the approaches introduced in this research can detect, identify, recognize, locate the welding position and classify the quality level of imperfections for butt welding joint automatically without any prior knowledge of the joint shapes.

ABSTRAK

Penyelidikan ini dapat mengenalpasti kedudukan sambungan kimpalan dan mengelaskan tahap kualiti ketidaksempurnaan kimpalan untuk sambungan kimpalan temu berdasarkan pendekatan pengurangan latar belakang, ambang tempatan dan tahap kelabu tanpa pengetahuan sebelumnya tentang sambungan bentuk kimpalan. Pengurangan latar belakang dan ambang tempatan terdiri daripada pemprosesan imej, pengurangan hingar dan algoritma perwakilan kimpalan temu. Pendekatan ini secara automatik dapat mengenali dan mencari kedudukan titik sambungan kimpalan temu samaada permulaan, pertengahan, persilangan dan pengakhiran mengikut tiga bentuk sambungan yang berbeza; garis lurus, gergaji gigi dan sambungan secara melengkung. Proses kimpalan dilakukan dengan melaksanakan penukaran koordinat antara kamera (piksel) dan kimpalan robot KUKA (milimeter) secara automatik dari nisbah antara kimpalan robot KUKA dan kamera yang diselaraskan. Nisbah itu diperolehi daripada kamera dan tiga titik rujukan (asal, arah x dan arah y) yang diambil di sekeliling benda kerja. Justeru itu, tahap kualiti ketidaksempurnaan untuk sambungan kimpalan temu akan diklasifikasikan menggunakan pengelas Gaussian Mix Model (GMM), Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) dan Support Vector Machine (SVM) mengikut kategori kelas ketidaksempurnaan mereka; kimpalan yang baik, kimpalan berlebihan, kimpalan yang tidak mencukupi dan tiada kimpalan di setiap sambungan kimpalan. Pengelas ini memperkenalkan 72 nilai ciri-ciri dalam piksel kelabu yang diambil dari matriks coocurrence. Nilai ciri-ciri tersebut terdiri daripada tenaga, hubung kait, serumpun dan pertentangan bergabung dengan histogram mutlak kelabu daripada pinggir amplitud termasuk tambahan ciri-ciri dengan meningkatkan faktor imej kepada 0.5. Pendekatan yang dicadangkan dibuktikan melalui percubaan dengan menggunakan kimpalan robot KUKA dalam persekitaran bengkel yang realistik. Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa pendekatan yang diperkenalkan dalam kajian ini dapat mengesan, mengenalpasti, mengenali, menyetempatan kedudukan kimpalan dan mengelaskan tahap kualiti ketidaksempurnaan untuk sambungan kimpalan temu secara automatik tanpa pengetahuan sebelumnya tentang sambungan bentuk kimpalan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the Name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful,

First and foremost, all praise to Allah, Subhanahu-wa-Ta'ala, the Almighty, Who gave me an opportunity, courage and patience to carry out this work. I feel privileged to glory His name in the sincerest way through this small accomplishment. I seek His mercy, favour and forgiveness.

I would to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Ir. Dr. Marizan Sulaiman for his constant support and constructive guidance throughout this research. It is hard to express in words just how crucial his support has been. I am truly honored to be under his tutelage. Special thanks my co-supervisor, Prof. Madya Dr. Ahmad Zaki Shukor for his kind help and encouragement during my study.

I would like to thanks colleagues of Center for Robotics and Industrial Automation Group (CERIA), Faculty of Electrical Engineering Staffs and all person who have direct and indirectly involved in this project. Thank you also to the technical staffs at Faculty of Manufacturing Engineering for setting up the robotic welding workshop.

I would like to thank my employer and corporate sponsor, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka and Government of Malaysia for providing financial support for this work.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest appreciation for my late parents, Mohd Shah bin Mohd Noor and Munah binti Hj. Omar, my wife, Zalina binti Kamis, my son, Muhammad Ziaul-Haq, my daughter, Iris Mardhiyah and all family members for their patience and encouragement during the period of this research.

