Experiences with low and high cost 3D surface scanner
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ABSTRACT - The increasing importance of virtual techniques in archaeology and anthropology puts the question of adequate hardware and software applications for a digitalization of collections for museums and institutions into the focus. Especially the market for mobile 3D scanning developed rapidly during the last years and provides a range of different models suitable for scientific purposes today. As the requirements for archaeological and anthropological applications are very high and differentiated - due to the, in some cases very complex surface morphologies of the objects and the different textures from shiny obsidian to porous bone - the decision for a scanner model is often complicated. The Neanderthal Museum and the Royal Belgian Institute of Sciences have been testing six different surface scanner from four companies during the last months concerning their suitability for archaeological and anthropological objects. Quality of the 3D models was rated by the visibility and exactness of standard attributes used for classification of the object type in archaeology or anthropology. Results are presented here. Generally, all types of archaeological and anthropological objects can be digitalized with surface scanner. If a high end or a low budget model should be used depends on the texture of the object and the intended purpose.
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Introduction

Virtual techniques and three-dimensional modeling have become increasingly important for archaeology and anthropology over the last few years. The possibilities of accomplishing research digitally on screen have made enormous progress within short time and open a wide range of new analysis options (see e.g. Guipert et al. 2003; Mafart & Delignette 2002; Zollikofer et al. 1998).

Especially in the nowadays widely established discipline of virtual anthropology theoretical foundations were laid (see e.g. Bookstein et al. 2004; Gibbons 2002; Gunz et al. 2004; Mafart et al. 2004; Recheis et al. 1999; Weber et al. 1998) and a number of important studies working with digitalized specimen have been published (see e.g. Falk et al. 2000; Neubauer et al. 2004; Pfisterer et al. 2007; Seidler et al. 1997; Weber et al. 2004; Zollikofer et al. 1995). Less frequently, digital techniques have also
been applied in Palaeolithic archaeology (see e.g. Borderie et al. 2004; Sumner & Riddle 2008). The advantages of 3D models are obvious as they do not only reduce traveling costs and preserve the originals but also assist the developing of new interdisciplinary approaches.

Digitalization of artefacts and human bones is often done by generating stereolithographic models (STLs) from computed tomography (CT) slices. CT scanning gives insights into the inner structures of scanned objects - an advantage no other system can offer. Recent developments of µ-CT in anthropology also study microstructures of human fossils with a resolution of 5 to 50 µm/pixel. Nevertheless where only the surface morphology is needed, 3D scanner offer a competitive and mobile alternative that could open the door for an extensive digitalization of archaeological and anthropological material.

During the last months, the Neanderthal Museum and the Royal Belgian Institute of Sciences (RBINS) subjected several surface scanner to test applications with the goal to ascertain which scanner suites best for which material and intended purpose. Tested were scanner by the companies Breuckmann, DEIOS, DesCam and NextEngine (Fig. 1). Materials were stone artefacts, ceramic and human fossils. Criteria for rating the quality of STLs were for stone artefacts the sharpness of retouches and Wallner lines. STLs of anthropological objects were evaluated after the visibility of sutures and the correct visualization of cancellous bone. The third important criterion for anthropological objects was how complete complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Structured Light</th>
<th>Structured Light Laser</th>
<th>Laser</th>
<th>Multi Laser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Breuckmann</td>
<td>Breuckmann</td>
<td>DEIOS</td>
<td>Nextengine HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-calibration</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automatic scan</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (recomposed)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtered</td>
<td>yes (optional)</td>
<td>yes (optional)</td>
<td>yes (each 10 nm)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>5 Mp colour</td>
<td>1.4 Mp colour</td>
<td>1 Mp monochrome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy (µm)</td>
<td>+/- 5 µm bis 100 µm</td>
<td>+/- 10 bis 50 µm</td>
<td>+/- 18 µm bis 148 µm</td>
<td>+/- 200 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. depth resolution</td>
<td>2 µm</td>
<td>2 µm</td>
<td>+/- 120 µm bis 360 µm</td>
<td>+/- 120 µm bis 360 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Time</td>
<td>1 sec</td>
<td>1 sec</td>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>23000 points/sec 28000 points/sec 35 - 150 sec 15 - 105 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of View</td>
<td>60 mm diag</td>
<td>90 mm diag</td>
<td>50 mm diag</td>
<td>180 mm diag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. resolution</td>
<td>15 µm</td>
<td>90 µm</td>
<td>50 µm</td>
<td>25 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed at max. resolution</td>
<td>1 sec</td>
<td>1 sec</td>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>23000 points/sec 28000 points/sec 150 sec 105 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of View</td>
<td>600 mm diag</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>225 mm</td>
<td>70 mm stripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>+/- 25 µm</td>
<td>+/- 25 µm</td>
<td>+/- 28000 points/sec 100 µm 200 µm 200 µm diag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>1 sec</td>
<td>1 sec</td>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>23000 points/sec 150 sec 105 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of View</td>
<td>1500 mm diag</td>
<td>600 mm diag</td>
<td>600 mm diag</td>
<td>100 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>+/- 380 µm</td>
<td>+/- 380 µm</td>
<td>+/- 200000 points/sec 100 µm 100 µm 190 µm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>1 sec</td>
<td>1 sec</td>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>230000 points/sec 150 sec 105 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating Plate</td>
<td>yes, but not included</td>
<td>yes, but not included</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement arm</td>
<td>robot (optional)</td>
<td>robot (optional)</td>
<td>7 axes arm</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software included</td>
<td>OPTOCAT</td>
<td>OPTOCAT</td>
<td>Kube</td>
<td>ScanStudio HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D alignment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D post processing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>export</td>
<td>STL, PLY, VRML</td>
<td>STL, PLY, VRML</td>
<td>STL, ASCII, IGES</td>
<td>STL, PLY, OBJ, VRML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import</td>
<td>STL, PLY, VRML</td>
<td>STL, PLY, VRML</td>
<td>STL, ASCII, IGES</td>
<td>STL, PLY, OBJ, VRML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max triangles</td>
<td>100 Mio</td>
<td>100 Mio</td>
<td>100 Mio</td>
<td>100 Mio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>about 80000 €</td>
<td>about 50000 €</td>
<td>about 100000 € (not yet available)</td>
<td>about 93000 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about 26000 €</td>
<td>about 23000 €</td>
<td>about 3100 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Table of tested scanner models.

