Low-Complexity Methods for Magnetometer Calibration
Philomaths Technical Note - TN9

C. R. Drane

Philomaths Pty. Limited

chris@philomaths.org

April 16, 2021

1 Introduction

This technical note analyses two low-complexity magnetometer calibration methods. Such methods are useful when the magnetometer is being connected to a Micro-controller Unit (MCU) which has only a small amount of storage and a limited computational capability. An example of such an MCU is the Arduiono. The methods could be applied to any vector Magnetometer, but we will use an example the InvenSense MPU-9250 [1].

2 Model

In this paper, we will use the model described by Kok et al [2].

The model relates to a measurement $\boldsymbol{y^b}$ of the local magnetic field $\boldsymbol{m_n}$ in the navigation frame. Denoting the rotation from the navigation frame to the body frame as $\boldsymbol{R^{bn}}$ we can define the magnetic field in the body frame as

$$\boldsymbol{m^b} = \boldsymbol{R^{bn}}\boldsymbol{m^n} \tag{1}$$

If there were no measurement errors or distortions, then then $\boldsymbol{y^b} = \boldsymbol{m^b}$, but there will be distortions and noise. Kok analyses possible types of distor-

tion/noise and concludes that

$$\boldsymbol{y^b} = \boldsymbol{C_{sc}}\boldsymbol{C_{no}}(\boldsymbol{C_{si}}\boldsymbol{m^b} + \boldsymbol{o_{hi}}) + \boldsymbol{o_{zb}} + \boldsymbol{e^b} \tag{2}$$

where

- $\boldsymbol{C_{no}}$ is a 3 x 3 matrix representing the non-orthogonality of the magnetometer with respect to the accelerometer,

- $\boldsymbol{o_{zb}}$ is a vector representing the zero bias of the magnetometer,

- $\boldsymbol{C_{sc}}$ is a 3 x 3 diagonal matrix representing the difference in sensitivity of the three magnetometer axes,

- $\boldsymbol{e^b}$ is a vector representing the identically distributed (i.i.d) Gaussian noise,

- $\boldsymbol{o_{hi}}$ is a vector representing the additional hard iron magnetic field component, which is fixed in the body frame,

- $\boldsymbol{C_{si}}$ is a 3 x 3 matrix representing the soft iron effect.

$\boldsymbol{C_{sc}}$ is given by a diagonal matrix

$$\boldsymbol{C_{sc}} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{f_0} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{f_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{f_2} \end{bmatrix} \tag{3}$$

where the f_i correspond to the sensitivity adjustment values. In the MPU-9250, these values are measured at the time of manufacture and stored in the Fuse ROM. For vectors, the indices $0, 1, 2$ correspond to the x, y, z axes respectively.

3 Simplified model

We will start by using a simplified model that makes the following assumptions:

- there is no misalignment between the magnetometer and the accelerometer, so $\boldsymbol{C_{no}} = I$,

- the magnetometer has no zero bias,

- the noise e^b, is negligible,

- the off-elements of C_{si} are negligible so that C_{si} is a diagonal matrix with diagonals (c_{11}, c_{22}, c_{33}). This assumption is discussed in section 7.

With these assumptions, the measurement model becomes:

$$y^b = C_{sc}C_{si}m^b + C_{sc}o_{hi} \tag{4}$$

As well, define $D = C_{sc}C_{si}$ so

$$y^b = Dm^b + C_{sc}o_{hi} \tag{5}$$

This gives the magnetic field measurement after hard/soft iron distortion and differing sensitivities of the magnetometer axes.

Given that C_{sc} and C_{si} are diagonal we have that D is given by

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_{00}}{f_0} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{c_{11}}{f_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{c_{22}}{f_0} \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

4   Flipping Calibration

An established simple technique for calibration is as follows:

- Make a measurement of y^b with the magnetometer,

- Flip (rotate by 180º) the magnetometer on the z-axis and make a measurement,

- flip it on the y-axis and make a measurement,

- flip it on the z-axis and make a measurement.