May Allah bless you and Thanks a lot for ALL.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
DECLARATION	
APPROVAL	
DEDICATION	
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF APPENDICES	xix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xx
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	xxii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	3
1.3 Objective of the Research	5
1.4 Scope of the Research	5
1.5 Contribution of the Research	6
1.6 Thesis Organization	8
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 Butt Welding Joint Identification and Localisation	9
2.1.1 Introduction	9
2.1.2 Type of Welding Joints	10
2.1.3 Type of Welding Material	10
2.1.4 Identification of Butt Welding Joints	12
2.1.5 Butt Welding Joint Algorithms	17
2.2 Robot Calibration and Camera Measurement	21
2.2.1 Introduction	21
2.2.2 Robot and Hand-Eye Calibration	22
2.2.3 Single Fixed Camera Distance Measurement	24
2.3 Butt Welding Joint Defect Classification	26
2.3.1 Introduction	26
2.3.2 Type of Welding Defects	27
2.3.3 Features Extraction of Welding Defects	29
2.3.4 Classification of Butt Welding Defect Algorithms	31
2.4 Summary of Research Gap	35

2.4.1	Butt Joint Identification	35
2.4.2	Butt Welding Joint Localisation	37
2.4.3	Robot Calibration and Camera Measurement	40
2.4.4	Butt Welding Imperfection Classification	41
3.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	46
3.1	Butt Joint Identification Approach	46
3.1.1	Introduction	46
3.1.2	Image Pre-processing	47
3.1.3	Image Segmentation	50
3.1.3.1	Background Subtraction	51
3.1.3.2	Local Thresholding	52
3.1.4	Noise Reduction based on Morphological Operation	53
3.1.5	Eliminated the Unwanted Edge Joint Points	55
3.1.5.1	Background Subtraction Approach	55
3.1.5.2	Local Threshold Approach	56
3.1.6	Position and Location of Butt Joint Recognition	57
3.2	Butt Welding Joint Representation Algorithms	59
3.2.1	Introduction	59
3.2.2	Case Study 1 – Straight Line	59
3.2.3	Case Study 2 – Tooth Saw	60
3.2.4	Case Study 3 – Curved	63
3.3	Vision Based for KUKA Welding Robotics System	64
3.3.1	Introduction	64
3.3.2	KUKA KR 150 (Series 2000) Robot Manipulator	65
3.3.3	Fronius Welding System	65
3.3.4	KUKA.ArcTech	67
3.3.5	Motion Types	67
3.3.6	Motions Programming	69
3.3.7	KUKA Welding Robot Coordinate	70
3.3.8	Camera Coordinate	71
3.3.9	Pixels Coordinate to Robot Coordinate Conversion Approach	71
3.4	Butt Welding Classification of Imperfection Approach	75
3.4.1	Introduction	75
3.4.2	Feature Extraction	76
3.4.2.1	Co-occurrence Matrix	77
3.4.2.2	Filtering of Butt Welding Imperfections	83
3.4.2.3	Butt Welding Imperfections Based on Gray Level Quantization	83
3.4.2.4	Feature Vector	84
3.5	Butt Welding Classifier of Imperfection Identification	87
3.5.1	Introduction	87
3.5.2	Training Classifiers	87
3.5.3	Classifying Testing Data	90
3.5.4	Results Selection	91
3.6	Summary	91

4.	RESULT AND DISCUSSION	93
4.1	Experimental Setup	93
4.2	Butt Joint Shape Recognition and Position Results	93
4.2.1	Workpiece Case Studies	93
4.2.2	Butt Welding Joint Shape Identification Results	95
4.2.2.1	Case Study 1 – Straight Line	95
4.2.2.2	Case Study 2 – Tooth Saw	102
4.2.2.3	Case Study 3 – Curved	108
4.2.3	Butt Joint Shape Identification Comparison	115
4.2.4	Butt Joint Image Matching Results	119
4.2.4.1	Test points	119
4.2.4.2	Proposed Approaches Results	120
4.2.4.3	Comparison between Proposed Approaches	122
4.2.4.4	Comparison with Existing Methods	126
4.3	KUKA Welding Robot Results	128
4.3.1	Converting Coordinate between Camera (pixels) and Robot Coordinated (millimeters)	128
4.3.2	Butt Joint Localisation in KUKA Welding Robot Results	133
4.3.3	Preliminary Welding Tests	135
4.4	The Quality Level for Imperfections in Butt Welding Results	136
4.4.1	Quality Level of Imperfections Joint Class Categories	136
4.4.2	Confusion Matrix Results	139
4.4.3	Performance of Butt Welding Imperfections Results	144
4.4.3.1	Classification of Imperfections Rate	145
4.4.3.2	Processing Time in Data Testing	147
4.4.4	Comparison between Existing Methods	150
4.5	Summary	160
5.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	162
5.1	Conclusion of Research	162
5.2	Achievement of Research Objectives	164
5.3	Significance of Research Outputs	165
5.4	Suggestion for Future Research	167
	REFERENCES	169
	APPENDICES	187

