

ISTITUTO NAZIONALE DI RICERCA METROLOGICA Repository Istituzionale

Metrological traceability of a digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometers sensor network

This is the author's accepted ver	sion of the contribution published as:
-----------------------------------	--

Original

Metrological traceability of a digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometers sensor network / Prato, A.; Mazzoleni, F.; D'Emilia, G.; Gaspari, A.; Natale, E.; Schiavi, A.. - In: MEASUREMENT. - ISSN 0263-2241. - 184:(2021), p. 109925. [10.1016/j.measurement.2021.109925]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11696/71010 since: 2023-05-30T15:13:55Z

Publisher: Elsevier

Published DOI:10.1016/j.measurement.2021.109925

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

1	Towards the metrological traceability of a sensor network and the
2	trustworthiness of data provided: a case study on 25 digital
3	MEMS accelerometers
4	
5	Andrea Prato ¹ , Fabrizio Mazzoleni ¹ , Giulio D'Emilia ² , Antonella Gaspari ² ,
6	Emanuela Natale ² , Alessandro Schiavi ¹
7	
8	¹ INRiM - Istituto Nazionale di Ricerca Metrologica, 10135 Torino, Italy
9	² University of L'Aquila, Department of Industrial and Information Engineering and of Economics, 67100
10	L'Aquila, Italy
11	Corresponding author e-mail: a.prato@inrim.it
12	
13	Abbreviated title: Metrological traceability of a sensor network
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29 20	
3U 31	
51	

32 Abstract

Digital MEMS sensor networks are nowadays widely applied in environmental and manufacturing appli-cations. However, fundamental metrological requirements, such as traceability and trustworthiness of data, are often disregarded by manufacturers and end-users. In this work, traceability of a sensor network prototype, composed of 25 digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometers, conceived for structural monitoring at low-frequencies, is investigated. Main and transverse sensitivities are provided for each axis at three low-frequencies by two laboratories with recently-developed independent vibration calibration systems using inclined planes. Com-parison of the 225 main sensitivities shows compatible results. Given the large amount of data to be managed by end-users, the possibility of decreasing its number is then investigated by managing sensitivity and uncer-tainty data according to different combinations of three examined factors, i.e. MEMS, frequency and axis. Thus, the number of data is reduced at the expense of higher uncertainties but preserving the traceability and the trustworthiness of sensors data. Keywords: Vibration calibration, Digital Sensors, Network sensitivity, MEMS, Trustworthiness, Traceability.

66 **1. Introduction**

67 Nowadays systems for survey, monitoring and control based on digital MEMS sensor networks has become 68 a widely established practice in many application and engineering fields. The ease of use, flexibility, low-cost 69 and low-power consuming of MEMS sensors, together with the enhanced big data flows managing and the 70 digitalization, have made these "technological sensing infrastructures" very attracting tools to detect a great 71 variety of physical quantities, processes and phenomena, from the small-scale up to the large-scale (until the 72 Earth-scale). Besides, the development of new technologies based on independent devices and communica-73 tions, such as IoT in each different implementation, from healthcare to smart industries, from domotics to 74 autonomous driving, is based on the deployment of very complex wide distributed grids of sensors.

However, by referring to the terminology defined in VIM [1] and in [2], some typical metrological attributes of measuring instruments, such as traceability, accuracy and the trustworthiness of data provided, are often disregarded for MEMS sensors, applied in the nodes of networks. «Trustworthiness of measurements» represents in a comprehensive and very communicative way the measurement quality level, under several technical points of view [3, 4].

Sometimes, end-users implement custom calibration techniques (or more properly, custom adjustments) or rely on the calibration data provided by the manufacturers, without traceable methods. Depending on the applications (more or less sensitive), it may be necessary to actually have traceable and accurate data, or at least data-sets expressed within well-defined confidence levels. It follows that a traceable network of sensors is certainly more trustworthy (and much more competitive) than ordinary networks, since data supplied can be considered effectively representative of measured phenomena, beyond to be compatible and reproducible.

In order to amend this lack, some applicative protocols begin to be published, e.g., by IEEE Standard Association [5] providing common framework for sensor performance specification terminology, units, conditions, and limits. Indeed, the large deployment of sensors with digital output and network systems needs to be underpinned by new metrological approaches (such as remote self-calibration, data aggregation in network systems and uncertainty analysis) allowing to support trustworthy and safe operation, linked to traceability chains, to guarantee higher quality management requirements.

The relevance of these emerging needs in the field of metrology, has recently oriented the strategy plan of BIPM [6], in order to «identify and deliver the highest impact opportunities to support National Metrology Institutes (NMIs) priorities in, for example, the areas of "big data" and digital transformation», as well as several consultative committees within it [7-10], with the aim to provide suitable calibration procedures for these systems, against national primary standards, and to provide the traceability chain to the national laboratories and to the manufacturers, at present not yet available.

In Fig. 1 the metrological traceability chain and the path of the International System of Units propagation,
 through subsequent calibrations, from primary standard to end-users, is schematically represented.





102

Fig. 1. The metrological traceability chain and the propagation of the SI.

As a consequence, there are not still technical standards for the calibration of sensors with digital output and digital interface, thus end-users will usually get neither a calibration certificate nor a traceability statement from the manufacturer, although the sensitivity is adjusted during the production process. As it is known, in some applications there are several legal or insurance reasons for which it is preferable to use sensors calibrated in accredited and certified laboratories, according to the ISO 17025 standard [11].

108 In the frame of the Strategy 2019 to 2029 of the Consultative Committee for Acoustics, Ultrasound, and 109 Vibration at BIPM, the vision is strongly oriented to the issue of digitalization and to the traceability of sensors 110 with digital interfaces, since markets are generating the basic components to enable to development of low-111 cost robust sensor systems capable of wireless, autonomous and intelligent operation, possibly combining 112 multi-parameter sensing within a single device or network of devices. Indeed, the metrology applied to sensor 113 networks, under several points of view, is particularly stimulated from both industrial needs and sensors man-114 ufacturers, and several NMIs worldwide are planning their activities along these perspectives. From a general 115 survey beyond specific applications, in USA at NIST, security, trust and trustworthiness of sensors applied in 116 networks and in distributed system for Internet of Things (IoT) and Network of Things (NoT), are investigated 117 [12]; in Germany at PTB, the role of metrology for the digitalization of the economy and society in the digital 118 age is studied [13]; in Italy at INRIM, within an integrated industrial partnership network [14], the processes of knowledge transfer, supporting the traceability chain to sensors with digital outputs, are applied for envi-119 120 ronment, industry and smart manufacturing [15-20].

121 Within the framework of the European Association of National Metrology Institutes (EURAMET), this 122 topic is widely debated and several proposals are developed within joint research projects, such as "Metrology for the Factory of the Future" (Met4FoF) [21], "Metrology for the next-generation digital substation instrumentation" (FutureGrid II) [22] or "Communication and validation of smart data in IoT-networks" (Smart-Com) [23], among others.

The metrological research devoted to the sensor networks, intended as the whole infrastructure – i.e., from the acquisition systems (sensing elements, nodes), to the systems for transferring, processing and distributing signals (microcontrollers), to the transmission and connectivity protocols, to the collecting hubs, up to the enduser – is a wide field of investigation, aimed to provide trustworthy and traceable data, within suitable coverage factors and uncertainties budgets, tailored to the actual needs of specific applications and employments, and a multidisciplinary effort of different competences has to be harmonized, steps by steps. In Fig. 2 the description of a simplified sensor network infrastructure and the related metrological needs are depicted.

133



134

135

Fig. 2. The sensor network infrastructure and the metrological needs.

136

137 The first fundamental step, from a metrological perspective towards the traceability of a sensor network as 138 a whole, is founded on the trustworthiness of data provided by the single sensors employed, once properly 139 calibrated, thus on the ability to provide measurement uncertainty and/or quality information together with the 140 measurement data. Nevertheless, since «these technologies have different mounting requirements, use differ-141 ent testing and calibration protocols, and use digital interfaces for data and communications» [7], it is not 142 always possible to completely fulfill the current standard requirements for the calibration; on the other hand, 143 some different analyses and limitations need to be applied, in order to identify and quantify the actual sensi-144 tivity values of digital sensors. In addition, standard calibration methods are not feasible in terms of timings 145 and costs, compatibly with the low-cost of the sensors.

In the case of digital MEMS accelerometers, the sensitivity is generally provided by the manufacturer without traceable methods and sometimes it is estimated in static conditions. Dynamic response, as a function of frequency, is often unknown. On the other hand, traceable calibration methods for digital sensors, including sensitivity parameter and uncertainty analysis are necessary, in order to consider digital MEMS accelerometers as actual measurement devices in the frequency domain [24-27]. For these reasons, two independent calibration systems using tilted plates suitable for MEMS accelerometers have been developed by INRIM (National Institute of Metrological Research) [28-29] and UNIVAQ (University of L'Aquila) [30-33].

