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#### Abstract

A six degree-of-freedom (6-DOF) parallel positioning system with high resolution, high repeatability, and low parasitic motions was proposed. It mainly consists of three identical limbs. Each limb consists of two symmetrical six prismatic-universal-spherical branches. First, the design process for a novel 6-DOF limb with input displacement reduction was introduced. By applying bipods and linear displacement output mechanisms, these novel limbs with symmetric configurations were designed. Moreover, a numerical compliance/stiffness model of the proposed mechanism was built based on the matrix method. This numerical model was verified by ANSYS finite-element analysis (FEA) software package. Hence, the input stiffness, the output compliance, and the stroke of the mechanism can be theoretically estimated. Furthermore, a prototype made of stainless steel 431 was successfully manufactured by wire electrical discharge machining process. It is actuated and sensed by piezoactuators and capacitive displacement sensors, respectively. Finally, the working performances of this proposed mechanism were experimentally investigated. It shows that the spatial resolution can be achieved in $10 \mathrm{~nm} \times$ $10 \mathrm{~nm} \times 5 \mathrm{~nm} \times 100 \mathrm{nrad} \times 100 \mathrm{nrad} \times 200 \mathrm{nrad}$ in an open-loop control. The closed-loop positioning accuracy in $3 \sigma$ ( $\sigma$, standard error) can reach $30 \mathrm{~nm} \times 30 \mathrm{~nm} \times 15 \mathrm{~nm} \times$ 150 nrad $\times 150$ nrad $\times 300$ nrad. The experimental results not only validate the effectiveness of the proposed positioning system but also verify the nanometer-scale spatial positioning accuracy within several tens of micrometers stroke range. The proposed micro/nanopositioning system may expand the actual application of alignment optical elements in projection lenses of 193 nm immersion lithography.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

MICRO/NANOPOSITIONING technology becomes much more essential in precision engineering, such as atomic force microscope system [1], microelectromechanical system [2], lithography [3], ultraprecision machining [4], and so on. In general, compliant mechanism can transmit some accurate relative motions in micro/nanometer scale through elastic deformation [5], [6]. This kind of mechanism has so many advantages, such as avoiding energy losses caused by friction, unnecessary of lubrication, absence of hysteresis, compactness, easy to be fabricated, position resolution in micro/nanometer scale, and so on. Hence, compliant mechanism becomes much more suitable for high-precision positioning applications than the conventional mechanism.

There are two types of compliant mechanisms named as serial and parallel mechanism, respectively. On one hand, the serial mechanism connects multiple lower mobility mechanisms in a nested or stacked manner [7]-[9]. Although the structure scheme and control strategy are simple in serial mechanism, it has low natural frequency, large inertia, error accumulation, and huge differences in dynamic characteristics of each motion element. The inconsistent performance of each motion axis in the workspace cannot be negligible. On the other hand, parallel mechanism connects an end effector by a series of individual limbs [10]-[12]. It is advantageous in high load capacity, small inertia, and especially negligible differences in dynamic characteristics of each motion axis with high motion accuracy [13]-[15]. Therefore, the parallel mechanism is more suitable and applicable for a micro/nanopositioning system. However, the end effector of parallel mechanism is directly connected with several limbs, resulting in the parasitic motions. Parasitic motion produces more than one direction of displacement, which is a typical character of parallel mechanism [16], [17]. Therefore, it is worth to pay much more attention to the compliant mechanism design to reduce the parasitic motion.

Over the past few decades, several piezoelectrically driven compliant parallel mechanisms have been reported [18]-[21]. Some successful commercial applications have emerged in market (e.g., the multiaxis positioners fabricated by Physik Instrumente GmbH and Company). Recently, more and more precision positioning systems with 6-DOFs, i.e., three linear and three rotational axes, are demanded in some special applications. The 6-DOF positioners make motion possible on the basis of complex trajectories in an arbitrary workspace. For example, Cai et al. [22] proposed a 6-DOF positioning system assembled by
two 3-DOF positioning platforms in series. The working space was $8.2 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 10.5 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 13.0 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 224 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times 105 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times$ $97 \mu \mathrm{rad}$ along the three linear and three rotational axes. Shin and Moon [23] reported a 6-DOF positioning system with double triangular parallel-positioning mechanisms. Three piezoelectric ceramic transducers (PZTs) were utilized in the inner triangle as in-plane positioning. The other three PZTs were mounted in the external triangle as out-of-plane positioning. The stroke of this mechanism exceeded $50 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 50 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 150 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 733 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times$ $733 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times 244 \mu \mathrm{rad}$. The translational and rotational resolutions were $0.1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ and $1 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, respectively. Moreover, a 6-DOF prismatic-spherical-spherical parallel compliant nanopositioner was introduced by Wu et al. [24]. This nanopositioner has a stroke of $7.49 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 8.22 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 8.79 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times 205 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times$ $245 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times 202 \mu \mathrm{rad}$ with a translational resolution of 5 nm and a rotational resolution of $0.7 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, respectively. Kang and Gweon [25] proposed a large-stroke 6-DOF micropositioning mechanism applied for optical alignment. The workspace was $\pm 2 \mathrm{~mm} \times \pm 2 \mathrm{~mm} \times \pm 2 \mathrm{~mm} \times \pm 35 \mathrm{mrad} \times \pm 35 \mathrm{mrad} \times$ $\pm 35$ mrad with a high translation resolution of 15 nm and a rotational resolution of $0.68 \mu \mathrm{rad}$. Furthermore, based on the kinematic coupling principle, a 6-DOF micropositioning mechanism was designed in by Varadarajan and Culpepper [26], [27]. Although the designed stage can demonstrate a position resolution of 4 nm within a single-axis stroke, the resultant parasitic motion cannot be ignored. The $z$-axis parasitic motion exceeded $1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ while driving the $x$-axis stroke of $\pm 25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ or rotating the $\theta_{\mathrm{x}}$-axis with $200 \mu \mathrm{rad}$. A 6-DOF parallel micromanipulator with an alternative type of Stewart mechanism was also introduced by Yue et al. [28]. Its maximum translation and rotation errors reached $12.8 \%$ and $9.6 \%$ of the target motion, respectively. Hence, it is worth to develop a 6-DOF precision positioning system with high motion accuracy and low parasitic motion.

