

Towards a sustainable approach for sound absorption assessment of building materials: Validation of small-scale reverberation room measurement

Original

Towards a sustainable approach for sound absorption assessment of building materials: Validation of small-scale reverberation room measurement / Shtrepi, Louena; Prato, Andrea. - In: APPLIED ACOUSTICS. - ISSN 0003-682X. - ELETTRONICO. - 165:(2020), pp. 1-16. [[10.1016/j.apacoust.2020.107304](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2020.107304)]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2807772 since: 2020-03-31T16:21:20Z

Publisher:

Elsevier Ltd.

Published

DOI:[10.1016/j.apacoust.2020.107304](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2020.107304)

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Towards a sustainable approach for sound absorption assessment of building materials:**
2 **validation of small-scale reverberation room measurements** ^{a)}

3

4 Authors: Louena Shtrepi¹, Andrea Prato²

5 ¹Politecnico di Torino, Torino, Italy

6 ²INRiM - Istituto Nazionale della Ricerca Metrologica, Torino, Italy

7

8 e-mail addresses: louena.shtrepi@polito.it, a.prato@inrim.it

9

10 Corresponding author: Louena Shtrepi

11 E-mail address: louena.shtrepi@polito.it

12 Postal address: Department of Energy (DENERG), Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129, Torino,

13 Italy

^{a)} Part of this work was presented in Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress on Acoustics, 2019, Aachen, Germany

15 **Abstract**

16

17 The research and development phase of sound absorptive building materials by designers,
18 engineers, acoustic consultants and architects need tools for fast, inexpensive preliminary
19 comparison tests on products or acoustic systems. The existing methods exhibit some drawbacks:
20 the impedance tube (IT) is not suitable for 3D systems, while the full-scale reverberation room
21 (FSRR) requires test samples of large dimensions. To overcome these limitations, this work aims to
22 explore the capabilities of small-scale reverberation rooms (SSRR) of about 3 m³ located at
23 Politecnico di Torino in evaluating the random-incidence sound absorption coefficient. In order to
24 define the range of application and reliability of the method, the considered factors are the sample
25 area and its orientation on the room floor. Four different materials have been tested by applying IT,
26 FSRR and SSRR. The absorption coefficients data obtained with SSRR are compatible with the
27 FSRR benchmarking in the 400-5000 Hz frequency range for three porous materials, and in the
28 range 1000-5000 Hz for the thin rigid material. Therefore, the SSRR can be considered as a reliable
29 alternative for the sound absorption characterization in these ranges for this kind of materials,
30 leading to several benefits. Among them, samples with reduced size can be evaluated with a
31 cheaper equipment in a short time, increasing the overall economical sustainability of the
32 measurement process; in turn, this can encourage designers and architects to perform acoustical
33 measurements since the very early research and development phase, leading to an overall reduction
34 of design costs and improved product quality.

35

36 *Keywords:* Acoustic measurements; Sound absorption coefficient; Measurement uncertainty;
37 Building materials; Sustainability; Small-scale reverberation room.

38

39 **1. Introduction**

40 The design process of sound absorptive materials is complemented by a preliminary exploratory
41 phase that requires an immediate feedback on the acoustic performance, i.e. the absorption
42 coefficient. Therefore, adequate tools are needed to accelerate the research and development
43 process, minimize costs, and reduce waste due to dismantled samples after their characterization.
44 The absorption coefficient measurement procedure has been the focus of continuous research that
45 have led to two main standardized methods, i.e. the impedance tube (IT) method defined in ISO
46 10534 [1] and the full-scale reverberation room (FSRR) method described in ISO 354 [2] and
47 ASTM Standard C423 [3]. However, these methods present several disadvantages: IT does not
48 allow to test 3D systems, while FSRR requires large samples. This paper aims to explore the
49 capabilities of small-scale reverberation rooms (SSRR) in providing accurate estimations of the
50 absorption coefficients with respect to the FSRR benchmarking and in overcoming the above-
51 mentioned drawbacks of existing methods.

52 The main advantages of a SSRR are the possibility to test samples that are much smaller than 10-
53 12 m² and the 6.69 m² recommended by the FSRR measurements ($V > 200 \text{ m}^3$) according to ISO 354
54 [2] and ASTM Standard C423 [3], respectively, and to allow more acousticians, manufacturers and
55 practitioners to build their test facility due to the more feasible construction compared to a FSRR.
56 This, in turn, enables a dramatic reduction of economical and time efforts necessary to perform a
57 FSRR measurement. Moreover, the SSRR can be used to improve the quality of acoustic
58 simulations: novel materials at configurations not available in existing databases can be
59 characterized much more easily [4].

60 Due to their cost effectiveness, SSRRs have been the focus of research in the automotive sector [5],
61 which usually requires absorption data at medium-high frequencies due to the small size of the
62 involved samples. The research has led to a SAE (Society of Automotive Engineers) standard [6] on
63 the use of small rooms for absorption coefficients measurements. The common size of these rooms

64 is in the range of 3-10 m³, and a sample area of 0.4-1.5 m² is usually deployed [7]: this leads to
65 nearly 90% reduction of the wasted material for laboratory measurements compared to the FSRR
66 (12 m²). The sample arrangement in the SSRR requires a shorter set-up time: a single panel is
67 usually sufficient, while in FSRR several panels need to be assembled to reach a 12 m² sample. In
68 turn the transportation costs and the related environmental pollution benefit from the reduction in
69 material volume. Moreover, the same samples could be reused to measure other important
70 properties for building materials, e.g. the thermal conductivity [8], since the required sample
71 dimensions are comparable to those used in small-scaled rooms.

72 Further SSRRs are reported in Rey et al. [9] with a volume of 1.12 m³ and test sample area of 0.3
73 m², and Pacheco et al. [10] with a volume of 0.96 m³ and test sample area of 0.3 m². These scaled
74 rooms have been useful also for testing more complicated structures, e.g. 3D rigid polyester
75 systems, which is difficult to test in an impedance tube [11]. The continuous research on SSRRs has
76 led to the Alpha Cabin, built by the Swiss company Rieter, with a volume of 6.5 m³. The design and
77 size of the Alpha Cabin is 1:3 scale of the large reverberation room located in the Swiss Federal
78 Laboratory of Material Testing and Research Institute (EMPA). It is largely used in the automotive
79 industry allowing to measure 1.2 m² of flat samples or 3D moulded finished parts providing
80 accurate measurements in the frequency range of 400-5000 Hz [11].

81 A few studies have also compared small-scale reverberation room measurements with those
82 performed in a full-scale reverberation room [9, 11-13]. A good match of the results has been
83 shown in the range of frequencies above 400 Hz, where the SSRR is expected to fulfil the perfect
84 diffusion conditions, i.e. where the degree of diffusion is close to 1. However, these studies also
85 highlight larger discrepancies at low frequencies due to the reduced size of the room. This is a
86 critical aspect since the resulting smaller sample area with equal height produces a larger edge
87 effect [14, 15]. The impact of these effects is particularly high at low frequencies if highly
88 absorbing materials with high thicknesses are tested.

89 Therefore, two main concerns appear when dealing with small reverberation rooms. The first is
90 related to the lack of a degree of diffusivity of the sound field required to make the measurement
91 conditions largely independent of the room properties [16]. To mitigate this issue, usually different
92 types of diffusers are introduced [2, 17,18]; nevertheless, the efficiency of the diffusers is shown to
93 be reduced when the frequency decreases [19]. In addition, according to Scrosati et al. [20], the
94 diffusers change the mean free path in the reverberation room, thus ISO 354 formula for the
95 calculation of the equivalent absorption area is no longer valid since it does not take into account
96 the actual mean free path and consequently the changed volume of the room. However, low
97 diffusivity of reverberation rooms is still one of the main concerns of the ISO 354 measurements
98 related to the low reproducibility values among laboratories. This is much evident at low
99 frequencies [21], but appear even above the Schroeder frequency, where the sound field should
100 reach a higher degree of diffusivity [22, 23]. One of the causes is due to the fact that the sound field
101 is diffuse in the empty room, while in the room with a highly absorbing sample the sound field
102 cannot be considered perfectly diffuse [20]. For this reason, the diffuse field conditions differences
103 among laboratories has been questioned lately aiming at new requirements to be defined in terms of
104 diffusivity for qualified laboratories [24]. Several studies have shown that large discrepancies might
105 occur among different full-scale laboratories even though they fulfil the ISO qualification
106 requirements [25]. As for FSRR, the low frequencies range in SSRR is the most critical one, where
107 the early decay is dependent on strong, distinct reflections and need to be treated with specific
108 methods [26, 27].

109 The second drawback of SSRR measurements is related to the diffraction due to the finite size of
110 the tested material, especially at the low frequencies, which is known as the edge effect [14, 28, 29],
111 and restricts the reliability frequency range at medium-high frequencies. Further investigation is
112 needed to clarify the trade-off between reduced sample size and the appropriate room and sample
113 conditions to obtain reliable results for building materials.