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Type of welding joints	11
2.2	Intersection point and corner detection method (Dinham et al. 2014)	13
2.3	Butt welding joint identification and localisation process (Dinham et al., 2013)	15
2.4	Curved seam identification in method (Dinham et al., 2013)	16
2.5	Saw-tooth seam identification in method (Dinham et al., 2013)	16
2.6	Butt welding initial grayscale images of the weld joints (Kong et al., 2007)	18
2.7	Butt welding joints pre-processing (Kong et al., 2007)	19
2.8	Butt welding joints after thresholding (Kong et al., 2007)	19
2.9	Butt welding joint detection using the method presented in (Chen et al., 2007)	21
2.10	Distance measurement between camera and object (reproduced from reference (Krishnan et al., 2010))	25
2.11	Different types of weld defects represented in method (Wang et al., 2003) and Liao et al., 1998, 2003 and 2009)	28
2.12	Block diagram of back-propagation neural network (Kumar et al., 2012, 2014)	33
2.13	3-layer structure of NEFCLASS	34

2.14	An example between existing method in (a) (Dinham et al., 2013) and (b) (Kong et al., 2007)	36
2.15	Existing approach for butt welding joint localisation (Dinham et al., 2013)	37
2.16	Taxonomy aspects used for the welding joint identification and localisation	39
2.17	Existing method (Kumar et al., 2012 and 2014) for classification of welding imperfection in good weld class categories	42
2.18	Existing method (Kumar et al., 2012 and 2014) for classification of welding imperfection in excess weld class categories	42
2.19	Existing method (Kumar et al., 2012 and 2014) for classification of welding imperfection in insufficient weld class categories	43
2.20	Existing method (Kumar et al., 2012 and 2014) for classification of welding imperfection in no weld class categories	43
2.21	Taxonomy aspects used for the quality of imperfection inspection in welding environment	45
3.1	Flow chart for identification the butt welding joint process	48
3.2	Butt welding joint with region of interest (ROI)	49
3.3	Results of the image 7 x 7 sizes (a) linear smoothing filter (b) median filter	50
3.4	Background subtraction segmentation results	51
3.5	Local thresholding segmentation results	52
3.6	Closing operation (a) structuring element B “rolling” on the outer boundary of set A (b) outer boundary line of the closing (c) complete closing (shaded)	53

3.7	Morphological operation (a) input image (b) structuring element (c) erosion (d) dilation.	54
3.8	Background subtraction approach for remove unwanted edge joint point results	56
3.9	Local Thresholding approach for remove unwanted edge joint point results	57
3.10	Butt welding edge joint detection process (a) selected region (b) skeleton	58
3.11	Procedure to find starting, middle and ending point in straight line welding joint	60
3.12	Procedure to define the starting, auxiliary and ending point in tooth saw welding joint	61
3.13	Diagram of intersect point between two lines	62
3.14	Auxiliary point in tooth saw weld joint represent by “X”	62
3.15	Procedure to define the starting, middle and ending point in curved welding joint	63
3.16	KUKA KR 150 dimensions (drawing) (KUKA., 2015)	65
3.17	Fronius welding system components	66
3.18	Types of KUKA welding robot motions (a) point to point (PTP), (b) linear (LIN) and (c) circular (CIR)	68
3.19	Three reference positions selection	70
3.20	Position of CCD camera and KUKA welding robot set up	73
3.21	Step for butt welding joint classification of imperfection process	76
3.22	Generate features process	77
3.23	Case Studies 2 - Gray Absolute Histogram (Good Weld)	85
3.24	Case Studies 2 - Gray Absolute Histogram (Excess Weld)	85

3.25	Case Studies 2 - Gray Absolute Histogram (Insufficient Weld)	86
3.26	Case Studies 2 - Gray Absolute Histogram (No Weld)	86
4.1	Workpiece of butt joint shape (a) case study 1 – straight line (b) case study 2 – tooth saw (c) case study 3 – curved	94
4.2	The workpiece setup on the workbench	94
4.3	Butt welding joint drawing for case study 1	96
4.4	Region of interest (ROI) – case study 1	96
4.5	Local thresholding approaches results (a) mean filter (b) segment an image using local threshold	97
4.6	Background subtraction approaches results (a) sobel filter (b) access channel (c) regions 1 (d) region 2 (e) region different	97
4.7	Local Thresholding approaches for removing unwanted seeds (a) connected region (b) selected regions (c) union (d) dilated (e) skeleton (f) joint with noise (g) joint after remove noise	98
4.8	Background subtraction approach method for removing unwanted points (a) closing (b) erosion (c) dilation rectangle (d) fill up regions (joint with noise) (e) selected regions (joint after remove noise) (f) skeleton (g) regions contour	99
4.9	Starting point close up - case study 1	100
4.10	Middle point close up - case study 1	100
4.11	Ending point close up - case study 1	101
4.12	Butt joint drawing for case study 2	102
4.13	Region of interest (ROI) – case study 2	103
4.14	Local thresholding approaches results (a) mean filter (b) segment an image using local threshold	103