The main contribution of this article is that a novel 6-DOF micro/nanopositioning system that is featured with high resolution, high repeatability, and low parasitic motion has been proposed. This article includes the following sections. At first, mechanical design and assembly are outlined in Section II. As following, an analytical model that can be used to predict the stroke range and stiffness of the designed mechanism is established in detail in Sections III. Furthermore, the numerical design of the positioning system is verified by applying ANSYS finite-element analysis (FEA) in Section IV. Moreover, the static performances of the proposed mechanism are tested with a self-fabricated prototype in Section V. A series of experimental investigations are carried out in Section VI, in order to clarify the positioning accuracy and repeatability of the proposed mechanism. Finally, Section VII concludes this research article.

## II. Mechanism Design

## A. Configuration Design

To begin with, the DOFs of a limb in a flexure parallel mechanism are introduced. Gao et al. [29] pointed out that if a parallel mechanism has a certain DOFs (\$), the limbs
$(1,2, \ldots, n)$ connecting the end effector and the base need to satisfy the following equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\$=\$_{1} \cap \$_{2} \ldots \cap \$_{n} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\$_{n}$ is the DOFs of the $n$th limb. As known, Plücker coordinates are adopted as an effective way to assign six homogeneous coordinates to each line in the projective three-dimensional (3-D) space. \$ can be considered as the special Plücker coordinates in characterizing the output displacement of a limb. Equation (1) indicates that the special Plücker coordinates of the stage motion equal to the intersection of the special Plücker coordinates of all the limbs in the parallel mechanism.

Gao et al. [29] reported that a 6-DOF parallel mechanism can be actualized by three or six limbs, where each limb should have 6-DOFs. Parallel mechanisms with six limbs have commonly been used so far, such as the Stewart platform. These configurations usually include 6-SPS, 6-RSS, 6-PUS or 6-RUS, where $P, R, U$, and $S$ are denoted as the prismatic, revolute, universal, and spherical joints, respectively. With considering that fewer limbs can achieve low cost, easy installation, high integration, and light weight, a novel 6/3-PUS flexure parallel mechanism with 6-DOFs is proposed in this article.

Hence, flexure hinges used in each limb are designed at first. In a flexure mechanism, hinges usually include revolute joints $(\mathrm{R})$, prismatic joints ( P ), and universal joints ( U ), as shown in Fig. 1. The rotation hinge has only 1-DOF of $y$-axis rotation ( $R_{\mathrm{y}}$ ), as shown in Fig. 1(a). Hinges with parallel rotation joints have three DOFs, which are $x$-axis translation $\left(T_{\mathrm{x}}\right), R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $z$-axis rotation $\left(R_{\mathrm{z}}\right)$, as shown in Fig. 1(b). Two rotating hinges are orthogonal to each other can be considered as a universal joint. It has three DOFs of $x$-axis rotation $\left(R_{\mathrm{x}}\right), R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{z}}$, as shown in Fig. 1(c). Two universal joints that are connected in series have five DOFs, i.e., $T_{\mathrm{x}}, y$-axis translation $\left(T_{\mathrm{y}}\right), R_{\mathrm{x}}, R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{z}}$, as shown in Fig. 1(d).

The limbs in Fig. 1(b), (c), and (d) can be obtained by series connection of multiple joints shown in Fig. 1(a), respectively. The limb, as shown in Fig. 1(e) and (f), can be obtained by connecting two identical hinges in parallel as introduced in Fig. 1(d). Although the single branch along the $z$-direction in Fig. 1(e) has 5-DOFs, i.e., $T_{\mathrm{x}}, T_{\mathrm{y}}, R_{\mathrm{x}}, R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{z}}$, it is constrained by the horizontal branch along the $x$-direction. Hence, due to the constrained $T_{\mathrm{x}}$, the limb has only 4-DOFs of $T_{\mathrm{y}}, R_{\mathrm{x}}, R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{z}}$. Similarly, horizontal branch along the $x$-direction also has 4 -DOFs of $T_{\mathrm{y}}, R_{\mathrm{x}}, R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{z}}$. These two combined hinges constraint 2-DOFs of $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ and $z$-axis translation $\left(T_{\mathrm{z}}\right)$. This structure is well known as bipod [30]. Moreover, the stability of the mechanism shown in Fig. 1(f) is better than that shown in Fig. 1(e) when considering the load capacity of the end effector. However, the mechanisms shown in Fig. 1(e) and (f) require at least three times threading from three different directions with the wire electrical discharge machining (WEDM) process. The manufacture process becomes complex and time consuming. Although it just needs twice threading from two vertical directions with optimizing the structure as Fig. $1(\mathrm{~g})$ shows, the rotational axis drift is increased due to the diamond shape of rotation hinge. Therefore, the structure was optimized, as shown in Fig. 1(h), to obtain not only the simple

manufacturing process but also the tiny rotational axis drift. Furthermore, if the driving motor is mounted at the bottom of each branch, as shown in Fig. 1(h), the output displacement of $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ and $T_{\mathrm{Z}}$ can also achieve. The DOFs of $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ and $T_{\mathrm{Z}}$ of the limb are not being constrained any more. Hence, a 6-DOF limb that satisfies (1) can be obtained.

## B. Mechanism Assembly

In order to decrease the resolution requirement for a motor, a displacement reduction lever was also adopted to achieve tens of nanometers output resolution. As shown in Fig. 1(i), a 6-DOF limb with a bipod and two levers (LBL) is proposed. The output ends of levers are connected with the two fixed ends of the branch, as shown in Fig. 1(h). A reduced $T_{\mathrm{z}}$ displacement of the output end is generated when two linear actuators move in the same direction. A reduced $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ displacement is obtained when two linear actuators move in the opposite direction. When only one actuator moves, a reduced translation in the $x z$-plane is obtained.