153 **2.** Material and methods

154 In this work, as a case-study, the traceability and the reproducibility of sensors to be employed in a network, 155 composed of 25 digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometers, nominally identical, are investigated. Each sensor is 156 calibrated by comparison to INRIM secondary standard (previously calibrated against INRIM primary stand-157 ard), to establish the first link to the metrological traceability chain. In this way, the traceability is assured, and 158 the robustness of compatibility and reproducibility is verified on the basis of a bilateral comparison between 159 INRIM and UNIVAQ. It is worth noting that in relevant standards, calibration of rectilinear vibration trans-160 ducers is mainly intended for the evaluation of magnitude sensitivity and optionally for phase shift sensitivity. 161 Therefore, in the following, calibration measurements are related to the first case. Traceability of the sensors, 162 to be applied within the network, is provided through calibration methods by comparison to a calibrated reference transducer: the actual main sensitivity, in frequency domain, of each axis for each single MEMS accel-163 164 erometer, and the transverse sensitivities, due to the mutual interactions among axes, are accurately quantified. Experimental results, obtained from the two independent dynamic calibration systems and procedures in terms 165 166 of "digitized sensitivities", are then verified and finally compared to each other and with the nominal sensitivity 167 provided by the manufacturer [34]. The analyzed MEMS accelerometers are a part of the same production 168 batch, provided by manufacturer (STMicroelectronics). Calibration results of the 25 MEMS accelerometers 169 are then compared and experimental expanded uncertainties are used to evaluate the sensitivity ranges of the 170 MEMS accelerometers, with suitable coverage factors, in order to estimate the trustworthiness of data provided 171 by the sensors within the network, employed by end-users. The sensors under investigation are the sensing 172 elements of a network-prototype, conceived for structural and infrastructures health monitoring and for seismic 173 safety networks at urban/building scale, suitable for low-frequency range vibration measurements [35-39].

175 2.1 Sensitivity and sensors

176 2.1.1 «Digitized» Sensitivity

177 First of all, it is necessary to define a proper sensitivity parameter for digital outputs. According to the IEEE 178 Standard for digital accelerometer [5], the sensitivity is defined in terms of Least Significant Bit (LSB) referred 179 to g, i.e., g/LSB. The change in acceleration input corresponding to 1 LSB change in output. This definition is widely used in digital sensors datasheets. Nevertheless, in our opinion, the use of term LSB is partially con-180 181 fusing for digital outputs for two main reasons. First, the actual digital output value is a n bit 0/1 binary se-182 quence, converted into a decimal number (Decimaln-bit). Second, although 1 LSB corresponds to 20=1 Deci-183 mal_{n-bit} in most of the cases, according to IEEE Standard, it is not always true, since 1 LSB could correspond to other bit positions, i.e. 21=2 Decimal_{n-bit}, 22=4 Decimal_{n-bit}, or more. Therefore, in the following, the «dig-184 185 itized sensitivity» of a digital MEMS accelerometer is expressed, in linear units, as Decimal_{n-bit}/(m s⁻²) (or 186 simply $D_{n-bit}/(m s^{-2})$), by analogy to typical sensitivity of analog accelerometers, expressed in linear units, in 187 terms of $V/(m s^{-2})$. The n-bit subscript indicates the number of bits to which the Decimal refers to, i.e. 12-bit, 188 16-bit, depending on the standard used by the device.

189

190 2.1.2 Sensor network sensitivity

191 The definition of sensor network sensitivity could be misleading when compared to the traditional concept 192 of sensitivity. In fact, traditionally, the sensitivity, together with the associated uncertainty, is provided to each 193 individual sensor by varying the main parameters of influence (e.g., frequencies and axes, in the case of accel 194 erometers), with the result that several quantities are related to a single transducer. However, in the case of 195 sensor networks, that may consist of tens, hundreds, if not thousands of transducers, attributing sensitivity to 196 each transducer and for each parameter of influence might be difficult to manage in numerical, computational 197 and consuming terms by end-users in actual applications [40-43], particularly at present time in which manu-198 facturers usually do not provide traceable sensitivities [27]. By way of example, in the case of triaxial accel-199 erometer transducers, the sensitivity is usually provided for each single axis of sensitivity for different fre-200 quencies, at a specific oscillation amplitude. Therefore, as a lower estimate, from 9 (3 frequencies \times 3 main 201 axes) to 36 (12 frequencies \times 3 main axes) sensitivity values are attributed to each sensor (neglecting the 202 possible variability with amplitude and the evaluation of the transverse sensitivities). Projecting this count to 203 a small network of 25 sensors, as in this case, an amount of sensitivity data ranging from 225 to 900 is obtained. 204 Despite the small size of this MEMS accelerometers network, however, such number of data might be difficult 205 to manage by the end-user, with the risk of compromising the trustworthiness of data provided by the network 206 if the end-user, in order to reduce the number of sensitivities to manage, has no experience in handling these 207 data with a metrological approach, in terms of mean sensitivity values and propagation of the associated un-208 certainties. Therefore, before drafting a traceability protocol, it is important to consider this aspect in order to 209 evaluate what kind of and how many sensitivity data should be provided to the end-users, commensurate with 210 the size and final application of the sensor network, that ensure its optimal trustworthiness.

In this case study, therefore, beside evaluating the sensitivity of all 25 MEMS in terms of main (and transverse) sensitivities for each single axis and for each tested frequency (225 main sensitivity values in total), the possibility to provide a lower number of sensitivity values with associated uncertainties, from the case of axisand frequency-independent sensitivity for each MEMS (25 sensitivity values) to the limit case of a single sensitivity value independent from MEMS, axis and frequency, is investigated, as it will be shown in Section IV.

217

218 2.1.3 The digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometer

The 25 digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometers investigated in this work (Fig. 3) are commercial low-power digital MEMS accelerometers (ST, model LSM6DSR [34]). The device is composed of an accelerometer sensor, a charge amplifier, and an analog-to-digital converter. The digital MEMS accelerometers are connected by a serial cable to a separated external microcontroller, in which other electronic components are integrated. In this comparison the same external microcontroller (ST, model 32F769IDISCOVERY [44]), to acquire the digital samples and to provide the required power supply to the MEMS accelerometer, is used.

225



- 226
- 227

228

Fig. 3. The set of 25 digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometers and the microcontroller.

229 The microcontroller has from 3 to 5 Serial Peripheral Interfaces (SPIs) available, and, to each one, it is 230 possible to connect up to 8/10 sensors. Therefore, it is technically possible to connect from 20 to 40 sensors 231 for each microcontroller, without introducing complications (such as other electronic components) [45]. How-232 ever, in real cases, as for the present case of structural and infrastructures health monitoring at urban/building 233 scale, different microcontrollers should be used. As a matter of fact, the maximum MEMS-microcontroller 234 distance depends on the interface and data speed. With an SPI interface and considering only one sensor, a 2 235 m cable, suitable for building scales, can be used. By increasing the number of sensors on the same channel, 236 the transfer speed has to be increased, thus the length of the cable has to be reduced. Therefore, at building scale, it would only be practical for such MEMS sensors to have a dedicated microcontroller and network the microcontrollers. However, since, as a first step, the aim is to provide traceability to single sensors independently of the adopted microcontrollers, calibration is performed by connecting the microcontroller to a single MEMS.

241 The signal is acquired by means of a SPI, which is a synchronous serial communication interface used for 242 connecting digital sensors together. The 1-bit signal from the $\Sigma\Delta$ -ADC is then converted through a decimation 243 process and a low pass filter into a standard 16-bit-signed PCM (Pulse Code Modulation) signal with a nominal 244 sampling frequency rate of 1660 Hz. According to the manufacturer [45], however, sampling frequencies up 245 to -6% of the target, i.e. up to 1560 Hz, can be expected. For this reason, the actual sampling frequency of 246 every MEMS, as shown in Fig. 4, is previously evaluated by counting the number of points of the known 247 generated sinusoidal signals, in order to perform accurate calibration measurements. Sampling frequencies 248 range from around 1580 Hz to 1630 Hz.



250 251

249

Fig. 4. The actual sampling frequency of the 25 digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometers.

252

```
253 The amplitude values range between -2^{16-1}=-32768 D<sub>16-bit-signed</sub> and +(2^{16-1}-1)=+32767 D<sub>16-bit-signed</sub>, where the
254 digit unit is a signed 16-bit sequence converted into a decimal number.
```

The linear acceleration sensitivity of a digital MEMS accelerometer, expressed by manufacturer in terms of mg/LSB, depends on the "full scale" used in testing condition, and it is conventionally attributed to every sensitive axis of the sensor, for static and dynamic measurements, independently from frequency, without any indication about the associated uncertainty, and is not evaluated thought traceable calibration methods. In this work, by using a "full scale" of ± 2 g, the sensitivity declared is 0.061 mg/LSB. In decimal units, it corresponds to 0.061 mg/D_{16-bit-signed}, i.e. 0.598×10^{-3} (m s⁻²)/D_{16-bit-signed}. As commonly used in analogue transducers, the sensitivity is expressed as a function of the reference quantity, thus it properly corresponds to 1671 D_{16-bit-signed} /(m s⁻²).

