tes

Multiphysics Structured Eddy Current and Thermography Defects Diagnostics System in Moving Mode

Haoran Li[®], Bin Gao[®], Senior Member, IEEE, Ling Miao, Dong Liu, Qiuping Ma, Guiyun Tian[®], Senior Member, IEEE, and Wai Lok Woo[®]

Abstract—Eddy current testing (ET) and eddy current thermography (ECT) are both important nondestructive testing methods that have been widely used in the field of conductive materials evaluation. Conventional ECT systems have often employed to test static specimens even though they are inefficient when the specimen is large. In addition, the requirement of high-power excitation sources tends to result in bulky detection systems. To mitigate these problems, in this article, a moving detection mode of multiphysics structured ET and ECT is proposed in which a novel L-shape ferrite magnetic yoke circumambulated with array coils is designed. The theoretical derivation model of the proposed method is developed which is shown to improve the detection efficiency without compromising the excitation current by ECT. The specimens can be speedily evaluated by scanning at a speed of 50-250 mm/s while reducing the power of the excitation current due to the supplement of ET. The unique design of the excitationreceiving structure has also enhanced the detectability of omnidirectional cracks. Moreover, it does not block the normal direction visual capture of the specimens. Both numerical simulations and experimental studies on different defects have been carried out and the obtained results have shown the reliability and detection efficiency of the proposed system.

Manuscript received March 19, 2020; revised May 7, 2020; accepted May 21, 2020. Date of publication May 26, 2020; date of current version January 4, 2021. The work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61971093, Grant 61527803, and Grant 61960206010, in part by the Science and Technology Department of Sichuan, China, under Grant 2019YJ0208, Grant 2018JY0655, and Grant 2018GZ0047, and in part by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under Grant ZYGX2019J067. Paper no. TII-20-1428. (*Corresponding author: Bin Gao.*)

Haoran Li, Bin Gao, Ling Miao, Dong Liu, and Qiuping Ma are with the School of Automation Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 610054, China (e-mail: horn_lee@ qq.com; bin_gao@uestc.edu.cn; 1558725860@qq.com; 17756959@ qq.com; 463979462@qq.com).

Guiyun Tian is with the School of Automation Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 610054, China and aslo with the School of Engineering, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, U.K. (e-mail: g.y.tian@ncl.ac.uk).

Wai Lok Woo is with the Department of Computer and Information Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 8ST, U.K. (e-mail: wailok.woo@northumbria.ac.uk).

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this article are available online at http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TII.2020.2997836

Index Terms—Eddy current testing (ET), eddy current thermography (ECT), moving mode, nondestructive testing (NDT).

I. INTRODUCTION

W ITH the rapid development of manufacturing industry, the types and quantities of industrial products have proliferated. It is important to efficiently detect the infrastructures while ensuring its reliability and safety [1]–[3]. Nondestructive testing (NDT) is commonly used for such analysis without changing the inherent characteristics of a component [4]–[6].

There are extensive NDT methods for near-surface defect detection such as magnetic particle testing (MT), penetrant testing (PT), ultrasonic testing (UT), radiographic testing (RT), Eddy current testing (ET), and Eddy current thermography (ECT). MT is good at detecting the discontinuities in the surface and subsurface of ferromagnetic materials with small dimensions and extremely narrow gaps. Unfortunately, it requires high surface smoothness of the tested parts and rich experience of the inspectors. Simultaneously, the detection area of MT is small and the speed is slow [7]. PT is not limited by the chemical composition, structure, and shape of the workpieces, and it is especially sensitive to opening cracks. However, the inspection is complicated and it produces pollution [8]. UT can detect deeper flaws because of its strong penetrability, whereas it is hard to inspect workpieces with complex shapes and also requires couplant [9], [10]. RT provides accurate, intuitive images whereas the shortcomings are also obvious, such as high cost, slow speed, and harmful to human beings with the accident [11].

Both ET and ECT play huge roles in the field of conductive materials evaluation due to their reliability and feasibility. ET is one of the most efficient NDT methods which has been widely used for crack detection at relatively high speeds without any direct physical contact between the coil probes and the inspected pieces. Nevertheless, it remains difficult to quantify the defects due to the limited impedance or voltage signals from detection coils [12], [13]. As another homologous technique, ECT has received increasing attention from researchers since its inception. The main advantage of ECT is that it can quickly evaluate a fixed region with high spatial resolution and sensitivity in a short excitation period (typically one hundred to several hundred ms) [14]–[16]. In addition, ECT has made some progress in the

1551-3203 © 2020 IEEE. Personal use is permitted, but republication/redistribution requires IEEE permission.

See https://www.ieee.org/publications/rights/index.html for more information.

detection of geometrically heterogeneous specimens [17], [18]. Regrettably, ECT systems are mainly used for static specimens testing where it is inefficient and less sensitivity for defects diagnostics across the whole aspect of the large samples as well as the limitation requirement of the high-power excitation source [4], [19].

To mitigate these problems, several research works have been carried out. Macecek proposed an advanced eddy current array to demonstrate the direction and empirical sizing of cracks and corrosion spots in low conductivity aluminum sheets [20]. Sun et al. [21] designed a flexible arrayed eddy current sensor to improve the sensibility of hollow axle inner surface defects detection. Endo et al. [22] applied an ET system with multicoil type probes to size up cracks fabricated on austenite stainless plates. Min et al. [23] presented a moving mode of eddy current thermography to investigate the artificial defect feature extraction methods which are suitable in the moving mode. He et al. [24] found a method for suppression of the effect of uneven surface emissivity of material in the moving mode of eddy current thermography. Gao et al. [25] reported a ferrite yoke based on ECPT to enhance the detectability of multiple cracks. Li et al. [26] illustrated a Helmholtz-coil based ECPT configuration for the state detection and characterization of bond wire lift-off in insulated gate bipolar transistor (IGBT) modules. Liu et al. [27] proposed an L-shaped sensor to diagnose natural cracks in a static system. Goldammer et al. [28] showed how NDT can be automated using as an example of industrial applications at the Siemens sector Energy. Streza et al. [29] used an active thermography approach to improve the testing efficiency of thermoelectric materials. Yang et al. [30] proposed a novel inclined excitation method for crack detection of non-ferromagnetic materials using ECT. However, there exists limited research works concentrated on the physics-based coupling of both thermal and electromagnetic fields to jointly build a diagnosis system.

