Horn loudspeaker design—2

Continuing the development of design theories and techniques

by J. Dinsdale, M.A., M.Sc.

Cranfield Unit for Precision Engineering

The previous sections have outlined the physical principles underlying the operation of horns, and have shown how, provided certain basic rules are followed, sound reproduction of startling clarity and realism is possible from horns. However, it will also be clear by now that, unless one is prepared to accept extremely large and costly structures, it is all too easy to lose many of the potential qualities of horns through attempts to reduce the size to more acceptable proportions. This section now considers the procedures to be adopted in designing a domestic horn enclosure.

It has already been stated that the horn behaves as a transformer, converting acoustic energy at high pressure and low velocity at the throat to energy at low pressure and high velocity at the mouth. As with the analogous electrical transformer in which electrical voltage and current correspond to acoustical pressure and velocity, the basic requirements of the acoustical horn are that: (a) the primary (throat) should be correctly matched to the signal source (loudspeaker motor); (b) the secondary (mouth) should be correctly matched to the load (listening room); (c) the horn should be designed to handle the specified power level and frequency range. There are four principal parameters of the horn, namely mouth area, throat area, flare contour, and axial length. Any three of these will determine the fourth, and hence the characteristics of the horn itself. Once non-circular cross-section and non-linear axes are adopted, the problem becomes far more complex, and mathematical and physical concepts are no longer sufficient to design a horn. Nevertheless, the basic characteristics even of folded horns are determined to a large extent by known acoustic principles, and the most effective method of design is to work from these principles, ensuring that any deviation from theory is made on scientific grounds where possible.

Flare profile

Previous sections discussed the most commonly considered flare profiles, and it was concluded that a contour which allowed an exponential increase of the area of the wavefront as it travelled from throat to mouth provided the best compromise between the extremely gradual expansion of the hyperbola (giving optimum loading of the motor, but excessive throat distortion) and the rapid expansion of parabolic and conical horns (giving minimum throat distortion but poor loading of the motor). However, the exact shape of the wavefront within a horn of curved profile is uncertain, and therefore assumptions have to be made, ranging from Wilson's modified exponential (lying a little inside the true exponential) to Voigt's tractrix, (which commences in a virtually identical manner to the true exponential, but departs substantially outside it in the region of the mouth). Which contour one adopts must be largely a matter of personal preference based preferably on careful listening experience.

Mouth geometry

The mouth of the horn couples the horn itself to the listening room. One of the commonly raised disadvantages of horns is that they require a very large mouth area if bass notes are to be properly reproduced. To some extent this is true; one cannot get a double bass out of a piccolo. However, there are a number of ways in which the mouth area may be reduced to manageable proportions without significantly sacrificing bass response.

As a sound wavefront travels up the steadily increasing bore of the horn, it should not meet any major discontinuity. However, it is clear that, unless the length and mouth diameter of the horn are infinite, there must be some discontinuity as the wavefront emerges and is no longer constrained by the walls of the horn. Although the cut-off frequency of the exponential horn is determined by the flare constant, the linearity with frequency of the acoustical resistance and reactance are determined by the mouth area, which, for a given throat area and flare constant will also determine the overall length of the horn. Strictly speaking, for no discontinuity, the mouth should have infinite area. However, Olson[3] has shown that provided the perimeter of the mouth of an exponential horn is greater than four times the cut-off wavelength,

i.e. $$p_m > 4\lambda_c$$

there will be no significant deviation of mouth resistance from that of the infinite horn.

A more important result is that for only 6dB variation in acoustic resistance, the mouth perimeter may be made equal to the cut-off wavelength, i.e. mouth area = $\lambda_c^2/4\pi$ where λ_c is the cut-off wavelength. As the mouth area is reduced below this value, the non-linearity of the acoustical resistance and reactance will increase.

Now these figures refer to the situation where the horn is suspended in free space, i.e. it radiates into an angle of 4π solid radians. In practice, this situation never occurs: even if the horn were placed on the ground at the centre of an infinite field, the mouth would only radiate into half a solid angle, or 2π solid radians; against the centre of a wall the mouth would be loaded by π solid radians, and in a corner formed by two walls and the floor the mouth will be loaded by only $\pi/2$ solid radians. The significance of this is that, whereas the minimum mouth area for a circular horn has been shown to be $\lambda_c^2/4\pi$ when loaded by 4π solid radians, *this value may be divided by a factor of two each time the solid angle is halved.* Thus the mouth area may be reduced to a size more in keeping with domestic conditions, e.g. a horn with a cut-off frequency of 56Hz (wavelength 20ft) would require a mouth area of 32 sq ft in space, but only 8 sq ft against a wall and 4 sq ft in a corner position, to give variations in loading of less than 6dB.


$$4\pi$$
(free space)

$$2\pi$$
(centre of floor)

$$\pi$$
(against wall)

$$\frac{\pi}{2}$$
(corner)

Fig. 8. Solid angles presented to a horn in different positions.