4.15	Background subtraction approaches results (a) sobel filter (b) access channel (c) regions 1 (d) region 2 (e) region different	104
4.16	Local Thresholding approaches for remove unwanted seeds (a) connected region (b) selected regions (c) union (d) dilated (e) skeleton (f) joint with noise (g) joint after remove noise	105
4.17	Background subtraction approach method for removing unwanted points (a) closing (b) erosion (c) dilation rectangle (d) fill up regions (joint with noise) (e) selected regions (joint after remove noise) (f) skeleton (g) regions contour	106
4.18	Starting point close up - case study 2	107
4.19	First saw tooth peak (auxiliary 1) point close up - case study 2	107
4.20	Second saw tooth peak (auxiliary 2) point close up - case study 2	108
4.21	Ending point close up - case study 2	108
4.22	Butt joint drawing for case study 3	109
4.23	Region of interest (ROI) –case study 3	109
4.24	Local thresholding approaches results (a) mean filter (b) segment an image using local threshold	110
4.25	Background subtraction approaches results (a) sobel filter (b) access channel (c) regions 1 (d) region 2 (e) region different	111
4.26	Local Thresholding approaches for removing unwanted seeds (a) connected region (b) selected regions (c) union (d) dilated (e) skeleton (f) joint with noise (g) joint after remove noise	112
4.27	Background subtraction approach method for removing unwanted points (a) closing (b) erosion (c) dilation rectangle (d) fill up regions (joint with noise) (e) selected regions (joint after remove noise)	113

	(f) skeleton (g) regions contour	
4.28	Starting point close up - case study 3	114
4.29	Middle point close up - case study 3	114
4.30	Ending point close up - case study 3	115
4.31	Butt joint segmentation results – case study 1 (a) Background Subtraction – Proposed 1 (b) Local Thresholding – Proposed 2 (c) M.K. method - joint not segmented	116
4.32	Butt joint segmentation results – case study 2 (a) Background Subtraction – Proposed 1 (b) Local Thresholding – Proposed 2 (c) M.K. method - joint not segmented	116
4.33	Butt joint segmentation results – case study 3 (a) Background Subtraction – Proposed 1 (b) Local Thresholding – Proposed 2 (c) M.K. method - joint not segmented	117
4.34	Butt joint identification - case study 1 (a) Background Subtraction – Proposed 1 (b) Local Thresholding – Proposed 2 (c) M.D. method - joint not detected	118
4.35	Butt joint identification - case study 2 (a) Background Subtraction – Proposed 1 (b) Local Thresholding – Proposed 2 (c) M.D. method - joint not detected	118
4.36	Butt joint identification - case study 1 (a) Background Subtraction – Proposed 1 (b) Local Thresholding – Proposed 2 (c) M.D. method - joint not detected	119
4.37	Localisation point test markers (a) case study 1 (b) case study 2 (c) case study 3	120
4.38	Localisation point proposed approach – case study 1	121

	(a) Background Subtraction (b) Local Thresholding	
4.39	Localisation point proposed approach – case study 2	121
	(a) Background Subtraction (b) Local Thresholding	
4.40	Localisation point proposed approach – case study 3	122
	(a) Background Subtraction (b) Local Thresholding	
4.41	Comparison of butt joint for cases study 1 between the actual and the proposed approaches	124
4.42	Comparison of butt joint for cases study 2 between the actual and the proposed approaches	125
4.43	Comparison of butt joint for cases study 3 between the actual and the proposed approaches	125
4.44	Example for class category of the imperfection joints for automatic (KUKA robot) welding in curve joint shapes (a) good welds, (b) excess welds, (c) insufficient welds (d) no welds	137
4.45	Example for class category of the imperfection joints for manual welding in tooth saw joint shapes (a) good welds, (b) excess welds, (c) insufficient welds (d) no welds	138
4.46	Quality level of imperfection for butt welding joint system setup	139
4.47	Proposed approach classification of imperfections rate results for automatic welding	146
4.48	Proposed approach classification of imperfections rate results for manual welding	147
4.49	Comparison of classification of imperfections rate results for automatic (KUKA robot) welding	154
4.50	Comparison of classification of imperfections rate results for	155

	automatic (KUKA robot) welding	
4.51	Case study 1 - Comparison of computation of imperfections time data testing classifiers for automatic (KUKA robot) welding	157
4.52	Case study 2 - Comparison of computation of imperfections time data testing classifiers for automatic (KUKA robot) welding	158
4.53	Case study 3 - Comparison of computation of imperfections time data testing classifiers for automatic (KUKA robot) welding	158
4.54	Case study 1 - Comparison of computation of imperfections time data testing classifiers for manual welding	159
4.55	Case study 2 - Comparison of computation of imperfections time data testing classifiers for manual welding	159
4.56	Case study 3 - Comparison of computation of imperfections time data testing classifiers for manual welding	160