114 To shed light in this direction, this study examines a broad measurement campaign in a small-scale
115 reverberation room in the laboratories of the Department of Energy (DENERG) of Politecnico di
116 Torino, with the aim to evaluate the reliability of the sound absorption coefficient measurements.
117 Four different materials at three different sizes and orientations on the room floor have been tested.
118 The work assesses the compatibility of the SSRR measurements towards measurements made on
119 the same materials in a full-scale reverberation room (ISO 354) [2] at INRiM (Istituto Nazionale di
120 Ricerca Metrologica). Moreover, the same materials have been additionally characterized with the
121 impedance tube method (ISO 10534-2) [1] in order to present an easier and direct comparison
122 towards another standardized method. Finally, the single sound absorption indices α_w (weighted
123 sound absorption coefficient), NRC (Noise Reduction Coefficient), and SAA (Sound Absorption
124 Average), which are used to assess the quality of the absorption and to select products by designers
125 and architects, are derived from the three measurement methods.

126 **2. Methods**


127 The research has been organized through the following steps:

- 128 1) Selection of materials and preparation of samples for the measurements in IT, FSRR and
129 SSRR;
- 130 2) Measurement of sound absorption in the IT according to ISO 10534-2 [1] and FSRR
131 according to ISO 354 [2];
- 132 3) Measurement of sound absorption in the SSRR and test the range of application of ISO 354
133 [2] method by varying the area of the sample and its orientation on the room floor;
- 134 4) Evaluation of the compatibility of the measured SSRR data with the results from IT and
135 FSRR;
- 136 5) Computation of the indices α_w , SAA and NRC for the IT, FSRR and SSRR data and
137 compatibility assessment.

138

139 2.1 Tested Materials

140 Four materials (here labelled A, B, C, D) available at INRiM have been tested (Figure 1). Materials
 141 A and B are made of glass wool panels with a density of 80 kg/m^3 and a 6 mm finished layer made
 142 of glass spheres and a marble powder with overall thickness of 40 mm and 50 mm, respectively.
 143 Material C is a 21 mm thick panel with a layer of 13 mm of plasterboard and 8 mm finished layer
 144 made of a marble powder. Material D is composed of two superimposed layers of polyester fibre
 145 with a density of 80 kg/m^3 and a thickness of 30 mm each. Also, this material has a cellular glass
 146 finish of 7.5 mm over the upper layer, and a mixture of rubber and concrete layer of 7.5 mm at the
 147 bottom. Since all these materials are obtained by layers of different characteristics, they can be
 148 considered as non-isotropic. The four materials have been chosen based on commercially available
 149 materials in order to have four different thicknesses: two similar materials A and B with the same
 150 layers characteristics but with slightly different thickness, material C considered as a thin rigid
 151 material and material D was chosen in order to test the SSRR also for significant thicknesses.



152

153 **Fig. 1.** Sample A and B: Glass wool panels with a finish of glass spheres and a marble powder (40
154 mm and 50 mm). Sample C: one layer of plasterboard and one of marble powder (21 mm). Sample
155 D: Double layered polyester fibre panel with a cellular glass finish (75 mm).

156

157 2.2 Impedance tube measurements

158 Measurements have been performed in the impedance tube in accordance with ISO 10534-2 [1]
159 (two-microphone technique) in order to measure the normal-incidence absorption coefficient (α_0)
160 for the four materials. The advantages of this method rely on the possibility to obtain measurements
161 using small samples of less than 0.1 m² that are easily obtained and introduced into the impedance
162 tube. These measurements took place in the INRiM laboratory. Two different tubes of 30 mm and
163 50 mm diameter each (Figure 2), both equipped with two ¼” microphones (Brüel & Kjær 4136),
164 have been used in order to assure a higher accuracy in the whole frequency range of interest, i.e.
165 100-5000 Hz. The 30 mm tube (length of 45 cm and microphone spacing of 16 mm) allows to
166 measure with a high accuracy in the frequency range of 400-6300 Hz and the 50 mm tube (length of
167 52 cm and microphone spacing of 26 mm) in the frequency range of 100-3150 Hz. The ISO 10534-
168 2:2001 standard does not define the exact frequency range for a given tube diameter and
169 microphone separation, but recommends the bounds for the lower and upper frequencies; therefore,
170 the frequency range was chosen to satisfy the standard requirements for the level of nonlinearities,
171 frequency resolution, measurement instabilities and signal-to-noise ratio [30].

172 Both the two tubes are equipped with a white noise source which generates a flat spectrum in the
173 100-5000 Hz frequency range. The possible gaps among the sample perimeter and the tubes inner
174 surfaces have been sealed by covering the sample border with vaseline without creating local
175 compression on the samples. In this way, the size of the voids between the tested material and the
176 sample holder was reduced so that the circumferential effect discussed in [31] could be considered
177 negligible. The effect of the irregularities in the samples, and in particular at the edges, was taken

178 into consideration by repeating the tests with three different samples. Temperature and atmospheric
179 pressure were measured with proper calibrated transducers. For each material type, measurements
180 were performed on three samples (nominally equal), obtained from the same larger sample, in order
181 to evaluate uncertainty contribution due to reproducibility.

182 The normal-incidence absorption coefficients (α_0) data from the two tubes measurements have been
183 combined in order to fulfil their covered frequency range, thus considering the values from the 50
184 mm tube in the range 100-315 Hz; the mean values from the two tubes in the range 400-3150 Hz
185 and the values from the 30 mm tube in the range 4000-5000 Hz. These data are shown in
186 Appendices A, B, C and D as IT_n .

187 These values have been corrected for diffuse incidence based on the approach proposed in Spagnolo
188 and Benedetto [32], which uses a physical model to determine the random-incidence absorption
189 coefficient (α) by integrating a vector of evenly spaced 90 angles between 0° and 90° , i.e. the whole
190 hemi-solid angle, allowing to estimate the sound energy density absorption at each angle of
191 incidence, randomly, as in near-diffuse field, according to Eq. (1). There are several methods that
192 can be used to perform this correction taking into account the finite sample size [33] and a different
193 angular integration limit [34].

$$\alpha = \int_0^{\pi/2} \alpha_\theta \cos\theta d\theta \quad (1)$$

194

195 where θ is the angle of incidence of the pressure waves on the sample and α_θ is the sound
196 absorption coefficient at angle θ given by Eq. (2);

$$\alpha_\theta = 1 - \left| \frac{Z \cos\theta - \rho_0 c}{Z \cos\theta + \rho_0 c} \right|^2 \quad (2)$$

197

198 where Z , assuming locally reacting surface, is the acoustic impedance of the absorbing material
199 given by:


$$Z = \rho_0 c \frac{1 + (1 - \alpha_0)^{1/2}}{1 - (1 - \alpha_0)^{1/2}} \quad (3)$$

200

201 where ρ_0 is the density of air, c is the speed of sound, and α_0 is the normal-incidence absorption
 202 coefficient evaluated in the impedance tube.

203

204



205 **Fig. 2.** Measurements set-up in the impedance tube with a diameter of a) 30 mm and b) 50 mm, and
 206 c) circular samples of the four materials with a diameter of 30 and 50 mm.

207

208 2.3 Full-scale reverberation room measurements

209 All the materials have been tested in the full-scale reverberation room at INRiM, which is a
 210 qualified room for measurements in accordance with ISO 354 [2]. The method allows to estimate
 211 the random-incidence absorption coefficient (α_s) in the 100-5000 Hz frequency range. The room
 212 has a floor surface of 59.4 m² and a height of 4.95 m, which lead to a volume of 294 m³. Room plan
 213 is irregular with non-parallel side walls. The indoor surfaces are characterized by strongly reflective
 214 walls and a marble floor characterized by an equivalent sound absorption area lower than 5 m² in
 215 the 100-5000 Hz frequency range. The mean reverberation time of the empty room between 100 Hz
 216 and 5000 Hz is of 10.3 s, thus the Schroeder frequency f_s is 374 Hz. Five diffusers are hung over the
 217 ceiling in order to assure diffusivity. The tested samples have an area of 12 m² and have been
 218 located on the floor of the room within a wooden frame, which is recommended to be used to seal
 219 the edges of the tested material. In this experiment the frame has been used for all the samples

220 except for the case of sample C, which has a negligible thickness. The porous layer for this material
221 is of 8 mm, which was taken into account in the estimation of the overall area of the sample by
222 increasing it of 0.11 m².

223 The set-up and the samples of each material have been arranged in accordance with the
224 recommendations of the ISO 354 standard (Figure 3):

- 225 • microphones should be positioned at a minimum distance of 1.5 m from each other, 1 m
226 from the room surfaces and 2 m from the sources;
- 227 • the two sources must be at least 3 m apart from each other. A spatial averaging is performed
228 considering all the 12 sources and microphones combination;
- 229 • the interval of frequencies of interest is reported as third-octave bands in the range 100-5000
230 Hz;
- 231 • controlled conditions of temperature (> 15 °C) and humidity (between 30-90 %);
- 232 • the sample must be rectangular with a ratio between width and length within the range 0.7-1.
233 In this specific case, the test specimens were composed of 25 single small panels with size
234 60×80 cm² combined in order to cover an area of 4×3 m²;
- 235 • the sides of the sample must be distant from the walls of the room by at least 1 m.