In order to reduce the input parasitic motion, a hook joint is mounted between the motor and the lever. It transmits only the axial force and protects the motor from undesired shear forces and bending moments. It should be noted that an LBL limb can also be changed into other forms. For example, both the output direction and displacement can be changed by substituting a Scott Russell mechanism or a four-bar mechanism for levers.

The designed 6-DOF parallel positioning system is shown in Fig. 2(a), where three identical 6-DOF limbs are uniformly distributed around the $z$-axis with $120^{\circ}$ intervals. By controlling the input displacement of the six linear actuators, these three limbs can do the synchronous motion. Hence, the end effector can achieve the posture adjustments with 6-DOF in the 3-D space. The maximum diameter and height of the 6-DOF mechanism are 264 mm and 148.4 mm , respectively. The computer-aided design (CAD) model and the assembly process of the proposed mechanism are illustrated in Fig. 2(b).

## III. Mechanism Modeling

There are several methods that can be used for modeling the elastic deformation of flexure mechanisms. The commonly used methods are pseudo-rigid-body (PRB) model [31] and Castigliano's second theorem [32]. The PRB model is suitable for planar structure while Castigliano's second theorem requires complex mechanical analysis in a linearly elastic structure. As compared with the above-mentioned methods, the compliance matrix method (CMM) which is derived from the linear Hooke's law [11], [19], [33] is much more efficient in modeling the complex space flexure mechanism. Hence, the CMM method was adopted to establish the stiffness/compliance model of the proposed mechanism in this article.

## A. Compliance of the LBL Limb

The system consists of three LBL limbs connected in parallel. First, the output compliance of Limb1 in the $B-x y$ coordinate


Fig. 2. Positioning system of 6-DOF is designed in this article. (a) Composition of the positioning system. (b) CAD model of the positioning system, the connecting screws, and sensor clamps are removed for clear observation.
system, as shown in Fig. 3, is investigated. The geometrical dimension of Limb1 is also shown in Fig. 3. Hook hinge $O_{2} O_{3}$ and hinge $O_{4} O_{5}$ are connected in parallel in the $O_{6}-x y$ coordinate system. The compliance of position $O_{6}$ with respect to $O_{1}$ and $O_{4}$ is given by
$\mathbf{C}_{6}=\left(\left(\mathbf{T}_{3}^{6} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{hook}} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{3}^{6}\right)^{T}\right)^{-1}+\left(\mathbf{T}_{5}^{6} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{5} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{5}^{6}\right)^{T}\right)^{-1}\right)^{-1}$
where $\mathbf{C}_{\text {hook }}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{5}$ are the local compliances of the hook hinge $O_{2} O_{3}$ and hinge $O_{4} O_{5}$, and $\mathbf{T}_{3}{ }^{6}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{5}{ }^{6}$ are the transformation matrices from coordinate systems $O_{3}-x y$ and $O_{5}-x y$ to $O_{6}-x y$.

Similarly, the hinges $O_{6} O_{7}, O_{8} O_{9}, O_{10} O_{11}$, and $O_{12} O_{13}$ are connected in series to the $B-x y$ coordinate system and the compliance can be calculated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}_{B}^{6}=\sum_{i=3}^{6} \mathbf{T}_{2 i+1}^{B} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{2 i+1} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{2 i+1}^{B}\right)^{T} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{2 i+1}$ (for $i=3,4,5$, and 6 ) are the local compliance and $\mathbf{T}_{2 i+1}^{B}$ are the transformation matrices.


Fig. 3. Geometric dimension of the left part in Limb1.

The compliance of the left branch in the $B-x y$ coordinate system is

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{l} \mathbf{C}_{B}=\mathbf{C}_{B}^{6}+\mathbf{T}_{6}^{B} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{6} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{6}^{B}\right)^{T} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{6}^{B}$ is the transformation matrix.
And then, since the Limb1 is left-right symmetric about the $x$ axis, two of the same branches, as shown in Fig. 3, are connected in parallel at point $B$. Hence, the resultant compliance of the Limb1 in the $B$-xy coordinate system can be derived as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}_{B}=\mathbf{K}_{B}^{-1}=\left(\left({ }_{l} \mathbf{C}_{B}\right)^{-1}+\left(\mathbf{T}_{r}^{l} \cdot\left({ }_{l} \mathbf{C}_{B}\right) \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{r}^{l}\right)^{T}\right)^{-1}\right)^{-1} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the transformation matrix from the right to left branch can be expressed by

$$
\mathbf{T}_{r}^{l}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{R}_{x}^{\pi} & \mathbf{0}  \tag{6}\\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{x}^{\pi}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{x}^{\pi}$ represents rotation matrix that rotates $\pi$ angle about the $x$-axis.

## B. Output Compliance of the End Effector

According to the system design in Fig. 2, the output compliance model of each limb is same at each respective output ends. Those three limbs are connected in parallel at the centroid point $O$ of the output end. The output compliance of the limbs at the centroid point $O$ can be obtained as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}_{O}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{3} \mathbf{K}_{i}^{O}\right)^{-1}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{3}\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}^{O} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{i} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}^{O}\right)^{T}\right)^{-1}\right)^{-1} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{i}$ (for $i=1,2$, and 3 ) is the local compliance of each limb at its own output end and the transformation matrix $\mathbf{T}_{i}^{O}$


