© April 2025| IJIRT | Volume 11 Issue 11 | ISSN: 2349-6002

Analysis and Overview of Printed Circuit Board Defect Detection Methods

Dr Rashmi P. Sonar, Sakshi Dudhe, Snehal Ghogare, Suhani Harsule, Ashwini Paturkar
Engineering Scholar, Department of Computer Science & Engineering, Prof Ram Meghe College of Engineering and Management, Amravati, Maharashtra, India
Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science & Engineering, Prof Ram Meghe College of Engineering and Management, Amravati, Maharashtra, India

Abstract: This paper provides an in-depth analysis and overview of various defect detection methods for Printed Circuit Boards (PCBs). A core focus is placed on feature extraction techniques, which are fundamental to accurate and reliable defect identification. The paper examines the evolution of these methods, from traditional image processing to machine learning and the now-dominant deep learning approaches, particularly Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs). A detailed discussion of feature information is presented, encompassing handcrafted, learned (with pre-processing), and deep learning-derived features. The paper highlights how different methods represent and utilize feature information, along with recent trends and algorithms that enhance feature representation and improve PCB defect detection performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Printed Circuit Boards (PCBs) are indispensable components in modern electronic devices, providing the essential connections and support for electronic components. The increasing complexity, miniaturization, and density of PCBs have led to a critical need for robust and efficient defect detection methods to ensure product quality and reliability. This paper offers a comprehensive analysis and overview of PCB defect detection methods, with a particular emphasis on the pivotal role of feature extraction in this process. Feature extraction involves transforming raw image data into a set of informative features that characterize potential defects. The effectiveness of subsequent defect detection stages relies heavily on the quality and relevance of these extracted features. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of feature extraction techniques and their application in PCB defect detection.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The development of PCB defect detection methods has progressed through three primary stages: traditional image processing-based methods, machine learning-based methods, and deep learning-based methods. A central theme in this review is the evolution of feature extraction techniques and how feature information is represented and utilized within each approach.

- 3.1 Traditional Image Processing-Based Defect Detection
  - 3.1.1 Image Processing Fundamentals:
    - Traditional image processing methods form the foundation of early PCB defect detection systems. These methods rely on analyzing image characteristics to identify deviations from expected patterns.
  - 3.1.2 Feature Information: Handcrafted Features
    - In traditional image processing, feature extraction is a manual process, where features are designed by human experts based on their knowledge of PCB defects. These "handcrafted" features are designed to capture specific, predefined defect characteristics.
    - Edge Information: Edge detection techniques, such as Canny, Sobel, and Prewitt operators, extract edge information, which is useful for identifying discontinuities in PCB patterns, such as breaks, shorts, and misalignments [Chen et al., 2019]. The feature information is represented as a binary image or a set of edge points.
    - Texture Information: Texture analysis methods, including Local Binary Pattern (LBP), Gabor filters, and Gray-Level Co-occurrence Matrix (GLCM), extract texture information, which can be used to detect surface defects, such as

scratches, stains, and uneven coatings [Ling and Isa, 2023]. The feature information is represented as statistical measures (e.g., contrast, correlation) or histograms.

- Shape Information: Shape descriptors, such as area, perimeter, and moments, are used to extract shape information, which is helpful for identifying missing components or distortions in PCB structures [Ling and Isa, 2023]. The feature information is represented as numerical values that describe the geometric properties of the regions of interest.

