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*Abstract*—Loudspeakers are electromechanical systems; therefore, they exhibit many non-linearities and unwanted responses to an input signal. Manufacturers favour spending huge amounts of money perfecting the balance between the mechanical and electrical parts of the loudspeaker system such that the input signal is reproduced accurately as a sound wave, instead of using feedback techniques, in order to drive up the price of higher fidelity sound systems. Here, a methodology for simulating a subwoofer driver with feedback and feed-forward techniques is presented. It is predicted that the performance of a cheap subwoofer driver paired with relevant control circuitry rivals that of an expensive system.
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# Introduction

E.R. Hanson stated in [1] that loudspeakers should be as small as possible, respond as linearly and across as much of the frequency spectrum as possible, to distort minimally, and to consume and emit power efficiently. The practical nature of conventional loudspeaker designs is such that this aim is difficult to achieve across the entire audible frequency spectrum. Hi-fi audio setups will therefore make use of multiple speakers, each responding adequately in a particular part of the audible frequency spectrum, to achieve a fairly linear response overall. The added complexity of multiple speakers and their associated crossover and filter electronics will vastly increase the price of such systems, relegating most consumers to inferior quality, single-speaker setups.

The worst-offending loudspeaker in the available range is the subwoofer – since it must move much larger amounts of air than woofers or tweeters, they are often much larger, more expensive, and more prone to distortions. In the sub-70Hz “sub-bass” range, performance is considered unreliable. [2]

This project combines these two problems; the aim is to take a cheap subwoofer driver and explore open- and closed-loop compensation electronics improvements to its response, focusing on the sub-bass frequencies. The cost of such electronic solutions in combination with a cheap subwoofer system should be significantly cheaper than the price of a similarly performing, non-compensated existing system. Thus, the audio-conscious consumer would have a cheaper way of achieving better audio reproduction, companies could earn more profit from existing systems, and the compensation techniques could be applied to any system exhibiting similar physical properties as a loudspeaker.

# Loudspeaker Theory

## Equivalent Circuit Diagram

A loudspeaker may be modelled as two circuits which interact through a magnetic field. From a design perspective, this is a very powerful tool – a full electrical simulation for a subwoofer in a box can also be combined with compensation circuit simulations, which saves time and makes the design process much easier. The electrical circuit is the voice coil resistance *RE* and inductance *LE*. The mechanical circuit represents the mass of the cone and air, the spring property of the suspension, and the total mechanical damping effects as an equivalent capacitance *MMs*, inductance *CMs*, and resistance *RMs* respectively [3]. These two circuits are linked by a transformer that represents the back-emf/force constant, *Bl*, which represents the constant of proportionality between force on the cone and current through the coil. The work in [4] introduces a simple equivalent circuit model (Fig. 1).

In accordance with the introduced force-current proportionality, and with the intuition that, since all the mechanical parts of the loudspeaker are attached, they must share the same velocity, the simple circuit can be improved. Using standard techniques to refer values on the secondary of a transformer to its primary, the equivalent mechanical circuit parameters can be placed in parallel with the electrical circuit parameters, and the coupling effect may be removed from the circuit. Both improvements are shown in Fig. 2.

An enclosure represents an additional mechanical resistance *RB*, since the loudspeaker is now affixed to a non-moving mounting face, which impedes more subtle movements than in the unmounted case. The compression of air behind the speaker that the box stiffens the cone suspension, thereby decreasing compliance, which is represented as an additional equivalent inductance *CB*. This represents the final additions to the equivalent electromechanical circuit that are actually relevant from a design perspective – any other additions would increase the accuracy of the model but only marginally, so it’s easier to just ignore these. Fig. 3 shows the final equivalent circuit used for the project.