Fig. 4. Stiffness model of the mechanism with only one limb actuated.
can be written as

$$
\mathbf{T}_{i}^{O}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{R}_{i}^{O} & \mathbf{R}_{i}^{O} \cdot \mathbf{S}\left(\mathbf{r}_{i}^{O}\right) \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{i}^{O}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{i}^{O}$ is the rotation matrix of the coordinate $B_{i}$ with respect to $O, \mathbf{r}_{i}^{O}$ is the position vector of the point $B_{i}$ expressed in reference frame $O$, and $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r})$ represents the skew-symmetric operator for a vector $\mathbf{r}=\left[r_{x} r_{y} r_{z}\right]^{\mathrm{T}}$ with the notation

$$
\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r})=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & -r_{z} & r_{y} \\
r_{z} & 0 & -r_{x} \\
-r_{y} & r_{x} & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

## C. Input Stiffness of the Mechanism

To calculate the input stiffness, the stiffness model of the proposed system can be illustrated in Fig. 4. Limb2 and Limb3 are connected in parallel at the center $O$ of the platform. And then, the compliance at the reference point $B$ of Limb1 can be derived as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Limb2,3}}^{B}=\left(\mathbf{T}_{O}^{B}\right)\left(\left(\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Limb} 2}^{O}\right)^{-1}+\left(\mathbf{C}_{\text {Limb3 }}^{O}\right)^{-1}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{T}_{O}^{B}\right)^{T} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{\text {Limb2 }}^{O}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text {Limb3 }}^{O}$ are the compliances of Limb2 and Limb3 at $O$ and $\mathbf{T}_{O}^{B}$ is the transformation matrix.

Limb2 and Limb3 are connected in parallel at $B$, the compliance is $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Limb2,3}}^{B}$. Then, $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Limb2,3}}^{B}$ and Limb1's right branch ${ }_{r} \mathbf{C}_{\text {Limb1 }}^{B}$ are parallel in the coordinate system $B-x y$. So, the parallel compliance at $B$ can be calculated as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Limb} 1(r), 2,3}^{B}=\left(\left({ }_{r} \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Limb} 1}^{B}\right)^{-1}+\left(\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Limb} 2,3}^{B}\right)^{-1}\right)^{-1} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

TABLE I
Structure Parameters of the Mechanism

| $l_{1}$ | $l_{2}$ | $l_{3}$ | $l_{4}$ | $l_{5}$ | $l_{6}$ | $l_{7}$ | $l_{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.0 | 2.0 | 34.3 | 13.2 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 5.2 |
| $l_{9}$ | $l_{10}$ | $l_{11}$ | $l_{12}$ | $l_{13}$ | $l_{14}$ | $l_{15}$ | $l_{16}$ |
| 12.0 | 4.8 | 29.7 | 17.5 | 9.5 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 8.0 |
| $l_{17}$ | $l_{18}$ | $l_{19}$ | $l_{20}$ | $l_{21}$ | $l_{22}$ | $l_{23}$ | $l_{24}$ |
| 6.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 112.0 |

Units: mm.

TABLE II
Material Parameters of the Mechanism

| Materials | Young's Modulus <br> $/ \mathrm{GPa}$ | Density <br> $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | Poisson's <br> Ratio | Yield strength <br> $/ \mathrm{MPa}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 431 | 198.6 | $7.75 \times 10^{3}$ | 0.27 | $655 \sim 1080$ |
| 60Si2Mn | 206 | $7.85 \times 10^{3}$ | 0.27 | 1175 |

The parallel compliance of position $B$ is transformed into the coordinate system $O_{6}-x y$ and connected in series with the hinges $O_{6} O_{7}, O_{8} O_{9}, O_{10} O_{11}$, and $O_{12} O_{13}$. The compliance of position $O_{6}$ with respect to the fixed end can be obtained as

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{C}_{B}^{6}= & \mathbf{T}_{B}^{6} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{Limb1}(r), 2,3}^{B} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{B}^{6}\right)^{T} \\
& +\sum_{i=3}^{6} \mathbf{T}_{2 i+1}^{6} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{2 i+1} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{2 i+1}^{6}\right)^{T} \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{B}^{6}$ is the transformation matrix.
The compliance of position $O_{6}$ is connected in parallel with the hinge $O_{4} O_{5}$ in the coordinate system $O_{3}-x y$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}_{6}^{3}=\left(\left(\mathbf{T}_{6}^{3} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{B}^{6} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{6}^{3}\right)^{T}\right)^{-1}+\left(\mathbf{T}_{5}^{3} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{5} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{5}^{3}\right)^{T}\right)^{-1}\right)^{-1} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{6}{ }^{3}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{5}{ }^{3}$ are the transformation matrices.
Then, the above compliance and hook hinge $\mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ are connected in series at the input $O_{1}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{in}}=\mathbf{T}_{3}^{1} \cdot \mathbf{C}_{6}^{3} \cdot\left(\mathbf{T}_{3}^{1}\right)^{T}+\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{hook}} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{3}{ }^{1}$ is the transformation matrix.
Finally, we can get the input stiffness

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{\mathrm{in}}=\left[\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{in}}(1,1)\right]^{-1} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

## IV. Model Validation With FEA

To verify the feasibility of the above proposed numerical model, the output compliance, input stiffness, and motion stroke of the proposed mechanism, the FEA process by ANSYS workbench software package is carried out in this section. The material was stainless steel 431. The mechanical dimension of the proposed mechanism in Fig. 3 is detailedly given in Table I. Its physical and mechanical properties are concluded in Table II. In the FEA process, a 3-D FEA model is established with the SOLID186 and SOLID5. A smaller mesh size is defined at the hinge cut-out position to obtain an accurate simulation result. The bases of those three limbs are fixed in the FEA.


Fig. 5. Mechanism deformation along the $z$-axis with a force of 1800 N on the end effector (enlarged 110 times for a clear view).

## A. Output Compliance and Input Stiffness

First, the stiffness/compliance and stroke of the proposed mechanism were analyzed by the static FEA. In order to calculate the input stiffness, a certain force $F_{\text {in }}$ was applied to the input end of Limb1. And then, the corresponding input displacement was extracted from the FEA to obtain the input stiffness. In addition, by applying a certain force $F_{\text {out }}$ to the end effector, the output compliance can be evaluated by extracting the platform displacement, as shown in Fig. 5.