In this article, a moving mode detection of multiphysics structured ET and ECT in which a novel L-shape ferrite magnetic yoke surround with array coils is proposed. The model is based on the multiphysics coupling mechanism that the induced eddy current generates thermal and electro-magnetic fields synchronously. In this model, the advantages of ET and ECT complemented each other. On one hand, quantifying and imaging the defects using ET remains difficult due to the limited impedance or voltage signals from the detection coils. Although there are research studies where ET systems have been applied with array coil probes, poor imaging caused by low resolution still remains a problem. ECT plays an important role that it leverages its visual capability to detect the defects with high spatial resolution, and the dimensions (length and width) of the defects can be measured in the thermal images. At this juncture, it should be noted that without the contributions of ECT, the shape of the defects cannot be directly measured. On the other hand, ECT is easily influenced by the impact of the surface condition such as variation of emissivity. In this respect, ET detection plays an important role to distinguish the abnormal signal between defects and surface conditions. In conclusion, with the aid of a conveyor belt, specimens can be evaluated fast by scanning at the speed of 50-250 mm/s as well as reducing the



Fig. 1. (a) Schematic diagram of the coupling structured system. (b) Diagram of the excitation-receiving structure. (c) radiant intensity depends on the direction of emission.

power range of the excitation current due to the supplement of ET. In addition, the high spatial resolution and sensitivity of the structured ET linked to ECT can be used to quantify the defects more accurately.

The rest parts of this article is organized as follows. Section II presents the basic theory of the new proposed configuration of ET and ECT. Section III describes the implementation of the system as well as the simulation and experiment studies along the results. Finally, Section IV concludes this article.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Configuration of the Coupling Structured System

The schematic diagram of the coupling structured system is shown in Fig. 1(a). The self-designed digital inductive device based on an field-programmable gate array (FPGA) controller is implemented to generate high-frequency alternating currents. It can drive the L-shape ferrite magnetic core and induce the eddy current as well as produce the resistive heat in the conductive materials. The diagram of the excitation-receiving structure is shown in Fig. 1(b), array coils are placed around the yoke by a three-dimensional printing holder which is perfectly fit to the shape of the yoke, the red dotted area represents the region of interest (ROI) of the IR camera. It should be noted that the ROI is not blocked due to the special design of the core. An object will continuously absorb or emit infrared radiation due to the random motion of the charged particles when the temperature of it is above absolute zero. According to Lambert's law of cosines, the radiant intensity I_{θ} denotes the radiated power which is emitted from a point source of the radiating object into a solid angle element along the given direction [27]

$$I_{\theta} = I_0 \cos \theta \tag{1}$$

where I_0 denotes radiation intensity in the normal direction of the surface, θ denotes the angle between the observed direction and normal direction of the surface. It indicates that the radiation intensity is the strongest in normal direction of the surface. Therefore, the viewing angle of the IR camera should be selected to the normal direction of the surface and it can be satisfied by using of the proposed L-shape yoke. The angular dependence of radiant intensity can be depicted in Fig. 1(c).

The purpose of the placement of coil1 is to detect the horizontal defects (perpendicular to the induced eddy current) that are insensitive to coil2–coil4. For vertical defects (parallel to the induced eddy current), the sequence information can be captured by coil2 and coil4 arrays as they are more sensitive to it, while the magnetic flux near the end of the yoke poles is dense in the z-direction and the changes of the voltage in coil2 and coil4 are more pronounced. In terms of coil3, it is an important position to capture both electromagnetic and thermal signals simultaneously. All coils are applied to capture both spatial and time sequences information in order to accurately locate the defects. A speed-controlled conveyor belt is employed other than the excitation, thermal imaging, and data acquisition systems in this moving mode of the multiphysics structured pattern.

When the FPGA controller provides a switch drive signal, high-frequency alternating current flows through the helical coil which is wound round the yoke and its turns number is 2, the radius and wire diameter are 12.5 and 4 mm, respectively. It generates alternating magnetic field and the ferrite magnetic core guides the magnetic flux through its shape and the flux is transmitted to the specimens by the two poles of the core. In that way, strong eddy currents are generated on the near-surface of the metal plate and can be acquired by both detection coils and an IR camera. With the movement of the conveyor belt, the carried specimen will be swept at a certain speed so that the array coils can detect the changes in the voltage signals and the IR camera can capture the disturbance of the temperature distribution when there are cracks on the near-surface of the specimens. Thus, two types of signals (i.e., electromagnetic and thermal) are acquired simultaneously with one excitation.

B. Mathematical Models of the Electromagnetic Field

Without considering the speed effect, electromagnetic field differential equation derived from Maxwell's equation can be drawn as follows:

$$\nabla \times \frac{1}{\mu} \left(\nabla \times \vec{A} \right) = \vec{j} - \sigma \frac{\partial \vec{A}}{\partial t}$$
(2)

where \vec{A} is the vector potential, \vec{j} is the conduction current density, and μ is the magnetic permeability of the medium. The vector potential \vec{A} can be defined as follows:

$$\vec{B} = \nabla \times \vec{A} \tag{3}$$

where \vec{B} is the magnetic flux density.

7

Lorentz force can be used to analyze the speed effect problem in the dynamic eddy current detection system. Due to the Lorentz force, when there is relative movement between detecting device and workpiece, the eddy current density equation generated in the specimen is given as follows:

$$\overrightarrow{J_v} = \sigma \overrightarrow{v} \times \overrightarrow{B} = \sigma \overrightarrow{v} \times \left(\nabla \times \overrightarrow{A} \right) \tag{4}$$

where $\overrightarrow{J_v}$ indicates the eddy current density excited in the workpiece, σ is the electrical conductivity, and \overrightarrow{v} is the relative velocity between detecting device and workpiece.

If (2) and (4) are combined to analyze the eddy current detection system under dynamic conditions, the electromagnetic fields differential equation can be transformed as follows:

$$\nabla \times \frac{1}{\mu} \left(\nabla \times \vec{A} \right) = \vec{J} - \sigma \frac{\partial \vec{A}}{\partial t} + \sigma \vec{v} \times \left(\nabla \times \vec{A} \right)$$
(5)

where $\sigma \frac{\partial \vec{A}}{\partial t}$ denotes the eddy current intensity caused by the change of the magnetic field, $\sigma \vec{v} \times (\nabla \times \vec{A})$ denotes the eddy current intensity caused by the speed effect.