263

264 2.2 Calibration procedure

265 The calibration procedure and the related metrological characterization of the set of 25 sensors is aimed at 266 verifying the actual amplitude response in dynamics, as a function of frequency, on the basis of the bilateral 267 comparison between laboratories. The procedure is based on a calibration by comparison, with a reference 268 accelerometer (in analogy to ISO Standard 16063-21 [46]), in order to provide the first "connection" to the 269 primary standard and to verify its transferability, through the secondary standards, to the sensors under investigation. In order to avoid further sources of uncertainty, the calibration of the 25 MEMS is performed by using 270 271 the same external microcontroller, in both laboratories, although the influence of the microcontrollers in terms 272 of systematic errors and uncertainty contribution, is negligible [45].

273 Calibration is carried out at in a low frequency range, namely 3 Hz, 6 Hz and 10 Hz, by comparison to a 274 reference transducer. A sinusoidal mechanical dynamic excitation is generated along a single-axis, by means 275 of linear vibrating tables (according to the laboratory equipment), at nearly constant peak amplitude of 1 m s-276 2. The reference acceleration aref is measured by a reference accelerometer, previously calibrated against IN-277 RiM primary standard. In order to simultaneously calibrate the three sensitive axes of the sensors, measure-278 ments are performed on inclined planes which allow to generate the projection of the single-axis excitation 279 acceleration, along three sensitive axes (a_x, a_y, a_z) simultaneously, as schematically shown in Fig. 5, according 280 to the laboratory setups and specific procedures.





282

Fig. 5. The schematic principle of the simultaneous 3-axis calibration, with respect to a single-axis of excitation.

285

In time domain, 100 cycles of oscillation, for each frequency of calibration, are taken into account for the determination of output data. The 3-axis digital MEMS accelerometer under investigation is fixed to the center of the vibrating table at known angles of rotation ω and at different tilt angles α , with respect to the direction of the single-axis excitation.

- The detailed uncertainty budget is evaluated by both laboratories according to GUM [47], taking into account to the sensitivity equations and the related uncertainty contributions peculiar of each calibration system.
- 292

293 2.3 The experimental method and uncertainty assessment

The calibration aims at quantifying, as a function of frequency, the average main sensitivities S_{ii} , as well as 294 295 the related dispersion of the 25 MEMS accelerometers within opportune coverage factors, and the occurring 296 transversal sensitivities S_{ii} , due to the possible mutual interaction among axes. As a matter of facts, in particular 297 for low-cost sensors, the outputs interact with each other and transverse sensitivities might play a crucial role, 298 unlike in traditional high-quality accelerometers. The three sensitivity axes of the MEMS accelerometer are 299 located with a certain tilt angle α , and a certain rotation angle ω , with respect to the direction of the excitation. 300 The experimental calibration systems are designed and independently realized in each laboratory, as described 301 in detail in [28-33].

302

303 2.3.1 INRIM

The calibration setup realised at INRIM consists of a single-axis vibrating table, on which aluminium inclined planes are screwed (Fig. 6). More details can be found in [28].

306



307

308

309

Fig. 6. Calibration setup used at INRIM laboratory.

The digital MEMS accelerometer is fixed to the inclined plane, along the axis of excitation, allowing to generate a projection of the excitation acceleration along the three axes of the MEMS simultaneously. The reference acceleration a_{ref} , corresponding to the sinusoidal excitation acceleration, is measured by a single axis 313 transducer (PCB model 080A199/482A23, calibrated against INRIM primary standard), integrated in the 314 stroke of the vertical shaker (PCB Precision Air Bearing Calibration Shaker), for the calibration at 6 Hz and 315 10 Hz. For the calibration at 3 Hz, a single axis horizontal linear slide (APS ELECTRO-SEIS shaker) is used 316 and the reference acceleration is measured by means of laser-Doppler velocimetry (Polytec OFV 505). The 317 reference acceleration is acquired by an acquisition board NI 4431 (sampling rate of 50 kHz) integrated in the 318 PC and processed through LabVIEW® software to provide the Root Mean Square (RMS) reference value in 319 m s⁻². In this way, the reference accelerations along the MEMS axes can be found according to:

320

321

$$a_x = \left| a_{ref} \sin \alpha \cos \omega \right| \tag{1}$$

$$a_x = |a_{ref} \sin \alpha \cos \omega| \tag{1}$$

$$a_y = |a_{ref} \sin \alpha \sin \omega| \tag{2}$$

$$a_z = \left| a_{ref} \cos \alpha \right| \tag{3}$$

322 where, α is the tilt angle, ω is the angle of rotation, a_{ref} is the RMS reference acceleration along the vertical 323 axis z' of the excitation system, and a_x, a_y, a_z are the RMS reference accelerations spread along x-, y- and z-324 axis of the MEMS accelerometer. Measurements are performed in four configurations at different angles of 325 rotation ω and tilt α ($\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ and $\omega = 270^{\circ}$; $\alpha = 15^{\circ}$ and $\omega = 90^{\circ}$; $\alpha = 75^{\circ}$ and $\omega = 90^{\circ}$). These 326 configurations are chosen since calibration results are compatible with those obtained from 48 configurations 327 as detailed in [48]. Systematic effects, due to spurious components acting on the perpendicular plane with 328 respect to the excitation axis caused by vibrational modes of the inclined aluminum plates and due to horizontal 329 motions of the shaker, are quantified in terms of amplitude and phase, by means of Laser-Doppler velocimetry 330 (Polytec OFV 505), and corrected for each inclined plane and for all frequencies, as described in detail in [28]. 331 The digital MEMS output is acquired by the external microcontroller and saved as binary files. These files are then processed with MATLAB[®] software: the digital value for each specific frequency *f* is obtained by 332 applying a first-order Butterworth band-pass filter, centred at the frequency of interest with a fractional band-333 334 width of 10%, to the temporal signals and, subsequently, by computing the Root Mean Square (RMS), in order 335 to remove the off-set due to gravity and the influence of background vibrations.

336 The 3-axis digital MEMS accelerometer outputs d_i (expressed in $D_{16bit-signed}$), are calculated in matrix form, as a linear combination of the acceleration component in m s⁻², as shown in (4), where the main sensitivities 337 338 S_{ii} and transverse sensitivities S_{ii} are directly obtained from the elements of the sensitivity matrix **S**:

339

$$\begin{bmatrix} d_x & d_y & d_z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_x & a_y & a_z \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{vmatrix} S_{xx} & S_{xy} & S_{xz} \\ S_{yx} & S_{yy} & S_{yz} \\ S_{zx} & S_{zy} & S_{zz} \end{vmatrix}$$
(4)

For each MEMS, sensitivity uncertainty matrix **U(S)** (at a confidence level of 95%) is obtained from the covariance matrix of the independent variables by applying the general rule of random error propagation in matrix form [28]. Independent variables, are schematically shown in Fig.7.

344



345346

Fig. 7. Schematic representation of uncertainties in INRIM calibration setup.

347

Independent variables are represented by the reference acceleration a_{ref} , tilt angle α , rotation angle ω , roll angle θ , and by the systematic terms $a_{x',syst}$, $a_{y',syst}$, $a_{z',syst}$ and $\varphi_{x',syst}$, $\varphi_{z',syst}$, $\varphi_{z',syst}$ which are the amplitudes and the phase differences, with respect to the reference signal a_{ref} , of the spurious components affecting the accuracy of the MEMS output d_x , d_y and d_z . Uncertainty contribution ε due to the roll angle θ , nominally 0°, is considered negligible.

Standard uncertainty $u(a_{ref})$ associated to the reference acceleration along the *z*'-axis of the excitation system derives from the Calibration and Measurement Capabilities (CMC) declared by INRIM [49], which is 0.8% in terms of relative expanded uncertainty from 5 Hz to 1 kHz. At 3 Hz, it is increased to 1%. Standard uncertainties associated to tilt angle $u(\alpha)$, rotation angle $u(\omega)$, considered as type B uncertainty contributions with half-widths δ =0.1°, γ =1°, respectively, and spurious components, $u(a_{x',syst}), u(a_{y',syst}), u(\varphi_{x',syst}), u(\varphi_{x$

By way of example, the detailed uncertainty budget for the a_x reference acceleration at an inclination of 75°, a rotation of 90° and a frequency of 6 Hz, is shown in Table I.

- 361
- 362
- 363

Table 1

365	Uncertainty table of reference acceleration along x-axis at an inclination of 75°, a rotation of 0° and a
366	frequency of 6 Hz.

