audioplay

PEAK CURRENT REQUIREMENT OF COMMERCIAL LOUDSPEAKER SYSTEMS

Matti Otala Otamation Inc. Helsinki, Finland

Pertti Huttunen Polarpro Inc. Kuusamo, Finland

Presented at the 79th Convention 1985 October 12-16 New York





This preprint has been reproduced from the author's advance manuscript, without editing, corrections or consideration by the Review Board. The AES takes no responsibility for the contents.

Additional preprints may be obtained by sending request and remittance to the Audio Engineering Society, 60 East 42nd Street, New York, New York 10165 USA.

All rights reserved. Reproduction of this preprint, or any portion thereof, is not permitted without direct permission from the Journal of the Audio Engineering Society.

AN AUDIO ENGINEERING SOCIETY PREPRINT

2293 (C-17)

PEAK CURRENT REQUIREMENT OF COMMERCIAL LOUDSPEAKER SYSTEMS

Matti Otala Otamation Inc., Helsinki, Finland

Pertti Huttunen Polarpro Inc., Kuusamo, Finland

Abstract

Measured terminal impedances of several commercial loudspeaker systems are developed into their equivalent electrical circuits by using the Brune network synthesis method. The synthesized circuits accurately describe the properties of the load as seen by the amplifier feeding the loudspeaker system.

A group of non-sinusoidal audio signal sequences, which cause the loudspeaker system to draw momentary currents considerably in excess of what could be expected from the rated terminal impedance is identified using computerized network analysis methods. The maximum value of peak current reported for a commercial loudspeaker system is 6.6 times larger than that of an eight ohm resistor. The current peaks typically last a few hundred microseconds.

The current peaks are caused by simultaneous parallel excitation of several of the drivers of a multiway system, by summation of cancellation currents originating from the energy stored in the mechanical and electrical reactances of the circuit, and by impedance transformation effects in the cross-over network.

The results imply that for short periods of time an amplifier should be able to drive, with full output voltage swing and without appreciable distortion, loads equal to a resistor of one ohm.

INTRODUCTION

A loudspeaker has a rated impedance, typically 8 ohms. International standards prescribe that a loudspeaker may not exhibit less than 80 % (i.e., 6.3 ohms) of its rated impedance in any part of its rated frequency range. The same standards prescribe that the performance of an amplifier is to be measured using a purely resistive rated load, normally 8 ohms (1).

Typical measured loudspeaker impedance plots show minima of 4 ohms or less, some dipping below 2 ohms. Moreover, loudspeakers exhibit highly reactive behaviour with typical impedance phase angle ranges of -60 to +60 degrees. Most commercial audio power amplifiers have seemingly been designed and tested using only the rated resistive load and exhibit gross harmonic distortion and/or severely reduced output voltage when driving complex loads resembling real-life loudspeakers (2).

The above measurements were performed using a sinusoidal signal, thereby exciting one driver of a multiway loudspeaker system only. However, a complex load such as a loudspeaker behaves markedly differently when excited with non-sinusoidal signals. Considerably larger current drains than those for a resistive load have been measured and reported elsewhere (3-6). To make the simplest possible illustration, consider a resistor and symmetrical square-wave voltage excitation. Then connect a capacitor in series with the resistor. The peak current drawn by the network will increase to twice the current drawn by the resistor alone, even though the "impedance" of the circuit has increased.

The worst excitation signals reported have been variable-length square-wave sequences (3). Experimental search of the signal sequences is time-consuming, and a more analytical procedure would be welcome. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate such a method.

LOUDSPEAKER IMPEDANCE MODELLING

Loudspeaker equivalent circuits have usually been derived from driver mechanical parameters by using electro-mechanical analogy. This method is inaccurate because it neglects the influence of the cabinet and many electrically relevant second-order driver parameters, and also makes the analysis of the cross-over network difficult. A more accurate method is to measure the terminal impedance of the loudspeaker and to derive the electrical equivalent circuit by using network synthesis methods. Three popular three-way loudspeaker systems were analyzed; Infinity Rsb, Yamaha NS 1000 M, and Heco Phon 3. The measurements were performed at 1 volt (rms) excitation level and the results therefore represent the linear operating region of the loudspeakers. The loudspeaker terminal impedances were measured for the woofer, the midrange, and the tweeter separately by dissecting the cross-over network at the speaker system terminals. This method partitions the loudspeaker system into three subsystems, each including the respective driver and its part of the cross-over network. The measurement system is depicted in Fig. 1.

The measured impedance plots were synthesized into driving point impedance polynomials by using partial fraction expansions (7). In this procedure, the modulus of the impedance and its phase were iteratively matched to the polynomial with an accuracy of 10 % or better, and the zero-phase points were matched with an accuracy better than two degrees. The resulting impedance polynomials are given in Appendix 1.