This situation which is illustrated in Fig. 8 may be compared with the mouth of a single horn placed at the intersection of eight rooms: four on the ground floor and four on the first floor. The bass response of the original horn will not be impaired, even though a listener in each room will see only one eighth of the total mouth area. One seldom gets anything for nothing in this world, and those who adopt corner speaker positioning in order to obtain a purer extended bass response from as small an enclosure as possible, may have to live with the eigentones such a position produces.

A plan view of a corner horn shows that the room itself provides a natural extension of the horn mouth. Many listeners have observed that corner horns can provide bass notes from fore-shortened horns, well below the limit dictated by the mouth area[25]. It is tempting to reduce the mouth area still further below the 3dB limit established earlier and rely instead on the corner placement itself to supply the additional mouth area and horn length. In the author's experience, this technique cannot be justified because although the bass response is undoubtedly there, careful listening reveals an uneven response over the first two octaves above the cut-off frequency which will often detract from the realism offered by the horn. It is therefore recommended that in cases where overall enclosure size is a limitation, a correctly-designed horn with a cut-off frequency of (say) 80Hz will give a more satisfying and linear response than a fore-shortened horn whose expansion constant has been set to 40Hz but whose length has been limited to give a mouth area corresponding to 80Hz.

Most domestic horns will be of rectangular cross-section for ease and cheapness of manufacture. The foregoing comments regarding horns of circular section apply also to rectangular sections, although it is clear that the wavefront must behave in a most complex way at the corners, thereby reducing slightly the effective cross-sectional area. Provided that the ratio between the major and minor axes at the mouth does not exceed 4:3, rectangular horns may be employed to good effect.

Tabular design data is given for horns of both round and square section, with mouth areas computed for both corner positioning ($\pi/2$ solid radians) and wall positioning (π solid radians).

Throat geometry

The throat of the horn couples the wavefronts from the loudspeaker, which should ideally be plane at this point, to the horn itself. It has previously been shown that the horn is an acoustic transformer, converting acoustic radiation of high pressure/low velocity at the throat to low pressure/high velocity at the mouth. It is clearly of advantage to have a high pressure (and hence a low velocity) at the throat, because the low velocity will result in smaller movement of the loudspeaker cone, thus reducing the distortion produced by non-linearities in the magnetic field and the suspension. One way of increasing the pressure, and also of ensuring a higher degree of "plane-ness" of the wavefronts is to employ a throat area

substantially smaller than that of the loudspeaker itself. Tests carried out on a number of loudspeakers have shown that the "equivalent piston area" is approximately 70% of the speech cone area, i.e. the loudspeaker diaphragm in the shape of a truncated cone gives the same acoustic output as a plane piston with 70% of its area.

There are a number of practical reasons why modern loudspeakers are not manufactured as plane pistons; one of the unfortunate results of employing conical diaphragms is that the resulting wavefronts are in general not planar. However it has been found empirically that a throat area of between one quarter and one half the "equivalent piston area" of the loudspeaker provides satisfactory coupling between the loudspeaker and the horn, and also gives an approximation to plane wavefronts at wavelengths well in excess of the throat dimensions. It must be emphasized that for higher frequencies, where the wavelengths are of the same order as the physical dimensions of the loudspeaker diaphragm, the throat area should be made the same as that of the loudspeaker, and the horn should be of circular section, at least at the throat, so as to minimize standing waves across the horn itself.

The phenomenon of air overload distortion is caused by the non-linear relationship between pressure and volume of the air in the throat of the horn as it undergoes adiabatic compression and expansion. Beranek[4] has derived the relationship for 2nd harmonic distortion at the throat of an infinite exponential horn as:

$$\% \text{ 2nd harmonic distortion} = 1.73(f/f_c)I_t \times 10^{-2}$$

where $f = $ driving frequency $f_c = $ cut-off frequency $I_t = $ intensity (watts/sq in) at the throat.

This expression is also closely correct for finite horns because most of the distortion occurs near the throat. This expression has been plotted in Fig. 9 from which the throat area for given power and distortion may be obtained.

It is important to appreciate that the *acoustic* power radiated by musical instruments is extremely small[26], and that the higher the frequency the lower is the acoustic power to give the same subjective effect at the human ear. With the exception of full orchestra and pipe organ, which in the author's view it is futile to attempt to reproduce in domestic surroundings at anything

approaching normal volume level, the acoustic power levels are extremely small, and an aim-point of (say) 3 watts and 1% distortion at the cut-off frequency, reducing to 0.05 watts and 0.5% distortion at four times the cut-off frequency, is likely to prove entirely satisfactory for domestic listening[27]

The above proposals for power and distortion give a throat area of around 10 sq cm, from Fig. 9, which compares not unfavourably with the effective piston area of 43 sq cm for a $3\frac{1}{2}$in loudspeaker, one quarter of which is a little over 10 sq cm. Of course, if the throat area is increased, as would be the case with larger loudspeakers, the available power for a given level of distortion will also increase.