Variable x_k				$u^2(\mathbf{x})$		$u^{2}(a)$	
Symb.	Value	Unit	Note	$u(x_k)$	c_k	$u_k(u_x)$	
a_{ref}	0.707	ms ⁻²	Cmc	8,1E-06	9,7E-01	7,6E-06	
α	75	0	Acc.	3,3E-03	3,6E-03	4,3E-08	
ω	0	0	Acc.	3,3E-01	3,1E-05	3,1E-10	
$a_{x',syst}$	0.011	ms ⁻²	Rep.	1,9E-06	-2,6E-01	1,3E-07	
$a_{y',syst}$	0.002	ms ⁻²	Rep.	1,9E-06	0,0E+00	0,0E+00	
$a_{z',syst}$	0.048	m s ⁻²	Rep.	1,9E-06	9,7E-01	1,8E-06	
$\varphi_{x',syst}$	173.04	0	Rep.	4,0E+00	-6,2E-06	1,5E-10	
$\varphi_{y',syst}$	-0.77	0	Rep.	4,0E+00	0,0E+00	0,0E+00	
$\varphi_{z',syst}$	0.01	0	Rep.	4,0E+00	4,1E-07	6,7E-13	
a_x	0.727	m s ⁻²		Varianc	$xe, u^2(a_x)$	9,5E-06	

367

373

368 2.3.1 UNIVAQ

The calibration set-up realised at University of L'Aquila, consisting of a single-axis horizontal vibrating table on which an aluminium hollow inclined plane with a tilt angle of 45° is screwed, generates a projection of the horizontal slide acceleration along three MEMS axes simultaneously (Fig. 8). More details can be found in [33].



Fig. 8. Calibration setup used at UNIVAQ laboratory

376 The reference acceleration a_{ref} , provided by a tri-axial piezoelectric accelerometer (PCB model 377 TLD356B18), and the MEMS accelerometer under test are coaxially installed on the two opposite sides of the 378 45° inclined plane surface, so that their axes are aligned. Measurements are performed in three configurations 379 by placing the MEMS and the reference accelerometer at three angles of rotation ω (0°, 30° and 330°). Single 380 sinusoidal signals are generated by a horizontal linear slide (APS 113 ELECTRO-SEIS shaker). Reference 381 accelerometer signal is acquired by CompactRio 9040 by National Instruments. MEMS output is acquired by 382 the external microcontroller and saved in binary file. Both MEMS and reference acceleration signals are pro-383 cessed by performing an FFT analysis. The amplitudes of the spectrum in the range, centred at the oscillation 384 frequency with a width of $\pm 10\%$, are added up, in order to prevent eventual variability of sampling frequency of the MEMS. Since the axes of the reference tri-axial accelerometer are nominally coaxial with those of the 385 386 MEMS accelerometer under investigation (i.e., $a_i = |a_{ref,i}|$), the main sensitivities S_{ii} are obtained by dividing 387 the MEMS digital output d_i values and the measured reference accelerations $a_{ref,i}$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{xx} &= \left| \frac{d_x}{a_{ref,x}} \right| \\ S_{yy} &= \left| \frac{d_y}{a_{ref,y}} \right| \\ S_{zz} &= \left| \frac{d_z}{a_{ref,z}} \right| \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

389

388

By analogy, the values of transverse sensitivities S_{ij} are calculated as $S_{ij} = d_i/|a_{ref,j}|$ by generating sinusoidal accelerations along each sensitivity axis and measuring the MEMS response along the other two orthogonal axes, simultaneously. In Fig. 9 a schematic rapresentation of uncertanty due to the independent variables, is shown.

394



Fig. 8. Schematic representation of uncertainties in UNIVAQ calibration setup

397 For each MEMS under investigation, the evaluation of the sensitivity expanded uncertainties $U(S_{ii})$ (at a 398 confidence level of 95%) is carried out by considering the reproducibility standard deviations of the three 399 configurations at three different angles of rotation and the uncertainty of the reference accelerometer; the un-400 certainty of the coaxiality, between MEMS axes and reference accelerometer axes, is estimated with a yaw 401 angle $\gamma^{\circ} = \pm 1^{\circ}$ on the rotation angle ω and a pitch angle $\delta^{\circ} = \pm 1^{\circ}$ on the tilt angle α , while the uncertainty due to 402 the roll angle θ , nominally 0°, can be considered negligible. Standard uncertainty $u(a_{ref})$ of the reference ac-403 celerations, in terms of relative expanded uncertainty, is 2% at 3 Hz and 6 Hz, and 1.5% at 10 Hz according to 404 the calibration certificate. By way of example, the detailed uncertainty budget of sensitivity along y-axis of 405 MEMS #22 at a rotation angle of 30° and at a frequency of 3 Hz, is shown in Table II

406

407 **Table 2**

408 Uncertainty table of MEMS #22 sensitivity along Y-axis at a rotation angle of 30 ° and at a fre-409 quency of 3 Hz.

	Variable x_k				C.	$u^{2}(S)$	
Symb.	Value	Unit	Note	$u(x_k)$	c_k	$u_k(\mathbf{S}_y)$	
$a_{ref,y}$	0,50	ms ⁻²	Cert.	2,5E-03	-3,3E+02	2,8E+02	
ω	45	0	Acc.	3,3E-01	-5,0E+01	8,4E+02	
α	30	0	Acc.	3,3E-01	-2,9E+01	2,8E+02	
			Repr.	2,1E+03	1,0E+00	2,1E+03	
S_{yy}	1657	$D_{16bit}/(m/s^2)$		Varian	ce, $u^2(S_y)$	3,5E+03	

410

411 **3.** Experimental results

Experimental results of the 25 MEMS accelerometers from the two laboratories, at 3 Hz, 6 Hz and 10 Hz, in terms of main sensitivities values along *x*-, *y*- and *z*-axis, and related expanded uncertainties (at a confidence level of 95%), expressed in $D_{16-bit-signed}/(m/s^2)$, are collected in Tables 3 and 4 (with mean values *m*, standard deviation *s*, and maximum value *M*) and summarized in Figs. 10 and 11.

In general, from a first qualitative point of view, both laboratories show quite uniform main sensitivity values among the 25 MEMS at the different frequencies under investigation, and are close to manufacturer sensitivity of 1671 $D_{16-bit-signed}/(m/s^2)$, which is nominally referred to all sensitivity axes and for all frequencies without the associated uncertainty. Expanded uncertainties at INRiM are in the order of 2%-4%, while at and UNIVAQ are in the order of 2%-6% with S_{yy} showing higher uncertainty values due to higher reproducibility standard deviations among the configurations. In both laboratories, uncertainties associated to S_{zz} are lower than the opposite axes due to the lower number of independent variables involved. It is also worth noting that 423 standard deviations between the 25 MEMS sensitivity values (as average, around 13 $D_{16\text{-bit-signed}}/(\text{m s}^{-2})$) are 424 lower than the calibration standard uncertainties (as average, around 35 $D_{16\text{-bit-signed}}/(\text{m s}^{-2})$).

425

426 **Table 3**

427 Main sensitivities with expanded uncertainties (k=2) of the 25 MEMS at INRIM. Values are ex-428 pressed in D_{16-bit-signed}/(m s⁻²).

#	3 Hz			6 Hz			10 Hz		
	S_{xx}	S_{yy}	S_{zz}	S_{xx}	S_{yy}	S_{zz}	S_{xx}	S_{yy}	S_{zz}
1	1658±56	1667±59	1691±37	1649±57	1657±59	1665±36	1653±57	1649±58	1678±37
2	1666±58	1653±57	1666±36	1650±58	1628±57	1650±36	1643±58	1628±57	1644±36
3	1691±59	1651±59	1687±37	1635±57	1653±59	1650±36	1663±57	1641±58	1660±36
4	1691±59	1693±59	1683±37	1630±57	1639±57	1648±36	1637±57	1642±57	1668±36
5	1672±58	1668±58	1680±37	1665±58	1628±57	1653±36	1664±58	1649±59	1658±36
6	1673±59	1700±61	1675±36	1647±58	1653±59	1643±36	1637±58	1641±59	1654±36
7	1660±58	1666±60	1669±36	1628±57	1647±59	1651±36	1639±57	1654±59	1661±36
8	1645±56	1683±60	1675±36	1625±57	1634±59	1652±36	1650±58	1653±59	1655±36
9	1665±58	1670±59	1693±37	1616±57	1639±58	1680±37	1647±58	1625±59	1666±36
10	1688±59	1667±59	1693±37	1626±57	1653±59	1675±36	1645±57	1644±59	1674±36
11	1685±58	1663±59	1672±36	1661±58	1634±58	1655±36	1639±57	1622±57	1647±36
12	1681±59	1670±59	1679±37	1656±59	1616±58	1669±36	1656±58	1634±59	1663±36
13	1672±58	1659±59	1694±37	1644±58	1630±58	1674±36	1633±57	1633±59	1670±36
14	1692±60	1697±60	1698±37	1670±59	1664±59	1648±36	1675±59	1637±59	1668±36
15	1685±59	1685±60	1682±37	1647±58	1652±59	1667±36	1636±57	1636±59	1655±36
16	1695±60	1680±60	1691±37	1661±59	1644±58	1660±36	1656±58	1635±59	1656±36
17	1686±59	1659±56	1685±37	1659±58	1640±56	1638±36	1642±57	1630±55	1651±36
18	1669±58	1669±59	1687±37	1635±58	1664±59	1677±37	1644±58	1647±59	1672±36
19	1678±58	1676±60	1708±37	1676±58	1657±59	1678±37	1650±57	1655±59	1674±37
20	1672±59	1666±59	1689±37	1666±59	1621±58	1669±36	1654±58	1640±59	1672±36
21	1666±59	1667±59	1695±37	1661±59	1667±59	1640±36	1659±59	1651±59	1656±36
22	1679±60	1673±60	1683±37	1622±58	1626±58	1640±36	1653±58	1649±59	1657±36
23	1680±59	1692±60	1699±37	1654±58	1632±58	1667±36	1658±58	1660±59	1677±37
24	1690±59	1670±59	1680±37	1648±58	1666±59	1635±36	1642±57	1641±59	1657±36
25	1657±57	1680±58	1684±37	1652±58	1641±57	1649±36	1617±56	1633±56	1670±36
т	1676	1673	1686	1647	1643	1657	1648	1641	1663
S	13	13	10	16	15	14	12	10	9
М	60	61	37	59	59	37	59	59	37