A full system block diagram for a loudspeaker is shown by Fig. 4 [5] [6]. The electrical system forms a low-pass filter, whose cut-off frequency will lie above the frequency of operation. The mechanical system forms a band-pass filter – below its resonant frequency, for a subwoofer, the cone will be moving slowly but pushing a large volume of air, which requires large forces, and therefore large currents. Above resonance, less air is being moved but the cone moves faster; as the cone’s acceleration increases, the force and therefore the current required increases. To achieve this project’s aim, it is more important to satisfy below-resonance requirements as opposed to those above resonance. Of note in [4] is that, assuming that the force on the cone is non-linear, it can be shown that the effects of a non-linear cone suspension are stronger than at higher frequencies, legitimising further the choice of using a subwoofer as part of this project.

## Thiele-Small Parameters

The Loudspeaker driver manufacturers do not directly quote values for MM, CM, RM etc. because it is difficult to measure these values directly. Instead, a set of values known as Thiele-Small parameters (TSPs), described in [7]. These values are easier for loudspeaker driver manufacturers to measure and can be converted into an equivalent circuit by the user if necessary. They also give a viewer a more intuitive view of the driver’s performance – whilst the equivalent circuit parameters describe individually each aspect of the mechanical parts of the driver, the correlation between their variation and a change in the driver’s performance is not easily obvious.

Common TSPs stated by manufacturers are [7]:

* *fs* – the driver’s unmounted resonant frequency
* *RE* – voice coil DC resistance
* *QM* – driver mechanical circuit Q-factor
* *QE* – driver electrical circuit Q-factor
* *QT* – driver total Q-factor
* *VAS* – driver compliance equivalent volume (a volume of air having equal compliance as the driver’s suspension)
* *Znom* – voice coil nominal impedance
* *Bl* – back-emf/force constant
* *Sd* – cone surface area
* *Xmax* – maximum cone excursion from equilibrium
* *D* – cone diameter

With TSPs, the equivalent circuit for a loudspeaker can be derived, and a box’s compliance and mechanical resistance can be added into it.

It can be the case that an actual driver’s TSPs will vary from the nominal ones given on a data sheet; it therefore may be advisable to measure all TSPs manually for each driver.

# Prepare Your Paper Before Styling

The methodology that was undertaken in the project thus far shall now be described. All SPICE models used are given in the Appendix.

Firstly, a driver was selected. For this project, the Pyle PLPW6D was chosen partly for its cheapness, but also because it features two voice coils. This dual voice-coil (DVC) setup could be used for a driving/sensing setup, where one voice coil drives the cone, and another provides the control circuitry discussed above with a reference signal. Therefore, the act of sensing would not impede upon the act of driving. The TSPs supplied in its datasheet [11] are given in the Appendix. On the datasheet can also be found the manufacturer’s impedance plot for the driver, which shall be referred to henceforth as the datasheet plot.

Whilst waiting for delivery of the drivers from the supplier, background research and initial simulations of electrical circuits occurred. As can be seen from the PLPW6D’s TSPs, some calculations were necessary to find Bl and CMS, MMS, RMS. These equations, laid out in [7], along with common circuit analysis techniques, were used to derive the equivalent circuit:

It was initially assumed that the amplifier’s output impedance was a necessary component in the equivalent circuit. Whilst it is true that amplifiers feature non-linearity and distortion, these effects are orders of magnitude lower than those for the loudspeaker, and so the amplifier could be ignored.

The voice coil’s inductance was initially erroneously derived from the resonant peak of the datasheet plot. After the error was identified, it was then estimated from the impedance at 20kHz of the datasheet plot – at high frequencies for an RL low-pass filter, only the inductor will define circuit behaviour.

The most important TSP that required calculation was Bl, as all equivalent circuit parameters are dependent on it. However, CMS can be calculated first as it only depends on VAS, which was given:

C\_MS=V\_AS/(ρ(cS\_d )^2 ) (1)

C\_MS=0.63 mm/N

Bl could then be calculated using:

Bl=√(R\_E/(2πf\_s Q\_ES C\_MS )) (2)

Bl=6.16 Tm

At the driver’s resonant frequency, only the equivalent mechanical capacitance and inductance would define the circuit. Therefore:

M\_MS=1/(C\_MS (2πf\_s )^2 ) (3)

M\_MS=14.76 g

RMS could then be derived from the mechanical circuit and its Q-factor:

R\_MS=1/Q\_MS √(M\_MS/C\_MS ) (4)

R\_MS=1.33 Ns/m

From the relationships seen in Figs. 2 and 3, the electrical equivalent values were derived, and the circuit was simulated in SPICE using these values:

C\_MS^'=23.9mH M\_MS^'=388.95μF R\_MS^'=28.42 Ω

It should be noted that the methodology from this point onwards is flawed – this will be discussed after the results section of this document.

