

EFFECT OF PERFORATED FACING ON SOUND ABSORPTION OF POLYESTER FIBRE MATERIAL

D. Borelli, C. Schenone*

DIPTeM, University of Genoa
Via All'Opera Pia 15/A – I-16145 Genova (ITALY)
Phone: +39 0103532577, Fax: +39 010311870

*Corresponding author, e-mail: corrado.schenone@unige.it
Oral presentation preferred

The perforated facing used in lined ducts or absorbing panels to protect the porous sound absorbing material from dust or grazing flow, or simply as a rigid support for the porous material, can affect the behaviour of the “backing” material, so modifying the acoustical performance of the porous layer.

In the present paper, the effect of perforated facings on sound absorption characteristics of samples made by polyester fibre has been experimentally investigated in the frequency range 500 - 2500 Hz. The polyester (PET) fibre material had bulk density of 30 kg/m³ and melting point at 260°C. The analysis has been performed for sample thicknesses equal to 50 mm and 100 mm.

The acoustical behaviour of unfaced polyester fibre samples was firstly characterized by measuring flow resistivity, R_1 , and sound absorption coefficient at normal incidence, α , by means of the standing wave ratio (SWR) method. Flow resistivity was measured according to ISO 9053:1991 standard [1], direct airflow method (method A), and resulted to be equal to 4285 Pa·s/m², that is a typical value for this material and density.




Fig. 1: Sound absorption coefficient curves for unfaced sample with thickness equal to: a) 50 mm; b) 100 mm.

Sound absorption coefficients were measured in accordance with ASTM C384-04 standard [2]: the experimental set-up consisted in a horizontal cylindrical Kundt's tube made of PMMA, with an inner diameter of 70 mm and an effective length of 630 mm.

Experimental data were compared with literature correlations from Delany-Bazley [3], Dunn-Davern [4] and Pompoli-Garai [5], which is especially intended for polyester fibre material (Fig. 1). The comparison showed a good agreement between measured and calculated values for both sample thicknesses; in this way the accuracy of the experimental set-up and of the operating procedure were validated.

Then the same samples were faced by means of different metal plates perforated with circular holes (Fig 2). The holes diameter was equal to 2 mm for all facings but the percent open area, σ , was varied from 15% to 30%.

The percent open area for each perforated facing is defined as:

$$\sigma = \text{perforated area/total area}$$

Metal plates were 1 mm thick and in close contact with the polyester fibre material. Normal incidence sound absorption coefficients were measured for all facings and compared both each other and with the results for the unfaced samples.




Fig. 2: Sketch of the different metal plates used as perforated facing.

In Figure 3 the sound absorption coefficient curves in one-third octave band for the samples faced with the different perforated screens are shown in comparison with the unfaced sample. The analysis of the results indicates that, in general, when σ rises, the α curves for faced and unfaced samples tend to be closer, that is the effect of facing reduces meanwhile the open area increases. In particular, when the percent open area is equal to 30%, for both porous material thicknesses the effect of perforated facing is negligible. For percent open area 15% faced samples tend to behave quite differently from unfaced ones for both thicknesses, and the curves for faced materials are separate, thus indicating a different acoustical behavior of the lined duct or of the absorbing panel on which the facing is applied.

The comparison of diagrams (a) and (b) in Fig. 3 suggests that, even if local α values change, the facing effect is similar for both thicknesses. In other words, the thickness of porous material influences its acoustical performance, but 50 mm and 100 mm thick samples are anyhow sensitive in a similar way to the presence of the perforated plates. This conclusion applies to porous material with the same thickness but different density, too.




Fig. 3: Sound absorption coefficient curves for samples faced with different perforated plates:
a) sample thickness 50mm; b) sample thickness 100 mm.

Present experimental data essentially agree with literature results. Munjal and Thawani [6], at the end of their theoretical analysis, conclude that for highly porous fibrous material a thin perforated of 34.9% percent open area is practically as good as 100% percent open area whereas a 4.9% percent open area affects absorbing behavior at high frequencies, and suggest that about a 10% percent open area is a good design compromise between acoustical performance and mechanical strength. Similarly in Ingard [7], where the effect of a perforated panel with a percent open area of 7.7% is theoretically analyzed and a considerable effect on absorption coefficient curves of porous materials is predicted.

Those conclusions are substantially confirmed by the present study, i.e. protective layers may have a dual function, which is to work like a mere support to the porous sound-absorbing material or to operate like a real absorbent panel according to the open area.

The different intended use therefore depends on the percentage of perforation: in the event that it is equal to or greater than 20% of the surface of the facing [8], this assumes the only function of supporting and protecting the sound-absorbing material.

-
- [1] ISO 9053:1991 Acoustics - Materials for acoustical applications - Determination of airflow resistance.
 - [2] ASTM C384-04 Standard Test Method for Impedance and Absorption of Acoustical Materials by Impedance Tube Method.
 - [3] M. E. Delany, E. N. Bazley, Acoustical properties of fibrous absorbent materials, *Applied Acoustics*, 3, pp. 105-116 (1970).
 - [4] I. P. Dunn, W. A. Davern, Calculation of acoustic impedance of multi-layer absorbers, *Applied Acoustics*, 19, pp. 321-334 (1986).
 - [5] M. Garai, F. Pompoli, A simple empirical model of polyester fibre materials for acoustical applications, *Applied Acoustics*, 66, pp. 1383-1398 (2005).
 - [6] M. L. Munjal, P. T. Thawani, Effect of protective layer on the performance of absorptive ducts, *Noise Control Engineering Journal*, 45 (1), pp. 14-18 (1997).
 - [7] U. Ingard, Perforated Facing and Sound Absorption, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 26(2), pp. 151-154 (1954).
 - [8] D. A. Bies, Acoustical properties of porous materials, in *Noise and Vibration Control*, pp. 245-269, L. L. Beranek Editor, Institute of Noise Control Engineering, Washington, DC (1988).