The first measurement will be:

$$y_1^b = (d_{00}m_0^b + \frac{o_{hi0}}{f_0}, d_{11}m_1^b + \frac{o_{hi1}}{f_1}, d_{22}m_2^b + \frac{o_{hi2}}{f_2})^T \tag{7}$$

3

Now flipping round the ith axis will leave m_i^b the same but multiply the value of the other two components by -1. So the sequence of flipping will produce the following:

$$\boldsymbol{y_2^b} = (-d_{00}m_0^b + \frac{o_{hi0}}{f_0}, -d_{11}m_1^b + \frac{o_{hi1}}{f_1}, d_{22}m_2^b + \frac{o_{hi2}}{f_2})^T \tag{8}$$

$$\boldsymbol{y_3^b} = (d_{00}m_0^b + \frac{o_{hi0}}{f_0}, -d_{11}m_1^b + \frac{o_{hi1}}{f_1}, -d_{22}m_2^b + \frac{o_{hi2}}{f_2})^T \tag{9}$$

$$\boldsymbol{y_4^b} = (-d_{00}m_0^b + \frac{o_{hi0}}{f_0}, d_{11}m_1^b + \frac{o_{hi1}}{f_1}, -d_{22}m_2^b + \frac{o_{hi2}}{f_2})^T \tag{10}$$

We define an estimator $\boldsymbol{h}$ given by

$$\boldsymbol{h} = \frac{\boldsymbol{y_1^b} + \boldsymbol{y_2^b} + \boldsymbol{y_3^b} + \boldsymbol{y_4^b}}{4} \tag{11}$$

The expectation of h will be

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{h}} = \boldsymbol{C_{sc}}\boldsymbol{o_{hi}} \tag{12}$$

so $\boldsymbol{h}$ can be subtracted from equation 5 to remove the hard iron bias term, $\boldsymbol{C_{sc}}\boldsymbol{o_{hi}}$.

5 Winer Calibration

Winer [3] describes a calibration method that consists of rotating the magnetometer through many angles, and finding the maximum and minimum for each axis of the magnetometer.

We can gather the maximum values from the three axes into a vector $\boldsymbol{u^b}$

$$\boldsymbol{u^b} = (d_{00}||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| + \frac{o_{hi_0}}{f_0}, d_{11}||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| + \frac{o_{hi_1}}{f_1}, d_{22}||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| + \frac{o_{hi_2}}{f_2})^T \tag{13}$$

,

and the minimum values are gathered into a vector $\boldsymbol{l^b}$

$$\boldsymbol{l^b} = (-d_{00}||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| + \frac{o_{hi_0}}{f_0}, -d_{11}||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| + \frac{o_{hi_1}}{f_1}, -d_{22}||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| + \frac{o_{hi_2}}{f_2})^T \tag{14}$$

This assumes the rotational sampling of the response surface catches all the extreme values.

If we add $\boldsymbol{u^b}$ to $\boldsymbol{l^b}$ we can see that the terms relating to the terrestrial magnetic field cancel out, so a suitable estimator for the hard iron bias is

$$\boldsymbol{h_w} = (\frac{\boldsymbol{u^b} + \boldsymbol{l^b}}{2}) \tag{15}$$

and the expectation of $\boldsymbol{h_w}$ is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{h_w}} = \boldsymbol{C_{sc}} \boldsymbol{o_{hi}} \tag{16}$$

so $\boldsymbol{h_w}$ can be subtracted from equation 5 to remove the hard iron bias term.

Now consider the soft iron distortion. If we subtract $\boldsymbol{l^b}$ from $\boldsymbol{u^b}$, the hard iron bias terms cancel and we are left with

$$\boldsymbol{u^b} - \boldsymbol{l^b} = 2(d_{00}||\boldsymbol{m^n}||, \frac{d_{11}}{f_1}||\boldsymbol{m^n}||, \frac{d_{22}}{f_2}||\boldsymbol{m^n}||)^T \tag{17}$$

so consider a simple estimator $\boldsymbol{T}$ for $\boldsymbol{D}$ to be

$$\begin{aligned} t_{00} &= \frac{u_0^b - l_0^b}{2} \\ t_{11} &= \frac{u_1^b - l_1^b}{2} \\ t_{22} &= \frac{u_2^b - l_2^b}{2} \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

with the off-diagonal terms set to zero.

