

## Headphone Essentials 6:

# Interpreting headphone frequency response graphs

© Dale Cotton, 2021. All rights reserved. Version 1.0.

You may re-circulate this document. You may not claim authorship or copyright to it.

**Note:** this document is part of an instructional series. If you would like to start with more foundational background information, check out the five [previous entries](#).

In *HE4: The Skinny on Headphone Frequency Response Graphs* we looked into the concepts and pitfalls of headphone frequency response graphs in the wild. In *HE5: The whole flat/neutral/Harman thing* we investigated what an accurate/neutral headphone frequency response looks like. In this episode we'll explore what frequency response graphs tell us about what it sounds like when a headphone graph departs from strict neutrality.

Let's take the Sennheiser HD-600 as an example. This +20-year-old headphone is renowned by many as being almost the definition of a neutral headphone sound. But we see in Fig. 1 that it does both overshoot and undershoot the pale blue neutrality reference curve all along the bass to treble expanse. Now let's look at the same graph but as a recording studio engineer would see/hear it:




Fig. 1: Sennheiser HD-600 with Oratory Optimum Hifi over-ear neutral target

**Note:** the mud region actually extends from 100 to 400 hertz. Also, Sib. = sibilance, which is a piercing quality certain vocal sounds, such as S, can have when over-loud.

First off, the plunge of the HD-600's frequency response on the far left is rarely an issue, since very little music extends that deep. The largest pipe organs can get down there, synth music can. Even the deepest *basso profundo* human voice doesn't reach that low. But if your music library contains a significant amount of music that is active in that area, The HD-600 and a large majority of other headphones will disappoint. Equally, very few people over the age of 10 can hear the very highest frequencies on the right, above 17 or 18 kilohertz. And essentially no musical content reaches up anywhere near that high.

Each coloured band is a potential auditory problem area. In each case the descriptive label, such as boom or mud, refers to the sound of that area when over-loud compared to the rest of the mix. When there is too little loudness in any given area it's just called a recession. So the undershoot of the HD-600 from 350 to 1000 hertz is called a mid-range recession. Equally, the overshoot of the reference curve centred at 3. 4 kilohertz can be referred to as an upper-mids

## Interpreting headphone frequency response graphs

elevation. The thing to keep in mind is the word *potential*. Any given person is a mix of sensitivities and tolerances. For example, many a person just finds that a bit of elevation in the boom and mud region tends to impart a welcome extra sense of body to the sound. But for others even a bit of elevation there makes for a an unpleasant tubbiness. This sort of person-to-person variation is equally true for all the labeled areas. Once you gain experience regarding which overshoot areas are annoying, you'll know what to look when looking at a frequency response graph for a headphone you're considering purchasing.

Undershoots of neutral are every bit as problematic. They just don't call attention to themselves the way excesses do. For example, the recession in the honk region will obviously make notes played our sung at the frequencies a bit quieter than they should be compared to the rest of the mix. A female vocalist might sound just that much less prominent than she should, while a male vocalist might sound a bit less incisive.

If you look at enough graphs you'll notice that headphone curves past the upper-mids peak tend to be particularly jagged. These are frequencies that result from pressure waves that are small enough to be directly affected by ear anatomy. Your own outer ears and ear canals are going to have a different shape than the statistically average ear incorporated into the measurement rig. The further to the right on the graph the more likely there is to be a discrepancy between what your ears do to the sound and what the measuring rig's ear simulators do to it.

If we look at a typical premium model Focal headphone measurement graph like Fig. 2...




Fig. 2: Focal Celestee

...we see not just that the right side of the graph is jagged, but also that it's consistently lower than the target. Very few people are going to listen to a Celestee (that's pronounced sel ess tee, three distinct, un-accented syllables) and talk about spikes or daggers in their ears. Equally, they're missing a bit of clarity, or incisiveness that could potentially be there.

On the other hand, the recession between the 160 hertz line and the 600 hertz line is very common in closed-back headphones like the Celestee. When centred on the bass-to-mids transition, or cross-over, like the Celestee's is, somehow just sounds natural. Similarly, there is a nearly universal dip in the 9 to 10 kilohertz region for both open- and closed-backs. This is apparently an important sound localization feature of human ear anatomy and should not be counted as a problem.

Another common recession area is from 1 kilohertz to at least 2 kilohertz, particularly in Hifiman headphones:

### Interpreting headphone frequency response graphs




Fig. 3: Hifiman Ananda

Many find this creates a bit of extra sound stage perception, but it does so at a cost. Many people find this creates a certain lack of a sense of immediacy or presence to voices and instruments.