Based on (7) and (13), the output compliance and the input stiffness are predicted to be $8.479 \mathrm{e}-08 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{N}$ and $1.229 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}$, respectively, by the CMM models. By the FEA simulation results, the output compliance and the input stiffness are $7.436 \mathrm{e}-08 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{N}$ and $1.041 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}$, respectively. The model deviations are $14.02 \%$ and $18.06 \%$ according to an error equation (CMM-FEA)/FEA $\times 100 \%$. These deviations are mainly caused by some assumptions in the numerical analytical model, such as the accuracy of the compliance equations, the neglect of the links compliance between hinges, and so on. Moreover, the linear relationship between the input force and input displacement indicates that stress stiffening does not happen in the proposed mechanism.

## B. Stroke

When a motor supplies a linear displacement of 0.5 mm to the input end of each limb, the maximum stress of 181.87 MPa subject to the axial load is generated at position $O_{7}$ of limbs of the proposed mechanism. Therefore, the safety factor can be calculated as $\sigma_{y} / \sigma_{\max }=655 \mathrm{MPa} / 181.87 \mathrm{MPa}=3.6$, where $\sigma_{\max }$ is the maximum allowable stress of the material. It indicates that the proposed mechanism can achieve reliably long-term running with the elastic deformation. The highprecision positioning repeatability can also be guaranteed. With a maximum input displacement not more than 0.5 mm at input ends of three limbs, the 6-DOF strokes of the end effector are also investigated by the FEA. The $T_{\mathrm{x}}, T_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $T_{\mathrm{z}}$ strokes are $59.441 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 67.33 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, and $37.786 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, respectively. The $R_{\mathrm{x}}, R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{z}}$ strokes are $326.477 \mu \mathrm{rad}, 350.25 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, and $512.801 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, respectively.


Fig. 6. Experimental setup. (a) Photograph of the positioning system. (b) Hardware connection.

## C. Modal Analysis

The constraint modal analysis was performed. It demonstrates that the 1st and 2nd natural frequencies are 188.84 Hz and 189.02 Hz , respectively. They are translational vibrations in the $x y$-plane. The third mode is the rotation around the $z$-axis, which is 231.89 Hz . The bending vibrations around $R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}}$-axis and the translation vibrations along the $z$-axis happen in the 4th, 5th, and 6th modes, respectively. The 4th and 5th modes are close to each other with the vibration frequency of 331.53 Hz and 331.66 Hz , respectively. The 6th mode is a translation along the $z$-axis with a frequency of 364.22 Hz .

## V. Prototype Fabrication and Tests

In this section, the working performances of the proposed positioning system were experimentally investigated with a fabricated prototype.

## A. Experimental Setup

The fabricated prototype and the experimental configurations are shown in Fig. 6. Capacitive displacement sensors are used to measure the postures of the end effector. The base of this system was fixed to a vibration isolation platform preventing the vibration from ground. Each limb was fabricated by the WEDM process, and the material is stainless steel 431. The end effector was bolted to three limbs and then mounted on the
base holistically. Each limb was actuated by two piezoactuators (LTC40 from PiezoMotor) with a stroke of $\pm 1.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ and a submicro/nanometer positioning resolution. The driving voltage of $0-48 \mathrm{~V}$ can be obtained from a six-axis piezoamplifier and controller (Driver 206 from PiezoMotor). The piezoelectric actuator was connected with a hook hinge. There was no gap between the motor and the mechanism during operation. Hence, it becomes unnecessary to carry out the preloading springs. In order to measure the six motion DOFs of the proposed mechanism, six measuring blocks were mounted on the end effector. The output motion of the end effector was measured by six capacitive displacement sensors (CSH05FL from MicroEpsilon) which have a linearity of $\pm 0.05 \%$ in a full stroke of $500 \mu \mathrm{~m}$. The static and dynamic resolutions are 0.38 nm and 10 nm under the sampling rate of 2 Hz and 8.8 kHz . The analog output voltage of the six sensors was changed into digital output by a data acquisition box. Then, the digital output was picked up by a computer through a RS232 interface with a sampling frequency of 10 Hz . It should be noted that the measure direction of each sensor is the same as the motion direction of the measured target, which is beneficial for eliminating Abbe errors.

## B. Open-Loop Performance Testing

In this section, the position resolution of the proposed mechanism was experimentally investigated by the open-loop control. The $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ response was studied by using a continuous-step command with a position resolution of $0.01 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, as shown in Fig. 7(a). Because the response speed is slow, the position overshoot of this positioning system is negligible. It also shows that the steady-state error remains within the range of $\pm 5 \mathrm{~nm}$, which verifies that the position resolution of $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ is about 10 nm . Similarly, the position resolution of $T_{\mathrm{y}}$ is also about 10 nm in the proposed mechanism, as shown in Fig. 7(b). In addition, the position resolution of $T_{\mathrm{z}}$ was also investigated. In Fig. 7(c), it shows that the position step of 5 nm can be clearly identified, and the tracking steady-state error is also within $\pm 2.5 \mathrm{~nm}$. It indicates that the position resolution of $T_{\mathrm{Z}}$ can achieve about 5 nm . Furthermore, the angular resolutions of $R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}$ are measured as $100 \mathrm{nrad}, 100 \mathrm{nrad}$, and 200 nrad , respectively, as shown in Fig. 7(d)-(f).

Moreover, with a maximum actuators' input displacement of 0.5 mm , the stroke of the proposed mechanism was also investigated with an open-loop control. The stroke is about $\pm 40$ $\mu \mathrm{m} \times \pm 40 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times \pm 30 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times \pm 200 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times \pm 200 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times$ $\pm 300 \mu \mathrm{rad}$ in the 3-D space. Due to the manufacturing errors and motor assembly tolerances, the actual two-direction travel range is not exactly symmetrical about the zero point.