Having established the throat and mouth areas and the flare profile, the length of the horn and hence its area at any point may be obtained mathematically or graphically.

The horn as a filter

The foregoing sections have indicated how the horn can act as a bandpass filter— the lower pass frequency of which is determined by the expansion coefficient and the upper by the volume of the cavity between the loudspeaker and the throat of the horn. It is important that the response should be as linear and free from distortion as possible over this passband, and as far as the lower frequencies are concerned, careful choice of mouth area, in conjunction with a knowledge of the solid angle into which the horn will radiate and the flare constant, can ensure that non-linearities in the frequency response are kept to a satisfactorily low level.

However, with regard to higher frequencies, non-linearities of increasing amplitude become apparent at frequencies exceeding about four times the cut-off frequency, due to internal cross-reflections and standing waves set up within the horn itself. These non-linearities will be more serious if the material of which the horn is constructed can resonate, and they are also accentuated if the horn is folded, when wavefronts at the higher frequencies will be distorted at bends. In fact, there is also a practical limit beyond which folding becomes undesirable: folding should not occur beyond the point at which the lowest wavelength (highest frequency) to be transmitted exceeds 0.6 of the diameter of the horn. More will be said of this limitation during the discussion on folding, but it clearly points to a practical limit on the highest frequency a horn may accurately transmit.

Yet a further limitation becomes apparent from the graph of throat distortion versus frequency (Fig. 9). As the frequency increases, the percentage distortion for a given power density at the throat will also increase, and although it is generally true that in the majority of complex musical sounds the energy level reduces with increasing frequency there will still be a frequency above which throat distortion becomes unacceptable.

A commonly used and quite adequate rule of thumb is that a horn should not handle frequencies higher than four octaves above its cut-off frequency, although purists may prefer to limit at only three octaves in order to ensure lower distortion levels.

Fig. 9. Distortion caused by air overload at the throat.

The complete multi-horn system

The maximum frequency range to be handled by a wide-range high-quality loudspeaker is about 9 octaves, i.e. 40Hz to 20kHz. This is clearly too wide a range to be handled by a single horn, for the reasons already noted, but it can conveniently be divided into three ranges, i.e. 40Hz to 320Hz, 320Hz to 2.5kHz and 2.5kHz to 20kHz. In practice, a 10% overlap should be allowed to ensure that there are no troughs in the response at the crossover points, and a case could be made for a four-horn system to cover a wider range.

It is worth considering a more modest instrument. If the cut-off frequency is limited · from 80Hz to 18kHz and a two-horn system is considered with each horn handling a little under four octaves, the frequency ranges become 80Hz to 1.2kHz and 1.2kHz to 18kHz. Again, about 10% frequency overlap should be allowed.

The great attraction of a two-horn system is that only a single loudspeaker is required: the bass horn will be loaded from the rear of the loudspeaker; while the middle and treble horns will be loaded from the front of the loudspeaker, to eliminate interference and diffraction effects caused by the frame and magnet assembly at lower wavelengths. It has already been emphasized that the throat of the horn should match exactly the loudspeaker dimensions at these higher frequencies, and this arrangement is particularly attractive if a twin-cone speaker is employed. Treble wavefronts may be prevented from going down the bass horn by the cavity. To show the ease and utility of this approach, this article will include the design of a "mini-horn" utilising both sides of a single loudspeaker in a cabinet of reasonable size and cost for small domestic living rooms.

Purists may claim that the curtailed frequency range of 80Hz to 18kHz is inadequate. It is however the author's experience that the flat relatively distortionless response between these limits, together with the sense of presence afforded by the horn's transformer action, make the mini-horn sound more attractive than many commercial loudspeaker systems of similar size but two or three times its price.

Once one adopts a multi-horn approach, there will be a number of frequencies which fall within the compass of two horns, i.e. 320Hz and 2.5kHz in the case of the three-horn system, and 1.2kHz for the two-horn system. It is essential that the radiation from the relevant pair of horns should be reasonably in phase at the crossover frequency, to avoid the presence of troughs in the frequency response, because the bass horn will be folded to bring its mouth adjacent to the other horns (it is not normally necessary or desirable to fold the middle and treble horns). This requirement places a restriction on the length of the horn, which has until now been regarded as a parameter to be determined solely by the throat and mouth diameters and the flare constant, and it is now apparent that the length of the lower horn of each pair should be either an odd or even number of half wavelengths of the crossover frequency, depending on whether the radiation wavefronts at the throats of the two horns are respectively in or out of phase.

Thus, if separate loudspeakers are used and the voice coils are connected in phase, the combined length of the horns from the loudspeakers to the plane of the mouths should be an even number of half wavelengths. Conversely, if a single loudspeaker is used to feed two horns, the radiation from the front and rear of the cone will be out of phase and the combined length of the two horns should be an odd number of half wavelengths. In practice, the lower horn will be considerably longer than the upper, and will effectively determine the design.