236



237

238 **Fig. 3.** Measurements in the full-scale reverberation room a) without and b) with the sample.

239

240 The procedure consists in using the interrupted noise method [2] on six different microphone
 241 positions in two conditions, i.e. with and without the sample on the floor of the room. The
 242 measurement chain is composed of a 1/2" microphone (Brüel & Kjær 4943), sequentially located at
 243 different positions, and two dodecahedral sources (Brüel & Kjær 4292 and Brüel & Kjær 4296).
 244 The applied recording system is the SINUS, Apollo system with software Samurai 2.6; while the
 245 sound equalizer is Yamaha (DEQ 5) and the power amplifier is Amcron Crown (MICRO-TECH
 246 1200). In these measurements two sound sources are used for the simultaneous excitation, therefore
 247 the number of spatially independent measured decay curves may be reduced to six [2]. For each of
 248 the six positions, measurements are repeated four times, and the reverberation time relative to a 20
 249 dB decay, i.e. T_{20} , is evaluated and used to estimate the T_{60} , i.e. the reverberation time occurring for
 250 a 60 dB decay. The data are spatially averaged with the ensemble averaging method in order to
 251 obtain T_1 and T_2 without and with the sample on the room floor, respectively. The difference
 252 between the two measures is used to calculate the variation of the equivalent sound absorption area
 253 A_T based on Sabine's theory:

$$A_T = 55.3V \left(\frac{1}{c_2 T_2} - \frac{1}{c_1 T_1} \right) - 4V(m_2 - m_1) \quad (4)$$

254
 255 where T_1 and T_2 are the reverberation times of the empty reverberation room and after the test
 256 specimen has been introduced, respectively; V is the volume of the empty reverberation room; c_1
 257 and c_2 is the propagation speed of sound in air in the room without the sample: $c_1 = 331 + 0,6 t_1$, t_1
 258 is the air temperature; m_1 and m_2 is the power attenuation coefficient of the climatic conditions in
 259 the reverberation room without and with the sample (calculated according to ISO 9613-1 [35]);

260
 261 The random-incidence absorption coefficient is defined as:

$$\alpha_S = \frac{A_T}{S} \quad (5)$$

262

263 Where S is the area covered by the test sample.


264

265 2.4 Small-scale reverberation room measurements (SSRR)

266 The small-scale reverberation room (Figure 4, a and Figure 5) is a laboratory at DENERG
267 (Department of Energy, Politecnico di Torino, Italy). It is a 1:5 scale reproduction of the
268 reverberation room described above. The room has been primarily built for random-incidence
269 scattering coefficient measurements according to ISO 17497-1 [36, 37]. It is an oblique angled
270 room with pairs of nonparallel walls. The floor area is about 2.38 m^2 and the height in the range 1-
271 1.2 m, which lead to a maximum volume of 2.86 m^3 and a total area of 12.12 m^2 . The structure is
272 raised from the ground on a wooden structure and damping layers have been used along the joints
273 and openings. One of the sides consists of two movable parts that allow to have a large opening to
274 ease the positioning of the sample. The construction material is self-supporting lightweight
275 partitions of MDF (Medium Density Fibreboard) with a thickness of 3.8 cm, which has been further
276 covered by a layer of adhesive film in order to maximize its reflective properties. The equivalent
277 sound absorption area of the empty room (A_1) and ISO [2] and ASTM [3] limits are shown in
278 Figure 4, c. The ISO limit values have been multiplied by the factor $(V/200)^{2/3}$, while the ASTM
279 limit value is given in terms of mean absorption coefficient ($\alpha_m \leq 0.05$ in the 250-2500 Hz interval,
280 and $\alpha_m \leq 0.10$ below 250 Hz and above 2500 Hz) and has been converted into equivalent sound
281 absorption area for comparison purposes. Given that the ISO limit is not specifically indicated for
282 rooms below a volume of 150 m^3 , A_1 can be considered acceptable even though slightly above the
283 limit in the range 800-1600 Hz. However, the average absorption coefficient of the indoor surfaces
284 is lower than $\alpha_m = 0.05$ in the frequency range of interest (100-5000 Hz). The mean reverberation
285 time of the empty room between 100 Hz and 5000 Hz of 0.95 s, thus the Schroeder frequency f_s is
286 1152 Hz.

287 In order to assure a high diffusivity of the sound field [38], 8 diffusers (13.5% of the total room
288 area) have been hung over the ceiling, which is considered as a more economical solution compared

289 to boundary diffusers leading to an almost equivalent effect on the diffusion of the sound field [18].
 290 A systematic study of the sound field diffusivity evaluation of the room has been performed in [39].
 291 The diffusivity check has been performed in accordance with ISO 354 based on the measurements
 292 of the mean absorption coefficient (500-5000 Hz) of a highly sound absorptive panel made of 5 cm
 293 thick polyester fibre (Figure 4, d). The final number of diffusers was set to 8, which was a
 294 compromise between the rule set by the standard i.e. the mean sound absorption coefficient
 295 approaches a constant value (6D to 8D), and limited effect on the volume reduction of the room due
 296 to the total coverage of the ceiling, i.e the condition with 10 diffusers (10D).



297
 298 **Fig. 4.** a) Empty small-scale reverberation room; b) spectral characteristics of the two sound sources
 299 (S1 and S2) and background noise; c) comparison of the equivalent sound absorption area of the
 300 empty room (A_1), ISO and ASTM limits; d) mean absorption coefficient of a polyester panel of 5
 301 cm measured in the room with no diffusers (0D) and 2-10 diffusers (2D-10D).

302

303 The procedure consists in using the integrated impulse response method [2] for simultaneous
304 measurements on six different microphone positions in two conditions, i.e. with and without the
305 sample on the floor of the room as in section 2.3. The measurement chain is composed of six 1/4”
306 BSWA Tech MPA451 microphones and ICP104 (BSWA Technology Co., Ltd., Beijing, China);
307 two ITA High-Frequency Dodecahedron Loudspeakers with their specific ITA power amplifiers
308 (ITA-RWTH, Aachen, Germany) and a sound card Roland Octa-Capture UA-1010 (Roland
309 Corporation, Japan) in order to perform 12 measurements (the minimum number required by ISO
310 354 [2]). The software used for the measurements, i.e. sound generation, recording and signal
311 processing, is MATLAB combined with the functions of the ITA-Toolbox (an opensource toolbox
312 from RWTH-Aachen, Germany) [40]. The sound source should fulfil the ISO 354 spectral
313 characteristics, that is, the sound pressure levels in the room shall be less than 6 dB in adjacent one-
314 third-octave bands and the level of the excitation signal before the decay shall be sufficiently high
315 so that the lower decibel level of the evaluation range is at least 10 dB above the background noise
316 level, i.e. 35 dB below the initial sound pressure level. The first criterion is fulfilled for the entire
317 frequency range, while the second is fulfilled only above the 250 Hz (Figure 4, b).

318 For each of the 12 measurements the reverberation time is evaluated. The data are spatially
319 averaged in order to obtain T_1 and T_2 without and with the sample on the room floor, respectively.

320 Equations 4 and 5 are then applied to estimate the random-incidence absorption coefficient.

321 The set-up and the samples of each material have been arranged in agreement with the
322 recommendations of the ISO 354 standard (Figure 5):

- 323 • “microphones should be positioned at a minimum distance of 1.5 m from each other, 1 m
324 from the room surfaces and 2 m from the sources”. This leads to 0.3 m; 0.2 m and 0.4 m in
325 1:5 scale;

- 326 • “the two sources must be at least 3 m apart”. This leads to 0.6 m in 1:5 scale. A spatial
327 averaging is performed considering all the 12 sources and microphones combination;
- 328 • the frequencies of interest are reported as third-octave bands in the range 100-5000 Hz.
329 Given the background noise criterion, this is valid for 250-5000 Hz;
- 330 • controlled conditions of temperature ($> 15\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$) and humidity (between 30-90 %). A sensor
331 has been installed inside the room;
- 332 • “the sides of the sample must be distant from the walls of the room by at least 1 m”. This
333 leads to 0.2 m in 1:5 scale;

334


335 2.4.1 Sample configuration

336 One of the aims of this study is to define the sample configuration that could lead to accurate results
337 of the absorption coefficient measurements in the small-scale reverberation room. Given the small
338 size of the SSRR, the sound field is expected to be strongly dependent on the configuration of the
339 measured material. Therefore, it is crucial to define the application range of this type of
340 measurements.

341 The following variables have been considered, tested and the results have been compared with the
342 IT and FSRR measurements:

- 343 - three different sample sizes for each material ($60\times 40\text{ cm}^2$; $60\times 60\text{ cm}^2$; and $60\times 80\text{ cm}^2$). It
344 should be noted that the ISO 354 recommends a ratio between width and length in the range
345 0.7-1;
- 346 - three different orientations on the floor (Fig.5) for the $60\times 40\text{ cm}^2$ and $60\times 80\text{ cm}^2$ sample
347 sizes and two different orientations for sample $60\times 60\text{ cm}^2$. Orientation 1 assumed the long
348 edge of the sample parallel to the side wall, orientation 2 assumed the axis of symmetry of
349 the sample aligned over the diagonal of the room floor giving an oblique orientation, and

350 orientation 3 assumed the long edge of the sample parallel to the rear wall. It should be
351 noted that the ISO 354 standard recommends an oblique orientation (orientation 2).
352 Three repetitions have been performed for each configuration.