And then, the parasitic motion of the end effector was investigated. Experiments were carried out with an open-loop control. When controlling the end effector just move along the $x$-axis direction within $\pm 40 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, the displacement of $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ and the other five parasitic motions ( $T_{\mathrm{y}}, T_{\mathrm{z}}, R_{\mathrm{x}}, R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{z}}$ ) are simultaneously measured. Fig. 8(a) illustrated the experimental results. The maximum translational parasitic errors of $T_{\mathrm{y}}$ and $T_{\mathrm{z}}$ are $0.426 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ and $-0.139 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, respectively. The ratio of the parasitic error to the primary motion in $T_{\mathrm{y}}$ and $T_{\mathrm{z}}$ is about $1.064 \%$ and $0.348 \%$, respectively. Similarly, the maximum


Fig. 7. Open-loop resolution results of the consecutive steps. (a) Response of $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ resolution. (b) Response of $T_{\mathrm{y}}$ resolution. (c) Response of $T_{\mathrm{z}}$ resolution. (d) Response of $R_{\mathrm{x}}$ resolution. (e) Response of $R_{\mathrm{y}}$ resolution. (f) Response of $R_{\mathrm{z}}$ resolution.
parasitic errors for $R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}$ are measured as $-0.915 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, $-2.521 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, and $-7.748 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, respectively. So, the ratio of the parasitic error to the primary motion in $R_{\mathrm{x}}, R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{z}}$ is $2.288 \%, 6.48 \%$, and $19.369 \%$, respectively. With the same investigation methods, the parasitic errors can also be obtained when just driving the end effector along the $T_{\mathrm{y}}, T_{\mathrm{z}}, R_{\mathrm{x}}, R_{\mathrm{y}}$, and $R_{\mathrm{Z}}$ direction, as shown in Fig. 8(b)-(f).

It is considered that there are several reasons causing the parasitic motion generation in an open-loop control, such as manufacturing error, misalignment of motors, assembly errors, mounting error of sensors, Abbe errors between the motion axes and the measurement point, and so on. The above mentioned conditions also decrease the positioning accuracy of the proposed mechanism in an open-loop control. Parasitic errors may be reduced by adjusting the sensor installation with a coordinate measuring machine. In order to increase the positioning accuracy and decrease the parasitic motion, a closed-loop control was applied to the proposed positioning system.

## VI. Experimental Tests and Discussions

In this section, the positioning performance of the proposed system was experimentally investigated with a closed-loop control.


Fig. 8. Parasitic errors of the end effector. (a) $T_{\mathrm{x}}$ primary motion. (b) $T_{\mathrm{y}}$ primary motion. (c) $T_{z}$ primary motion. (d) $R_{\mathrm{x}}$ primary motion. (e) $R_{y}$ primary motion. (f) $R_{z}$ primary motion.

## A. Positioning Accuracy in Six-Axis Control

The positioning accuracy was investigated by moving the end effector from an initial position $(0,0,0,0,0,0)$ to a target position $(10 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 100 \mu \mathrm{rad}, 100 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, $100 \mu \mathrm{rad})$ with controlling all the six motion axis simultaneously. The measurement results are shown in Fig. 9. It shows that the finally achieved position is $(10.000 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 10.005$ $\mu \mathrm{m}, 9.998 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 99.973 \mu \mathrm{rad}, 99.961 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, and $99.937 \mu \mathrm{rad})$. The positioning processes are shown in Fig. 9(a)-(f). The steady-state errors at the target position are enlarged view in Fig. 9(g)-(1), and the corresponding histograms of those steady-state errors are shown in Fig. 9(m)-(r). The $3 \sigma$ positioning accuracy of $T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}} / R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}$ is $21.69 \mathrm{~nm}, 18.92 \mathrm{~nm}$, $10.71 \mathrm{~nm}, 86.43 \mathrm{nrad}, 87.78 \mathrm{nrad}$, and 200.51 nrad , respectively.

With controlling the entire six motion axis simultaneously in a close-loop control, the positioning repeatability of the proposed system was also investigated. The positioning tests were repeated ten times to ensure the reproducibility. The initial and target positions in each test remain the same as abovementioned. The measured target position and the calculated positioning accuracy ( $3 \sigma$ ) are concluded in Table III. The root-mean-square (RMS) of $T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}} / R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}$ are $10.0003 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 10.0023 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, $9.9961 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 100.0042 \mu \mathrm{rad}, 99.9593 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, and $99.9715 \mu \mathrm{rad}$, respectively, which can be obtained as

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{\mathrm{RMS}}=\sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_{i}{ }^{2}}=\sqrt{\frac{X_{1}^{2}+X_{2}^{2}+\cdots+X_{N}^{2}}{N}} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N$ is the number of samples and $X$ is the variable.


Fig. 9. Positioning results in the six axes. (a)-(f) Time history of positioning. (g)-(l) Steady-state error magnification diagram. (m)-(r) Histograms of steady-state errors of the positioning system.

The standard deviations $(\sigma)$ of $T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}} / R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}$ are 0.0099 , $0.0047,0.0022,0.0194,0.0282$, and 0.0632 , respectively, which can be obtained as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma=\sqrt{\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(X_{i}-\mu\right)^{2}} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ is the sample mean.