Table 4

431 Main sensitivities with expanded uncertainties (k=2) of the 25 MEMS at UNIVAQ. Values are 432 expressed in D_{16-bit-signed}/(m s⁻²).

#	3 Hz			6 Hz			10 Hz		
π	S_{xx}	S_{yy}	S_{zz}	S_{xx}	S_{yy}	S_{zz}	S_{xx}	S_{yy}	S_{zz}
1	1693±65	1701±80	1732±45	1668±65	1681±79	1708±44	1646±62	1660±76	1692±37
2	1692±50	1715±102	1697±44	1675±50	1700±102	1681±43	1680±45	1706±100	1690±37
3	1698±49	1711±74	1703±44	1671±49	1685±72	1680±43	1661±45	1677±69	1671±37
4	1692±50	1721±77	1713±44	1678±48	1705±76	1700±44	1659±43	1683±72	1683±37
5	1711±47	1724±67	1712±45	1679±48	1695±66	1682±43	1672±44	1689±62	1677±37
6	1694±49	1710±89	1705±43	1681±51	1701±90	1692±43	1676±45	1695±88	1691±36
7	1694±60	1724±126	1715±46	1679±58	1709±126	1702±44	1673±54	1702±126	1698±38
8	1698±52	1728±101	1712±44	1670±51	1702±99	1687±43	1654±45	1686±97	1673±37
9	1691±52	1704±101	1709±44	1677±52	1692±102	1697±44	1671±47	1683±100	1694±37
10	1692±51	1708±101	1717±44	1666±51	1681±98	1694±44	1654±45	1667±96	1684±37
11	1692±51	1705±87	1706±44	1664±50	1681±88	1680±43	1655±46	1672±85	1673±37
12	1688±52	1713±76	1698±44	1674±49	1702±76	1688±43	1673±46	1698±73	1690±37
13	1688±50	1719±103	1730±45	1661±50	1693±101	1704±44	1647±47	1679±97	1692±38
14	1690±58	1752±120	1704±44	1679±54	1741±122	1694±44	1668±51	1727±115	1686±37
15	1686±51	1729±112	1705±44	1663±51	1709±110	1685±43	1671±48	1717±108	1695±37
16	1717±51	1692±82	1707±45	1693±51	1670±81	1686±44	1688±47	1668 ± 80	1682±37
17	1708±53	1720±101	1715±44	1681±52	1697±97	1689±43	1671±47	1686±95	1685±37
18	1710±53	1717±101	1717±45	1676±52	1688±97	1686±43	1669±47	1684±94	1682±37
19	1704±51	1728±97	1721±46	1689±50	1714±97	1707±42	1684±45	1710±94	1705±38
20	1705±49	1713±73	1713±44	1688±47	1699±74	1699±44	1672±42	1683±69	1685±37
21	1703±51	1739±98	1710±44	1688±49	1724±99	1697±44	1669±44	1704±98	1680±38
22	1687±49	1726±98	1707±45	1662±50	1704±98	1685±43	1667±44	1708±96	1692±37
23	1717±48	1648±86	1710±45	1694±49	1739±90	1679±43	1688±45	1735±87	1677±37
24	1697±47	1761±94	1691±45	1677±48	1737±94	1671±45	1680±44	1735±97	1676±39
25	1696±55	1712±114	1714±45	1676±54	1694±114	1696±44	1676±48	1693±115	1698±38
m	1698	1717	1711	1676	1702	1691	1669	1694	1686
S	9	21	9	9	18	10	11	20	9
М	65	126	46	65	126	45	62	126	39

435

436 437

438



Fig. 10. Main sensitivities of the 25 MEMS at 3 Hz, 6 Hz and 10 Hz evaluated at INRIM.







Fig. 11. Main sensitivities of the 25 MEMS at 3 Hz, 6 Hz and 10 Hz evaluated at UNIVAQ.

Transverse sensitivities of the 25 MEMS evaluated by the two laboratories are in the order of 1%-3% and are depicted in Figs. 12 and 13 as boxplots. It is worth noting that transverse sensitivities evaluated by INRIM in matrix form, also defined as cross-sensitivities, are part of the sensitivity of the sensor as they are used in the exploitation equations [28], therefore values can be positive or negative.



451

452

- 453
- 454



An analysis based on the estimation of the normalized error (E_n), according to ISO/IEC 17043:2010 [51], is performed in order to assess the compatibility of the 25 MEMS sensitivity values, obtained from the two laboratories, for each axis and frequency under investigation. The data can be considered compatible when $E_n \le 1$. Results, reported in Table 5, are compatible, although different mechanical excitation systems are used and different data analysis are adopted for the simultaneous determination of the sensitivities along the three axes. This result confirms the compatibility and the reproducibility of the two independent calibration systems for MEMS accelerometers within the metrological traceability chain.

- 462
- 463

464 **Table 5**

465 Normalized errors between INRIM and UNIVAQ

#	3 Hz			6 Hz		10 Hz			
π	$E_n(S_{xx})$	$E_n(S_{yy})$	$E_n(S_{zz})$	$E_n(S_{xx})$	$E_n(S_{yy})$	$E_n(S_{zz})$	$E_n(S_{xx})$	$E_n(S_{yy})$	$E_n(S_{zz})$
1	0.40	0.34	0.71	0.22	0.24	0.76	0.08	0.12	0.28
2	0.34	0.53	0.55	0.33	0.62	0.56	0.50	0.67	0.90
3	0.09	0.63	0.27	0.48	0.35	0.53	0.03	0.40	0.21
4	0.02	0.29	0.52	0.65	0.69	0.92	0.31	0.45	0.29
5	0.53	0.63	0.55	0.18	0.77	0.52	0.11	0.47	0.37
6	0.28	0.09	0.53	0.44	0.45	0.88	0.53	0.52	0.72
7	0.41	0.42	0.79	0.62	0.44	0.89	0.44	0.35	0.72
8	0.70	0.39	0.65	0.59	0.59	0.63	0.05	0.29	0.35
9	0.33	0.29	0.28	0.80	0.45	0.30	0.32	0.50	0.55
10	0.05	0.35	0.42	0.52	0.24	0.34	0.13	0.21	0.19
11	0.09	0.40	0.59	0.04	0.45	0.44	0.22	0.49	0.51
12	0.09	0.44	0.33	0.24	0.90	0.33	0.23	0.68	0.52
13	0.21	0.51	0.62	0.22	0.54	0.54	0.19	0.40	0.42
14	0.03	0.41	0.11	0.11	0.57	0.81	0.10	0.70	0.34
15	0.01	0.35	0.40	0.21	0.46	0.32	0.46	0.66	0.78
16	0.28	0.12	0.28	0.41	0.26	0.46	0.43	0.34	0.50
17	0.28	0.53	0.52	0.28	0.51	0.91	0.40	0.51	0.66
18	0.52	0.41	0.51	0.52	0.21	0.16	0.34	0.34	0.20
19	0.34	0.46	0.22	0.16	0.51	0.52	0.46	0.50	0.59
20	0.43	0.50	0.41	0.29	0.83	0.52	0.25	0.48	0.25
21	0.48	0.63	0.26	0.36	0.49	1.00	0.14	0.47	0.47
22	0.11	0.46	0.41	0.53	0.69	0.80	0.19	0.53	0.68
23	0.49	0.42	0.19	0.53	1.00	0.21	0.40	0.71	0.00
24	0.09	0.82	0.18	0.38	0.64	0.63	0.53	0.83	0.35
25	0.49	0.25	0.52	0.31	0.42	0.83	0.80	0.47	0.54

466

467 **4. Discussion**

As stated in Section II, even a small sensor network implies a large number of sensitivity data to be managed by end-users. By way of example, in this case, the sensitivity related to the sensor network, consisting of these 25 MEMS, entails a number of data from 225 (25 MEMS × 3 frequencies × 3 main sensitivity axes) up to 675 (if transverse sensitivities are also considered). Therefore, considering INRIM data as reference (Table 3), the 472 possibility of decreasing the number of sensitivities related to the sensor network is investigated. The idea is 473 to perform different types of averages from the 225 main sensitivity data, in order to provide a lower number 474 of sensor network sensitivities. Averages are performed in order that sensitivities are independent of MEMS, 475 frequency or axis, or combination of these factors, up to the limit case of a single sensitivity value attributed 476 to the whole sensor network independent from the three examined factors, the so-called ensemble sensitivity. 477 In this way, the number of data to be managed is reduced, at the expense of an introduction of larger uncer-478 tainties and a loss of information about the influence of the investigated factors, but that can be accepted in 479 several practical conditions and in this particular case of structural and infrastructures health monitoring and 480 seismic safety networks at urban/building scale [52-54].