The Linkwitz Transform [12,13] was chosen as the best open-loop compensator for the subwoofer system. This is because it not only extends the bass response for a subwoofer, but also reduces the group delay of the system, meaning that the driver responds faster to an input signal, reducing potential lag between different parts of the audio reproduction signal chain. Traditional equalisation methods revolve around introducing electronically a pair of zeros to cancel out undesirable poles in the frequency response to try and flatten it. Further detail is given in the appendix. There are two methods of designing a Linkwitz Transform for a system:

Using the original formulas laid out by the transform’s late designer [12].

Using resources available from the late designer’s website [13] that automate the process of designing and optimising the circuit for a system.

Many hours were spent on optimising the Linkwitz Transform for the simulated circuit. Many different values were given to the design tools available to try and ascertain a perfectly flat response that still gave a reduction in group delay. Eventually, one circuit topology was chosen:

Impedance measurements for each voice coil were taken using a Bode 100 Impedance Analyser. Connections were made across each voice coil’s terminals, as well as across both voice coils to ensure that there was no electrical coupling between the two. The resulting impedance plots were used to verify the calculated inductance of the voice coils.

A design for a box commenced. Putting a driver into a reasonably sized box is guaranteed to increase its resonant frequency, because the air behind the driver is sealed in the box and therefore has a compliance. The air can be thought of as a spring, stiffening the driver’s suspension – below resonance, adequate power is required to overcome this spring.

It is best to choose a new resonant frequency for the driver-box system and ascertain the power requirements for the system at that point.

This can be done by ascertaining the acceleration of the cone at this frequency:

a=(2πf)^2∙X\_max (5)

Given this acceleration, the force required to accelerate the mass of the cone can be found, and this can be converted into a current through Bl. Since the excursion must not exceed Xmax¬, the calculated force may be considered as a peak force, so the equivalent current can be considered a peak current Ip.

This peak current may be converted into a power amplifier requirement given the impedance of the voice coil as seen in the specification:

P=(Ip/√2)^2∙Z\_nom (6)

P=28.7893 W

By definition, the driver can only excurse to Xmax¬ given the calculated peak force, which is equivalent as saying that the box has a certain compliance – a certain amount of excursion per Newton. Thus, a new box compliance is derived.

C\_B=0.17 mm/N

This compliance can be converted through Bl into an equivalent circuit parameter, and into an equivalent volume of air using (1). This volume is the volume of the inside of the box.

Vol=5.74 litres

The box resistance is large enough such that when combined in parallel with RMS, it barely alters RMS. Therefore, it may be ignored if sufficiently large.

Some further simple arithmetic can be conducted to form the dimensions of the exterior of the box, given a material thickness. This whole process was automated using MATLAB, the code for which is given in the Appendix.

The box was modelled in Autodesk Fusion 360 to ensure visually that the driver would fit inside it, and that the dimensions seemed reasonable.

A Simulink model was created to ensure that Xmax would not be disobeyed, given a certain size of box. To derive Xmax, the current through the capacitor was measured – this current is analogous to the force on the moving mass of the subwoofer through Bl. Dividing this force by the mass of the cone MMS gives the acceleration of the cone in time, so a double integral yields the displacement of the cone from equilibrium at that point in time. The implementation of this simulation is shown in Fig. 5. This validated the theory and code described in part 5 of this section.you begin to format your paper, first write and save the content as a separate text file. Complete all content and organizational editing before formatting. Please note sections A-D below for more information on proofreading, spelling and grammar.
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