- 3.1.3 Defect Detection Strategies
- Traditional image processing methods can be implemented using reference-based or non-reference-based strategies. Reference-based methods compare test images with a template, while non-reference-based methods rely on predefined algorithms to identify anomalies.
- 3.1.4 Limitations
- Handcrafted features are often sensitive to variations in lighting, noise, and image orientation.
- Designing effective features requires significant domain expertise and careful parameter tuning.
- These methods may struggle to generalize to complex or subtle defects, limiting their effectiveness in modern PCB inspection [Chen et al., 2019; Ling and Isa, 2023].
- The feature information extracted may not be sufficient to distinguish between different types of defects.
- 3.2 Machine Learning-Based Defect Detection
- 3.2.1 Machine Learning Integration
- Machine learning algorithms have been integrated into PCB defect detection systems to improve detection accuracy and automation.
- 3.2.2 Feature Information: Learned Features (with Pre-processing)
- Machine learning methods can learn to classify defects, but often require a pre-processing step using traditional image processing techniques to extract initial features. The machine learning algorithm then learns to map these pre-extracted features to defect categories.
- For example, template matching can be used to locate potential defect regions, and the output of template matching (e.g., correlation coefficients) can be used as input features for a machine learning classifier.
- 3.2.3 Algorithms
- Machine learning algorithms used in PCB defect detection include Support Vector Machines (SVMs), Neural Networks (NNs), Genetic Algorithms (GAs), and Decision Trees [Ling and Isa, 2023].
- 3.2.4 Limitations
- Machine learning methods may not be fully automated and can still rely on manual feature engineering.
- The performance of machine learning methods is highly dependent on the quality of the pre-extracted features.
- Computational cost can be high, particularly for methods like template matching, which can be computationally intensive [Chen et al., 2019; Ling and Isa, 2023].
- 3.3 Deep Learning-Based Defect Detection
- 3.3.1 Deep Learning Revolution
- Deep learning, particularly Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), has revolutionized PCB defect detection due to its ability to automatically learn hierarchical and abstract features directly from image data.
- 3.3.2 Feature Information: Deep Learning-Derived Features
- CNNs learn feature representations directly from the image data, eliminating the need for manual feature engineering. The feature information is contained within the weights and activations of the network.
- CNNs extract features at multiple levels of abstraction:
- Low-level features: Edges, corners, and simple textures, represented as activations in the initial layers of the network.
- Mid-level features: More complex textures, shapes, and object parts, represented in the intermediate layers.
- High-level features: Abstract representations of defects, enabling robust detection, represented in the deeper layers of the network.
- 3.3.3 CNN Architectures for Feature Extraction
- Various CNN architectures have been employed for feature extraction in PCB defect detection.
- Efficient CNN architectures, such as MobileNet-V2 [Zheng et al., 2022], GhostNet [Wu et al.,

2022], and EfficientNetv2-L [Chi et al., 2024], are used to balance accuracy and computational efficiency. These architectures are designed to extract relevant feature information with fewer parameters and computations.

- 3.3.4 Feature Enhancement and Attention Mechanisms
  - Attention mechanisms are used to enhance feature representation by focusing on relevant image regions and suppressing irrelevant information. They allow the network to selectively attend to the most informative parts of the input image.
  - Examples include:
  - Convolutional Block Attention Module (CBAM) [Wang et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2022]: CBAM refines the feature information by applying attention along both the channel and spatial dimensions.
  - Squeeze-and-Excitation Module (SE Module) [Wu et al., 2022]: SE Module focuses on channel attention, adaptively recalibrating the channel-wise feature responses.
  - SimAM (Simple Parameter-Free Attention Module) [Pan et al., 2024]: SimAM infers attention weights based on the information theory, determining the importance of each neuron.
  - Efficient Channel Attention Networks (ECANet) [Chen et al., 2024]: ECANet is designed for efficient channel attention with low computational overhead.
  - These mechanisms help the model to focus on defect-related features and improve detection accuracy by modulating the feature information flow within the network.
- 3.3.5 Multi-Scale Feature Fusion
  - Multi-scale feature fusion is used to combine feature maps from different layers of a CNN, enabling the model to detect defects of various sizes.
  - Techniques include:
  - Feature Pyramid Networks (FPN) [Pan et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024]: FPN constructs a feature pyramid by combining low-resolution, semantically rich features with high-resolution, semantically poor features.
  - Path Aggregation Network (PAN) [Pan et al., 2024]: PAN enhances FPN by adding a bottom-up path augmentation network.
  - Improved Skip Layer [Zheng et al., 2022]: Skip connections are used to fuse feature maps from different layers.
- 3.3.6 Specialized Network Architectures
  - Specialized network architectures are designed to address specific challenges in PCB defect detection.
  - Twin networks, for example, are used to compare test images with reference images or design files [Choi and Kim, 2023].
- 3.3.7 Advanced Convolutional Techniques
  - Atrous/Dilated Convolutions: These convolutions increase the receptive field without increasing the number of parameters, useful for detecting defects of varying sizes [Zheng et al., 2022].
- 3.3.8 Data Augmentation and Generation
  - Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) are used to augment limited defect data by generating synthetic defect images, effectively expanding the feature space the network learns from.
- 3.3.9 Contextual Information
  - Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) can be used to model the relationships between different components on a PCB, aiding in defect detection by incorporating contextual feature information.
- 3.3.10 Learning Strategies
  - Transfer Learning: Using pre-trained models can improve performance when defect data is limited.
  - Few-Shot Learning: Few-shot learning techniques are used when the number of defect samples are limited [Wang et al., 2022].