481 Mean sensitivities associated to the different combinations of these factors can be summarized in the fol-482 lowing paragraphs. It is worth reminding that the sensitivity value declared by the manufacturer is 1671 D_{16-bit} signed /m s⁻² and is reported in the following figures, as a continuous black line, for comparisons. For each case, 483 484 uncertainties, in terms of expanded uncertainties U at a confidence level of 95%, are evaluated by performing 485 the root sum squared of the maximum calibration uncertainty among the averaged data and the standard devi-486 ation of the averaged data. As a consequence, in this case, relative expanded uncertainties increase at increasing 487 number of averaged data. However, in general, the data-set of sensitivity values, averaged as a function of 488 MEMS, frequency or axes, show good compatibility, both in terms of mean values and associated expanded 489 uncertainties, beyond to be consistent with the nominal sensitivity provided by the manufacturer.

490 However, preliminarily, an analysis of variance of the three factors (MEMS, axis and frequency) is per-491 formed in order to identify the main influencing effects on sensitivity. As a matter of fact, depending on the 492 application, it can be useful to have a better resolution of vibration measurements as a function of frequency 493 or direction of propagation. Results of analysis of variance, with sum of squares (SS), degree of freedom (DF) 494 and Fisher's-Test *F* value, are reported in Table 6.

495

496 **Table 6**

Factor	Factor SS		F	
MEMS	23771.01	24	0.8	
Freq.	119480.19	2	49.7	*
Axis	30480.99	2	12.7	*
MEMS \times Freq.	17267.15	48	0.3	
MEMS \times Axis	32680.35	48	0.6	
Freq. × Axis	1715.73	4	0.4	
MEMS \times Freq. \times Axis	30472.93	96	0.3	

497 Analysis of variance of sensitivity data

498

499 Significant values at 95% confidence level are marked with * symbol. It is found that frequency and axis 500 have a statistically significant effect on the sensitivity, whereas no influence due to the different MEMS sensors 501 or due to interactions among the three factors is found. This is confirmed by the fact that, as average, standard deviations of frequency and axis dependent sensitivities among all 25 MEMS are lower than MEMS dependent
 sensitivities, as shown as follows.

504

505 4.1 Ensemble sensor network sensitivity

The limit case of this approach is the evaluation of one single sensitivity to be attributed to the whole sensor network by calculating the mean value between sensitivity values of all MEMS. axes and frequencies. In this way, an «ensemble» sensitivity of $1659\pm72 \text{ D}_{16\text{-bit-signed}}/(\text{m/s}^2)$ is obtained and is reported in the following figures as grey lines (continuous line represents the mean value. dotted lines represent lower and upper limits). It should be noted that 72 D_{16-bit-signed}= $4.3 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ m s}^{-2}$, in the MEMS configuration used in the investigation. It follows that, by using the ensemble sensitivity, the associated expanded uncertainty is around 4.5%.

512

513 4.2 MEMS dependent sensor network sensitivity

By averaging sensitivities of each single MEMS for all axes and frequencies. values reported in Fig. 14 are obtained. Given the similar sensitivity, due to the observed good compatibility among the 25 MEMS, mean values are close to the ensemble sensitivity of all 25 MEMS and it can be reasonably attributed to each single MEMS independently if specific frequency and axis information is not necessary. Associated relative expanded uncertainties are around 4.3%.

519



520

Fig. 14. Sensitivities of the 25 MEMS averaged for all frequencies and axes. Black line corresponds to
 the sensitivity declared by the manufacturer. Grey lines correspond to the ensemble sensitivity with lower
 and upper limits.

524

525 4.3 Frequency dependent sensor network sensitivity

526 By averaging the sensitivity values of the 25 MEMS as a function of frequency, the related sensitivity of 527 the network is more trustworthy and accurate for frequency analysis of occurring vibration phenomena. In this 528 case study the sensitivity is $1678\pm 66 D_{16-bit-signed}/(m/s^2)$ at 3 Hz. $1649\pm 67 D_{16-bit-signed}/(m/s^2)$ at 6 Hz and 1650 ± 65 529 $D_{16-bit-signed}/(m/s^2)$ at 10 Hz, and relative expanded uncertainties are around 4%. 530 In the graph of Fig. 15, the values of frequency dependent sensitivities are shown, with respect to the nom-531 inal sensitivity and within the ensemble sensitivity lower and upper limits.



Fig. 15. Frequency dependent network sensitivity. Black line corresponds to the sensitivity declared by

the manufacturer. Grey lines correspond to the ensemble sensitivity with lower and upper limits.

533

532

534 535

536

537

4.4 Axis dependent sensor network sensitivity

538 By averaging the sensitivity values of the 25 MEMS as a function of axis, the sensitivity of the network 539 allows to define the direction of vibration propagation with a better resolution, with respect to frequency.

540 In this case study the sensitivity is $1657\pm71 \text{ D}_{16\text{-bit-signed}}/(\text{m/s}^2)$ for *x*-axis. $1653\pm72 \text{ D}_{16\text{-bit-signed}}/(\text{m/s}^2)$ for *y*-541 axis and $1668\pm50 \text{ D}_{16\text{-bit-signed}}/(\text{m/s}^2)$ for *z*-axis. Relative expanded uncertainties are around 3% -4%. In the graph 542 of Fig. 16, the values of axis dependent sensitivities are shown, with respect to the nominal sensitivity and 543 within the ensemble sensitivity lower and upper limits.



545

Fig. 16. Axis dependent network sensitivity. Black line corresponds to the sensitivity declared by the
 manufacturer. Grey lines correspond to the ensemble sensitivity with lower and upper limits.

- 548
- 549

550 4.5 Frequency and axis dependent sensor network sensitivity

An optimized compromise, in order to evaluate with a suitable trustworthiness both frequency response and direction of propagation of the vibration phenomena at the same time, by managing only 9 values of sensitivity data. can be achieved by defining the network sensitivity as a function of averaged frequency sensitivities and averaged axes sensitivities, as shown in the graph of Fig. 17. In this case study, the sensitivities in $D_{16-bit-signed}/(m/s^2)$ at 3 Hz, along *x*-, *y*- and *z*-axis, are, respectively, 1676±65, 1673±66 and 1686±42; at 6 Hz, are 1647±67, 1643±66 and 1657±46; and, at 10 Hz, are 1648±64, 1641±62 and 1663±42. Relative expanded uncertainties are between 2% and 4%.

558



559

Fig. 17. Sensitivities of the 25 MEMS averaged for all frequencies and axes. Black line corresponds to
 the sensitivity declared by the manufacturer. Grey lines correspond to the ensemble sensitivity with lower
 and upper limits.

563

564 5. Conclusions

565 The increasingly widespread use of digital sensor networks. in many applications, including very sensitive 566 ones (such as structural health monitoring), raises some important questions about the actual trustworthiness 567 and accuracy of the data collected, in particular if neither standard calibration procedures nor traceable protocols are available for these sensors and for the interconnected network as a whole. In the field of metrology 568 569 and measurement science, this fundamental topic begins to be investigated, with the aim of including these 570 sensing infrastructures within the traceability chain, in analogy to traditional measuring instruments, therefore 571 identifying their accuracy and trustworthiness, from adequate calibration systems and procedures, and sup-572 porting their compatibility and reproducibility, based on comparisons. In addition, the new developed proce-573 dures will have also to take into account both the low cost of the sensors and the huge quantity of MEMS 574 produced, and they will have therefore to be adequately proportioned in such context.