TABLE III
Positioning Repeatability of the 6-DOF System

| N o | Perf. | Tx | Ty | Tz | Rx | Ry | Rz |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mean | 10.012 | 9.995 | 9.998 | $\begin{gathered} 100.00 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | 99.982 | 99.893 |
|  | $\sigma$ | 7.931 | 6.474 | 2.279 | 18.567 | 13.620 | 23.503 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 23.793 | 19.422 | 6.836 | 55.700 | 40.861 | 70.508 |
| 2 | Mean | 10.015 | 10.002 | 9.996 | $\begin{gathered} 100.01 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | 99.894 | 99.924 |
|  | $\sigma$ | 8.778 | 5.471 | 2.069 | 20.184 | 28.138 | 80.375 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 26.335 | 16.412 | 6.206 | 60.553 | 84.414 | $\begin{gathered} 241.12 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3 | Mean | 10.009 | 10.004 | 9.997 | $\begin{gathered} 100.01 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | 99.983 | 99.883 |
|  | $\sigma$ | 8.954 | 7.914 | 2.160 | 24.066 | 24.848 | 96.748 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 26.863 | 23.741 | 6.479 | 72.199 | 74.544 | $\begin{gathered} 290.24 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| 4 | Mean | 9.992 | 9.997 | 9.994 | 99.991 | 99.975 | $\begin{gathered} 100.05 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\sigma$ | 5.046 | 4.625 | 1.559 | 26.392 | 18.148 | 70.870 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 15.139 | 13.874 | 4.676 | 79.176 | 54.444 | $\begin{gathered} 212.61 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |
| 5 | Mean | 10.006 | 10.005 | 9.992 | $\begin{gathered} 100.03 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | 99.928 | $\begin{gathered} 100.02 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\sigma$ | 6.501 | 5.820 | 1.180 | 32.008 | 16.412 | 35.182 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 19.504 | 17.459 | 3.540 | 96.024 | 49.237 | $\begin{gathered} 105.54 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 | Mean | 9.994 | 10.004 | 9.997 | 99.960 | 99.959 | 99.998 |
|  | $\sigma$ | 7.432 | 4.734 | 2.227 | 19.967 | 22.128 | 89.575 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 22.296 | 14.201 | 6.800 | 59.900 | 66.385 | $\begin{gathered} 268.72 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| 7 | Mean | 9.992 | 10.005 | 9.996 | $\begin{gathered} 100.00 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 99.965 | $\begin{gathered} 100.01 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\sigma$ | 6.332 | 8.179 | 2.270 | 29.948 | 22.839 | 98.656 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 18.995 | 24.536 | 6.810 | 89.845 | 68.519 | $\begin{gathered} 295.96 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| 8 | Mean | 10.003 | 10.008 | 10.000 | $\begin{gathered} 100.00 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | 99.966 | 99.910 |
|  | $\sigma$ | 4.600 | 7.199 | 2.874 | 36.738 | 22.247 | 85.236 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 13.799 | 21.597 | 8.622 | $\begin{gathered} 110.21 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | 66.740 | $\begin{gathered} 255.70 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |
| 9 | Mean | 9.994 | 10.007 | 9.996 | $\begin{gathered} 100.00 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | 99.959 | $\begin{gathered} 100.03 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\sigma$ | 5.622 | 5.131 | 2.185 | 32.870 | 19.511 | 93.574 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 16.865 | 15.392 | 6.556 | 98.610 | 58.533 | $\begin{gathered} 280.72 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |
| 10 | Mean | 9.986 | 9.996 | 9.995 | $\begin{gathered} 100.00 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | 99.982 | 99.985 |
|  | $\sigma$ | 5.494 | 5.213 | 1.959 | 29.923 | 32.127 | 77.528 |
|  | $3 \sigma$ | 16.481 | 15.638 | 5.876 | 89.771 | 96.380 | $\begin{gathered} 232.58 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Units:
Mean $T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}}(\mu \mathrm{m}), R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}(\mu \mathrm{rad})$.
$\sigma T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{nm}), R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{nrad})$.
$3 \sigma T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{nm}), R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{nrad})$.

The positioning repeatability in $3 \sigma$ of the proposed positioning system is better than $30 \mathrm{~nm} \times 30 \mathrm{~nm} \times 15 \mathrm{~nm} \times 150 \mathrm{nrad} \times$ $150 \mathrm{nrad} \times 300 \mathrm{nrad}$ in the 3 -D space.

## B. Discussions on System Performance

In order to make a comparison with some already reported 6-DOF systems, several typical performances of the present proposed system are given in Table IV.

With an open-loop controlling, a large stroke of $\pm 0.04 \mathrm{~mm} \times$ $\pm 0.04 \mathrm{~mm} \times \pm 0.03 \mathrm{~mm} \times \pm 0.2 \mathrm{mrad} \times \pm 0.2 \mathrm{mrad} \times$ $\pm 0.3 \mathrm{mrad}$ can be achieved with the present proposed system. It should be noted that the stroke of this presented system is conservative due to the installation errors and the limited working displacement of the driving motor. If a larger travel

TABLE IV
Performance Comparisons for the Proposed System

| Ref. | Diameter <br> $\times$ height | Resolution | Workspace | Accuracy $(3 \sigma)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $0.0082 \times 0.0105 \times$ |  |
| $[22]$ | unknown | unknown | $0.013 \times 0.224 \times$ | unknown |
|  |  |  | $0.105 \times 0.097$ |  |
| $[23]$ | unknown | $0.1 \times 0.1 \times 0.1 \times$ | $\pm 0.05 \times \pm 0.05 \times$ |  |
|  |  | $1 \times 1 \times 1$ | $\pm 0.15 \times \pm 0.733 \times$ | unknown |
|  |  | $0.005 \times 0.005 \times$ | $0.733 \times \pm 0.244$ |  |
| $[24]$ | $173.2 \times 50$ | $0.005 \times 0.7 \times$ | $0.008 \times 0.008 \times$ |  |
|  |  | $0.7 \times 0.7$ | $\times 0.2 \times 0.2$ | unknown |
| $[25]$ | $350 \times 120$ | $0.015 \times 0.015 \times$ | $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 34.907$ |  |
|  |  | $0.678 \times 0.678 \times$ | $\times 34.907 \times 34.907$ | unknown |
|  |  | $0.004 \times 0.004 \times$ |  |  |
| $[27]$ | $250 \times 80$ | $0.004 \times$ unknown | $\pm 0.04 \times \pm 0.04 \times$ | $0.033 \times 0.033 \times$ |
|  |  | $\times$ unknown $\times$ | $\pm 0.08 \times \pm 0.8 \times$ | $0.084 \times 0.21 \times$ |
|  |  | unknown | $\pm 0.8 \times \pm 0.4$ | $0.9 \times 0.9$ |
| This | $264 \times 148$. | $0.01 \times 0.01 \times$ | $\pm 0.04 \times \pm 0.04 \times$ | $0.03 \times 0.03 \times$ |
| work | 4 | $0.005 \times 0.1 \times$ | $\pm 0.03 \times \pm 0.2 \times$ | $0.015 \times 0.15 \times$ |
|  | $0.1 \times 0.2$ | $\pm 0.2 \times \pm 0.3$ | $0.15 \times 0.3$ |  |