Abb. 1. Übersichtstabelle der getesteten Scanner-Modelle.
structures like vertebrae or the area around the Arcus zygomaticus were recognized by the scanner and if the inner surface of eye sockets or foramen openings could be captured. For ceramic we considered most important that all details of the decoration are recognizable. Further tests in cooperation with the IIIPC de Cantabria, the MUPAC and the company Breuckmann also concerned rock art, portable art and statues (Breuckmann et al. in preparation).

Methods of 3D scanning

3D scanners analyze the surface information (shape and sometimes also colour) of real world objects by projecting laser beams or structured light on the object. From these data, digital three-dimensional models can be constructed. As the information is based on the light that is reflected, shiny, mirroring or transparent objects encounter some difficulties. There is a wide range of different technologies.

Topometric 3D scanner work with a pattern of structured light projected on the object and a digital camera. A point cloud is then calculated based on the geometry of the sensor system and the phase images acquired by the camera.

Multi-laser scanner use an array of lasers to scan in parallel.

Handheld laser scanner project a dot or line onto the object from a handheld device and a sensor measures the distance to the surface.

To create a three-dimensional model, the scanner have to take a series of shots from different angles. Those shots can be aligned automatically by the software or might have to be aligned manually.

The market offers a wide range of different 3D scanner models from € 3 000 far beyond € 60 000. Our task was to explore the possibilities and limits of models from different price segments to find out which expenditures should be made to obtain suitable results. All scanners used in our tests do provide colour information.

Test results

Breuckmann

Breuckmann scanner work with structured light that is projected on the object via the patented MPT-technology, and digital cameras.

For the scanning of a skull we worked with the topometric 3D scanner smartSCAN3D. The smartSCAN3D works with the OPTOCAT software and offers a resolution of up to 50 μm depending on the used measuring field. The smartSCAN3D has already been applied successfully in palaeoanthropology by the Senckenberg Museum (Hemm-Herkner 2007).

With a fully automated turntable we were able to scan a complete skull within under five minutes in good quality. The skull is placed on the turntable, which turns operated by the software. The different shots are aligned automatically. But separate scanning of the base of the skull and of complex details like the Arcus zygomaticus is necessary and has to be aligned manually. A disadvantage is that the scanner cannot capture the inner surface of a skull. The opening of the Foramen magnum does only provide space to reach very small areas of the endocranium. The eye sockets are also very time intensive to scan as a large series of shots is necessary to record the complete area and align it. If those details are not necessary, a quick and high-value scanning of skulls is possible with the smartSCAN3D. Producing an exact digital copy of a skull is still a time consuming task.

For scanning of a small flint backed bladelet the optoTOP-HE was used. The optoTOP-HE is available with a standard objective with a measuring field of 50 mm to 775 mm diagonal. With supplementary telephoto- and wide-angle-lenses 30 mm to 1050 mm diagonal can be reached. The digital camera works with 1.4 MegaPixel and can be upgraded to 6.6 Mega-Pixel. optoTOP-HE works also with OPTOCAT.