EQUIVALENT CIRCUIT SYNTHESIS

The equivalent circuits were synthesized from the calculated impedance polynomials by first performing a Foster resistance reduction preamble and a Cauer cycle, where necessary, and thereafter performing successive Brune network synthesis cycles until the synthesis procedure terminated (7). This method realizes all positive real functions with real components, and although the synthesized circuit does not necessarily resemble the actual circuit physically, it behaves electrically in the same way.

The resulting equivalent circuits are shown in Figs. 2-4. They are much more complicated than expected and contain all the effects of the cross-over network, the possible driver anomalies, and the reflected acoustic properties of the cabinet. In order to check the validity of the synthesized circuits, their impedance plots were calculated using the SPICE network analysis program run on a VAX 11/730. The results are shown in Appendix 2 along with the original measured impedances, indicating an almost perfect match.

Characteristic findings from the synthesized equivalent circuits can be summarized as follows:

- * Some of the equivalent circuits are not realizable without transformers.
- * In some cases the series arm resistance of the equivalent circuit is smaller than the driver voice coil resistance. This is probably caused by the cross-over circuit reactances acting as step-down impedance transformers (as in RF tuning circuits). It is possible that the designer has inadvertently used this effect to equalize the efficiencies of the drivers.

WORST-CASE EXCITATION SIGNALS

Using the synthesized equivalent circuits and the NAP-2 circuit analysis program run on a Univac 1100/22 computer, a search for a worst-case excitation signal was conducted. The first phase was to determine such a voltage excitation which would maximize the current into a single driver. To make certain that the signal was legitimate and realistic, it was bandwidth-limited to 20 Hz - 20 kHz and its maximum rise time set to 5 μ s. All the signals were normalized to 1 volt peak amplitude. The following signal shapes were tested on each equivalent circuit:

- 1. Half-cycle of a sinusoid, which is a realistic acoustical signal.
- 2. Sin²-pulse, which is a realistic acoustical impulse.
- Rise-time-limited step, which is a realistic acoustical transient.
- 4. Combination of a step and a half-sine.
- Non-periodic sequence of steps of equal but opposite polarity.

The basic computational procedure was to feed one signal element into the equivalent circuit while observing the current flow into the circuit. At a suitable moment, the next signal element with either the same or opposite polarity was fed into the circuit so as to increase the peak current. This procedure was repeated a few times until the peak current no longer increased. Fig. 5 shows a typical excitation sequence for one of the drivers, indicating the way the current builds up during successive properly timed voltage steps. Table 1 lists the peak currents for each signal and driver separately. The worst signals for all drivers turned out to be step sequences with variable timing.

The equivalent circuit for the complete loudspeaker system was then created by connecting the three separate circuits in parallel. The worst-case signal was synthesized by exciting the woofer section with its maximum-current signal and then adding first the midrange and thereafter the tweeter signals. The summation was carried out so that the peak voltage of the excitation signal remained at 1 volt. The worst-case signals for each of the loudspeaker systems are shown in Figs. 6-8, and the maximum system currents are listed in Table 2. The Table also shows how much larger the loudspeaker system current is as compared to the current into an 8 ohm resistor excited with the same signal. The typical duration of the peak current is 50 to 200 microseconds, i.e., not short in comparison to acoustical impulses in general.

CONCLUSIONS

It has been shown that commercial loudspeaker systems may, under suitable excitation, draw current considerably in excess of what could be deduced from their rated impedance. The maximum current found is 6.6 times larger than that drawn by an eight ohm resistor with the same excitation signal. The peak currents typically last for 50-200 microseconds.

The worst-case signals causing the excessive currents are bandwidth- and voltage-limited sequences of non-periodic steps. Similar behaviour, although with smaller peak currents, can be found using properly timed sequences of sin- and sin -pulses. All of these are fully legitimate as acoustical and musical signals. Every loudspeaker has an individual worst-case timing sequence, and no universally applicable test signal has been identified.

In order to prevent gross distortion during musical passages resembling this type of signal, the audio power amplifier must be capable of delivering linearily short-term currents into the load as if the amplifier were driving a one-ohm resistor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful for the insights and constructive criticism of Ilpo Martikainen and Ari Varla of Genelec Inc., Iisalmi, Finland, and for the numerous detailed discussions with Mamoru Sekiya and Marty Zanfino of Harman/Kardon Inc., New York, USA. University of Oulu, Finland, is gratefully acknowledged for the use of about hundred hours of their prime computer CPU time.