575 In this work, the possibility of providing traceability, in terms of magnitude sensitivity, to digital MEMS 576 accelerometers is investigated, on the basis of a rigorous metrological approach. The main purpose is to iden-577 tify the problems inherent in calibration and to provide the relative possible solutions. Experimental data of 578 the calibration of 25 MEMS accelerometers at 3 Hz, 6 Hz and 10 Hz, at nearly constant amplitude of 1 m·s⁻², 579 from two laboratories (NMI and University) are shown and compared. The resulting comparison gives useful 580 information with reference to a possible procedure for calibration of MEMS tri-axis accelerometers. Different 581 calibration methods are used, in terms of test benches, data processing techniques and reference standards, 582 allowing to identify pros and cons of the specific approach. An analysis based on the estimation of the normal-583 ized error (E_n) , according to ISO/IEC 17043:2010 shows compatible results at uncertainty levels between 2% -584 6%. This comparison allows to point out the aspects to be optimized into the procedure, concerning the man-585 agement of the geometrical parameters of the devices used for calibration and the dynamic effects of test 586 benches at low frequencies, to improve, in the future, calibration accuracy and further decrease the associated 587 uncertainties.

588 Once the traceability of digital MEMS accelerometers is provided and the proper sensitivity (within the 589 related uncertainty budget) is identified, a procedure to provide a suitable sensitivity to the sensor network as 590 a whole is proposed, in order to decrease the number of sensitivity values to be managed by end-users. Differ-591 ent types of averages from the 225 main sensitivity data, in order that sensitivities are independent of MEMS, 592 frequency or axis, or combination of these factors, up to the limit case of a single sensitivity value attributed 593 to the whole sensor network, are proposed.

594 It is shown that, if a single value of sensitivity is used, independently on MEMS, axis and frequency of 595 vibration, the associated uncertainty to this ensemble sensitivity is within 4.5%. Furthermore, the nominal 596 value of sensitivity provided by the manufacturer is consistent with the obtained results, if this level of uncer-597 tainty is considered. Similar sensitivities appear among all the MEMS, if the same axes and frequencies are 598 considered, while an increasing effect is acknowledged depending on the axis of vibration and on the vibration 599 frequency, having the most relevant effects. An optimized compromise, in order to evaluate with a suitable 600 trustworthiness both frequency response and direction of propagation of the vibration phenomena at the same 601 time, by managing only 9 values of sensitivity data, instead of 225 single sensitivity values, can be achieved 602 by defining the network sensitivity as a function of averaged frequency sensitivities and averaged axes sensi-603 tivities.

As a final remark, this work demonstrates the need of evaluating performances of MEMS as a single sensor or as a network, by a calibration procedure which takes into account carefully the main interfering aspects, in order to provide trustworthy and traceable data, within suitable coverage factors and uncertainties budgets, tailored to the actual needs of specific applications and employments.

Future work will be aimed at realizing a suitable calibration procedure for networks of digital MEMS accelerometers in terms of phase shift sensitivity, at evaluating the effects related to the different sampling rates

- among MEMS sensors for dynamic applications, and finally at validating this MEMS accelerometers networkin *in-field* applications.
- 612

613 Acknowledgements

- 614 The authors would like to thank Davide Lena, Camilla Mura and Andrea Labombarda. from the STMicro-
- electronics company, for the technical support, information and for the provision of the 25 digital 3-axis
- 616 MEMS accelerometers.

617 **References**

- 618 [1] JCGM 200 2012 International Vocabulary of Metrology Basic and General Concepts and Associated Terms
- 619 (VIM 3rd Edition) (France: Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology, Sévres).
- [2] M. J. T. Milton and A. Possolo, Trustworthy data underpin reproducible research, Nature Physics 16(2)
 (2020) 117-119.
- 622 [3] A. Possolo and H. K. Iyer, Invited Article: Concepts and tools for the evaluation of measurement uncer-
- tainty, Review of Scientific Instruments 88(1) (2017) 011301.
- 624 [4] A. Possolo, Concepts, methods & tools enabling measurement quality, In: Proceedings of 13th International
- Workshop on Intelligent Statistical Quality Control 2019, IWISQC 2019, Hong Kong, Aug. 2019, pp. 195-214.
- 627 [5] IEEE Standard for Sensor Performance Parameter, IEEE Standard 2700-2017, Jan. 2018.
- 628 [6] Bureau International des Poids et Mesures BIPM Strategy Plan (2018). [Online]
- 629 Available: https://www.bipm.org/utils/en/pdf/BIPM-strategic-plan-2018.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 630 [7] BIPM Consultative Committee for Acoustics, Ultrasound, and Vibration (CCAUV), Strategy plan 2019
- 631 to 2029, (2019). [Online].
- 632 Available: https://www.bipm.org/utils/en/pdf/CCAUV-strategy-document.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- [8] BIPM Consultative Committee on Electricity and Magnetism (CCEM), Strategic plan, (2014). [Online].
- 634 Available: https://www.bipm.org/utils/en/pdf/CCEM-strategy-document.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 635 [9] BIPM Consultative Committee for Length (CCL), Strategy 2018 2028, (2018). [Online].
- 636 Available: https://www.bipm.org/utils/en/pdf/CCL-strategy-document.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- [10] BIPM Consultative Committee for Mass and Related Quantities (CCM), Strategy 2017 to 2027, (2017).
- 638 [Online].
- 639 Available: https://www.bipm.org/utils/en/pdf/CCM-strategy-document.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 640 [11] ISO/IEC 17025:2018, General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories.
- 641 [12] J. Voas, Networks of 'Things', Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol. Spec. Publ. 800-183 (2016).
- 642 [13] PTB Communication, Metrology for the digitalization of the economy and society, (2017). [Online].

- 643 Available:
- 644 https://www.bipm.org/cc/PARTNERS/Allowed/2017_October/2017-Metrology-for-the-Digitalisation-of-
- 645 Economy-and-Society.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 646 [14] MESAP "Smart Products and Manufacturing", [Online].
- 647 Available: https://www.mesap.it/mission/agenda-strategica/, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 648 [15] D. Smorgon and V. Fernicola, A wireless reference node to provide self-calibration capability to wireless
- sensors networks, In: Proc. Of ICST, Auckland, New Zealand, pp. 335-340, 2015.
- [16] G. Crotti, A. Delle Femine, D. Gallo, D. Giordano, C. Landi, M. Luiso, and A. Scaldarella, A Method for
- the Measurement of Digitizers' Absolute Phase Error, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, vol. 1065, no. 5,
- 652 pp. 052035, Aug. 2018, 10.1088/1742-6596/1065/5/052035
- 653 [17] G. Crotti, A. D. Femine, D. Gallo, D. Giordano, C. Landi and M. Luiso, Measurement of the Absolute
- 654 Phase Error of Digitizers, IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement 68(6) (2019) 1724-1731.
- 655 DOI: 10.1109/TIM.2018.2888919.
- 656 [18] A. Prato, F. Mazzoleni and A. Schiavi, Metrological traceability for digital sensors in smart manufactur-
- 657 ing: calibration of MEMS accelerometers and microphones at INRiM, In: Proc of IEEE International Work-
- shop on Metrology for Industry 4.0 and IoT, Napoli, Italy, 2019, pp. 371-375.
- [19] M. Galetto, A. Schiavi, G. Genta, A. Prato and F. Mazzoleni, Uncertainty evaluation in calibration of low-
- cost digital MEMS accelerometers for advanced manufacturing applications, CIRP Annals 68(1) (2019) 535538. DOI: 10.1016/j.cirp.2019.04.097.
- 662 [20] D. Smorgon, V. Fernicola, J. Sousa, L. Ribeiro, E. Tamburini and M. Catto, Assuring Measurement
- 663 Traceability to ATE Systems for MEMS Temperature Sensors Testing and Calibration, In: Proc. Of IEEE
- International Workshop on Metrology for Industry 4.0 and IoT, Rome, Italy, 2020.
- [21] EURAMET, "Publishable summary for 17IND12 Met4FoF metrology for the factory of the future," 2018.[Online].
- 667 Available:https://www.ptb.de/empir2018/fileadmin/documents/em-
- pir/Met4FoF/Docments/17IND12_Met4FoF_Publishable_Summary_M9.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- [22] EURAMET, Publishable Summary for 17IND06 FutureGrid II Metrology for the next-generation digital
- 670 substation instrumentation, (2018). [Online].
- 671 Available: https://www.euramet.org/research-innovation/search-research-projects/details/project/metrology-
- 672 for-the-next-generation-digital-substation-instrumentation/?L=0&tx_eurametctcp_project%5Bac-
- 673 tion% 5D=show&tx_eurametctcp_project% 5Bcontroller% 5D=Pro-
- 674 ject&cHash=3a961373b053be81eede260ad0b8b5fb, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 675 [23] EURAMET, Publishable Summary for 17IND02 SmartCom Communication and validation of smart data
- 676 in IoT-networks, 2018. [Online].