The optoTOP-HE was used in several palaeoanthropological studies before (Henke & Tattersall 2007; Kullmer 2004; Ulhaast et al. 2007) but was first tested on a stone artefact by us.

It took several runnings before we found settings that produced results suitable for scientific purposes. A scanner with a measuring field of 60 mm diagonal, a lateral resolution of ca. 40 μm and a camera resolution of 1.4 MP finally produced the best scanning result for a stone artefact generally (Fig. 2). The retouches are very clearly and accurately visible and even the waves of percussion are in evidence. No other scanner recorded waves of percussion. We were able to examine all technological aspects of the backed bladelet on the STL, which means with such a high quality scan the complete stone artefact analysis could be done digitally while the original could be indeed very far away. The only remaining weakness of this method is...
the raw material. Even though surface colour and texture is recorded by most 3D scanner, colours are still not realistic enough in most cases and aspects like the level of transparency or occlusions in the material are not detailed enough in the scans.

**Descam**
The DesCam ModelMaker Z is another high-end scanner. Unlike the other scanner used in our test, the ModelMaker Z is a handheld laser scanner. It works with a 7-axes-tactile-index-arm that is passed around the object by the person who accomplishes the scan. So in this case, the scanner turns around the object while usually the object that is scanned has to be turned. Important to know is that the movement by a human hand does not produce irregularities in the scan. The ModelMaker Z is available with a band size of 50, 100 and 200 mm and works with the software KUBE.

We scanned a point with fine retouches and a polished white patina. Even with finest band range and point density, the ModelMaker couldn’t produce scans that would have fitted for scientific purposes. Most surprising, the glossy surface of the point was no problem for the scanner, but it couldn’t capture the small retouches precisely enough.

We also tried to scan the point with the MicroScribe digitizer with a laser scanner head. The MicroScribe is a model especially designed for scanning of small objects and has an operating range of 1.27 m to 1.67 m. It works with the utility-software MUSE. Results produced with the MicroScribe were somewhat better but unfortunately still not precisely enough for stone artefact analysis (Fig. 3).

Much more appropriate results are produced by the ModelMaker Z in scanning of complex bony structures like skulls or vertebrae. The 7-axes-tactile-index-arm allows scanning of complete skulls within a single measuring procedure and the flexible sensor can be used to scan the inner surface of a skull or eye sockets relatively uncomplicated (Fig. 4). It is possible to stop the scan during the measuring procedure to turn the object and then continue without having to start a new scan. This makes complicated and time consuming fusion of different scans to one STL model unnecessary. Scanning of a complete human skull with all details would take ten to fifteen minutes. The

---

**Fig. 3.** STL of a point scanned with a DesCam ModelMaker Z.  
**Abb. 3.** STL einer Spitze, gescannt mit einem DesCam ModelMaker Z Scanner.

**Fig. 4.** Fronto-lateral view of a skull scanned with a DesCam ModelMaker Z and detail of the region around the Arcus zygomaticus.  
**Abb. 4.** Fronto-laterale Ansicht eines Schädels, gescannt mit einem DesCam ModelMaker Z Scanner und Detailansicht der Region um den Arcus zygomaticus.
software does alignment automatically during the scanning process without any problems. The scanner was also used successfully in palaeontology for digitalizing a dinosaur skull (Hone 2005).

**Deios**

During two years RBINS and DEIOS collaborated in developing a 3D scanner prototype specially dedicated to archaeological and anthropological objects and using a patented technology of structured light with laser source (Fig. 5). The prototype used a B/W camera with a set of coloured LCD filters in order to obtain the complete colorimetric profile of each pixel. The DEIOS prototype has to be considered as the state of the art of 3D surface scanning, but in the second part of 2008 a bankruptcy of the DEIOS Company unfortunately abandoned the progress abruptly. The prototype was sold by the trustee and is not open to archaeological and anthropological investigations any more.

**NextEngine**

The multi-laser scanner NextEngine is a low budget model also affordable for smaller museums and institutions. We tested the 2020i Desktop 3D NextEngine HD. This is the newest version of the scanner with major technical improvements. The NextEngine is delivered with a fully automated turntable for 360° acquisition. The previous version of Nextengine scanner was already used for recording rock art (Cavers et al. 2008) and metallic decoration (Guidi et al. 2007).

We did a first set of scanning with the Studioscan 1.7.3 application, which cannot use the HD functionalities. Different settings of resolution (macro or wide) and speed can be defined for the scan. The fastest operates in 35 seconds while the best resolution necessitates 120 seconds. Complete acquisition of a hand axe needs a 360° acquisition composed of 8-12 shots and at least two series in order to scan the top and the bottom parts of the artefact. The number of shots is about 20 in order to digitize the whole artefact with texture and mesh.