Consulting equation 17 this provides an estimate of the d_{ii} up to a multiplicative constant i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} E(t_{00}) &= ||\boldsymbol{m^n}||d_{00} \\ E(t_{11}) &= ||\boldsymbol{m^n}||d_{11} \\ E(t_{22}) &= ||\boldsymbol{m^n}||d_{22} \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

or more compactly $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}} = ||\boldsymbol{m^n}||\boldsymbol{D}$.

Magnetometers are often used in a Attitude Heading Reference System (AHRS), where the algorithm normally works with the norm of the magnetic field vector i.e. it does not use the absolute field strength. In such systems the value of $||\boldsymbol{m^n}||$ does not matter, so we can set $||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| = 1$, or some other arbitrary value. Winer removes $||\boldsymbol{m^n}||$ by dividing by

$$y_{avg}^b = \frac{f_0(u_0^b - l_0^b) + f_1(u_1^b - l_1^b) + f_2(u_2^b - l_2^b)}{6} \tag{20}$$

The expectation of y_{avg}^b is

5

$$E(y_{avg}^b) = \frac{d_{00}||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| + d_{11}||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| + d_{22}||\boldsymbol{m^n}||}{3} = ||\boldsymbol{m^n}||\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})}{3} \qquad (21)$$

so it represents some measure of the average field strength in the body frame.

So our estimator becomes $\boldsymbol{S}$ where

$$
\begin{aligned}
s_{00} &= \frac{u_0^b - l_0^b}{2y_{avg}^b} \\
s_{11} &= \frac{u_1^b - l_1^b}{2y_{avg}^b} \\
s_{22} &= \frac{u_2^b - l_2^b}{2y_{avg}^b}
\end{aligned}
\qquad (22)
$$

and the off-diagonal elements are zero.

This has an expectation of

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{s_{00}} &= \frac{3d_{00}}{\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})} \\
\widehat{s_{11}} &= \frac{3d_{11}}{\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})} \\
\widehat{s_{33}} &= \frac{3d_{22}}{\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})}
\end{aligned}
\qquad (23)
$$

We can write equation 22 in matrix form

$$\boldsymbol{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{u_0^b - l_0^b}{2y_{avg}^b} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{u_1^b - l_1^b}{2y_{avg}^b} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{u_2^b - l_2^b}{2y_{avg}^b} \end{bmatrix} \qquad (24)$$

with an expectation of

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{S}} = \frac{3}{\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})} \begin{bmatrix} d_{00} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & d_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{3}{\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})}D \qquad (25)$$

Using this method of normalization has the advantage compared to setting $||\boldsymbol{m^n}|| = 1$ that the calibrated field strength will not be too different from the measured field strength. It has the disadvantage that it may be difficult to compare the calibration of two different magnetometers because the normalization factor $\mathrm{Tr}(D)$ will differ between systems. It also makes it more difficult to full analyze the effects of measurement error.

The calibration is complete. Our calibration results can be applied to the model in equation 5

$$y^b = Dm^b + C_{sc}o_{hi} \tag{26}$$

So first subtract out estimate $\hat{h_w}$ (equation 15) and then pre-multiply by the inverse of $\hat{S}$ (equation 24) giving

$$y^b_{cal} = \hat{S}^{-1}(y^b - h_w) \tag{27}$$

Using equations 16 and 25, the expectation of y^b_{cal} is

$$E(y^b_{cal}) = \frac{||d||}{\sqrt{3}}(S^{-1}(Dm^b + C_{sc}o_{hi} - C_{sc}o_{hi}) \tag{28}$$

which becomes

$$E(y^b_{cal}) = \frac{3}{\text{Tr}(D)}m^b \tag{29}$$

i.e the magnetic field strength apart from a multiplicative constant that will be removed with normalization.