Folding, cabinets and room placing

Hitherto, discussion has been confined to ideal horns, of circular cross-section and straight axis, constructed of very stiff material. Although typical dimensions for practical horns have not been calculated formally, it will be clear from many of the tables and diagrams that the dimensions of bass horns are almost certainly too large for comfortable accommodation in an average living room. Two further points must therefore be added to the design procedure, adoption of rectangular sections and folding the horn into a compact size.

Rayleigh showed that bends in tubes of constant cross-section will have no effect on transmitted sounds if the wavelength is large compared with the diameter, but that any cross vibrations set up will have a fundamental wavelength of 1.7 times the tube diameter. Wilson[11] has summarized the three principal rules of folding horns as follows: the wavefronts must not be twisted across the horn; the horn diameter (or width if rectangular) must be less than 0.6 times the lowest wavelength to be transmitted by that horn; the wavefront should be accelerated round bends to preserve its form.

As soon as one departs from the straight horn of circular cross-section, the scientific design principles described cease to be so relevant and become of more approximate value, although the three basic rules quoted above, together with the choice of a suitably stiff material for construction, provide very acceptable results.

A folding technique which twists the wavefront across the horn is difficult to achieve in practice, and may be eliminated by folding always in one plane. The requirement to "accelerate the wavefront around bends to preserve its form" is difficult to achieve when more than one fold is involved, since it requires a rectangular cross-section before the bend to become trapezoidal around the bend itself[11], and then revert to a different rectangular section after the bend. If one considers a multi-fold horn, concertina-fashion within an overall rectangular enclosure, this is not really a practical proposition, and is unnecessary because


(a)   (b)   (c)

section X-X   section Y-Y

mouth in disused fireplace

(d)   under floor horn   (e)

Fig. 10. Methods of folding horns (a) Olson, (b) Olson and Massa, (c) Lowther, (d) Newcombe, (e) Klipsch.

subsequent bends correct the waveform. But for single bends it can be adopted, and the mini-horn design described later could utilize this feature.

Examination of the Patent Office records for folded horn designs registered during the 1920s and 30s provides a fascinating monument to the ingenuity of acoustical designers, and Fig. 10 illustrates a number of the more well-known methods of folding. The restriction of horn width at a bend to 0.6 times the highest wavelength to be transmitted suggests initially that folding can only be attempted over the first few feet of the length of a horn; after that point the width will have reached the limiting value. However, this limitation may be overcome by bifurcating the horn (splitting into two equal channels) at each point when the width limits. Thus the mouth of a horn may comprise four equal mouths (brought together for convenience and to ensure audio realism) and the four "quarter-horns" may be folded far closer to the mouth than would otherwise be possible. Rayleigh has shown[7] in Art. 264 that bifurcating a conduit will have no effect on the transmission of sound provided the lengths of the two portions are equal and the sum of their areas at corresponding points is equal to that of the original conduit.

In many cases, the front side of a loudspeaker, whose reverse side is horn loaded, will be physically close to the mouth of the horn itself, and it is commonly feared that there will be concellation at certain frequencies caused by interference between the two radiations in anti-phase. However, the direct radiation from the unloaded front of the cone is only a few percent of that through the horn, and so the amount of cancellation is negligible.

Frequency handling

Although it has been shown that each horn acts as an acoustic bandpass filter, the lower cut-off frequency being determined by the expansion coefficient and the upper cut-off frequency by the throat cavity, there are important reasons why the full audio signal should not be applied directly to all horns regardless of their frequency handling capability. At the low frequency end of the spectrum, examination of Fig. 3 (Part 1) shows that the horn provides the loudspeaker with no resistive acoustic loading below its cut-off frequency. Thus any applied signals below this frequency will cause excessive movement of the loudspeaker diaphragm, which will be constrained only by the mechanical and electro-magnetic factors. This excessive movement can cause unpleasantly high intermodulation distortion, and can also lead to further non-linear distortion when the loudspeaker moves outside its linear range. At the upper frequency end, signals of excessive power can also give rise to distortion products due to deficiencies in the cavity/throat relationship. It is therefore beneficial to restrict the bandwidth of the electrical signal reaching each loudspeaker to match the acoustic bandwith of its corresponding horn.

Although most commercial multi-unit loudspeaker systems use passive *LC* crossover networks between power amplifier and


Fig. 11. Circuit for an active filter network. See appendix for component details.

loudspeaker to route signals of the appropriate bandwidth to each loudspeaker, careful comparative listening tests show that these units undoubtedly introduce a "dullness" or loss of "brilliance" into the audio output. Many explanations have been offered for this situation; in the author's opinion, the most likely reason being the loss of "direct drive" from the output of the amplifier, allied with a significant reduction in the degree of electro-magnetic damping afforded by the low output impedance of the amplifier.