From the differential equation of the electromagnetic fields, the changes of the eddy current intensity are caused by the joint action of magnetic vector potential and speed effect. The eddy current induced by the change of the magnetic vector potential is inversely proportional to its frequency and the velocity-induced eddy current is proportional to the speed as well as magnetic field strength. According to this, it can be inferred that with the speed increases, the velocity-induced eddy current intensity would increase. This principle can be used for crack detection in the moving mode. Nevertheless, if the relative motion speed between the coil and the specimen is slow, this effect is negligible and can therefore be ignored.

In this study, an L-shape core is implemented for magnetism gathering. The magnetic circuit generated by the L-shape core in the space can be summarized into three paths (as shown in Fig. 2). Path I means the magnetic flux leakage produced by the helical coil that does not flow into the core, one of them is expressed as the red dotted loop and assume the average length of them is l_{leak} . Path II includes the flux passing through part of the L-shape core as well as the air between the two poles, one of them is marked as green dotted loop and assume the average length in the core is l_x and in air is l_{air} . Path III includes the flux flow through the entire core and the specimen placed under the ferromagnetic core. Of course, if there are gaps between the core and the sample, the length of the gaps should be taken into consideration. One of the paths is expressed as the purple



Fig. 2. Magnetic flux paths of the core in space.



Fig. 3. Equivalent magnetic circuit of the model.

dotted loop and the total length can be divided into l_{core} , l_{gap} , and l_{sample} . Besides, the flux overflow of the specimen can be ignored.

The equivalent magnetic circuit of this model can be simplified as shown in Fig. 3. According to Ohm's law in magnetic, similar to the electric circuit, the magnetic circuit can be derived. The relationship among magnetic flow Φ , magnetomotive force F, and magnetic resistance R_m can be written as follows:

$$F = \Phi R_m = NI \tag{6}$$

where I is the current that generates the magnetic field and N represents the turns of the helical coil.

The magnetic resistances in the path I, II, and III can be denoted as R_{m1} , R_{m2} , and R_{m3} . Due to the determination formula of the magnetic resistance, R_{m1} , R_{m2} , and R_{m3} can be described as follows:

$$R_{m1} = R_{\text{mair1}} = \frac{l_{\text{leak}}}{\mu_0 A_{\text{air1}}} \tag{7}$$

$$R_{m2} = R_{mx} + R_{mair2} = \frac{l_x}{\mu_{core}A_{core}} + \frac{l_{air}}{\mu_0 A_{air2}}$$
(8)

$$R_{m3} = R_{mcore} + R_{mgap} + R_{msample} = \frac{l_{core}}{\mu_{core}A_{core}} + \frac{l_{gap}}{\mu_{core}A_{core}}$$

$$+\frac{{}^{\epsilon_{\rm gap}}}{\mu_0 A_{\rm gap}} + \frac{{}^{\epsilon_{\rm sample}}}{\mu_{\rm sample} A_{\rm sample}} \tag{9}$$

where μ_0 , μ_{core} , and μ_{sample} are the magnetic permeability of the air, core, and sample, respectively. A_{air1} , A_{air2} , A_{core} , A_{gap} , and A_{sample} are the valid cross-sectional areas of the air, core, gaps, and sample passed by the magnetic flux. R_{mair1} , R_{mair2} , R_{mcore} , R_{mgap} , and $R_{msample}$ are the magnetic resistances in the air, core, gaps, and sample, respectively. In addition, R_{mx} represents the resistance of the path in part of the core whose length is x.

Thus, from path III, it can be known that the flux is gathered in the area between the two poles of the yoke, it is beneficial to generate stronger eddy currents. Detection coils can be placed around the ends of the core due to the strong electromagnetic induction. In a dynamic system, when a conductive material moves to the underneath of the excitation core, uniform eddy currents generate, and a crack will obstruct the eddy current flow. This directly leads to the extension of the eddy current path, the induced magnetic field will be reduced and the voltage signal on the coil probe varies. With the departure of the crack, the voltage will revert to the initial value.

C. Mathematical Models of the Electromagnetic-Thermal Field

As the tested piece moves, the whole aspect of the sample can be heated by eddy current over time. Thus, the thermal field at each point is a combination of the local induction heating and the surrounding thermal diffusion field. The skin depth of the eddy current is related to the characteristics of the conductive materials and the frequency of the excitation current, it can be described as follows:

$$\delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\sigma\mu f}}\tag{10}$$

where δ is the skin depth and f is the frequency of the excitation current. It is not difficult to find that δ is inversely related to the square-root of the electrical conductivity, magnetic permeability, and excitation frequency.

In the light of Joule's law, heat is generated when eddy currents exist in the specimen. As the heat source, the expression of the eddy current can be shown as follows:

$$Q = \frac{1}{\sigma} \left| \vec{J_e} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma} \left| \vec{J_v} \right|^2 \tag{11}$$

where Q is the strength of the generated heat, J_e is the eddy current density, J_v is the current density generated by the relative motion. The Joule heat which is produced by eddy current can be propagated to other parts of a specimen and this process can be represented as follows:

$$\rho C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (k \nabla T) + Q \tag{12}$$

where ρ , C, k are the density, specific heat, and the heat transfer coefficient of the specimen, respectively. T is the temperature. When speed effect is taken account, the formula should be rewritten as follows [23]:

$$\rho C \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \rho C \vec{v} \cdot \nabla T = \nabla \cdot (k \nabla T) + Q$$
(13)

where \vec{v} is the relative velocity of the specimen. It should be noted that while the relative motion speed between the coil and the specimen is slow, the heat generated by $\vec{J_v}$ can be safely neglected.

The eddy currents on the specimen produced by alternating magnetic in this model is shown in Fig. 4. Assuming the moving



Fig. 4. Eddy currents paths when the crack at different position.



Fig. 5. Thermal imaging detection mechanism of the moving mode.

direction of the specimen is along with the *x*-axis, as a crack moves to position 1, the eddy currents will bypass it and their paths are extended. Since a detection coil is placed above this position, the voltage will be changed dramatically. When the crack moves to position 2, the voltage of the detection coil conduct the variation again due to the same principles. However, the fluctuation at the latter is less obvious because the crack at position 2 obstruct less currents than the former. On the other hand, these two variation construct a double detect pattern during the temporal moving situation.

In addition, as shown in Fig. 5, the detection process can be considered into four parts: region I (unexcited area), region II (backward heat conduction area), region III (exciting area), and region IV (excited area). In particular, the excited area can be further divided into the forward heat conduction area, the residual heat area, and the cooled area. Moreover, the forward heat conduction area and the exciting area constitute a heat superimposed area. The ROI is in exciting area and it will scan along the moving direction.