6   Adding noise to the equation

If we include the independent Gaussian noise to our model, equation 5 becomes

$$y^b = Dm^b + C_{sc}o_{hi} + e^b \tag{30}$$

Considering Flipping calibration, the estimator for the hard iron bias $C_{sc}o_{hi}$ is h. Adding noise to equation 11 gives

$$\hat{h} = \frac{y^b_1 + o^b_1 + y^b_2 + o^b_2 + y^b_3 + o^b_3 + y^b_4 + o^b_4}{4} \tag{31}$$

where the o^b_j is the Gaussian noise vector generated by the jth measurement. We assume the noise is i.i.d Gaussian zero mean noise with a variance equal to σ^2. Accordingly the expectation of h remains equal to $C_{sc}o_{hi}$. The Variance of $\hat{h}$ becomes

$$\text{Var}(h) = E(||h - \hat{h}||^2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{4} \tag{32}$$

Considering Winer calibration, the estimator for the hard iron bias $C_{sc}o_{hi}$ is h_w. Adding noise to equation 15 gives

$$\hat{h_w} = (\frac{u^b + o^b_u + l^b + o^b_l}{2}) \tag{33}$$

where $\boldsymbol{o_u^b}$ and $\boldsymbol{o_l^b}$ is the Gaussian noise generated by the measurement of the u_i^b and $\boldsymbol{l_i^b}$ respectively. We assume the noise is i.i.d Gaussian zero mean noise with a variance equal to σ^2. Accordingly the expectation of h_w remains equal to $\boldsymbol{C_{sc}o_{hi}}$ The Variance of $\hat{\boldsymbol{h_w}}$ becomes

$$\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{h_w}) = E(||\boldsymbol{h_w} - \hat{\boldsymbol{h_w}}||^2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \tag{34}$$

The estimator of the elements of the diagonal elements of D is of the form 22

$$\widehat{s_{ii}} = \frac{u_i^b + o_u^b - l_i^b - o_l^b}{2y_{avg}^b} = \frac{u_i^b - l_i^b}{2y_{avg}^b} + \frac{o_u^b - o_l^b}{2y_{avg}^b} \tag{35}$$

or using equation 25, 21, and our assumption the noise is zero mean, we have

$$\widehat{s_{ii}} = \frac{3}{\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})} 2d_{ii} \tag{36}$$

and the variance of the estimator will be

$$\text{Var}(\widehat{s_{ii}}) = \frac{2\sigma^2}{4||\boldsymbol{m^n}||^2} \frac{3}{\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2||\boldsymbol{m^n}||^2} \frac{3}{\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{D})} \tag{37}$$

We will use the process gain to compare different estimates, which measures the increase in Signal to Noise Ratio (SNR) attained by the estimator. We define it as

$$G = 10 \log_{10} \frac{\sigma^2}{\text{Var}_e} \tag{38}$$

where Var_e is the variance of the estimator.

As a reference, we will use the process gain of an ellipsoid fitting algorithm that uses 106 points. The algorithm needs a minimum of 6 points to make a fit, so the approximate process gain is

$$10 \log_{10}(\sigma^2 \frac{(106 - 6)}{\sigma^2}) = 20 \text{ dB} \tag{39}$$

7 Error due to Rotation of Principal Axes

The above assumes that D is diagonal. This represents an ellipse with the principal axes aligned along the x, y, and z axes. Suppose the soft iron effect also causes a rotation of the principal axes i.e

$$\boldsymbol{D}^{''} = \boldsymbol{R_{\theta,\phi}}\boldsymbol{D} \tag{40}$$

where R is the matrix representing a rotation of the axes through an azimuth angle θ and and elevation angle ϕ. The rotation will create off-diagonal elements in $\boldsymbol{D}^{''}$. For example, if $\phi = 0$ then we have

$$\boldsymbol{R_{\theta,\phi}} = \begin{bmatrix} cos\theta & -sin\theta & 0 \\ sin\theta & cos\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{41}$$

