

---

Subject: "Distributed Mode Radiation"

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 16:19:40 GMT

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

---

Look what Linc found, and posted in the Planar forum. He's right, it looks like the same idea that Manger uses. Basically, the idea is to allow the cone surface to flex and to use each decoupled zone as a separate radiator.

NXT

---

---

Subject: Re: "Distributed Mode Radiation"

Posted by [Martin](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 23:37:03 GMT

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

---

Wayne, Looked at some of the plotted data, it is clear they are using MathCad for doing some of the calculations and data reduction/plotting. Gotta like that a lot! Martin

---

---

Subject: Re: "Distributed Mode Radiation"

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 02:53:11 GMT

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

---

Yep, yep. Mathcad is an excellent tool. I love FEA software too.

---

---

Subject: Re: "Distributed Mode Radiation"

Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 08:58:56 GMT

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

---

What a great link. Thanks Linc & Wayne! My take after a very cursory reading was that: a) it reduces beaming and b) it does so with few tradeoffs. However, I am curious if the piston model is not better in some way for natural reproduction. It just seems more "intuitive" than a random model. Doesn't a large array of speakers approximate the random model? Aren't there issues with the many driver array design that involve fundamental tradeoffs when compared to a single driver or even a 2-3 way design? -akhilesh

---