As shown in Fig. 5, the temperature in region I is the lowest (close to ambient temperature) because it is far away from the heating source and it cannot be affected by the heat conduction. The temperature in region I rises from right to left gradually due to the heat diffusion from the source. The temperature in region II rises dramatically because of the direct heating from the eddy current. In particular, the diminishing temperature in region III is due to the increasing distance away from the yoke in spite of it has been heated before. According to the analysis above, it can be understood that the region which keeps the same distance from the yoke will probably present unequal temperature.

The scanning and exciting process can be illustrated in Fig. 6. In order of exciting, three points are selected as A, B, and C, respectively. At the time t_1 , point A is excited and its temperature has increased rapidly while there exist defects. Meanwhile, the



Fig. 6. Schematic diagram of the scanning and heating process.

detection coil above this point will monitor its impedance and the voltage fluctuates obviously. In this instant, the time derivative term of \vec{A} at point A moving with the coordinate system can be described as follows [31]:

$$\frac{\partial \vec{A}^{t+\Delta t}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \vec{A}}{\partial t} + (\vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{A}$$
(14)

where Δt denotes the time interval, \vec{A} is the vector potential, and \vec{v} is the velocity of specimen. Similarly, the time derivative term of T can be described as follows:

$$\frac{\partial T^{t+\Delta t}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + (\vec{v} \cdot \nabla) T.$$
(15)

With the movement of the specimen, point A gradually moves away from the detection coil and its voltage will be recovered while the heat is spread around. When the time comes to t_3 , the effect of heating point A disappears completely. Similarly, points B and C are excited at t_2 , t_4 and eliminated the impacts at t_4 , t_5 , respectively. It should be noted that when point A is excited at t_1 , the initial heat is not zero due to the heat diffusion from previous area. In addition, although the points after t_4 will generate heat and transfer to previous area, it cannot be recorded by IR camera because the ROI has already changed and this part of heat should be ignored. If only the changes in heat from t_3 to t_4 are concerned, and completing all points from between t_1 and t_4 , the total heat Q_{totalt} during ROI can be given by the following:

$$Q_{\text{total}t} = Q_{1t} + Q_{2t} + \dots + Q_{nt} \tag{16}$$

where $Q_{1t}, Q_{2t}, \ldots, Q_{nt}$ indicate the heat generated by all points between t_1 and t_4 from t_3 to t_4 .

In this detection, when the excitation yoke and thermal camera place relatively stationary, as a large temperature contrast occurs in the region of interest, for example, the above t_3-t_4 , it can be applied to distinguish the defects.

III. SIMULATION AND EXPERIMENT SET-UP

A. Numerical Experiment and Discussion

Several numerical simulations based on the COMSOL Multiphysics 5.4 platform are performed in order to investigate the electromagnetic-thermal mechanism of the proposed system. The dynamic parametric scanning module has been constructed for ET and induction heating simulation experiments.



Fig. 7. Geometric diagrams of the simulation model. (a) Top view. (b) Side view. (c) Space diagram with the directions of x, y, z.



Fig. 8. Simulation voltage curves of coils. (a) 45# steel. (b) 316# stainless steel. (c) Horizontal defect.

TABLE I PHYSICAL PARAMETERS OF MATERIALS

Parameters	copper	ferrite	45#	316#
conductivity (S/m)	5.99e7	1e-12	5.5e6	1.3e6
relative permittivity	1	1	1	1
relative permeability	1	5000	190	1
heat capacity (J/(kg·K))	385	600	475	502
thermal conductivity (W/(m·K))	400	5	51.9	12.1
density (kg/m ³)	8960	7800	7850	7990

The geometric diagrams of this simulation model are carried out as shown in Fig. 7. Furthermore, the (a) top view and (b) side view, as well as the (c) space diagram, are presented, respectively.

In the finite element simulation model, the number of scales has been interpreted directly in Fig. 7(a) and (b), respectively. The outer and inner diameters as well as the height of the detection coils are 6.5, 4.5, and 3 mm. The length, width and thickness of the sample are 140, 60, and 10 mm. The length of the four artificial slots is 8 mm, the width is 1 mm and the depth of the four slots a-d are 5.5, 6, 6.5, and 7 mm, respectively. In order to reduce the memory usage of the desktop, eddy current testing and induction heating simulations are implemented separately.

Commonality, materials and their physical parameters (as listed in Table I) are critical to the simulations where the coils are composed of copper, the yoke is composed of alloy powder core ferrite and the samples are composed of the isotropic 45# steel (ferromagnetic material) or 316# stainless steel (non-ferromagnetic material), respectively. In the simulations of eddy

current testing, the main parameters include conductivity, relative permittivity, and relative permeability. In the simulations of induction heating, the parameters of heat capacity, thermal conductivity, and density of these materials are also required. In addition, the excitation mechanism is same configuration that the selected lift-off distances in all simulation experiments are 2 mm, the turns of the coil probes are 570, the ambient temperature is 20 °C, the peak value of the excitation current is 100 A and its frequency is 180 kHz.

1) Numerical Simulations of Eddy Current Testing: In the eddy current testing simulations, the method of parametric scanning is executed. As shown in Fig. 7(c), the moving direction of the sample is the positive direction along the *x*-axis and the step is set to 2 mm. The simulated data is organized into Fig. 8. When the coils are marked as coil1–coil4 from the left side to the right side in Fig. 7(c), it can be noticed that the data of coil1 is insignificant because the vertical cracks (parallel to the induced eddy current) never pass the directly below of it.

The purpose of the placement of coil1 is to detect horizontal defects that are insensitive to coil2–coil4. As the first coil approaches the sample, the voltage of coil4 drops sharply between the position of -55 and -40 mm because of the edge effect. It then stabilizes until the appearance of slot *a*. It is precisely seen that the voltage fluctuates during this time. Similarly, slot *b*, slot *c*, and slot *d* can be detected seriatim. There is a phase difference among voltage signals of coil4, coil3, and coil2 due to the time difference of the proximity of the defects. In particular, if crack becomes a horizontal one that can pass the below of coil1 during the movement, the situation will be changed that coil1 is sensitive.



Fig. 9. Density of induced current and magnetic flux in simulation.