- 677 Available: https://www.euramet.org/research-innovation/search-research-projects/details/project/communica-
- 678 tion-and-validation-of-smart-data-in-iot-networks/?L=0&tx_eurametctcp_project%5Bac-
- 679 tion% 5D=show&tx_eurametctcp_project% 5Bcontroller% 5D=Pro-
- 680 ject&cHash=2341e12363c8623088e97fd7acf8872c, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 681 [24] T. Bruns and S. Eichstädt, A smart sensor Concept for traceable dynamic measurements, Journal of Phys-
- 682 ics: Conference Series 1065(21) (2018) 212011. DOI: 10.1088/1742-6596/1065/21/212011.
- 683 [25] T. Dorst, B. Ludwig, S. Eichstädt, T. Schneider and A. Schütze, Metrology for the factory of the future:
- towards a case study in condition monitoring, In: Proc I2MTC, Auckland, New Zealand, May 2019, pp. 1-5.
- 685 [26] B. Seeger, T. Bruns and S. Eichstädt, Methods for dynamic calibration and augmentation of digital accel-
- eration MEMS sensors, In: Proc CIM2019, Paris, France, Sep. 2019, p. 22003.
- 687 [27] M. Mende and P. Begoff, Sensors with Digital Output A Metrological Challenge, In: Proc CIM2019,
- 688 Paris, France, Sep. 2019, p. 22002.
- 689 [28] A. Prato, F. Mazzoleni, and A. Schiavi, Traceability of digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometer: simultaneous
- 690 determination of main and transverse sensitivities in the frequency domain, Metrologia 57(3) (2020) 035013.
- 691 DOI: 10.1088/1681-7575/ab79be
- 692 [29] A. Schiavi, F. Mazzoleni and A. Germak, Simultaneous 3-axis MEMS accelerometer primary calibration:
 693 description of the test-rig and measurements, In: Proc XXI IMEKO World, Prague, Czech Republic, Sep.
 694 2015.
- [30] G. D'Emilia, A. Gaspari, E. Natale, F. Mazzoleni and A. Schiavi, Calibration of tri-axial MEMS accel-
- 696 erometers in the low-frequency range Part 1: Comparison among methods, Journal of Sensors and Sensor
 697 Systems 7(1) (2018) 245-257. DOI: 10.5194/jsss-7-245-2018.
- 698 [31] G. D'Emilia, A. Gaspari, E. Natale, F. Mazzoleni and A. Schiavi, Calibration of tri-axial MEMS accel-
- erometers in the low-frequency range Part 2: Uncertainty assessment, Journal of Sensors and Sensor System
 7(1) (2018) 403-410. DOI: 10.5194/jsss-7-403-2018.
- 701 [32] G. D'Emilia, A. Gaspari and E. Natale, Amplitude-phase calibration of tri-axial accelerometers in the
- low-frequency range by a LDV, Journal of Sensors and Sensor Systems 8 (2019) 223–231. DOI: 10.5194/jsss-
- 7038-223-2019.
- 704 [33] G. D'Emilia, A. Gaspari, E. Natale, A simple method for amplitude/phase calibration of tri-axial accel-
- rometers in the low frequency range, Journal of Physics Conference Series 1149(1) (2018) 012018.
- 706 [34] STMicroelectronics, "LSM6DSR," Mar. 2019. [Online].
- 707 Available: https://www.st.com/resource/en/datasheet/lsm6dsr.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 708 [35] A. D'Alessandro, A. Costanzo, C. Ladina, F. Buongiorno, M. Cattaneo, S. Falcone, C. La Piana, S. Mar-
- 709 zorati, S. Scudero, G. Vitale, S. Stramondo and C. Doglioni, Urban seismic networks, structural health and
- 710 cultural heritage monitoring: the National Earthquakes Observatory (INGV, Italy) experience, Frontiers in
- 711 Built Environment 5(127) (2019). DOI: 10.3389/fbuil.2019.00127.

- 712 [36] S. Scudero, A. D'Alessandro, L. Greco and G. Vitale, MEMS technology in seismology: A short review,
- 713 In: Proc. 2018 IEEE International Conference on Environmental Engineering (EE), Milan, Italy, Mar. 2018,
- 714 pp. 1-5.
- 715 [37] M. C. Rodriguez-Sanchez, S. Borromeo and J. A. Hernández-Tamames, Wireless sensor networks for
- 716 conservation and monitoring cultural assets, IEEE Sensors Journal 11(6) (2010) 1382-1389. DOI:
 717 10.1109/JSEN.2010.2093882.
- 718 [38] P. Ragam, and N. D. Sahebraoji, Application of MEMS-based accelerometer wireless sensor systems for
- 719 monitoring of blast-induced ground vibration and structural health: A review, IET Wireless Sensor Systems
- 720 9(3) (2019) 103-109. DOI: 10.1049/iet-wss.2018.5099.
- [39] R. S. Concepcion, F. R. G. Cruz, F. A. A. Uy, J. M. E. Baltazar, J. N. Carpio and K. G. Tolentino, Triaxial
- 722 MEMS digital accelerometer and temperature sensor calibration techniques for structural health monitoring of
- reinforced concrete bridge laboratory test platform, In: Proc HNICEM, Manila, Philippines, Dec. 2017, pp. 16.
- [40] D. Bhattacharyya, T. H. Kim and S. Pal, A comparative study of wireless sensor networks and their routing
 protocols, Sensors 10(12) (2010) 10506-10523. DOI: 10.3390/s101210506.
- [41] A. Dâmaso, N. Rosa and P. Maciel, Reliability of wireless sensor networks, Sensors 14(9) (2014) 1576015785. DOI: 10.3390/s140915760.
- [42] M. A. Mahmood, W. K. Seah and I. Welch, Reliability in wireless sensor networks: A survey and chal-
- 730 lenges ahead, Computer Networks 79 (2015) 166-187. DOI: 10.1016/j.comnet.2014.12.016.
- 731 [43] C. Del-Valle-Soto, C. Mex-Perera, J. A. Nolazco-Flores, R. Velázquez and A. Rossa-Sierra, Wireless
- 732 Sensor Network Energy Model and Its Use in the Optimization of Routing Protocols, Energies 13(3) (2020)
- 733 728. DOI: 10.3390/en13030728
- 734 [44] STMicroelectronics, 32F769IDISCOVERY, (2016). [Online].
- 735 Available: https://www.st.com/resource/en/data_brief/32f769idiscovery.pdf, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 736 [45] STMicroelectronics, private communication, (2020).
- [46] ISO 16063-21, Methods for the calibration of vibration and shock transducers Part 21: Vibration cali-
- bration by comparison to a reference transducer, ISO (Geneva: International Organization for Standardization),
 2003.
- 740 [47] JCGM 100, Evaluation of Measurement Data Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement
- 741 (GUM), Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology, Sèvres, France, 2008.
- 742 [48] A. Prato, A. Schiavi, F. Mazzoleni, A. Touré, G. Genta and M. Galetto, A reliable sampling method to
- reduce large sets of measurements: a case study on the calibration of digital 3-axis MEMS accelerometers, In:
- 744 Proc. IEEE International Workshop on Metrology for Industry 4.0 and IoT, Rome, Italy, 2020.
- 745 [49] BIPM, KCDB, (2020). [Online].

- 746 Available:https://www.bipm.org/kcdb/cmc/search?domain=PHYSICS&areaId=1&key-
- 747 words=&specificPart.branch=2&specificPart.service=7&specificPart.subService=15&specificPart.individu-
- 748 alService=-1&_countries=40&publicDateFrom=&publicDateTo=&unit=&min-
- 749 Value=&maxValue=&minUncertainty=&maxUncertainty=, Accessed on: Oct. 16, 2020
- 750 [50] ISO 16063-31, Methods for the calibration of vibration and shock transducers Part 31: Testing of
- transverse vibration sensitivity, ISO (Geneva: International Organization for Standardization), 2009.
- 752 [51] ISO/IEC 17043 Conformity assessment General requirements for proficiency testing, ISO (Geneva:
- 753 International Organization for Standardization), 2010.
- 754 [52] F. Lorenzoni, F. Casarin, M. Caldon, K. Islami and C. Modena, Uncertainty quantification in structural
- health monitoring: Applications on cultural heritage buildings, Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing 66(2016) 268-281.
- 757 [53] R. Ferrari, F. Pioldi, E. Rizzi, C. Gentile, E. Chatzi, R. Klis, E. Serantoni and A. Wieser, Heterogeneous
- sensor fusion for reducing uncertainty in Structural Health Monitoring, 1st ECCOMAS thematic conference
- on uncertainty quantification in computational sciences and engineering (UNCECOMP 2015) 1 (2015) 511-
- 760 528.
- 761 [54] L. J. Prendergast, M. P. Limongelli, N. Ademovic, A. Anžlin, K. Gavin and M. Zanini, Structural health
- 762 monitoring for performance assessment of bridges under flooding and seismic actions, Structural Engineering
- 763 International 28(3) (2018) 296-307.