

---

Subject: Re: Efficiency of backhorns

Posted by [DMoore](#) on Wed, 16 Apr 2008 02:30:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Derived from Plach: Back-loading generally is not as efficient as a front-loaded horn, all things being equal. The gain of back-loading is that the horn's frequency response bandwidth is increased over a comparable front-loaded horn. Rear-loading a horn generally requires a driver with a higher  $F_s$  than the horn's  $F_c$ , and a "rising response curve" for the driver in question. A front-loaded horn is best utilized with a LOWER  $F_s$  driver than the horn's  $F_c$  of relatively linear (flat) response. However, if I remember correctly, Bruce Edgar advocates a driver of a higher  $F_s$  (than  $F_c$ ) and lower  $Q_t$  for a front-loaded application. So there is plenty of arguments both ways. One note of precaution, though: a rear-loaded horn often requires that the high(er) frequencies be limited by some method (i.e., a tortuous horn pathway, or an acoustic filter of some sort) to prevent them from going through the horn, which will result in comb-filter distortion when the same frequencies are being produced by the front of the cone at the same time. Having an indirect (i.e., downward or rear-firing, etc.) horn mouth may alleviate this effect somewhat. DM

---