Recent correspondence in *Wireless World*[28] and elsewhere has extolled the virtues of splitting the frequency range at low signal level, and employing a separate power amplifier directly coupled to each loudspeaker. The author has devised such a circuit, which consists of three (or four) parallel frequency-selective channels comprising Sallen & Key active filters giving preset low and high-pass characteristics in series in each channel, together with some gain adjustment to allow for the inevitable differences in sensitivity of each loudspeaker/horn combination. The active filters provide 2nd order Butterworth characteristics, a response which appears to give the least displeasing effects at the cross-over frequencies. (There will inevitably be phase-shifts associated with any filter circuit, and the effects of these on transients can produce a marked difference in their character.) This circuit is in Fig. 11 and the Appendix.

Thus, some form of electrical cross-over is generally necessary in addition to the acoustic cross-over provided by the horn itself. An exception is of course the case where a single loudspeaker drives two horns: one loading the front and one loading the rear of the diaphragm. In this situation, some compromise will be necessary in the acceptable distortion level and bandwidth of the loudspeaker system.

Directional horns

This article has extolled the ability of the horn to propagate wavefronts that are nearly plane at its mouth. However, there are situations where it is desirable to propagate wavefronts with different characteristics in the vertical and horizontal planes, particularly when middle and treble horns are used in stereophonic systems; it is often desirable to spread the wavefronts in the vertical plane while preserving more of a "point-source" in the horizontal plane. There are a number of different techniques

for achieving this, based on diffraction and refraction effects at the horn mouth with the comparatively short wavelengths (a few inches or less) with which these high frequency horns are concerned.

The design and manufacture of multi-cellular horns, distributed-source horns, diffraction horns and reciprocal-flare horns is beyond the scope of this article, and with the exception of the first two mentioned is probably outside the capability of most amateur constructors. Those interested should refer to the papers by Smith[29], Winslow[30] and to the relevant chapters by Olson[3] and Cohen[5].

Klipsch[16,17] has described the design of his high frequency horn, in which the length/breadth ratio of the (rectangular) mouth assumes a value in excess of 4:1 c.f. the ratio of near unity advocated for bass horns). The optimum dimensions, length/breadth ratio, and apportionment of flare to the long and short axes depend on a number of complex factors, however, an aspect ratio between 2:1 and 4:1 with the flare apportioned in similar ratio has been found to give good practical results, and these parameters have been adopted for the "no-compromise horn" to be described. Although the high frequency horn of the "mini-horn" system is specified as circular (in view of its handling the relatively large wavelengths at 1kHz) an alternative rectangular mouth with aspect ratio of 2.5:1 has also been described.

Detailed design procedure

The previous sections have dealt in some detail with the basic theory of the horn, and the essential design procedures have been outlined for a series of horns which can cover the complete audio range. The final sections will consider the detail design of two horns: a "mini-horn" and a "no-compromise horn".

Because all horns are designed to slightly different requirements, and inevitably many readers will wish to "bend" the specification to a greater or lesser extent in order to satisfy their own needs, the designs are presented here by means of tables so that they represent a comprehensive design code for a wide range of horns.

Bass horn design

The bass horn should be examined initially, commencing with the mouth. Tables 1, 2 and 3 indicate the relationship between

Table 1

Freq. (Hz)	Wave-length (ft)	Diameter (ft)	Area (sq. ft)
30	37.5	11.94	111.98
40	28.13	8.95	62.92
50	22.5	7.16	40.27
60	18.75	5.97	28.0
70	16.07	5.12	20.59
80	14.06	4.48	15.77
90	12.5	3.98	12.44
100	11.25	3.58	10.07
110	10.23	3.25	8.30
120	9.38	2.98	6.98

Table 1. Minimum mouth dimensions for bass horn (free loading).

Table 2

Freq. (Hz)	Area (sq. ft)	Dia. (ft)	Sq. side (ft)	Rect. sides (ft)	
30	28	5.97	5.29	4.69	5.97
40	15.73	4.47	3.96	3.52	4.47
50	10.07	3.58	3.17	2.81	3.58
60	7.0	2.98	2.64	2.34	2.98
70	5.15	2.56	2.27	2.01	2.56
80	3.94	2.24	1.98	1.76	2.24
90	3.11	1.99	1.76	1.56	1.99
100	2.52	1.79	1.58	1.41	1.79
110	2.07	1.62	1.44	1.27	1.62
120	1.74	1.49	1.32	1.17	1.49

Table 2. Minimum mouth dimensions for bass horn (wall position).

Table 3

Freq. (Hz)	Area (sq. ft)	Dia. (ft)	Sq. side (ft)	Rect. sides (ft)	
30	14.0	4.22	3.75	3.32	4.22
40	7.87	3.16	2.81	2.49	3.16
50	5.03	2.53	2.24	1.99	2.53
60	3.5	2.11	1.87	1.66	2.11
70	2.57	1.80	1.60	1.42	1.80
80	1.97	1.58	1.40	1.24	1.58
90	1.55	1.41	1.25	1.10	1.41
100	1.26	1.27	1.12	0.995	1.27
110	1.04	1.15	1.02	0.904	1.15
120	0.87	1.05	0.93	0.829	1.05

Table 3. Minimum mouth dimensions for bass horn (corner position).