4. FEATURE INFORMATION IN PCB DEFECT DETECTION

Feature information is the core of any defect detection system. It represents the characteristics of the PCB image that are relevant to identifying defects. The type of feature information and how it is extracted significantly impacts the system's performance.

- 4.1 Handcrafted Feature Information
  - Handcrafted features are designed by human experts to capture specific defect properties.
  - Examples include edge information (abrupt changes in pixel intensity), texture information (spatial variations in pixel intensity), and shape information (geometric properties of regions).
  - These features are explicitly defined and extracted using traditional image processing techniques.

- 4.2 Learned Feature Information (with Pre-processing)
  - Learned features are extracted using machine learning algorithms, often with a pre-processing step using traditional image processing techniques.
  - The pre-processing step extracts basic feature information, and the machine learning algorithm learns to combine these features to classify defects.
- 4.3 Deep Learning-Derived Feature Information
  - Deep learning models, particularly CNNs, learn feature representations directly from the image data in a hierarchical manner.
  - CNNs extract features at multiple levels of abstraction:
    - Low-level features: Represent basic image properties like edges, corners, and colors.
    - Mid-level features: Represent more complex structures and patterns.
    - High-level features: Represent abstract concepts related to the presence or absence of defects.
  - The feature information is implicitly encoded in the network's weights and activations, and the network learns to optimize these features for the defect detection task.

5. ANALYSIS OF DEFECT DETECTION METHODS

This section analyzes the different defect detection methods, focusing on how they extract and utilize feature information, and their strengths and weaknesses in terms of feature representation and detection performance.

- 5.1 Traditional Image Processing Analysis
  - Strengths:
    - Computationally efficient for simple defect detection tasks.
    - Provides interpretable feature information, as the features are designed by humans.
  - Weaknesses:
    - Limited in handling complex defects and image variations.
    - Relies heavily on manual feature engineering and domain expertise.
    - Extracted features may not be robust or discriminative enough for accurate detection.
- 5.2 Machine Learning-Based Defect Detection Analysis
  - Strengths:
    - Can learn to classify defects based on pre-extracted features, offering some automation.
    - More robust than traditional methods in some cases.
  - Weaknesses:
    - Still requires pre-processing and manual feature engineering to extract initial features.
    - Performance is highly dependent on the quality of the pre-extracted features.
    - Computational cost can be high for some algorithms.
- 5.3 Deep Learning-Based Defect Detection Analysis
  - Strengths:
    - Automatic and hierarchical feature learning, eliminating the need for manual feature engineering.
    - High accuracy and robustness for complex defect detection scenarios.
    - Ability to learn highly discriminative features that capture subtle defect characteristics.
    - State-of-the-art performance in PCB defect detection.
  - Weaknesses:
    - Requires large training datasets to learn effective feature representations.
    - Computationally intensive, although efficient architectures are being developed.
    - The learned feature representations can be difficult to interpret (black box nature).

CONCLUSION

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis and overview of PCB defect detection methods, with a strong focus on feature extraction techniques. The evolution from traditional image processing to machine learning and, most significantly, deep learning-based methods has dramatically improved the accuracy and efficiency of PCB defect detection. Deep learning, particularly CNNs, has become the dominant approach, offering automatic feature learning and state-of-the-art performance. The way each method extracts and utilizes feature information is a key differentiator. Traditional methods rely on handcrafted features, machine learning uses pre-processed features, and deep learning learns features directly from the data. The choice of defect detection method depends on the specific application requirements, including defect complexity, data availability, computational resources, and the desired level of interpretability.