Units:
Diameter $\times$ height $(\mathrm{mm} \times \mathrm{mm})$.
Resolution $T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}}(\mu \mathrm{m}), R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}(\mu \mathrm{rad})$.
Workspace $T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{mm}), R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{mrad})$.
Accuracy $(3 \sigma) T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}}(\mu \mathrm{m}), R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}(\mu \mathrm{rad})$.
range is demanded, the stroke of the proposed system may be further increased by using a linear motor with a larger working displacement, such as voice coil motors.

Moreover, the properties of utilized sensors have significant influences on the positioning tests. The capacitive displacement sensor, which is a noncontact device capable of high-resolution measurement of the position, is adopted in this research. It is advantageous to precision positioning. Capacitive displacement sensors can be used to measure the position of the objects down to the nanometer level. Even though the capacitive displacement sensors with a compact design are utilized, the signal noise from the sensor cannot be ignored in the nanometer level positioning process. Hence, an advanced signal processing technique should be developed in the following step to efficiently filter out noises. A high-precision grating with low-noise generation may be used for further improving the position resolution of the proposed positioning system. It is hoped that the positioning accuracy may be increased from tens of nanometers to several nanometers with the proposed system.

Additionally, the $3 \sigma$ positioning accuracy of the proposed system can be achieved about 30 nm in linear position control and $0.3 \mu \mathrm{rad}$ in angular position control, which is advanced in the present proposed 6-DOF positioning systems. Comparing the closed-loop positioning with the open-loop positioning, the standard deviations of $T_{\mathrm{x}} / T_{\mathrm{y}} / T_{\mathrm{z}} / R_{\mathrm{x}} / R_{\mathrm{y}} / R_{\mathrm{z}}$ are reduced from $0.0326 \mu \mathrm{~m} / 0.0383 \mu \mathrm{~m} / 0.0201 \mu \mathrm{~m} / 0.41315 \mu \mathrm{rad} /$ $0.4598 \mu \mathrm{rad} / 0.9404 \mu \mathrm{rad}$ to $0.0099 \mu \mathrm{~m} / 0.0047 \mu \mathrm{~m} / 0.0022 \mu \mathrm{~m} /$ $0.0194 \mu \mathrm{rad} / 0.0282 \mu \mathrm{rad} / 0.0632 \mu \mathrm{rad}$. The positioning accuracy is obviously improved.

In ultraprecision optical engineering, the posture of some optical elements needs to be adjusted in 6-DOF with several tens of nanometers position resolution and within several tens of micrometers workspace. For example, the alignment of optical elements in lithographic projection lenses [3], [34].

Although commercial 6-DOF positioning systems have enough workspace, the position resolution and positioning accuracy can not satisfy the requirements. Furthermore, the mechanism proposed in this article is made of stainless steel 431. The thermal expansion coefficient of this material is close to that in optical glasses. The 6-DOF positioning system proposed in this article has a practical prospect in the above-mentioned ultraprecision optical engineering. The proposed system is more advantaged than the present commercial ones in achieving the high-precision positioning accuracy. In order to improve the position tracking accuracy and the response speed of the system, a more compact 6-DOF positioning system will be developed by optimizing the structural design in the future research works. Some advanced control strategies, i.e., discrete-time repetitive control [8], enhanced model-predictive control [14], slidingmode control [35], and fuzzy adaptive control [36], will be adopted.

## VII. Conclusion

This article proposed a parallel 6-DOF positioning system with high resolution, high repeatability, and low parasitic motion. Lever-bipod-lever was adopted to design the limb with input displacement reduction, which improves the position resolution of the end effector. Based on the matrix method, a compliance model of the proposed mechanism was built. The output compliance, input stiffness, and stroke of the proposed mechanism were theoretically calculated. As following, the feasibility of the proposed numerical model was also verified by an FEA simulation process. Furthermore, a prototype was manufactured for experimental investigations. The travel range of the proposed system can achieve $\pm 40 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times \pm 40 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times$ $\pm 30 \mu \mathrm{~m} \times \pm 200 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times \pm 200 \mu \mathrm{rad} \times \pm 300 \mu \mathrm{rad}$ with the resolution of $10 \mathrm{~nm} \times 10 \mathrm{~nm} \times 5 \mathrm{~nm} \times 100 \mathrm{nrad} \times 100 \mathrm{nrad} \times$ 200 nrad in an open-loop control. The positioning accuracy of the six axes can achieve $30 \mathrm{~nm} \times 30 \mathrm{~nm} \times 15 \mathrm{~nm} \times$ $150 \mathrm{nrad} \times 150 \mathrm{nrad} \times 300 \mathrm{nrad}$ in closed-loop control. The experimental results not only validate the effectiveness of the proposed positioning system but also verify the nanometer-scale spatial positioning accuracy within several tens of micrometers stroke range. The proposed micro/nanopositioning system may expand the actual application of alignment optical elements in projection lenses of 193 nm immersion lithography.

In the future, some research works can be carried out to improve the applicability of the proposed 6-DOF positioning system: High-performance control strategies will be carried and high-speed tracking performance will be investigated, and the geometrical dimension of the proposed mechanism will be optimized and miniaturized.
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