353
354 **Fig. 5.** Measurements in the small-scale reverberation room of one of the samples with three
355 different orientations; Sample A ($60 \times 80 \text{ cm}^2$), Sample B ($60 \times 40 \text{ cm}^2$), Sample C ($60 \times 40 \text{ cm}^2$) and
356 Sample D ($60 \times 40 \text{ cm}^2$).

367 3 Analyses

368 An analysis based on the estimation of the normalized error (E_n) has been performed in order to
369 assess the compatibility of the absorption coefficient data measured in the SSRR with respect to the
360 FSRR ($E_{n,FSRR}$), considered as reference value for random incidence sound absorption, and IT
361 extended for random-incidence absorption coefficients ($E_{n,IT}$). Moreover, also the normalized error
362 of IT results has been assessed with respect to the FSRR values. E_n is defined as the ratio of the
363 difference between the reference value (α_x) and the reported value (α_y) compared to the root sum
364 square of associated expanded uncertainties (U_x and U_y) at a confidence level of 95% ($k=2$).
365 According to ISO/IEC 17043:2010 [41], it is evaluated as follows:

$$E_n = \frac{|\alpha_x - \alpha_y|}{\sqrt{U_x^2 + U_y^2}} \quad (6)$$

366

367 The data can be considered compatible when $E_n < 1$. This is an indicator of accuracy/inaccuracy as
368 compared to an assigned reference value (FSRR or IT) with respect to the associated uncertainties.

369 The uncertainty of the impedance tube measurements has been assessed according to GUM-JCGM
370 100:2008 [42]), taking into account, as type B uncertainty contribution, the difference between the
371 maximum and minimum values coming from the measurement on three nominally equal samples
372 with a uniform rectangular distribution. The specific guidelines given by Wittstock (2018) (see Eq.
373 (2) and Table II – smooth case) [43], which are currently the most reliable reference for the
374 uncertainty evaluation in reverberation rooms based on a database of Interlaboratory Tests, have
375 been applied for the SSRR and FSRR measurement uncertainties. Nevertheless, as shown by the
376 author itself [43], larger uncertainties might occur, especially for highly absorptive materials with
377 ISO 354 method, thus entailing a possible underestimation of the E_n values. Such aspect should be
378 taken into account in the conclusions. The measured frequency dependent absorption coefficients of
379 the four materials and the estimated measurement uncertainties are shown for further details in
380 Appendices A, B, C and D.

381 The normalized error data have been further analysed with a focus on the effects of the independent
382 factors, i.e. the sample size and orientation. The SPSS Statistics software [44] has been used to
383 perform the ANOVA (ANalysis Of VAriance). The data have been first analysed with a normality
384 test (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test): $E_{n,IT}$ showed a skewness of 0.793 (std.error = 0.105) and kurtosis
385 of 0.004 (std.error = 0.210); $E_{n,FSRR}$ showed a skewness of 0.793 (std.error = 0.105) and kurtosis of
386 0.004 (std.error = 0.210), thus falling within the acceptable range of ± 2 [44].
387 Moreover, the single indices for sound absorption (α_w , NRC and SAA) are derived from the IT,
388 FSRR and SSRR measurements and compared in terms of compatibility.

389

390 Table 1: ANOVA results for $E_{n,IT}$ and $E_{n,FSRR}$ data set.

Material	$E_{n,IT}$				$E_{n,FSRR}$			
	Size		Orientation		Size		Orientation	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
A	(2, 135) 21.580	0.000	(2, 135) 0.095	0.910	(2, 135) 15.248	0.000	(2, 135) 0.110	0.896
B	(2, 135) 13.910	0.000	(2, 135) 0.093	0.980	(2, 135) 5.496	0.005	(2, 135) 0.090	0.914
C	(2, 135) 0.827	0.440	(2, 135) 0.468	0.628	(2, 135) 0.501	0.607	(2, 135) 0.235	0.791
D	(2, 135) 5.481	0.005	(2, 135) 0.308	0.736	(2, 135) 20.018	0.000	(2, 135) 0.255	0.776

391

392 4 Results and discussion

393 4.1 Effects of the independent factors

394 The ANOVA performed on the overall E_n set of data showed that the four materials are
395 significantly different from each other at a confidence level of 95% for $E_{n,IT}$ with respect to IT ($F(3,$
396 $540) = 14.143$ and $p < 0.001$) and at a confidence level of 90% for $E_{n,FSRR}$ with respect to FSRR (F
397 $(3, 540) = 2.277$ and $p = 0.079$). Therefore, sample size and orientation variables have been
398 analysed for each material separately (Table 1).

399 The effect of the sample size is statistically significant for all the samples typologies ($p < 0.05$),
400 except for sample C. This result might be due to the limited edge effect for thinner samples, as
401 sample C is 21 mm thick. Appendices A, B, C and D show the absorption coefficient values for
402 each material. For panels with higher thickness (i.e. A, B, D) and when the panel reaches the
403 smallest dimensions $60 \times 40 \text{ cm}^2$, there are evident irregular high peaks at mid and high frequencies
404 for panels A and B, and also at low and mid frequencies for panel D. It can be noticed that the
405 sound absorption increases at 160-400 Hz and above 800 Hz with decreasing samples size
406 (Appendices A, B, and D). This behaviour might be due to a combination of edge effects and to
407 diffusivity effects, caused by the influence of the material on the modal behaviour of the room with
408 and without the sample inside, whereas for low absorbing materials (Appendix C) it can be considered
409 equivalent in terms of spatial distribution and amplification of standing waves. Schiavi and Prato [45]
410 showed these discrepancies by comparing full scale reverberation room, impedance tube, and
411 airflow resistivity methods. The same result has been highlighted also in full-scale rooms by Jain et
412 al. [46], for samples size smaller than 1 m^2 , which is due to diffraction occurring at the sample
413 edges. Anyway, in general terms, depending on the sample thickness, the small room gives higher
414 sound absorption values as compared to large reverberation rooms [15]. Samples A, B and D
415 showed this trend above 800 Hz, while sample C above 2000 Hz.

416 The correct scaling of the sample size with respect to the room volume has been investigated also in
417 Veen et al. [28]. This study shows that a sample of 1.12 m² could be considered in order to have
418 reliable results in a small reverberation room with a volume of about 6.4 m³. The ratio between the
419 room volume and the sample area is comparable to the one obtained with the room volume of
420 2.86 m³ and the sample size 60×80 cm² (0.48 m²) used in the present study (i.e. ratio ≈ 6).
421 The effect of the sample orientation has been analysed for all the materials and all the sample sizes.
422 Table 1 shows that the differences due to sample orientations are not statistically significant for all
423 the materials considered ($p > 0.05$). It is therefore possible to choose an oblique panel orientation
424 (Orientation 2), as suggested in the standard for full-scale measurements. Previous research [16] has
425 shown that different orientations may cause discrepancies at lower frequencies (below 400 Hz) and
426 that the smoothest curve is obtained for the oblique orientation, which is the most asymmetric one.
427 This study also highlighted that the other two orientations cause strong peaks in the absorption
428 coefficient, which were unrealistic for the tested porous materials. The authors argued that this
429 behaviour might be due to the parallel orientation of two edges of the material against two side
430 walls of the reverberation room. However, this effect is not fully observed in the study presented in
431 this paper. Some differences between the three orientations are observed at specific frequencies for
432 the smallest sample size, i.e. 60×40 cm² (Appendixes A, B, C, and D). Discrepancies at lower
433 frequencies are reduced when the material has lower thickness, i.e. these differences are more
434 evident in the case of panel D, which has a thickness of 75 mm. This finding is coherent with the
435 results of Cops et al. [16], which showed the same discrepancies between different orientations for
436 samples with thickness higher than 100 mm in full-scale measurements.