REFERENCES

- International Electrotechnical Commission, Publication 268-3, Geneva, Switzerland.
- (2) Sekiya, M. and Otala, M., Load handling capability of commercial power amplifiers. Audio Engineering Society 78th Convention, Anaheim, USA 1985. Preprint no 2237, 8 p.
- (3) Martikainen, I., Varla, A. and Otala, M., Input current requirements of high-quality loudspeaker systems. Audio Engineering Society 73rd Convention, Eindhoven, the Netherlands 1983. Preprint no 1987, 10 p.
- (4) Martikainen, I. and Varla, A., About loudspeaker system impedance with transient drive. Audio Engineering Society 71st Convention, Montreux, Switzerland 1982. Preprint no 1886, 13 p.
- (5) Otala, M. and Lammasniemi, J., Intermodulation distortion at the amplifier-loudspeaker interface. Part 1, Wireless World, November 1980, pp. 45-47. Part 2, Wireless World, December 1980, pp. 42-44. Based on Audio Engineering Society 59th Convention, Hamburg, Germany 1978, preprint no 1336, 19 p.
- (6) Cordell, R., Open-loop output impedance and interface intermodulation distortion in audio power amplifiers. Audio Engineering Society 64th Convention, New York City, USA 1979. Preprint no 1537, 29 p.
- (7) Weinberg, L., Network analysis and synthesis. McGraw-Hill, New York 1962, 692 p.

TABLE 1. Peak current into each driver for various excitation signals. Signals are two half-sine pulses, two sin²-pulses, step, step + half-sine, and step sequence. Excitation voltage is 1 volt peak.

LOUDSPEAKER	DRIVER	CURRENT	IN mA	AT 1 V	OLT EXCI	TATION
		sin	sin ²	step	step +sin	step seq
Infinity	woofer	249	230	206	316	462
	midrange	115	112	239	124	288
	tweeter	460	436	461	440	576
Yamaha	woofer	161	156	109	207	327
	midrange	129	126	272	138	301
	tweeter	208	190	230	208	278
Несо	woofer	231	230	201	286	356
	midrange	168	149	201	181	235
	tweeter	338	296	387	343	404

TABLE 2. Peak currents into loudspeaker systems for the worst-case step sequence. Excitation voltage is +/- 1 volt. "Multiplier" indicates how much more current the loudspeaker draws than an 8 ohm resistor for the same signal.

LOUDSPEAKER SYSTEM	CURRENT PEAK mA	MULTIPLIER re 8 ohm res
8 ohm resistor	125	1.0
Infinity	830	6.6
Yamaha	476	3.8
Несо	637	5.1



Fig. 1. Setup used to measure the impedance plots.



Fig. 2a. Synthesized equivalent circuit for Infinity Rsb woofer.



Fig. 2b. Synthesized equivalent circuit for Infinity Rsb midrange.



R1 = 0,798 Ω C1 = 7.650 μF L1 = 65.019 μH R2 = 3.375 Ω C2 = 2,444 μF

R3 = 0.640 A

Fig. 2c. Synthesized equivalent circuit for Infinity Rsb tweeter.





R1 = 3.766 n	C1 = 27.225 µF	L1 = 0,258 mH
R2 = 0.577A	C2 = 37.740 µF	L2=0.334 mH
R3 = 2.097A		

Fig. 3b. Synthesized equivalent circuit for Yamaha NS 1000 M midrange.



R1 = 2.697.0	C1 = 2.713 µF	L1 = 4.095 µH
R2 = 9.146.0	C2 = 2.621µF	L2 = 78.935 µH
R3 = 5.053A		L3 = 0.247 mH

R4 = 171.751A

Fig. 3c. Synthesized equivalent circuit for Yamaha NS 1000 M tweeter.





Fig. 4b. Synthesized equivalent circuit for Heco Phon 3 midrange.



R1 = 2,616 f	C1 = 7.197 µF	L1 = 11.884 μH
R2=2.856A	C2 = 0.729µF	L2 = 20, 276 µH
R3 = 0.2270		

Fig. 4c. Synthesized equivalent circuit for Heco Phon 3 tweeter.



Fig. 5. Current response (solid line) of Infinity Rsb woofer to a step sequence excitation of 1 volt (dotted line).



Fig. 6. Current response (solid line) of Infinity Rsb to a worst-case step sequence excitation of 1 volt (dotted line).



Fig. 7. Current response (solid line) of Yamaha NS 1000 M to a worst-case step sequence excitation of 1 volt (dotted line).



Fig. 8. Current response (solid line) of Heco Phon 3 to a worst-case step sequence excitation of 1 volt (dotted line).