FUTURE SCOPE

The future of PCB defect detection will likely involve:

- Explainable AI (XAI): Developing methods to enhance the interpretability of deep learning models, providing insights into the learned feature representations.
- Self-Supervised Learning: Reducing the need for large labeled datasets by learning feature representations from unlabeled data.
- Graph Neural Networks (GNNs): Further research on GNNs for modeling PCB circuit connectivity and incorporating contextual information into feature extraction.
- Edge Computing: Optimization of deep learning models for real-time inspection on edge devices, enabling faster and more localized defect detection.
- Multi-Sensor Fusion: Combining information from various sensors (e.g., optical images, X-ray images) to improve defect detection accuracy and robustness by capturing complementary feature information.

REFERANCE

[1] Z. Zhong and Z. Ma, ‘‘A novel defect detection algorithm for flexible integrated circuit package substrates,’’ IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron., vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 2117–2126, Feb. 2022.

[2] A.M. Darwish and A. K. Jain, ‘‘A rule based approach for visual pat_x0002_tern inspection,’’ IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell., vol. 10, no. 1,pp. 56–68, Jan. 1988

[3] T. Vafeiadis, N. Dimitriou, D. Ioannidis, T. Wotherspoon, G. Tinker, and D. Tzovaras, ‘‘A framework for inspection of dies attachment on PCB utilizing machine learning techniques,’’ J. Manage. Anal., vol. 5, no. 2,pp. 81–94, Apr. 2018.

[4] C. Rother, V. Kolmogorov, and A. Blake, ‘‘GrabCut: Interactive foreground extraction using iterated graph cuts,’’ ACM Trans. Graph., vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 309–314, 2004

[5] Y. Du, F. Yang, and X. Y. Wang, ‘‘Research on edge detection algorithm of color PCB image,’’ Video Appl. Project, vol. 35, no. 13, pp. 113–115, 2011.

[6] Tempo Automation, “How industry 4.0 impacts your pcb development,” 2021, https://www.tempoautomation.com/blog/how-industry-4-0- impacts-your-pcb-development/, Last accessed on 2022-12-23.

[7] B. Ren and L. Cheng, ‘‘Analysis and optimal design of illuminator of AOI vision system,’’ Control Autom., vol. 25, no. 27, pp. 42–44, 2009.

[8] D. B. Anitha and M. Rao, “A survey on defect detection in bare pcb and assembled pcb using image processing techniques,” in *2017 International Conference on Wireless Communications, Signal Processing and Networking (WiSPNET)*, 2017, pp. 39–43.

[9] M. Moganti, F. Erçal, C. H. Dagli, and S. Tsunekawa, “Automatic pcb inspection algorithms: A survey,” *Comput. Vis. Image Underst.*, vol. 63, pp. 287–313, 1996.

[10] T. Evgeniou and M. Pontil, “Support vector machines: Theory and applications,” in *Machine Learning and Its Applications*, vol. 2049, 092001, pp. 249–257.

[11] E. Grossi and M. Buscema, “Introduction to artificial neural networks,”*European journal of gastroenterology and hepatology*, vol. 19, pp. 1046–54, 01 2008.

[12] X. Y. Zhao, Y. T. Zhou, F. He, S. Wang, and Z. W. Zhang, ‘‘Hierarchical extraction matching printed circuit board components defect detection,’’ Instrum. Technique Sensor, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 84–89, Aug. 2018.

[13] T. Hu, B. P. Guo, and X. Guo, ‘‘Contour feature based on image registration,’’ Opto-Electron. Eng., vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 118–122, 2009

[14] J. Yao, Y. T. Ye, and J. Zhang, ‘‘Research of parsing Gerber file in PCB automatic optical inspection,’’ Comput. Eng. Des., vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 2481–2485, 2012.