If we consider equation 6, but using $\boldsymbol{D}^{''}$ instead of $\boldsymbol{D}$ we have that

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{b'} = \boldsymbol{R_{\theta,\phi}}\boldsymbol{D}^{''}\boldsymbol{R^{bn}}\boldsymbol{m^n} \tag{42}$$

Now if $\boldsymbol{R^{bn}}\boldsymbol{m^n}$ is oriented along the x-axes, this becomes

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{b'} = \boldsymbol{R_{\theta,\phi}}(||\boldsymbol{m^n}||, 0, 0)^T \tag{43}$$

so if $\phi = 0$, using equation 41 we have

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{b'} = (||\boldsymbol{m^n}||cos\theta, ||\boldsymbol{m^n}||sin\theta, 0) \tag{44}$$

From this we can see the maximum value of the x-axis reading will no longer be equal to $||\boldsymbol{m^n}||$ but $||\boldsymbol{m^n}||cos\theta$. If θ is small this will cause only a small amount of error, but if θ is large, then there will be a very significant error in the calibration. Accordingly, in its present form, the Winer algorithm appears only to be able to calibrate accurately soft iron effects where the off-diagonal elements are small.

It may be possible to correct for this by recording the value of x-axis, y-axis, and z-axis magnetometer readings at each extremum. From this information it may be possible deduce the rotation of the principal axes. If doing this, it may also be worth considering the extrema values of the norm of the magnetic field strength.

Estimating the off-diagonal elements might be possible, but would likely add complexity to an algorithm that is specifically designed to be low-complexity. Nevertheless the recording of all three axes at each extremum could provide an indication whether the off-diagonal terms are small.

8 Error Analysis of Flipping Calibration

From equation 32 the measurement noise will introduce a bias error of the order of $\frac{\sigma}{2}$, so the process gain is 6 dB. This gain provides an error that is half the measurement error but the final angular error will be significantly reduced by the effects of filtering. Accordingly, this bias error introduces a systematic error which can affect the ultimate measurement results. A reasonable system design aim is to make the bias error considerably less than the filtered measurement error. Based on what is achievable with a ellipsoid fitting estimator, we will set a goal of achieving a process gain of 20 dB. With Flipping calibration, this could be achieved by repeating the entire flipping procedure 25 times. However, this could introduce additional errors due to incorrect alignment of the unit upon each flip. A simpler way would be for each orientation, average 25 individual measurements, to give $\overline{y_1}, \overline{y_2}, \overline{y_3}, \overline{y_4}$.

In order to reduce the possibilities for alignment errors, it is recommended that a piece of paper be taped to the measurement surface, and an outline of the unit be drawn on the paper. Any subsequent flips should ensure that the unit is still aligned with that outline.

9 Error Analysis of Winer Calibration

In order to carry out the calibration, Winer suggests maneuvering the magnetometer through a Figure 8 pattern. Whilst moving in this pattern the software records the readings from the x, y, and z axes of the magnetometer. The Figure 8 pattern is commonly used for calibrating magnetometers. If well executed, it will take many samples which are approximately uniformly distributed over the three dimensional response surface of the magnetometer. This is well suited to a calibration method that fits all the points to ellipsoid. In this case, the fact that the points are widely distributed increases the accuracy of the points, and the fact that all the points are used dramatically reduces the effect of the measurement error for individual measurements.

A by-product of the low-complexity of the Winer method is that only 6 points are used are the maximum and minimum of the x, y, and z readings. One significant source of error for the Winer method is that the maximum or minimum reading for a particular axis may not actually correspond with the true minimum or maximum. Winer ameliorates this by taking many measure-

ments (about 128) and also doing scatter plots of the measurements which can be used to check there is reasonable coverage at the extrema. However taking numerous measurements has a draw back, given each measurement is noisy.