437

438 4.2 Compatibility of SSRR with IT and FSRR data


439 Figure 6 shows the maximum normalized error values estimated in each third octave band
440 frequency range for the SSRR data with respect to FSRR and IT data. SSRR data are reliable from

441 250 Hz upward, due to the background noise criterion previously discussed, however, for the sake
 442 of completeness, results are reported from 100 Hz. These plots show the E_n for material A, B, C and
 443 D at three sample sizes ($60 \times 40 \text{ cm}^2$, $60 \times 60 \text{ cm}^2$, and $60 \times 80 \text{ cm}^2$) and Orientation 2 only, since this
 444 factor was not found to be statistically significant. The results show that the normalized error (E_n) is
 445 minimized for sample size $60 \times 80 \text{ cm}^2$ for all the materials. $E_{n,FSRR}$ values are lower than 1 in the
 446 frequency range 400-5000 Hz, for materials A, B and D. Sample C presents $E_{n,FSRR}$ values lower
 447 than 1 at 400 Hz and in the frequency range 1000-5000 Hz. Values slightly higher than 1 result
 448 between 500 Hz and 800 Hz. As highlighted in the previous section, this might be due to the limited
 449 effects of this low absorbing and thinnest sample on the modal behaviour of the room it-self. This
 450 result suggests further future investigation on the room diffusivity. The same conclusions can be
 451 obtained for $E_{n,IT}$ for materials A, B and C. For what concern material D, it can be noted that $E_{n,IT} <$
 452 1 only at 500-1000 Hz. This could be due to the fact that IT method tends to underestimate the
 453 sound absorption at mid-high frequencies as shown in Appendix and in Figure 6. $E_{n,IT}$ values are
 454 higher than $E_{n,FSRR}$ values, which leads to a higher compatibility of the SSRR with respect to the
 455 FSRR. These differences are maximized for the thickest material D, i.e. $E_{n,IT} > 1$ and $E_{n,FSRR} < 1$ at
 456 1250-4000 Hz. The same behaviour can be observed also when evaluating the normalized error of
 457 the IT data with respect to the FSRR (Figure 7), i.e. $E_n > 1$ at 1600-3150 Hz.



458


459 **Fig. 6.** Normalized error (E_n) for SSRR results (material A, B, C and D) with respect to IT ($E_{n,IT}$)
 460 and FSRR ($E_{n,FSRR}$) values for the three sample sizes ($60\times 40\text{ cm}^2$, $60\times 60\text{ cm}^2$, and $60\times 80\text{ cm}^2$) and
 461 orientation 2. The data can be considered compatible when $E_n < 1$.



462
 463 **Fig. 7.** Normalized error (E_n) for IT results (material A, B, C and D) with respect to the FSRR
 464 values. The data can be considered compatible when $E_n < 1$.

465
 466 The absorption coefficient data of the optimal condition i.e. size $60\times 80\text{ cm}^2$ and sample orientation
 467 2, together with the uncertainty values of the results, are shown in Figures 8. The plots show that
 468 the SSRR values tend to be higher for frequencies above 800 Hz for samples A, B and D and above
 469 2000 Hz for sample C. One of the causes for this behaviour is that the absorption coefficient
 470 approaches to 1 at these frequency ranges and influences the diffusivity of the sound field generated
 471 within the small-scale room. This has been observed also in Veen et al. [28], where higher
 472 discrepancies around 1000 Hz for samples with thickness above 25 mm were found. Also, Jain et al.
 473 [46] showed a good match at mid frequencies from 400-1000 Hz between FSRR and SSRR and an
 474 overestimation of sound absorption values above 1000 Hz for the small-scale reverberation room.
 475 This is attributed to the use of Sabine's formulas instead of Eyring's as highlighted by Vercammen
 476 [21]. Moreover, it should be highlighted that the differences obtained here between the small- and

477 full-scale room or impedance tube measurements are comparable with those obtained from
 478 absorption coefficient measurements in 13 different laboratories Vercammen [21].



479
 480 **Fig. 8.** Absorption coefficient of four materials in the conditions that minimized the normalized
 481 error: samples with a size of 60×80 cm², orientation 2, with sealed edges (Sample A, B, and D) and
 482 with unsealed edges (Sample C). Also, the FSRR data report measurements with sealed edges and
 483 no sealed edges, respectively. IT data are given after correction for diffuse incidence.

484
 485
 486 **4.3 Single number acoustic indices α_w , NRC, and SAA**

487 Based on the above results, sound absorption indices α_w , NRC, and SAA are derived from the IT,
 488 FSRR and SSRR measurements. These single indices are useful for an immediate and practical
 489 comparison of the performance of different materials. The higher the α_w , SAA or the NRC values,
 490 the better is the material capability in sound absorption. Their values normally range from 0 to 1,
 491 with 1 meaning 100% sound absorption for 1 m² of material. These three indices have been
 492 compared in former studies in order to estimate the differences and any possible drawback that
 493 could lead to flaws in the performance comparison [47].

494 The weighted sound absorption coefficient α_w is derived from practical sound absorption
495 coefficients, α_p . They are frequency-dependent values of the sound absorption coefficient, based on
496 measurements on one-third octave bands (according to EN ISO 354 [2]) and calculated in octave
497 bands in accordance with EN ISO 11654 [48]. An averaged α_p is calculated for the three one-third
498 octave sound absorption coefficients within the octave. Weighted sound absorption coefficient α_w
499 can be obtained with the reference curve ($\alpha_{250}=0.8$; $\alpha_{500}=1$; $\alpha_{1000}=1$; $\alpha_{2000}=1$; $\alpha_{4000}=0.9$). The curve is
500 shifted in steps of 0.05 towards the α_p values until the sum of unfavourable deviations (this occurs
501 when the measured value is lower than the value of the curve) is less or equal to 0.10. Finally, the
502 weighted sound absorption coefficient is the value of the adjusted reference curve at 500 Hz.

503 The single number rating obtained from ASTM C423 [3] is the Sound Absorption Average (SAA).
504 This is the average of the absorption coefficients for the twelve one-third octave bands from 200 Hz
505 to 2500 Hz. The SAA supersedes the Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC), which is the arithmetic
506 average of the absorption coefficients determined at the octave bands of 250 Hz, 500 Hz, 1000 Hz
507 and 2000 Hz, rounded to the nearest multiple of 0.05. The SAA value is rounded off the nearest
508 0.01 increment. The ASTM standard does not introduce any shape indicators as the ISO method
509 described above.

510 The expanded uncertainty, at a confidence level of 95% ($k=2$), of the measured data under
511 reproducibility conditions for α_w has been evaluated according to Wittstock (2018) [43] and is equal
512 to 0.07, i.e. twice the reproducibility standard deviation; the same value has been considered also
513 for SAA and NRC, since no information is given on this regard in literature. As can be noticed in
514 table 2, there are a few differences among the single indices within each material data. The
515 differences SSRR and FSRR related to α_w are within a 0.10 for samples A and B, and 0.05 for
516 samples C and D; differences related to NRC and SAA are within 0.05 for all the samples. Table 2
517 shows also the normalized error which has been evaluated for IT and SSRR measurements with
518 respect to the FSRR data and SSRR with respect to the IT single values. The results can be

519 considered compatible in most of the cases ($E_n < 1$). However, it can be noticed that the differences
 520 between SSRR and FSRR are comparable to those between IT and FSRR.

521

522 Table 2: Comparison of results of single acoustic indices (NRC, SAA and α_w) for the four samples
 523 (A, B, C, D) and three different test methods (IT, FSRR, and SSRR). Normalized error of the IT and
 524 SSRR measurements with respect to the FSRR data and SSRR measurements with respect to IT
 525 data. $E_n > 1$ are indicated in bold.

Sample	A			B			C			D		
Test Method	α_w	SAA	NRC	α_w	SAA	NRC	α_w	SAA	NRC	α_w	SAA	NRC
IT	0.70	0.73	0.75	0.75	0.77	0.75	0.20	0.32	0.30	0.65	0.67	0.65
FSRR	0.75	0.79	0.75	0.85	0.84	0.75	0.20	0.31	0.30	0.70	0.66	0.70
SSRR	0.65	0.78	0.80	0.75	0.87	0.85	0.15	0.26	0.25	0.70	0.68	0.70
E_n (IT-FSRR)	0.51	0.61	0.00	1.01	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.51	0.10	0.51
E_n (SSRR-FSRR)	1.01	0.10	0.51	1.01	0.30	1.01	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.00	0.20	0.00
E_n (SSRR-IT)	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.00	1.01	1.01	0.51	0.61	0.51	0.51	0.10	0.51

526

527

528 4.4 Comparison among the three methods

529 Finally, a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the three methods are listed in Table 3.

530 It can be noticed that the SSRR presents a series of practical advantages that could allow for faster
 531 measurements applying less resources, i.e. allows for an explorative phase in the early stages of the
 532 design process as well as reduces the amount of material used for the production of the samples
 533 leading to more sustainable ways of performing acoustic measurements. Moreover, these practical
 534 features and faster feedback could ease the dissemination and increase awareness related to the
 535 acoustic performance among designers and architects.

536 5 Conclusions

537 This work explored the range of application and reliability of the random-incidence absorption
 538 coefficient measured within a small-scale reverberation room. Four different materials have been
 539 measured with three different methods in the impedance tube (IT), full-scale (FSRR) and small-

540 scale (SSRR) reverberation room. It was shown that the SSRR presents several advantages
 541 compared to the other methods, which have a practical relevance in the explorative design process
 542 of sound absorptive building materials. After the research and development phase, the final material
 543 can be sent to an independent acoustical laboratory for qualified ISO 354:2003 measurements.