APPENDIX 1

HECO Phon 3 WOOFER

$$Z(s) = 1.275 \cdot 10^{-3} \frac{s^{5} + 1.036 \cdot 10^{4}s^{4} + 9.143 \cdot 10^{7}s^{3} + 2.017 \cdot 10^{11}s^{2} + 7.516 \cdot 10^{13}s + 5.325 \cdot 10^{16}}{s^{4} + 9.516 \cdot 10^{3}s^{3} + 6.531 \cdot 10^{7}s^{2} + 8.465 \cdot 10^{9}s + 1.788 \cdot 10^{13}}$$

MIDRANGE

$$2(s) = 2,309 \cdot 10^{-4} \frac{s^4 + 2,780 \cdot 10^4 s^3 + 7,255 \cdot 10^8 s^2 + 3,711 \cdot 10^{12} s + 3,516 \cdot 10^{16}}{s(s^2 + 4,039 \cdot 10^3 s + 7,195 \cdot 10^7)}$$

TWEETER

$$Z(s) = 1,188 \cdot 10^{-5} \frac{s^4 + 7,113 \cdot 10^5 s^3 + 3,082 \cdot 10^{11} s^2 + 2,310 \cdot 10^{16} s + 8,535 \cdot 10^{20}}{s(s^2 + 4,912 \cdot 10^5 s + 7,300 \cdot 10^{10})}$$

APPENDIX 1. SYNTHESIZED IMPEDANCE POLYNOMIALS FOR THE DRIVERS

INFINITY RSD WOOFER

.

$$Z(s) = 2,363 \cdot 10^{-3} \frac{s^5 + 3,947 \cdot 10^3 s^4 + 4,736 \cdot 10^8 s^3 + 5,355 \cdot 10^{11} s^2 + 6,041 \cdot 10^{12} s + 2,342 \cdot 10^{15}}{s^4 + 3,455 \cdot 10^3 s^3 + 4,778 \cdot 10^8 s^2 + 1,178 \cdot 10^9 s + 1,582 \cdot 10^{12}}$$

MIDRANGE

$$Z(s) \approx 3,668 \cdot 10^{-4} \frac{s^{6} + 2,894 \cdot 10^{4} s^{5} + 9,955 \cdot 10^{8} s^{4} + 1,449 \cdot 10^{13} s^{3} + 2,248 \cdot 10^{17} s^{2} + 1,428 \cdot 10^{21} s + 9,306 \cdot 10^{24} s^{6} s^{$$

TWEETER

$$2(s) = 4,173 \frac{s^{3} + 7,785 \cdot 10^{5}s^{2} + 2,920 \cdot 10^{10}s + 1,237 \cdot 10^{15}}{s(s^{2} + 6,912 \cdot 10^{5}s + 3,984 \cdot 10^{10})}$$

YAMAHA NS 1000 M WOOFER

$$2(s) = 4,927 \cdot 10^{-3} \frac{s^5 + 4,286 \cdot 10^3 s^4 + 1,004 \cdot 10^7 s^3 + 8,864 \cdot 10^9 s^2 + 2,842 \cdot 10^{12} s + 4,373 \cdot 10^{14}}{s^4 + 3,914 \cdot 10^3 s^3 + 7,570 \cdot 10^6 s^2 + 6,293 \cdot 10^8 s + 4,383 \cdot 10^{11}}$$

MIDRANGE

$$Z(s) = 2.581 \cdot 10^{-4} \frac{s^4 + 3.119 \cdot 10^4 s^3 + 5.839 \cdot 10^8 s^2 + 3.519 \cdot 10^{12} s + 1.438 \cdot 10^{16}}{s(s^2 + 1.436 \cdot 10^4 s + 1.011 \cdot 10^8)}$$

TWEETER

$$Z(s) \approx 4,095 \cdot 10^{-6} \frac{s^{5} + 3,215 \cdot 10^{6}s^{4} + 7,174 \cdot 10^{11}s^{3} + 8,560 \cdot 10^{16}s^{2} + 4,187 \cdot 10^{21}s + 1,507 \cdot 10^{26}}{s(s^{3} + 3,231 \cdot 10^{5}s^{2} + 3,426 \cdot 10^{10}s + 1,674 \cdot 10^{15})}$$

IPPENDIX 2 a. MEASURED AND CALCULATED IMPEDANCE AND PHASE PLOTS Measured values are from actual measurements using the setup of Fig. 1. Calculated values are from synthesized equivalent circuits shown in Appendix 1.

Measured	modulus	of	impedance			_		_	
Measured	phase o	of	impedance	-		-		-	
Calculated	modulus	of	impedance	•	•	٠	•	•	
Calculated	phase	of	impedance	-	• -		-		











APPENDIX 2d.