With the NextEngine we scanned the same flint point as with the ModelMaker. Scanning of ten shots took 21 minutes in standard resolution, without post-processing and alignment. The retouches were badly captured and sometimes even wrong reproduced. The surface had a lot of holes. This is due to the difficult, glossy texture of the object.

Scanning of a flint core with patina produced usable results with the same settings. Negatives were clearly visible and the scan had only very small holes. The scanning procedure took around 45 minutes, postprocessing another 40 minutes.

The third lithic object we scanned was a flint dirk with retouched surface. Scanning took 33 - 43 minutes, depending on the settings. Even with highest resolution, retouches were only visible with colour texture. The stereolithographic model showed no retouches at all, so the scanner did not record the 3D information of the retouches.

The skull of the Neanderthal Spy II was also scanned with wide view and yielded a good result (Fig. 6). Scanning took more than a day and it could be...
shown that there is no qualitative difference between scans in highest and normal resolution.

Since 2009, the NexEngine is delivered with a new version of the software Studioscan HD that in theory allows obtaining more accurate models. We compared the old software package and the new one with a neolithic hache (Fig. 7). The resolution is higher and the retouches are now visible in most of cases. Some defects remain and are due to high contrast in the texture which is interpreted as relief.

The HD scanning is also faster. It takes 105 sec by shot and it is possible to buy additional software (ScanStudio HD Pro) that scans twice as fast with a higher resolution.

We also evaluated the NextEngine for scanning of pottery with ornamentation. It is sometime difficult to see the ornamentation techniques with a heterogeneous texture. Removing texture on the scanned view allows seeing the details of the décor (Fig. 8).

Scans done with the NextEngine can be in a good quality depending on the texture of the scanned object. The NextEngine is a good tool for 3D representation in museums, lectures or movies. It is also very useful for simple surface scanning as for the reconstitution of ornamentation techniques of pottery.

Scanning of complexes surface is possible but necessitates many shots and a long post-processing and alignment time. The software aligns automatically in many cases but manual alignment is still necessary for objects with low contrast or with too many points. Problems also occurred during fusing of the different shots. The software is limited to fuse ~2 million points with textures and ~4 million points with out textures (NextEngine support). This is mainly due to the 32 bit windows application and could not be enough for highly detailed model of large object.

This could be solved by the use of an external 3D application for the post-processing of the data like Rapidform or other 3D softwares with 64 bit OS. NextEngine is also developing a 64 bit version os Scanstudio for Windows XP64/Vista 64.

Discussion

In general, stone artefacts were the most difficult objects to scan with the models we used. This is due to their smooth texture, which is in most cases semi-transparent and glassy as well. Such a kind of surface absorbs most of the projected laser light and causes imprecise results, especially for fine details like retouches. A dark colour further complicates the scanning. High-resolution scanner with tight laser raster and high-quality software like the Breuckmann models still produce good results suitable for scientific purposes. A solution for scanning stone artefacts with budget-priced scanner is the use of a white developer spray on menstruum basis. Such sprays can be removed with water after scanning (Hemm-Herkner 2007) but spraying of artefacts is often impossible due to conservation restraints. Therefore, we did not use spray in our tests.

The enamel of teeth also absorbs part of the laser beam. But as the absorption is much lower than for flint or obsidian, spraying usually is not necessary if the time for repeated scanning and intensive post-processing is taken, even with lower priced models.
The texture of bones is in principle uncomplicated for scanning but their complex geometry can cause difficulties. Scanner with a tactile index arm like the DesCam Model Maker are the best solution for anthropological applications. They do not only significantly reduce the time for scanning but also allow capturing of elements like the inner surface of the skull or the eye sockets, which are not - or only fragmentarily - attainable by other scanner.

Challenging is the scanning of cancellous bone. As a lot of fossils dealt with in palaeoanthropology are broken, this is a problem that appears quite often and unfortunately cannot be resolved completely. A greater number of shots in highest resolution produce better results but perfect quality can’t be reached for cancellous bone with surface scanning. Even stereolithographic models generated after CT data sometimes struggle with the graphical representation of cancellous bone.

Our point is that the decision for a scanner should be taken on base of the intended purpose. A high priced scanner is not necessarily the best choice for every task.

Despite the difficulties and the money and time that have to be invested, surface scanning should become a standard application in archaeology and palaeoanthropology. 3D scanner are mobile alternatives to CT scanning and make digital copies of the precious originals available for research. Over the online database NESPOS (www.nespos.org) the data can be shared with colleagues worldwide, which reduces traveling costs and preserves the cultural heritage (Beren & Slizewski 2008; Weniger et al. 2007).
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