Assume that the pattern is perfectly executed and each time the six extremum points are measured each time. For each extremum, there is a sampling of a random variable, and if that sample is more extreme than the last, then it is taken as the new estimate of the extremum. If the measurement error is Gaussian, then it is well known that such a sampling method will be biased. This is because if you keep sampling a Gaussian random variable and remembering the largest value, the over time that largest value will become larger and larger. In particular [4]

$$E(zS) \approx \mu + \sigma \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{n - \frac{\pi}{8}}{n - \frac{\pi}{4} + 1}\right) \tag{45}$$

where μ is the mean of the Gaussian variable, z, σ^2 is the variance, n is the number of samples and Φ is the cumulative Gaussian distribution. This grows slowly without limit as n increases.

Another potentially significant source of error when using the Winer calibration method is the measurement noise, analyzed in section 6.

From equation 34, the bias error is of the order of $\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2}}$, which is a process gain of 3 dB. Again, it would be good to increase this to 20 dB, which could be approximated by averaging 50 measurements. However with the MPU-9250 there is a difficulty with this approach. The fastest update rate of the magnetometer reading is 100Hz, so it would take about 5 seconds to gather 50 measurements, so blurring the result, unless the person carrying out the Figure 8 maneuver was able to move agonizingly slowly.

Let us assume that the soft iron effect is small so the diagonal elements of D are near 1 and so $\frac{\text{Tr}(D)}{3} \approx 1$ so equation 37 becomes

$$\text{Var}(\widehat{s}_{ii}) \approx \frac{\sigma^2}{2||\boldsymbol{m^n}||^2} \tag{46}$$

and the expectation of the estimator from equation 22 is approximately d_{ii}. After calibration, the author's measurements on a MPU-9250 device indicate that at a maximum of 495 mG and standard deviation of 7.3 mG. Using these measurements implies that the standard deviation of the estimate of

the d_{ii} is 0.01, so the 95% Confidence Interval of the estimates of the $d_i i$ is approximately $+$ 0.02 or $+$ 2%.

As was the case with the bias error, it is desirable to average the measurements in order to be able to obtain an accurate estimate of D. Due to blurring, there will be limits to how much averaging can take place, but it might be possible by a trial and error approach to be able to average a few measurements together, so making a moderate improvement.

10   Possible improvements to the Winer Method

It may be possible to significantly reduce the sources of error in the Winer by replacing the Figure 8 maneuver by a more targeted approach. Using a Figure 8 means that almost all the points gathered in the Figure 8 are discarded, recording only the six extrema.

Instead, it is proposed the software be altered to print out for the operator, in a continuous fashion, the moving average of the x, y, and z axis readings. Then the operator could take execute a manual gradient descent procedure [5]. The procedure assumes the operator has a compass that is able to indicate the direction of Magnetic North. Once the direction of North is known, then the operator knows that local magnetic vector points in that direction but is tilted upwards or downward depending on whether they located in the Northern or southern hemisphere. The idea of the algorithm is align and anti-align the x-axis with the magnetic vector, and then do the same for the y-axis and the z-axis. Step by step instructions for the operator are given in Appendix A.

This procedure significantly reduces a major source of error associated with using the Figure 8. This is because the gradient ascent/descent approach looks for the actual extrema, so is more likely to find them. However, it will still only have a process gain of 3dB.

Because the operator is able to move slowly in the gradient ascent/descent approach and is encouraged to pause for a second or two at the extremum, it is possible to feed a moving average of the extremum into the calibration algorithm. If the moving average is one second long and the update rate is 100HZ, then this will improve the process gain to 13 dB. It may be possible to average longer, but the resultant feedback to the operator is likely to become too lagged.

It is noted using a Figure 8 it is possible to accurately locate the extrema

12

accurately, but it requires a careful approach, and the use of additional metrics, such as scatter plots of the response surface.