Fig. 8(a) shows the tendency of voltage curves when the 45# steel is chosen to be the material of the sample, and the result is shown in Fig. 8(b) when the material changed to be 316# stainless steel. Fig. 8(c) shows the voltage curve of coil1 when the crack is horizontal. From this figure, the marked three points a, b, and c represent that the crack has just moved into the coil, the crack is exactly under the coil, and the crack has just moved out of the coil. The length of the crack can be expressed as follows:

$$l = s - d \tag{17}$$

where l denotes the length of the crack, s denotes the total distance of the crack moved, d denotes the outer diameter of the detection coil. It is worth noting that this formula can be only applied to horizontal cracks passing directly below the coil, otherwise, the angle should be included in the calculation. When the total distance s is replaced by the speed and time, (17) can be rewritten as follows:

$$l = \nu t - d \tag{18}$$

where ν is the velocity of the sample and t is the time spent. Thus, if the velocity, time, and outer diameter are given, the length of the crack can be estimated. It should be noted that the result can be inaccurate due to the error caused by a complex measurement environment, thus, it is necessary to take multiple measurements at different speeds and get the average value.

2) Numerical Simulations of Induction Heating: The density of the induced eddy current and magnetic flux on the near-surface of the plate are shown in Fig. 9. In particular, the red arrows represent the current flow, the blue arrows represent the magnetic flux, and the size of the arrows is proportional to the intensity of the flow. It can be seen that the current flow and magnetic flux are perpendicular to each other. When a vertical crack moves below the ferromagnetic core, the induced current will flow around the crack, the density of the current on two sides of the defect grows higher than those of other areas. In ferromagnetic materials, the density of magnetic flux in plate is increased around the crack and this phenomenon is alleviated when in nonferromagnetic materials. It will directly cause the heat generated by the hysteresis loss to be reduced drastically. This is the main reason that the L-shape yoke is sensitive to horizontal defects rather than vertical defects in non-ferromagnetic materials. Consequently, the supplement of ET is indispensable.



Fig. 10. Distribution of temperature on the surface of the plate. (a) At 0.05 s. (b) At 1 s.



Fig. 11. Experimental system.

The distributions of temperature on the surface of the plate at 50 mm/s are presented in Fig. 10. When the plate was heated by the core, the heat will be gathered at the tip of the crack at the beginning [as shown in Fig. 10 (a)]. Over time, heat will spread around. The edge of the crack will block the conduction of heat while it generates trailing smear based on the speed effect [as shown in Fig. 10(b)].

B. Experimental Study and Validation

Experiments are executed to verify the feasibility of the system. The developed experimental system is shown in Fig. 11. It consists of a self-designed digital excitation source based on FPGA, an FLIR A655sc infrared camera with the temperature resolution of 0.08 K and the maximum recording frame rate of 200 Hz, a conveyor belt with the carrying speed of 50–250 mm/s, an NI USB-6366 DAQ card with the maximum sampling rate of 2 MHz and a laptop which is used for storing data.

1) Design of the Excitation Source: Specifically, the digital excitation source is composed of a full-bridge *LC* resonant circuit, an FPGA control board, a high-power dc power supply, and an auxiliary power supply. The topology of the full-bridge *LC* resonant circuit is shown in Fig. 12. S_1 – S_4 are four IPD110N12N3 power MOSFETS, V_s is the voltage provided by dc power supply and its value is set to 10 V for the test samples of 45# steel and 316# stainless (artificial cracks). And it is set to 40 V in the test sample of stainless steel (natural crack).

In addition, R_{eq} denotes the equivalent resistance of the circuit, it is typically ranged from several dozen to several hundred m Ω . C_r denotes the resonant capacitor and the value is 4.8 μ F. L_r denotes the resonant inductance and the value is 1 μ H. The turns ratio of the transformer is 5:1. When the circuit works at



Fig. 12. Topology of the full-bridge LC resonant circuit.



Fig. 13. (a) Isotropic samples. (b) Result of magnetic particle testing in stainless steel.

the resonant state, the current flowing through the excitation coil reaches a peak value, and the magnetic field generated by the coil is the strongest. The resonant frequency of the series resonant circuit f_r can be described as follows:

$$f_r = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{L_r C_r}}.$$
(19)

The working logic of the excitation system can be summarized as follows: First, the FPGA is programmed as the drive frequency sweep from 300 to 50 kHz and acquire the secondary current of the transformer during this process. Second, if this current value is greater than a set threshold, it means that the frequency is close to the resonant frequency and mark this value. Finally, the FPGA will stop sweeping and output at the marked frequency. Thus, the system will find the resonant frequency automatically and generate the maximum output power which is important to inspection.

2) Experimental Validation: The isotropic samples are presented in Fig. 13(a), from the left to right, they are 45# steel piece with four artificial cracks, 316# stainless steel piece with four cracks of the same specification, as well as the stainless steel piece from nuclear industry with a subsurface natural stress corrosion crack that cannot be directly observed. The dimensions of the 45# and 316# samples with four slots are consistent with the simulations (as shown in Fig. 7). And the length, width, thickness of the stainless steel piece are 200, 100, and 20 mm, respectively. However, the accurate length of the natural crack is uncertain. As a comparison, the result of magnetic particle testing is presented in Fig. 13(b) and from this picture, it can be inferred that the length of the crack is 50–60 mm.

The samples are carried by the conveyor belt. The main settings of the experiments are illustrated as follows.

1) The speeds of conveyor belt are selected to be 50, 100, 150, 200, and 250 mm/s, respectively.

- 2) The lift-off between the yoke and sample is 2 mm.
- 3) The valid values of excitation currents are 20 A in the sample of 45# steel, 25 A in the sample of 316# stainless, and 100 A in the sample of stainless steel piece. The excitation frequency is 181 kHz.
- 4) The sampling rate of the DAQ card is set to 1 MHz and the frame rate of the IR camera is 200 Hz and its resolution is 640×120 array.

Comparison experiments using a line-coil with wire diameter of 6 mm and a spiral-coil with the same wire diameter are configured. In particular, the radius of the spiral-coil is 22 mm and its turns are 3. To clarify, all of the experimental conditions are consistent except for the shape of the excitation coils.

3) Results Analysis: After configuration, experiments can be carried out and the results are illustrated as follows.

a) Detection results of artificial cracks: In eddy current testing, in order to quantitative evaluate the detection sensitivity of the system, a parameter S is carried out which can be expressed as follows [32]:

$$S = \frac{|\text{Max}(v_{\text{defect}} - v_{\text{normal}})|}{\text{Max}(v_{\text{nolmal}})}$$
(20)

where S is the sensitivity of detection in the corresponding place, v_{defect} indicates the voltage value of coil probes when there is a defect, and v_{normal} means no defect.