The biggest and most common departure from neutral is of course the bass bloat we see in so many headphone FR graphs. When well done, as it is here in this Beats headphone...




Fig. 4: Beats Solo Pro (using alternate Harman reference curve in purple)

...we get plenty of bass quantity but importantly, it drops off before the mid-range starts. By doing so it does no harm to the important mid-range, which is nicely shaped for excellent vocal and instrumental presentation. (The elevation on the right side of the graph is equally interesting. I suspect it's there to discourage people from listening too loudly and thereby heading toward tinnitus). To the right of the bass region the Harman 2018 over-ear reference curve shown in Fig. 5 is essentially the same as the Oratory Optimum HiFi curve we've been using above. But the Harman curve's bass shows the majority consumer preference in bass quantity, crucially with the tapering off happening before the mid-range begins. The Harman curve could equally have been used for the Celestee graph, depending on your personal preference.

A bass bloat gone wrong looks like this:

## Interpreting headphone frequency response graphs




Fig. 5: Beats Solo 3 Wireless

Here, the bass drop-off does not arrive until well past the bass-to-mids transition and then is followed by a serious recession in the honk and shout areas. This sacrifices the very heart of melody territory for the sake of total domination by the forces of thump and slam.

Another distinguishing characteristic of headphone graphs is the degree of smoothness or choppiness along the measurement line. We've seen that large up/down swings in the high frequencies is simply a by-product of human ear anatomy. But that isn't the case in the bass and mid-range. If we look back at the Beats Solo Pro and the Ananda, we see a fairly fine-grained waviness in the heart of the mid-range. This has to have some consequence for sound quality — most likely fairly subliminal — but I haven't heard it discussed, and I don't have experience with a sufficient number of headphones to have formed an opinion of my own.

All of the above hopefully gives the basic idea. But in reality, as stated we all have our preferences and sensitivities. A rock and metal head might well want at least as much bass as shown in the Harman curve — but also strongly prefer less of an overall ear gain region rise (reduced upper mids) to save wear and tear on his nerves from the screech of electric guitars played at max volume. For such a person the curve he should use as reference would look something like this:




Fig. 6: example personal preference curve

So this person would evaluate the Focal Celestee like so:

## Interpreting headphone frequency response graphs




Fig. 7: Celestee compared to Fig. 6 preference curve

And even then the recession in the upper-mids and treble might not even be a show-stopper given this person's genre preferences.

For example, I own both the beyerdynamic DT 1990 and the Sennheiser HD 600. To my ears the DT 1990 (with the optional analytic ear pads) is clearly preferable, even though the HD 600 looks closer to my preferred neutral target. Using the amp and DAC unit I own, the DT 1990's sound is leaner, tighter and more detailed. Somehow, this makes its mud region overshoot less noticeable than the HD 600's. But for a person with an 8 kilohertz treble sensitivity, the DT 1990 isn't even in the running.

In closing, it's time to emphasize that frequency response is not the be-all of headphone sound production. Instead, it's more like the starting point. If a car doesn't have four round wheels sporting road-worthy tires, it's not going to serve much purpose. But once that's assured, then it's time to look at the engine, the passenger area, handling, mileage, etc. I cover the basics of the headphone equivalents, such as dynamics, detail, sound stage and imaging in the earlier unit *HE2: the basics of headphone sound*. What's missing is an objective basis, such as frequency response graphs provide, with which to analyze these equally important aspects of the headphone sound signature. Which means that, short of buy-and-try, most of us are lost in a sea of highly conflicting subjective reportage.




Fig. 8: Sennheiser HD 600 and beyerdynamic DT 1990 PRO

For example, I own both the beyerdynamic DT 1990 and the Sennheiser HD 600. To my ears the DT 1990 (with the optional analytic ear pads) is clearly preferable, even though, when looking at Fig. 8, the HD 600 looks closer to my preferred neutral target. But at least using the amp and DAC unit I own, the DT 1990's sound is leaner, tighter and more detailed. Somehow,

### Interpreting headphone frequency response graphs

this makes its mud region overshoot less noticeable than the HD 600's. But for a person with an 8 kilohertz treble sensitivity, the DT 1990 isn't even in the running.



And that concludes this episode as well as the non-specialized entries in the Headphone Essentials series. The final two entries delve into some non-standard approaches to headphone equalization. As we've amply seen in this exploration, headphone sound design is so fraught with compromises that you're unlikely to perfectly match your own hearing without EQ. So if interested proceed to: *HE-7: A headphone EQ primer for Windows and Mac* (<http://daystarvisions.com/Music/index.html>).