Table 4

Freq. (Hz)	Wave-length (in)	Dia. (in)	Area (sq. in)	Sq. side (in)	Rect. sides (in)	
200	67.5	32.2	815.4	28.6	25.3	32.2
250	54.0	25.8	522.9	22.3	20.3	25.8
300	45.0	21.5	365.1	19.1	16.9	21.5
350	38.57	18.4	265.9	16.3	14.5	18.4
400	33.75	16.1	203.6	14.3	12.6	16.1
450	30	14.3	160.6	12.7	11.3	14.3
500	27.0	12.9	130.7	11.4	10.1	12.9
550	24.55	11.7	107.5	10.4	9.2	11.7
600	22.5	10.7	89.9	9.5	8.4	10.7
700	19.28	9.2	66.5	8.2	7.2	9.2
800	16.88	8.1	51.5	7.2	6.3	8.1
900	15	7.2	40.7	6.4	5.6	7.2
1000	13.5	6.4	32.2	5.7	5.1	6.4
1100	12.27	5.9	27.3	5.2	4.6	5.9
1200	11.25	5.4	22.9	4.8	4.2	5.4
1300	10.38	4.9	18.8	4.3	3.9	4.9
1400	9.64	4.6	16.6	4.1	3.6	4.6
1500	9	4.3	14.5	3.8	3.4	4.3
2000	6.75	3.2	8.0	2.8	2.5	3.2
2500	5.40	2.6	5.3	2.3	2.0	2.6

Table 4. Minimum mouth dimensions for mid/top horn (free loading).

Table 5

Freq. (Hz)	Cut-off freq. (Hz)	Flare coeff. (ft⁻¹)	Area increase (% ft⁻¹)	Doubling dist. (ft)
30	25	.278	32	2.49
40	33	.366	44	1.89
50	42	.466	59	1.49
60	50	.555	74	1.25
70	58	.644	90	1.08
80	66	.733	108	.945
90	75	.833	130	.832
100	84	.932	154	.744
110	92	1.02	178	.679
120	100	1.11	205	.624

Table 5. Exponential constants for bass horn.

Table 6

Freq. (Hz)	Cut-off freq. (Hz)	Flare coeff. (in⁻¹)	Area increase (% in⁻¹)	Doubling dist. (in)
200	166	.155	17	4.48
250	208	.193	21	3.59
300	250	.233	26	2.97
350	292	.271	31	2.56
400	330	.307	36	2.26
450	375	.349	42	1.98
500	420	.391	48	1.77
550	458	.426	53	1.63
600	500	.465	59	1.49
700	580	.539	71	1.29
800	660	.614	85	1.13
900	750	.698	101	.993
1000	840	.781	118	.887
1100	920	.855	135	.810
1200	1000	.930	153	.745
1300	1083	1.01	175	.686
1400	1166	1.08	196	.642
1500	1250	1.163	218	.596
2000	1660	1.54	368	.450
2500	2080	1.93	590	.359

Table 6. Exponential constants for mid/top horn.

Table 7

Nom. dia. (in)	Area (sq. in)	Effective area (sq. in)	Throat area (sq. in)	Throat area (sq. ft)
3½	9.62	6.74	2.02	.014
5	19.64	13.75	4.12	.029
6½	33.19	23.23	6.97	.048
8	50.27	35.19	10.56	.073
10	78.55	54.99	16.50	.114

Table 7. Throat dimensions.

Table 10

Freq. (Hz)	3½	5	6½	8
200	30.9	26.3	22.9	20.3
250	22.5	18.8	16.1	14.0
300	17.1	14.0	11.8	10.0
350	13.6	10.9	8.98	7.46
400	11.1	8.78	7.07	5.73
450	9.09	7.05	5.55	
500	7.58	5.77	4.42	
550	6.51	4.84		
600	5.56			
700	4.24			
800	3.31			
900	2.58			

Table 10. Length of mid/top horn (in), free loading. Since the mouth perimeter equals 1.5 times the highest working wavelength, the tractrix cannot be used. Tractrix contours can however be incorporated if the mouth perimeter is reduced to one wavelength.

Table 8

Freq. (Hz)	3½ Ex	3½ Tr	5 Ex	5 Tr	6½ Ex	6½ Tr	8 Ex	8 Tr	10 Ex	10 Tr
30	27.3	25.1	24.7	22.5	22.9	20.7	21.4	19.2	19.8	17.6
40	19.2	17.6	17.2	15.6	15.8	14.2	14.7	13.1	13.5	11.9
50	14.1	12.8	12.6	11.3	11.5	10.2	10.6	9.3	9.62	8.30
60	11.2	10.1	9.88	8.78	8.98	7.88	8.22	7.12	7.42	6.32
70	9.17	8.23	8.05	7.11	7.25	6.31	6.60	5.66	5.92	4.98
80	7.69	6.83	6.70	5.84	6.01	5.15	5.44	4.58	4.83	3.97
90	6.48	5.75	5.61	4.88	5.00	4.27	4.50	3.77	3.97	3.24
100	5.57	4.91	4.79	4.13	4.25	3.59	3.80	3.14	3.32	2.66
110	4.90	4.30	4.18	3.58	3.69	3.09	3.28	2.68	2.84	2.24
120	4.34	3.79	3.68	3.13	3.23	2.68	2.85	2.30	2.46	1.91

Table 8. Length of bass horn (ft) for different flare constants, wall position. Ex-exponential, Tr-tractrix. N.B. The tractrix lengths are approximate.

Table 9

Freq. (Hz)	3½ Ex	3½ Tr	5 Ex	5 Tr	6½ Ex	6½ Tr	8 Ex	8 Tr	10 Ex	10 Tr
30	24.8	22.6	22.2	20.0	20.4	18.2	18.9	16.7	17.3	15.1
40	17.3	15.7	15.3	13.7	13.9	12.3	12.8	11.2	11.6	10.0
50	12.6	11.3	11.1	9.8	9.98	8.66	9.08	7.76	8.12	6.80
60	9.95	8.85	8.64	7.54	7.73	6.63	6.97	5.87	6.17	5.07
70	8.10	7.16	6.96	6.02	6.18	5.24	5.53	4.59	4.83	3.89
80	6.75	5.89	5.75	4.89	5.07	4.21	4.50	3.64	3.89	3.03
90	5.65	4.92	4.78	4.05	4.17	3.44	3.67	2.94		
100	4.83	4.17	4.05	3.39	3.51	2.85				
110	4.22	3.62	3.51	2.91						
120	3.72	3.17								

Table 9. Length of brass horn (ft) for different flare constants, corner position. Ex-exponential, Tr-tractrix. N.B. The tractrix lengths are approximate.

minimum frequency and mouth dimensions for horns positioned in free air (4π solid radians) at a wall (π solid radians), and in a corner ($\pi/2$ solid radians). In table 1, the speed of sound has been taken as 1125 ft/sec, and the mouth perimeter as the wavelength. The mouth areas in tables 2 and 3 are equal to $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{8}$ respectively of the mouth area in free air, and the dimensions for the circular, square and rectangular mouths are derived from these areas. It is tempting to reduce the areas of the square and rectangular horns so as to give a perimeter equivalent to the wavelength (suitably scaled for wall or corner positioning) but this is not recommended. However, the shorter side of the rectangular horn has been derived in this way (i.e. a square horn with this side would have the appropriate perimeter).

After settling the mouth dimensions, the throat may be determined from the chosen loudspeaker unit. Table 7 gives suggested throat areas for five typical mean loudspeaker sizes. In some designs, the choice of loudspeaker will be influenced by considerations of overall size (the length of the horn is greatest for the smallest loudspeaker) and whether the loudspeaker is to perform as both bass and mid/top driver, using two separate horns on either side. Many loudspeakers will possess different dimensions, and in these cases table 7 will be of little value. The effective area (piston area) has been taken as 0.7 of the area derived from the mean (quoted) diameter, and the throat area as 0.3 of the effective area. Although there is obviously scope for experiment here, the quoted dimensions should give very acceptable results.

Having decided the throat and mouth areas, tables 8 and 9 give the overall lengths of horns with true exponential and tractrix contours for both wall and corner placing for horns with the five derived throat areas at each of the cut-off frequencies specified in table 1. The factor of 1.2 applied to the cut-off frequency in table 5 when calculating the flare coefficient is to ensure a fairly linear frequency relationship throughout the working range of the horn. The flare coefficient m is thus given by

$$m = (4\pi/c)(f/1.2)$$

where c is the speed of sound (1125ft/sec) and f is the lowest frequency to be reproduced.

The area increase is given by $(e^m - 1)\%$ and the doubling distance by $(log_e 2)/m$ for each frequency. The length of the exponential horn is given by $(1/m) \, log_e \, S_m/S_T$ for each specified set of areas, and the length of the tractrix horn will be $r_m(1 - log_e 2)$ shorter than the true exponential, where $S_m =$ mouth area, $S_T =$ throat area, $r_m =$ mouth radius.

N.B. The tractrix lengths given in tables 8 and 9 are approximations, being based on the fully developed tractrix referred to the flare cut-off frequency, whereas the mouth radius is referred to the lowest bass frequency to be reproduced.

Middle top horn design

Attention should now be directed to the middle and high frequency horns. The mouth perimeter should not be less than the wavelength of the lowest working frequency, and in practice a perimeter of 1.5 times the lowest working frequency has been found to give good results. Table 4 is based on this factor of 1.5, and gives the recommended minimum mouth dimensions for free air loading. It is safest to assume free air loading to apply at these higher frequencies, because diffraction and reflection effects at short wavelengths prevent true wall or corner loading from being achieved, and it is for this same reason that the perimeter has been specified at 1.5 times the wavelength of the lowest working frequency. The dimensions of square and rectangular horns have been derived in the same way as those in tables 2 and 3. The throat dimensions of middle and high frequency horns should match the drive unit directly, and may be taken as the mean diameter and area of the chosen loudspeaker, shown in table 7. Tables 6 and 10 give the flare constants and lengths of exponential horns assuming the throat and mouth dimensions of tables 7 and 4 respectively.

Integration of multiple horns

It has been emphasized that the radiation from the mouths of each pair of horns at their common crossover frequency should be in-phase. Assuming that the mouths of all the horns will lie in the same plane, the total length of each pair of horns should be compared with the multiples of half wavelengths of the crossover frequency set out in table 11. If the drive signals at both throats are in-phase (separate loudspeakers), the total length should be an even number of half-wavelengths; if the drive signals are out-of-phase (single speaker horn-loaded at both front and rear) the total length should be an odd number of half wavelengths. If necessary, small changes may be made to the crossover frequency (with subsequent re-design of the higher frequency horn) to ensure optimum conditions at crossover.

The complete design

The bass horn will generally be folded. Originally it was intended to provide a table giving the maximum permitted length of horn before folding should cease because the horn diameter has become equal to 0.6 times the lowest wavelength to be transmitted. However, examination has shown that at frequencies up to five times the bass cut-off frequency (i.e. 4 octaves bandwidth) this restriction does not apply to the corner-positioned horn (due to the small mouth dimensions) and with the wall-positioned horn the limitation lies between 92% and 95% of the full exponential length. It may therefore be assumed that provided the wall-positioned horn is not folded within the final 10% of its length, the problem of cross reflections will not arise.

Finally, the cavities at the throats of the lower frequency horns should be designed in accordance with the formula already given, remembering to allow for the loss of cavity volume due to the frame, magnet and cone assembly of the loudspeaker itself.

The design procedure laid down in this part has been applied to two different designs of horn to follow, and further examples of overall horn design are given in refs 34 to 37, and also in ref. 5.

Appendix

A variable bandpass active filter for feeding a 3 horn loudspeaker system (see Fig. 11):

Low-pass filter

Frequency (Hz)	R_1 (kΩ)	R_2 (kΩ)	C_1 (pF)	C_2 (pF)
200	59	59	20,000	10,000
1k	12	12	20,000	10,000
2k	59	59	2,000	1,000
10k	12	12	2,000	1,000
6k	59	59	680	330
30k	12	12	680	330

N.B. R_1 & R_2 to be realized as 12k in series with 47k log pots.

High-pass filter

Frequency (Hz)	R_3 (kΩ)	R_4 (kΩ)	C_3 (pF)	C_4 (pF)
25	28	57	160,000	160,000
100	7	14	160,000	160,000
250	28	57	16,000	16,000
1k	7	14	16,000	16,000
4k	28	57	1,000	1,000
16k	7	14	1,000	1,000

N.B. R_3 to be realized as 6.8k in series with 22k log pot. R_4 to be realized as 12k in series with 47k log pot.

All i.cs to be Signetics N5741V, etc. R_5 10k log, R_6 22k, R_7 100k.

REFERENCES

28. "Biamplifier Loudspeakers", correspondence in *Wireless World*, Mar., May, June, Aug., Sept., 1973.
29. Smith, R. H., "A Distributed-Source Horn", *Audio Engineering*, Jan. 1951.
30. Winslow, "Two-way Speaker System", *Audio Engineering*, Nov. 1947.
31. Sanial, A. J., "Graphs for Exponential Horn Design", *RCA Review*.
32. "The Design of Acoustic Exponential Horns", *Electronic Engineering*, Sept. 1947.
33. Newcombe, A. L., Jr., "Home Installation, Design and Performance of an Exponential Low-frequency Horn", *IEE Trans, Audio & Electro-acoustics*, Vol. AU-15 No. 4, Dec. 1967.
34. Massa, F., "Loudspeakers for High Fidelity Large-scale Reproduction of Sound", *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, Vol. 8, Oct. 1936.
35. Olson, H. F. & Hackley, R. A., "Combination Horn and Direct Radiator Loudspeaker", *Proc. I.R.E.*, Vol. 24, No. 12, Dec. 1936.
36. Olson, H. F. & Massa, F., "A Compound Horn Loudspeaker", *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, Vol. 8, July 1936.
37. McProud, C. G., "A New Corner Speaker Design", *Audio Engineering*, Jan./Feb. 1949.
38. Keele, D. B., Jnr., "Optimum Horn Mouth Size".*
39. Gilliam, J. R., "Optimising Horn Loudspeaker Performance".*
*Papers presented at the 46th Convention of the Audio Engineering Society, New York, Sept. 1973.