In this study, the reason for placing multiple detection coils is to improve the detectability since the variation of velocity has a limited impact on the values of S in the same material. Thus, to simplify the results, only the detection results of coil probes at the speed of 50 mm/s in 45# steel and 316# stainless are summarized in Fig. 14 and 15, respectively. The S values of detection results of different materials at the speed of 50 mm/s are displayed in Table II. It can be known from Fig. 14 and 15, there are voltages fluctuations at the occurrence of the defects, and the voltage variation of coil2 and coil4 is more pronounced than coil3. This is mainly because the magnetic flux near the end of the yoke poles is dense in the z-direction. The relative position of each defect and the interval between every two defects can be estimated based on times and speeds. The variation tendency of S is incremental from slot a to d, it is mainly because the depth of them are different and the coil probe is more sensitive to deeper cracks. Nevertheless, due to the complex test environment, it can only be used to roughly estimate the change in depth of the defects to some extent.

In thermal detection, the thermal contrast is generally used to quantify the sensitivity. The formula can be drawn as follows:

$$\Gamma C = \frac{T_d - T_n}{T_n - T_0} \tag{21}$$

where TC is the thermal contrast, T_d is the temperature in the defective area, T_n denotes the temperature in the nondefective area, and T_0 represents the ambient temperature.

The thermal images of slot a-d at the speed of 50 mm/s in 45# steel and 316# stainless are shown in Fig. 14 and 15, respectively. In comparison, the fourth row of them shows the testing results by adopting line-coil and the fifth row shows the testing results by adopting spiral-coil. In addition, some representative results



Fig. 14. Experimental results of slot a-d in 45# steel by using the proposed structure (1st three rows), line-coil (4th row), spiral-coil (5th row) at the speed of 50 mm/s.



Fig. 15. Experimental results of slot *a*–*d* in 316# stainless by using the proposed structure (1st three rows), line-coil (4th row), spiral-coil (5th row) at the speed of 50 mm/s.

Authorized licensed use limited to: University of Electronic Science and Tech of China. Downloaded on January 13,2021 at 01:25:43 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.



Fig. 16. Experimental results of slot b in 45# steel and 316# stainless by using the proposed structure at the speed of 100 and 250 mm/s.



Fig. 17. Diagram of the thermal sequence.

at other speed are shown in Fig. 16. In this study, the cracks can be easily distinguished at each speed in 45# steel. However, it becomes more blurred as the speed increases in 316# stainless steel. It shows that the speed effect is unfavorable for ECT and the compensation of ET is necessary. It should be indicated that all of the thermal results use fixed subtraction except for second row which uses the sliding subtraction processing (also known as temporal differencing), which is a commonly used video processing method in moving mode. The process of this algorithm can be described as follows [33]:

$$D_n(x,y) = |f_n(x,y) - f_{n-1}(x,y)|, n = 2, \dots, N \quad (22)$$

where $f_n(x, y)$ represents the temperature value of each pixel of the *n*th frame, $D_n(x, y)$ is the pixel wise difference function, and N is the number of thermal images. As shown in Fig. 17, it actually subtracts the previous frame from the next frame to obtain a new sequence while this captures the transient changes in temperature.

An extra ruler guide is added to these images in order to judge the size of crack. As can be seen, in each coil, heat will be collected on both sides of the crack and generate trailing smear due to the speed effect, the results in the proposed configuration are better than the other two excitation structures under the same conditions. In addition, the detection results in ferromagnetic materials are better than those in nonferromagnetic materials due to the heat generated by hysteresis loss. Particularly, it is significant difficult to detect the crack in 316# stainless when using the line-coil and spiral-coil. The TC values of the experimental results of different materials at the speed of 50 mm/s are displayed in Table II. The "-" refers no value. From these values, it can be indicated that the combination of the two sensing methods can strengthen the detectability and reliability. Furthermore, the surface emissivity and impurities of the samples will interfere with the evaluation of ECT. This is validated in Fig. 18 by painting the surface of the 45# steel with black strip near slot b and it can be noticed that ECT cannot distinguish the crack and strip in the thermal images due to the similarity characteristic for both defects and variation of emissivity. Thus, this detection challenge can be conquered with the supplement of ET as it enables the integrated system to distinguish the interference of the paint. Fig. 18(d) shows the crack and black strip are well distinguished by detecting whether the coil voltage in this area fluctuates. In this way, the proposed system can not only retains the high resolution of ECT, but also avoids the interference of the impurities.

b) Detection results of natural stress corrosion cracks: In eddy current testing, the detection results of coil probes at the speed of 50 mm/s in stainless steel are summarized in Fig. 19. In particular, Fig. 19(a) shows the detection direction of the crack is vertical (parallel to the eddy current flows), Fig. 19(b) shows the detection direction of the crack is horizontal (perpendicular to the eddy current flows). Under these circumstances, coil1 plays an important role due to its complement to horizontal cracks detection. As shown in Fig. 19(a), although the vertical crack can be detected by all coil probes, they are difficult to be shaped in ECT since natural defects of this angle in nonferromagnetic materials are difficult to be heated. The horizontal cracks directly below the yoke can be imaged by ECT while they cannot be detected by coil2–coil4. Thus, the placement of coil1 can not only detects the horizontal cracks but

 TABLE II

 S and TC Values of Crack Detection Experiments

		proposed			line-coil				spiral-coil				
slot		а	b	С	d	а	b	С	d	а	b	С	d
45#	TC(%)	157	185	185	185	120	118	129	125	114	114	114	114
	S(%)	13	14.3	17.7	17.9		_			_			
316#	TC(%)	114	114	114	114	33	50	50	50	66	66	66	50
	S(%)	17.5	21.7	23.7	38	_			_				
Stainless steel	TC(%)	120			×			50					
	S(%)	38.4			-			-					



Fig. 18. Experimental results of integrated system to distinguish the interference of the black strip at the speed of 50 mm/s. (a) Sample with black strip. (b) ECT result (initial). (c) ECT result (processed). (d) ET result.