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Welding Joints Description	11
3.1	Description of the parameters setting value	66
3.2	Description on KUKA welding robot motion movement	69
3.3	Camera and robot point data recorded	73
3.4	Gray Level Co-occurrence Matrix (GLCM) features characteristics	79
3.5	Sample result of co-occurrence matrix features for straight welding joint shape (automatic welding)	80
3.6	Sample result of co-occurrence matrix features for tooth saw welding joint shape (automatic welding)	80
3.7	Sample result of co-occurrence matrix features for curve welding joint shape (automatic welding)	81
3.8	Sample result of co-occurrence matrix features for straight welding joint shape (manual welding)	81
3.9	Sample result of co-occurrence matrix features for tooth saw welding joint shape (manual welding)	82
3.10	Sample result of co-occurrence matrix features for curve welding joint shape (manual welding)	82
3.11	Description of classification operator	91

4.1	Total butt joint point detection	123
4.2	Numbers of butt joint points simplification	124
4.3	Image matching error for case study 1	127
4.4	Image matching error for case study 2	127
4.5	Image matching error for case study 3	128
4.6	Image matching for case study 1 - origin camera coordinate (306,84)	132
4.7	Image matching for case study 2 - origin camera coordinate (307,86)	132
4.8	Image matching for case study 3 - origin camera coordinate (306,84)	133
4.9	Localisation error case study 1	134
4.10	Localisation error case study 2	134
4.11	Localisation error case study 3	135
4.12	Confusion matrix results of GMM classification (KUKA Robot Welding)	140
4.13	Confusion matrix results of GMM classification (Manual Welding)	141
4.14	Confusion matrix results of MLP classification (KUKA Robot Welding)	142
4.15	Confusion matrix results of MLP classification (Manual Welding)	142
4.16	Confusion matrix results of SVM classification (KUKA Robot Welding)	143
4.17	Confusion matrix results of SVM classification (Manual Welding)	144
4.18	Proposed approaches for computation of imperfections time data testing for GMM, MLP and SVM classifiers in case study 1	149
4.19	Proposed approaches for computation of imperfections time data testing for GMM, MLP and SVM classifiers in case study 2	149
4.20	Proposed approaches for computation of imperfections time data testing for GMM, MLP and SVM classifiers in case study 3	150
4.21	Comparison confusion matrix results of GMM classification	152
4.22	Comparison confusion matrix results of MLP classification	152

4.23	Comparison confusion matrix results of SVM classification	153
4.24	Existing method (S.K) for computation of imperfection time data testing for GMM, MLP and SVM classifiers in case study 1	156
4.25	Existing method (S.K) for computation of imperfection time data testing for GMM, MLP and SVM classifiers in case study 2	156
4.26	Existing method (S.K) for computation of imperfection time data testing for GMM, MLP and SVM classifiers in case study 3	157

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Co-Occurrence Matrix (Automatic Welding)	187
B	Co-Occurrence Matrix (Manual Welding)	193
C	Gray Absolute Histogram (Automatic Welding)	199
D	Gray Absolute Histogram (Manual Welding)	205
E	Gray Absolute Histogram (Testing Data)	211
F	Computation of Imperfection Time (Automatic Welding – KUKA Robot)	223
G	Computation of Imperfection Time (Manual Welding)	226

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACO	- Ant colony optimization
ANFIS	- Fuzzy inference system based adaptation
ANN	- Artificial neural network
CCD	- Charge coupled devices
CIR	- Circular motion
CoD	- Correction of defect
DEA	- Differential evolutionary algorithm
DOGS	- Degree of grey similarity
EM	- Expectation maximization
GLCM	- Gray level co-occurrence matrix
GMA	- Gas metal arc
GMM	- Gaussian mixture model
GTAW	- Gas tungsten arc
KRL	- KUKA robotic language
LED	- Light emitting diode
LIN	- Linear motion
MIG	- Metal inert gas
MLP	- Multi-layer perceptrons
NCC	- Normalized cross correlation
NDT	- Non-destructive testing