544

545 Table 3: Synthetic comparison among IT, FSRR and SSRR methods.

Method	Sound incidence	Frequency range [Hz]	Sample area (m ²)	Advantages	Disadvantages
IT	Normal	100-5000 (depending on the tube diameter)	< 0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduced sample size • affordable measurement costs • limited wasted material • measurement time duration (< 30 min) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited frequency range • normal sound incidence • 3D absorbing systems
FSRR	Random	100-5000	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound incidence • limited edge effect • broad frequency range • 3D absorbing systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large sample size • huge measurement costs • high quantity of material to be dismantled • measurement time duration (> 60 min)
SSRR	Random	400-5000 (for porous materials) 1000-5000 (for thin rigid materials)	0.2-1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sound incidence • reduced sample size • affordable measurement costs • limited wasted material • measurement time duration (<30 min) • 3D absorbing systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited lower frequency range • edge effect • limited sample height

546

547 The SSRR-based results have been compared against FSRR measurement, used as a reference, and
 548 IT measurements. The analyses showed that normalized errors smaller than 1 – i.e. compatible
 549 results – can be generally achieved, provided that some recommendations in measurement setup are
 550 needed. First, to have reliable data a sample size close to 60×80 cm² is recommended; the size

551 should be placed with an oblique orientation on the room floor. Second, the sound absorption
552 coefficients data showed that the edge effect is more evident for thicker panels (>50cm) and smaller
553 samples (60x40cm²). For samples sizes of 60x80cm² the edge effect has been shown to be reduced
554 also for thicker samples. This aspect should be investigated in a more systematic way including
555 panels with thicknesses above those considered here in order to find a threshold of validity due to
556 this parameter. Third, a sound absorption overestimation can take place depending on the sample
557 thickness. Fourth, due to the limited diffusivity of the sound field, the SSRR method can be
558 profitably adopted when the frequencies of interest lie above 400 Hz for porous materials and above
559 1000 Hz for thin low absorptive rigid materials. Nevertheless, as previously stated, since larger
560 uncertainties in SSRRs and in FSRRs might occur especially for higher absorptive materials with
561 ISO 354 method [43], compatibility ranges could be wider. Future research will be aimed at
562 investigating this aspect.

563 Within these use-cases, the discussed results show that that the small reverberation room is a
564 reliable measurement tool in the frequency range 400-5000 Hz (for porous materials) and 1000-
565 5000 Hz (for thin rigid materials), and therefore, can be considered as a valid alternative to the
566 measurements in the full-scale or in the impedance tube. These might require a more systematic
567 study that would consider also other variables (e.g. room volume variations) in order to define the
568 proper range of application.

569 Finally, this work has pointed out the advantages related to the possibility to test small-size
570 samples, thus potentially leading to limited wasted material and transportation costs for the tested
571 samples. Moreover, the sample arrangement in the SSRR set-up requires a shorter time, enabling in
572 turn to dedicate an increased time to test different alternatives. Moreover, this could ease the
573 dissemination and increase awareness related to the acoustic performance among designers and
574 architects while pursuing more sustainable ways to perform acoustic measurements.

575

576 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

577 The authors are grateful to professors Arianna Astolfi, Marco Masoero and Alessandro Schiavi for
578 the useful discussions and encouragement on this research. They would like to thank the architect
579 Chiara Devecchi, the engineers Paolo Onali and Davide Squarciapino for having provided some of
580 the materials used in these measurements and Francesca Latorella and Andrea Gerbotto for their
581 contribution to the small-scale measurements. The small-scaled reverberation room was built in
582 collaboration with 3F S.r.l..

583

584 **References**

585

586 [1] ISO 10534-2:1998, Acoustics - Determination of sound absorption coefficient and impedance in
587 impedance tubes - Part 2: Transfer-function method. International Organization for
588 Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.

589 [2] ISO 354:2003, Acoustics - measurement of sound absorption in a reverberation room.
590 International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.

591 [3] ASTM C423-17:2017, Standard Test Method for Sound Absorption and Sound Absorption
592 Coefficients by the Reverberation Room Method, ASTM International, West Conshohocken,
593 PA.

594 [4] A. Alonso, F. Martellotta, Room acoustic modelling of textile materials hung freely in space:
595 from the reverberation chamber to ancient churches, *Journal of Building Performance Simulation*
596 9 (2016), 469-486. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19401493.2015.1087594>

597 [5] J. R.Veen, J. Pan, P. Saha, Development of a Small Size Reverberation Room Standardized Test
598 Procedure for Random Incidence Sound Absorption Testing, Proc. SAE conference 2005,
599 Traverse City, USA, 2005.

600 [6] SAE j2883:2015 - Laboratory Measurement of Random Incidence Sound Absorption Tests Using
601 a Small Reverberation Room. SAE International.

602 [7] P. Jackson, Design and Construction of a Small Reverberation Chamber, Proc. SAE conference
603 2005, Traverse City, USA, 2005.

604 [8] G. Baldinelli, F. Bianchi, S. Endelis, A. Jakovics, G. L. Morini, S. Falcioni, S. Fantucci, V. Serra,
605 M. A. Navacerrada, C. Díaz, A. Libbra, A. Muscio, F. Asdrubali, Thermal conductivity
606 measurement of insulating innovative building materials by hot plate and heat flow meter
607 devices: a round Robin test. *Int. J. Therm. Sci.* 139 (2019), 25-35.
608 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijthermalsci.2019.01.037>

- 609 [9] R. Del Rey, J. Alba, L. Bertó, A. Gregoriù, Small-sized reverberation chamber for the
610 measurement of sound absorption, *Materiales de Construcción* 67 (2017), 139.
611 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/mc.2017.07316>
- 612 [10] L. Pacheco Bastos, G. Da Silva Vieira de Melo, N. Sure Soeiro, Panels Manufactured from
613 Vegetable Fibers: An Alternative Approach for Controlling Noises in Indoor Environments,
614 *Advances in acoustic and vibration* 2012, (paper 698737).
615 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2012/698737>
- 616 [11] M. Kierzkowski, H. Law, J. Cotterill, Benefits of Reduced-size Reverberation Room Testing.
617 *Proc. Acoustics 2017*, Perth, Australia, 2017.
- 618 [12] A. Rasa, Development of a small-scale reverberation room, *Proc. Acoustics 2016*, Brisbane,
619 Australia, 2016.
- 620 [13] A. Chappuis, Small size devices for accurate acoustical measurements of materials and parts
621 used in automobiles, *Proc. SAE conference 1993*; Traverse City, USA, 1993.
- 622 [14] A. De Bruijn, On the scattering of a plane wave by porous sound-absorbing strip, *Proc.*
623 *Euronoise 2008*, Paris, France, 2008.
- 624 [15] A. Duval, J.-F. Rondwau, L. Dejaeger, F. Sgard, N. Atalla, Diffuse field absorption coefficient
625 simulation of porous materials in small reverberant chambers: finite size and diffusivity issues,
626 *Proc. Congres Francais d'Acoustique 2010*, Lyon, France, 2010.
- 627 [16] A. Cops, J. Vanhaecht, K. Leppens, Sound Absorption in a Reverberation Room: Causes of
628 Discrepancies on Measurement Results, *Appl. Acoust.* 46 (1995), 215-232.
629 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-682X\(95\)00029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-682X(95)00029-9)
- 630 [17] M. Nolan, M. Vercammen, C. H. Jeong, Effects of different diffusers types on the diffusivity in
631 reverberation chambers, *Proc. Euronoise 2018*, Crete, Greece, 2018.

- 632 [18] D. T. Bradley, M. Müller-Trapet, J. Adelgren, M. Vorländer, Effect of boundary diffusers in a
633 reverberation chamber: Standardized diffuse field quantifiers. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 135 (2014),
634 1898-1906. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4866291>
- 635 [19] T.J. Cox, P. D'Antonio, *Acoustic Absorbers and Diffusers: Theory, Design and Application*,
636 Spon Press, London, United Kingdom, 2004.
- 637 [20] C. Scrosati, F. Scamoni, M. Depalma, N. Granzotto, On the diffusion of the sound field in a
638 reverberation room, *Proc. 26th International Congress on Sound and Vibration, ICSV, Montréal,*
639 *Canada, 2019.*
- 640 [21] M. Vercammen, Improving the accuracy of sound absorption measurements according to ISO
641 354, *Proc. ISRA 2010, Melbourne, Australia 2010.*
- 642 [22] W. A. Davern, P. Dubout, First report on Australasian comparison measurements of sound
643 absorption coefficients, *Proc. CSIRO 1980, Melbourne, 1980.*
- 644 [23] N.B. Roozen, E.A. Piana, E. Deckers, C. Scrosati, On the numerical modelling of reverberant
645 rooms, including a comparison with experiments, *Proc. ICSV 2019, Montréal, Canada, 2019.*
- 646 [24] M. Nolan, M. Vercammen, C. H. Jeong, J. Brunskog, The Use of a Reference Absorber for
647 Absorption Measurements in a Reverberation Chamber, *Proc. Forum Acusticum 2014, Krakow,*
648 *Poland, 2014.*
- 649 [25] C. Scrosati, D. Annesi, L. Barbaresi, R. Baruffa, F. D'Angelo, G. De Napoli, M. Depalma, A. Di
650 Bella, S. Di Filippo, D. D'Orazio, M. Garai, N. Granzotto, V. Lori, F. Martellotta, A. Moschetto,
651 F. Pompoli, A. Prato, P. Nataletti, F. Scamoni, A. Schiavi, F. Serpilli, Design Principles of the
652 Italian Round Robin Test on Reverberation Rooms, *Proc. of ICA 2019, Aachen, Germany, 2019.*
- 653 [26] A. Prato, F. Casassa, A. Schiavi, Reverberation time measurements in non-diffuse acoustic field
654 by the modal reverberation time, *Appl. Acoust.* 110 (2016), 160-169.
655 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2016.03.041>

- 656 [27] S. De Cesaris, D. D’Orazio, F. Morandi, M. Garai, Extraction of the envelope from impulse
657 responses using pre-processed energy detection for early decay estimations, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*
658 138 (2015), 2513-2523. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4931904>
- 659 [28] J. R. Veen, P. Saha, Feasibility of a standardized test procedure for random incidence sound
660 absorption tests using a small size reverberation room, Proc. SAE conference 2003, Traverse
661 City, USA, 2003.
- 662 [29] T. W. Bartel, Effect of absorber geometry on apparent absorption coefficients as measured in a
663 reverberation chamber, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 69 (1981), 1065-1074.
664 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.385685>
- 665 [30] F. Pompoli, P. Bonfiglio, K. V. Horoshenkov, A. Khan, L. Jaouen, F. Bécot, F. Sgard, F.
666 Asdrubali, F. D’Alessandro, J. Hübel, N. Atalla, C. K. Amédin, W. Lauriks, L. Boeckx, How
667 reproducible is the acoustical characterization of porous media?, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 141 (2017),
668 945-955. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4976087>
- 669 [31] D. Pilon, R. Panneton, F. Sgard, Behavioural criterion quantifying the effects of circumferential
670 air gaps on porous materials in the standing wave tube, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 116 (2004), 344-356.
671 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1756611>
- 672 [32] R. Spagnolo, G. Benedetto, Reverberation time in enclosures: The surface reflection law and the
673 dependence of the absorption coefficient on the angle of incidence, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 77
674 (1985), 1447-1451. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.392039>
- 675 [33] P. Bonfiglio, F. Pompoli, R. Lioni, A reduced-order integral formulation to account for the
676 finite size effect of isotropic square panels using the transfer matrix method, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*
677 139 (2016), 1773-1783.
- 678 [34] C-H. Jeong, Non-uniform sound intensity distributions when measuring absorption coefficients
679 in reverberation chambers using a phased beam tracing. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 127 (2010), 3560–
680 3568.

- 681 [35] ISO 9613:1993, Acoustics – attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors – Part 1:
682 calculation of the absorption of sound by the atmosphere. International Organization for
683 Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.
- 684 [36] ISO 17497-1:2004, Acoustics – sound-scattering properties of surfaces – Part 1: measurement of
685 the random-incidence scattering coefficient in a reverberation room. International Organization
686 for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.
- 687 [37] L. Shtrepi, A. Astolfi, G. D’Antonio, G. Vannelli, G. Barbato, S. Mauro, A. Prato, Accuracy of
688 the random-incidence scattering coefficient measurement. *Appl. Acoust.* 106 (2016), 23-35.
689 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2015.12.021>
- 690 [38] C. -H. Jeong, Diffuse Sound Field: Challenges and Misconceptions. Proc. INTER-NOISE 2016,
691 Hamburg, Germany.
- 692 [39] A. Gerbotto, Caratterizzazione di una camera riverberante in scala - Acoustic characterization of
693 a scaled reverberation room, Master Thesis, Politecnico di Torino, 2016.
- 694 [40] ITA-Toolbox for MATLAB® Developed at the Institute of Technical Acoustics at RWTH
695 Aachen University.
- 696 [41] ISO/IEC 17043:2010, Conformity assessment - General requirements for proficiency testing.
697 International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.
- 698 [42] JCGM 100 2008 Evaluation of Measurement Data — Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in
699 Measurement (*GUM*), Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology, Sèvres, France.
- 700 [43] V. Wittstock, Determination of Measurement Uncertainties in Building Acoustics by
701 Interlaboratory Tests. Part 2: Sound Absorption Measured in Reverberation Rooms, *Acta Acust.*
702 United with *Acust.* 104 (2018), 999 – 1008. <https://doi.org/10.3813/AAA.919266>
- 703 [44] D. George, P. Mallery, SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference 17.0
704 Update. 10th Edition, Pearson, Boston, 2010.

- 705 [45] A. Schiavi and A. Prato, Valuation of sound absorption: an experimental comparative study
706 among reverberation room, impedance tube and airflow resistivity-based models, Proc. ICSV
707 2019, Montréal, Canada, 2019.
- 708 [46] Jain, S., Joshi, M., Bankar, H., Kamble, P., Yadav P., Karanth N. Measurement and Prediction
709 of Sound Absorption of Sound Package Materials in Large and Small Reverberation Chambers,
710 Proc SAE conference 2017, Traverse City, USA, 2017.
- 711 [47] J. Białek, E. Nowicka, Comparison of sound absorption ratings calculated according to ISO and
712 ASTM standards, Proc. OSA 2016, Warsaw, Poland, 2016.
- 713 [48] ISO 11654:1997, Acoustics - Sound absorbers for use in buildings - Rating of sound absorption.
714 International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.

Appendix A

Sound absorption coefficient (α_s) and related uncertainty (U) for material A measured in SSRR, IT and FSRR. Given the background noise criterion (section 2.4), the SSRR data are valid for 250-5000 Hz. IT_n shows the data for normal-incidence sound absorption coefficients.

SSRR			Frequency [Hz]																	
Size [cm ²]	Orientation		100	125	160	200	250	315	400	500	630	800	1000	1250	1600	2000	2500	3150	4000	5000
60x40	O1	α_s	0.11	0.24	0.00	0.42	0.61	0.53	0.52	0.64	0.68	1.10	1.29	1.10	1.10	1.05	1.13	1.23	1.14	1.04
		U	0.17	0.23	0.06	0.24	0.28	0.22	0.18	0.19	0.18	0.24	0.27	0.24	0.23	0.23	0.24	0.28	0.30	0.35
	O2	α_s	0.10	0.20	0.00	0.40	0.60	0.48	0.53	0.60	0.68	1.03	1.15	1.20	1.20	0.96	1.21	1.10	1.17	0.94
		U	0.15	0.20	0.06	0.24	0.28	0.21	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.23	0.24	0.26	0.25	0.22	0.25	0.26	0.30	0.34
	O3	α_s	0.09	0.17	0.00	0.36	0.58	0.49	0.58	0.56	0.63	1.02	1.05	1.22	1.27	0.90	1.22	1.18	1.15	1.02
		U	0.15	0.18	0.06	0.22	0.27	0.21	0.20	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.23	0.26	0.26	0.21	0.25	0.27	0.30	0.35
60x60	O1	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.32	0.46	0.51	0.56	0.59	0.70	1.17	0.98	1.04	1.04	0.83	1.00	0.95	0.94	0.85
		U	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.25	0.22	0.23	0.23	0.20	0.22	0.24	0.27	0.33
	O2	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.33	0.47	0.47	0.58	0.63	0.80	1.06	1.00	1.06	0.96	0.86	1.00	0.92	1.07	0.91
		U	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.21	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.23	0.22	0.23	0.21	0.20	0.22	0.24	0.29	0.33
60x80	O1	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.26	0.38	0.49	0.57	0.72	0.96	1.04	1.08	1.02	1.09	0.92	0.96	0.95	0.97	0.85
		U	0.06	0.06	0.16	0.18	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.24	0.28	0.33
	O2	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.29	0.33	0.43	0.61	0.74	0.97	1.05	1.07	0.94	1.02	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.87
		U	0.06	0.06	0.14	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.24	0.28	0.33
	O3	α_s	0.00	0.01	0.14	0.24	0.32	0.49	0.56	0.73	0.85	1.07	1.03	0.94	1.05	0.88	0.95	0.92	0.98	0.88
		U	0.06	0.07	0.14	0.16	0.18	0.21	0.19	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.24	0.28	0.33
IT		α	0.20	0.21	0.24	0.30	0.40	0.53	0.64	0.76	0.84	0.88	0.89	0.89	0.88	0.86	0.84	0.82	0.83	0.79
		U	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.02
IT _n		α_0	0.14	0.15	0.17	0.22	0.30	0.42	0.53	0.66	0.76	0.81	0.83	0.82	0.80	0.78	0.75	0.73	0.74	0.69
		U	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.02
FSRR		α_s	0.09	0.13	0.23	0.32	0.52	0.64	0.79	0.81	0.92	0.94	0.96	0.93	0.95	0.91	0.86	0.84	0.83	0.79
		U	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.13	0.16

Appendix B

Sound absorption coefficient (α_s) and related uncertainty (U) for material B measured in SSRR, IT and FSRR. Given the background noise criterion (section 2.4), the SSRR data are valid for 250-5000 Hz. IT_n shows the data for normal-incidence sound absorption coefficients.

SSRR			Frequency [Hz]																	
Size [cm ²]	Orientation		100	125	160	200	250	315	400	500	630	800	1000	1250	1600	2000	2500	3150	4000	5000
60x40	O1	α_s	0.11	0.24	0.00	0.42	0.61	0.53	0.52	0.64	0.68	1.10	1.29	1.10	1.10	1.05	1.13	1.23	1.14	1.04
		U	0.17	0.23	0.06	0.24	0.28	0.22	0.18	0.19	0.18	0.24	0.27	0.24	0.23	0.23	0.24	0.24	0.28	0.30
	O2	α_s	0.10	0.20	0.00	0.40	0.60	0.48	0.53	0.60	0.68	1.03	1.15	1.20	1.20	0.96	1.21	1.10	1.17	0.94
		U	0.15	0.20	0.06	0.24	0.28	0.21	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.23	0.24	0.26	0.25	0.22	0.25	0.26	0.30	0.34
	O3	α_s	0.09	0.17	0.00	0.36	0.58	0.49	0.58	0.56	0.63	1.02	1.05	1.22	1.27	0.90	1.22	1.18	1.15	1.02
		U	0.15	0.18	0.06	0.22	0.27	0.21	0.20	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.23	0.26	0.26	0.21	0.25	0.27	0.30	0.35
60x60	O1	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.32	0.46	0.51	0.56	0.59	0.70	1.17	0.98	1.04	1.04	0.83	1.00	0.95	0.94	0.85
		U	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.25	0.22	0.23	0.23	0.20	0.22	0.24	0.27	0.33
	O2	α_s	0.00	-0.09	0.04	0.33	0.47	0.47	0.58	0.63	0.80	1.06	1.00	1.06	0.96	0.86	1.00	0.92	1.07	0.91
		U	0.06	-0.01	0.08	0.21	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.23	0.22	0.23	0.21	0.20	0.22	0.24	0.29	0.33
60x80	O1	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.26	0.38	0.49	0.57	0.72	0.96	1.04	1.08	1.02	1.09	0.92	0.96	0.95	0.97	0.85
		U	0.06	0.06	0.16	0.18	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.24	0.28	0.33
	O2	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.29	0.33	0.43	0.61	0.74	0.97	1.05	1.07	0.94	1.02	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.87
		U	0.06	0.06	0.14	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.24	0.28	0.33
	O3	α_s	0.00	0.01	0.14	0.24	0.32	0.49	0.56	0.73	0.85	1.07	1.03	0.94	1.05	0.88	0.95	0.92	0.98	0.88
		U	0.06	0.07	0.14	0.16	0.18	0.21	0.19	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.24	0.28	0.33
IT		α	0.10	0.15	0.23	0.35	0.49	0.63	0.74	0.84	0.88	0.90	0.90	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.85	0.86	0.83
		U	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
IT _n		α_0	0.07	0.10	0.17	0.26	0.38	0.52	0.64	0.75	0.81	0.83	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.81	0.79	0.77	0.79	0.74
		U	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
FSRR		α_s	0.09	0.18	0.28	0.52	0.65	0.75	0.82	0.86	0.91	0.90	0.99	0.96	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.87	0.85	0.80
		U	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.13

Appendix C

Sound absorption coefficient (α_s) and related uncertainty (U) for material C measured in SSRR, IT and FSRR. Given the background noise criterion (section 2.4), the SSRR data are valid for 250-5000 Hz. IT_n shows the data for normal-incidence sound absorption coefficients.

SSRR			Frequency [Hz]																	
Size [cm ²]	Orientation		100	125	160	200	250	315	400	500	630	800	1000	1250	1600	2000	2500	3150	4000	5000
60x40	O1	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.10	0.12	0.32	0.38	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.21	0.98
		U	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.12	1.07	1.07	1.07	0.26	0.31
	O2	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.10	0.14	0.28	0.43	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.02	1.22	0.97
		U	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.13	1.18	1.18	1.18	0.25	0.31	0.34
	O3	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.30	0.51	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.03	1.15	0.97
		U	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.11	0.14	1.28	1.28	1.28	0.25	0.30	0.34
60x60	O1	α_s	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.11	0.14	0.34	0.46	0.50	0.54	0.82	0.93	1.02	1.02
		U	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.20	0.24	0.28	0.35
	O2	α_s	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.12	0.14	0.37	0.36	0.44	0.55	0.79	0.96	1.14	1.03
		U	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.14	0.16	0.20	0.24	0.30	0.35
60x80	O1	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.12	0.15	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.57	0.90	1.01	1.12	1.00
		U	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.21	0.25	0.29	0.34
	O2	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.12	0.12	0.33	0.43	0.52	0.58	0.87	1.02	1.12	1.08
		U	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.21	0.25	0.29	0.35
	O3	α_s	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.15	0.32	0.43	0.44	0.59	0.85	0.90	1.00	1.00
		U	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.17	0.21	0.24	0.28	0.34
IT		α	0.27	0.16	0.17	0.13	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.19	0.24	0.33	0.45	0.56	0.67	0.79	0.91	0.95	0.91
		U	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.04
IT _n		α_0	0.20	0.11	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.14	0.18	0.25	0.35	0.45	0.56	0.70	0.85	0.92	0.86
		U	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.04
FSRR		α_s	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.23	0.30	0.34	0.45	0.54	0.66	0.74	0.83	0.85	0.89
		U	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.13

Appendix D

Sound absorption coefficient (α_s) and related uncertainty (U) for material D measured in SSRR, IT and FSRR. Given the background noise criterion (section 2.4), the SSRR data are valid for 250-5000 Hz. IT_n shows the data for normal-incidence sound absorption coefficients.

SSRR			Frequency [Hz]																	
Size [cm ²]	Orientation		100	125	160	200	250	315	400	500	630	800	1000	1250	1600	2000	2500	3150	4000	5000
60x40	O1	α_s	0.07	0.28	0.39	0.65	0.78	0.98	1.07	0.74	1.00	1.21	1.36	0.90	0.85	0.95	1.00	1.21	1.20	1.01
		U	0.12	0.26	0.28	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.32	0.21	0.24	0.25	0.28	0.21	0.20	0.22	0.22	0.27	0.30	0.35
	O2	α_s	0.03	0.26	0.38	0.72	0.79	0.93	0.85	0.70	0.94	1.11	1.29	0.88	1.03	0.90	1.05	1.13	1.25	1.10
		U	0.09	0.25	0.27	0.38	0.34	0.34	0.26	0.20	0.23	0.24	0.27	0.20	0.22	0.21	0.23	0.26	0.31	0.35
	O3	α_s	0.00	0.26	0.40	0.70	0.88	0.92	0.90	0.72	0.94	1.19	1.13	0.99	1.02	0.87	0.99	1.04	1.28	0.96
		U	0.06	0.25	0.29	0.37	0.38	0.34	0.28	0.20	0.23	0.25	0.24	0.22	0.22	0.21	0.22	0.25	0.31	0.34
60x60	O1	α_s	0.09	0.37	0.35	0.53	0.68	0.67	0.58	0.67	0.75	0.93	0.91	0.84	0.78	0.98	0.96	0.98	1.26	1.07
		U	0.14	0.33	0.26	0.29	0.30	0.26	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.19	0.22	0.22	0.25	0.31	0.35
	O2	α_s	0.20	0.41	0.37	0.54	0.59	0.67	0.64	0.61	0.76	1.04	0.84	0.87	1.02	0.87	0.97	1.05	1.25	1.09
		U	0.25	0.35	0.27	0.30	0.27	0.26	0.21	0.18	0.20	0.23	0.19	0.20	0.22	0.21	0.22	0.25	0.31	0.35
60x80	O1	α_s	0.15	0.24	0.34	0.33	0.47	0.66	0.53	0.69	0.70	0.69	0.73	0.71	0.72	0.76	0.80	1.05	1.12	0.99
		U	0.21	0.23	0.25	0.21	0.23	0.26	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.25	0.29	0.34
	O2	α_s	0.24	0.25	0.33	0.40	0.60	0.66	0.53	0.61	0.67	0.74	0.69	0.84	0.80	0.85	0.83	0.99	1.19	0.98
		U	0.29	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.28	0.26	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.25	0.30	0.34
	O3	α_s	0.14	0.26	0.38	0.43	0.54	0.65	0.66	0.78	0.68	0.70	0.73	0.59	0.76	0.85	0.86	0.98	1.11	0.92
		U	0.19	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.25	0.26	0.22	0.22	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.20	0.21	0.25	0.29	0.34
IT		α	0.38	0.42	0.55	0.64	0.71	0.74	0.75	0.74	0.72	0.68	0.64	0.61	0.58	0.58	0.61	0.65	0.75	0.84
		U	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.04
IT _n		α_0	0.29	0.32	0.44	0.53	0.60	0.64	0.65	0.63	0.62	0.57	0.53	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.50	0.54	0.65	0.75
		U	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.04
FSRR		α_s	0.43	0.50	0.53	0.54	0.58	0.68	0.66	0.70	0.72	0.69	0.65	0.64	0.67	0.71	0.73	0.78	0.86	0.85
		U	0.24	0.21	0.18	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.13	0.16