Fig. 19. Experimental results of the stainless steel plate by using (a), (b) the proposed structure, (c) line-coil, (d) spiral-coil the speed of 50 mm/s. (a) vertical direction.(b) horizontal direction. (c) line-coil. (d) spiral-coil.

also estimates their length under proper conditions. According to Fig. 19(b), substituting the parameters into (18) of each speed and average repeatedly, the length of the natural stress corrosion crack can be calculated which it is ranged between 55 and 60 mm. The S value of detection result in stainless steel is added in Table II.

In thermal detection, the horizontal natural crack is observable when the speed is 50 mm/s, however it becomes blurred at 100 mm/s and the situation worsens with the increase of speed. Fig. 19(b) shows the detection results of the thermal images at the speed of 50 mm/s in stainless steel. In comparison, Fig. 19(c) shows the testing result by adopting line-coil and Fig. 19(d) shows the testing result by adopting spiral-coil. It can be observed that the detection results of both using line-coil and spiral-coil are dissatisfactory under the speed effect, the crack can hardly be discovered by using line-coil and it is unclear by using spiral-coil. The TC values of different excitation coils in stainless steel are added in Table II, and the "×" refers to the crack cannot be detected in this way. From the results, compared with the line-coil and spiral-coil, the thermal contrast of the proposed mechanism is average enhanced with 55% and 64% in 45# steel, 68.3% and 62% in 316# stainless, as well as 120%

and 70% in stainless steel. In addition, the supplement of the coil probes improves the detection sensitivity of the proposed structure average by 15.7%, 25.2%, and 38.4% in the samples of 45# steel, 316# stainless, and stainless steel, respectively. These demonstrate the obvious superiority of the proposed detection system.

According to the change trend of the voltage curves and the temperature distribution of the thermal images, the above experimental results are consistent with the simulation results. In particular, the comparisons with the other two common excitation coils indicate that the proposed multiphysics structured system has strong detection capability and reliability.

IV. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this article, an efficient moving detection mode of a multiphysics structured system was proposed. The theoretical analysis of dynamic eddy current testing and eddy current thermography was presented. Both numerical simulations and verification experiments were conducted to demonstrate the feasibility and detectability of the proposed system. Several conclusions can be drawn as follows.

- In the proposed model, the advantages of ET and ECT complemented each other, the coupling structure enhances the detectability and reduces the false alarm by reinforcing the evaluation of the defect region from two physics mechanisms simultaneously.
- The required excitation current for the mechanism is small in metal plates inspection (45# steel 20 A, 316# stainless 25 A, natural microcrack in stainless steel 100 A) due to the multiphysics structured model compared to conventional ECT.
- 3) The specimens can be evaluated fast by scanning at the speed of 50–250 mm/s which improved the speed of detection.
- 4) The results of the experiments verify the executability of the system and provide a method for estimating the length of horizontal cracks under specified conditions.

Future work will concentrate on multi-dimensional scanning detection of infrastructures which would probably by means of a robotic arm.

REFERENCES

- M. Trimm, "An overview of nondestructive evaluation methods," *Practical Failure Anal.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 17–31, 2003.
- [2] B. Gao, Y. He, W. L. Woo, G. Y. Tian, J. Liu, and Y. Hu, "Multidimensional tensor-based inductive thermography with multiple physical fields for offshore wind turbine gear inspection," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 6305–6315, Oct. 2016.
- [3] G. Y. Tian *et al.*, "Eddy current pulsed thermography for fatigue evaluation of gear," *Amer. Inst. Phys.*, vol. 1581, 2014, Art. no. 1652.
- [4] R. Yang and Y. He, "Optically and non-optically excited thermography for composites: A review," *Infrared Phys. Technol.*, vol. 75, pp. 26–50, 2016.
- [5] B. Gao, W. L. Woo, Y. He, and G. Y. Tian, "Unsupervised sparse pattern diagnostic of defects with inductive thermography imaging system," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 371–383, Feb. 2016.
- [6] O. Lucia, P. Maussion, E. J. Dede, and J. M. Burdío, "Induction heating technology and its applications: Past developments, current technology, and future challenges," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 2509– 2520, May 2014.
- [7] N. Kasai *et al.*, "Quantitative investigation of a standard test shim for magnetic particle testing," *NDT&E Int.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 421–426, 2011.