11   Conclusion

This tecnical note was originally motivated to settle an issue [6] that had been raised on the Winer MPU-9250 Github repository. In essence, the issue was how or whether to apply the MPU-2950 fuse values calibration algorithm. The fuse values are the sensitivity of the magnetometer axes as measured at the time of manufacture. In the context of this paper, the fuse values correspond to the f_i. From the previous development, it can be seen that the magnetometer can be calibrated without knowledge of these values. This means that if the person doing the calibration is not confident that the fuse values are correct, then the values should be ignored, and the fuse values should not be applied to any subsequent measurements.

If the person doing the calibration is confident that that fuse values are correct, then they should be applied to every measurement, including the measurements made to do the calibration and any subsequent measurement. This can be seen to be true by considering the converse, a systems engineer would never multiply measurements by arbitrary factors prior to calibration on the basis that the calibration will remove the arbitrary factors. If one is confident of the fuse values and do not apply them, then incorrect measurements are fed into the calibration.

This technical note also carried out a error analysis of two low-complexity calibration methods. It found the errors comparable to the measurement errors, which means that if subsequent filtering is applied to the measurement errors, then systematic errors from the calibration methods can significantly degrade system accuracy. In the case of Flipping Calibration, there is a simple remedy of a lengthy averaging the measurements prior to feeding them into the calibration algorithm. This results in a 20 dB process gain

In the case of the Winer calibration, a different calibration maneuver is proposed, which would then allow a lengthy averaging of the measurements prior to feeding into the calibration algorithm. This could result in a 13 dB process gain.

It may be possible to increase this process gain further. The current Winer procedure is using a maneuver that is designed specifically for the ellipsoid calibration. Perhaps there is an easy-to-use calibration maneuver

13

that is designed specifically for the Winer algorithm that can achieve a 20 dB process gain. It would also be useful to extend the applicability of the algorithm to soft iron distortion with significant off-diagonal terms in $\boldsymbol{D}$

A Instructions for Gradient Ascent/Descent Maneuver

1. Orient the x-axis in the direction of Magetic North

2. Keeping the x-axis aligned with North, rotate the box downwards towards the earth whilst observing the x-axis values. Depending in which hemisphere the procedure is being performed, the readings will either be **increasing** or **decreasing**.

3. If the initial measurements are **increasing**, keep rotating until a maximum value is found. Try moving a small amount to the left or right to see if you can increase the x-value further. Once you have found the maximum, keep the unit still at that orientation for a second or two. Then keep rotating the box in the same manner that you had started, while maintaining the x-axis pointing to true North. Now the readings should be decreasing. Keep rotating until you find the minimum value, then try to move to left or right to see if you can decrease the value further. Once you have found the minimum, keep the unit still at that orientation for a second or two.

4. If the initial measurements are **decreasing**, then follow the procedure outlined in the above step, except look first for a minimum value and then a maximum value.

5. Repeat above steps but with the y-axis aligned to North and then do the same with the z-axis aligned to North.

B Resources

This technical note are available for access at `https://github.com/philomaths-org`. You can access earlier versions of this note on Github by clicking on the tag corresponding to the earlier technical note's version number. This paper has not been refereed, so informed comments are especially welcome.

References

[1] T. InvenSense, "Mpu - 9250." `https://invensense.tdk.com/products/motion-tracking/9-axis/mpu-9250/`, 2021.

[2] M. Kok, J. D. Hol, T. B. Schön, F. Gustafsson, and H. Luinge, "Calibration of a magnetometer in combination with inertial sensors," in *2012 15th International Conference on Information Fusion*, pp. 787–793, IEEE, 2012.

[3] K. Winer, "Simple and effective magnetometer calibration." `https://github.com/kriswiner/MPU6050/wiki/Simple-and-Effective-Magnetometer-Calibration`, 2017.

[4] soakley (https://stats.stackexchange.com/users/24073/soakley), "Expected value of maximum of samples from normal distribution." Cross Validated. URL:https://stats.stackexchange.com/q/344044 (version: 2018-05-02).

[5] Wikipedia contributors, "Gradient descent — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia," 2021.

[6] K. Winer and C. Drane, "The magcalibration does not appear to be applied consistently when calculating the magscale values." `https://github.com/kriswiner/MPU9250/issues/456`.