- [8] H. Xue and Q. Yang, "Nondestructive testing of pressure vessels: Penetrant testing," *Nondestructive Testing.*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 357–363, 2004.
- [9] F. Bettayeb, S. Haciane, and S. Aoudia, "Improving the time resolution and signal noise ratio of ultrasonic testing of welds by the wavelet packet," *NDT&E Int.*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 478–484, 2005.
- [10] M. Ghate and K. Bhope, "Development, optimization and validation of ultrasonic testing for NDE of ELM coils," *Fusion Eng. Des.*, vol. 121, pp. 218–226, 2017.
- [11] G. Wang and T. W. Liao, "Automatic identification of different types of welding defects in radiographic images," *NDT&E Int.*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 519–528, 2002.
- [12] M. Morozov, G. Rubinacci, A. Tamburrino, and S. Ventre, "Numerical models of volumetric insulating cracks in eddy-current testing with experimental validation," *IEEE Trans. Magn.*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1568–1576, May 2006.
- [13] M. Fan et al., "Analytical modeling for transient probe response in pulsed eddy current testing," NDT&E Int., vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 376–383, 2009.
- [14] I. Z. Abidin *et al.*, "Quantitative evaluation of angular defects by pulsed eddy current thermography," *NDT&E Int.*, vol. 43, no. 7, pp. 537–546, 2010.
- [15] L. Cheng, B. Gao, G. Y. Tian, W. L. Woo, and G. Berthiau, "Impact damage detection and identification using eddy current pulsed thermography through integration of PCA and ICA," *IEEE Sens. J.*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1655–1663, May 2014.
- [16] H. Zhang *et al.*, "Optical and mechanical excitation thermography for impact response in basalt-carbon hybrid fiber-reinforced composite laminates," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 514–522, Feb. 2018.
- [17] R. Yang *et al.*, "Lateral heat conduction based eddy current thermography for detection of parallel cracks and rail tread oblique cracks," *Measurement*, vol. 66, pp. 54–61, 2015.
- [18] Y. He *et al.*, "An investigation into eddy current pulsed thermography for detection of corrosion blister," *Corrosion Sci.*, vol. 78, pp. 1–6, 2014.
- [19] Y. He and R. Yang, "Eddy current volume heating thermography and phase analysis for imaging characterization of interface delamination in CFRP," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 1287–1297, Dec. 2015.
- [20] M. Macecek, "Advanced eddy current array defect imaging," NDT&E Int., vol. 30, no. 3, p. 178, 1997.
- [21] Z. Sun *et al.*, "A flexible arrayed eddy current sensor for inspection of hollow axle inner surfaces," *Sensors*, vol. 16, no. 7, 2016, Art. no. 952.
- [22] H. Endo et al., "Natural crack sizing based on eddy current image and electromagnetic field analyse," in Proc. AIP Conf. Amer. Inst. Phys., 2006, Art. no. 720.
- [23] H. Min *et al.*, "Crack detection based on a moving mode of eddy current thermography method," *Measurement*, vol. 109, pp. 119–129, 2017.
- [24] M. He *et al.*, "Methods for suppression of the effect of uneven surface emissivity of material in the moving mode of eddy current thermography," *Appl. Thermal Eng.*, vol. 118,pp. 612–620, 2017.
- [25] Y. Gao et al., "Multiple cracks detection and visualization using magnetic flux leakage and eddy current pulsed thermography," Sens. Actuators A, Phys., vol. 234, pp. 269–281, 2015.
- [26] K. Li, G. Y. Tian, L. Cheng, A. Yin, W. Cao, and S. Crichton, "State detection of bond wires in IGBT modules using eddy current pulsed thermography," *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.*, vol. 29, no. 9, pp. 5000–5009, Sep. 2014.
- [27] Z. Liu, B. Gao, and G. Y. Tian, "Natural cracks diagnosis system based on novel L-shaped electromagnetic sensing thermography," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, no. 99, p. 1, to be published, doi: 10.1109/tie.2019.2952782.
- [28] M. Goldammer et al., "Automated induction thermography of generator components," in Proc. AIP Conf. Proc., 2010, vol. 1211, pp. 451–457.
- [29] M. Streza *et al.*, "An active thermography approach for thermal and electrical characterization of thermoelectric materials," *J. Phys. D, Appl. Phys.*, vol. 49, no. 28, 2016, Art. no. 285601.
- [30] Z. W. Yang *et al.*, "A novel inclined excitation method for crack detection of non-ferromagnetic materials using eddy current thermography," *Strength Mater.*, vol. 51, pp. 558–568, 2019.
- [31] Y. K. Shin and Y. Sun, "Numerical techniques for solving magnetostatic problems involving motion and nonuniform geometry," *IEEE Trans. Magn.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 1161–1166, Mar. 1997.
- [32] C. Yang, B. Gao, Q. Ma, L. Xie, G. Y. Tian, and Y. Yin, "Multi-layer magnetic focusing sensor structure for pulsed remote field eddy current," *IEEE Sens. J.*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 2490–2499, Apr. 2019.
- [33] A. J. Lipton, H. Fujiyoshi, and R. S. Patil, "Moving target classification and tracking from real-time video," in *Proc. 4th IEEE Workshop Appl. Comput. Vis.*, 1998, pp. 8–14.



Haoran Li received the B.Sc. degree in electrical engineering and automation and the M.Sc. degree in control science and engineering from the Southwest University of Science and Technology, Mianyang, China, in 2015 and 2018, respectively. He is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, China.

His current research mainly focuses on eddy current testing and thermography as well as in-

strumentation manufacturing.



Bin Gao (Senior Member, IEEE) received the B.Sc. degree in communications and signal processing from Southwest Jiao Tong University, Chengdu, China, in 2005, the M.Sc. degree (distinction) in communications and signal processing and the Ph.D. degree from Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K., in 2006 and 2011, respectively.

He worked as a Research Associate (2011– 2013) with Newcastle University on wearable acoustic sensor technology. He is currently a

Professor with the School of Automation Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, China. He is also a very active Reviewer for many international journals and long standing conferences. He has coordinated several research projects from National Natural Science Foundation of China. His current research interests include electromagnetic and thermography sensing, machine learning, nondestructive testing and evaluation where he actively publishes in these areas.



Ling Miao received the B.Sc. degree in electrical engineering and automation from the Tianjin University of Technology, Tianjin, China, in 2014. She is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, China.

Her current research mainly focuses on induction heating power and eddy current thermography.



Dong Liu received the B.Sc. degree in physics from Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, in 2004, the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in control science and engineering from the University of Electronic Science and Technology, Chengdu, China, in 2010 and 2017, respectively.

He is currently a Research Associate with the School of Automation Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China. His current research interests include crystal oscillators, piezoelectric sensor and eddy current sensor.



Giuping Ma received the B.Sc. degree in electronic information engineering from Sichuan Normal University, Chengdu, China, in 2017,. She is currently working toward the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in nondestructive testing using eddy current technique with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu.

Her current research interests focus on eddy current testing including near-remote filed eddy current testing and eddy current array.



Guiyun Tian (Senior Member, IEEE) received the B.Sc. degree in metrology and instrumentation and the M.Sc. degree in precision engineering from the University of Sichuan, Chengdu, China, in 1985 and 1988, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in precision engineering from the University of Derby, Derby, U.K., in 1998.

From 2000 to 2006, he was a Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Reader, Professor, and the Head of the group of Systems Engineering, respectively, with the University of Huddersfield, U.K. Since

2007, he has been based at Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K., where he has been the Chair Professor in Sensor Technologies. He is currently also an Adjunct Professor with the School of Automation Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu. He has coordinated several research projects from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), Royal Academy of Engineering and FP7, on top of this he also has good collaboration with leading industrial companies such as Airbus, Rolls Royce, BP, nPower, Networkrail, and TWI among others.



Wai Lok Woo (Senior Member, IEEE) received the B.Eng. degree in electrical and electronics engineering, and the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in statistical machine learning from Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K., in 1993, 1995, and 1998, respectively.

He was the Director of Research with the Newcastle Research and Innovation Institute, and the Director of operations with Newcastle University. He is currently a Professor of Machine Learning with Northumbria University,

Newcastle upon Tyne. He has published more than 400 papers on these topics on various journals and international conference proceedings. His research interests include the mathematical theory and algorithms for data science and analytics, artificial intelligence, machine learning, data mining, latent component analysis, multidimensional signal, and image processing.

Prof. Woo is a Member of the Institution Engineering Technology. He was the recipient of the IEE Prize and the British Commonwealth Scholarship. He serves as an Associate Editor to several international signal processing journals, including *IET Signal Processing*, the *Journal* of Computers, and the Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering.