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Unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) technologies are rapidly advancing due to the unlimited number of applications from parcel delivery to people transportation. As the UAV market expands, community noise impact will become a significant problem for public acceptance. Compact drone architectures based on contra-rotating propellers bring significant benefits in terms of aerodynamic performance and redundancy to ensure vehicle control in case of component failure. However, contra-rotating propellers are severely noisy if not designed appropriately. In the framework of a perception-influenced design approach, this paper investigates the optimal rotor spacing distance configuration to minimise noise annoyance. On the basis of a series of psychoacoustic metrics (i.e. loudness, fluctuation strength, roughness, sharpness and tonality) and psychoacoustic annoyance models, the optimal rotor axial separation distance (expressed as a function of propeller blade diameter) is at a range of 0.2 to 0.4. This paper also discusses the performance of currently available psychoacoustic models to predict propeller noise annoyance, and defines further work to develop a psychoacoustic annoyance model optimised for rotating systems.
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I. INTRODUCTION

New aviation markets, such as Urban Air Mobility (UAM) operations for passengers and drone operations for goods’ deliveries and blue light services, are estimated to have a global potential of between $132 and $227 billion over the next 20 years (ATI, 2019). As the drone delivery market intensifies over the coming years, the payload requirement is predicted to increase by a factor of 50 to 100, leading to further problems with their public acceptance; with noise becoming a primary focus. This increase in payload requirements can only be achieved with compact drone architectures such as co-axial or overlapping propellers. The use of contra-rotating propellers in Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) has the benefit of increasing aerodynamic performance (Stract et al., 1981), reducing the UAV’s plan size and adding redundancy in case of component failure (McKay et al., 2019).

However, the small tip-to-tip spacing between contra-rotating propellers results in a significant source of noise due to blade interaction effects (Tinney and Sirohi, 2018; Alexander et al., 2019). Extensive laboratory testing has found that in the frequency spectra of multi-rotor UAV there are significant sound levels at higher harmonics of the blade passage frequency, which seems to be caused by interaction noise from disturbed inflow due to other rotor blades or the fuselage (Magliozi, 1991; Cabell et al., 2016; Torija et al., 2019). In an experimental investigation of static multi-rotor contra-rotating UAV propellers, McKay et al. (2019) observed that potential field interaction tones are about 20 dB higher than rotor alone tones at typical ground observer locations with a hovering UAV. This suggests that proper design of multi-rotor contra-rotating UAV propellers to minimise interaction between rotors can lead to significant reductions in noise emission.

The noise sources on a co-axial propeller system can be categorized into either rotor self-noise or interaction noise. Rotor self-noise is principally composed of tonal components and has contributions due to the steady loading and aerofoil thickness, while the broadband component is relatively weak (Marte and Kurtz, 1970). An interaction source is generated when the spiraling wake and tip vortex
from the upper propeller interacts with the lower propeller. At sufficiently small rotor separation distances, an additional interaction noise source is present arising from the interaction of the potential near field of each propeller with the other (Heff, 1990). A more recent study by Chaitanya et al. (2020) performed a detailed investigation on the sensitivity of the aerodynamic and aeroacoustic performance to the axial separation distance between a counter-rotating propeller configuration. An optimum separation distance to diameter ratio for maximum efficiency and minimum radiated noise was found to be at 0.25 based on overall sound power level. The reason behind this optimum is attributed to the balance between potential field interactions and tip-vortex interactions radiated from the contra-rotating configuration. The current paper extends their work to perform psychoacoustic optimization of contra-rotating propellers.

Anghinolfi et al. (2016) carried out a psychoacoustic optimization of blade spacing in subsonic, open, or nearly open axial-flow rotors. This optimization focused only on tonal noise and the objective function was based on the Tone-to-Noise Ratio (TNR) metric. They found optimal blade spacing for different numbers of blade rotors as a function of TNR and level of the highest tonal peak. However, these results do not have direct relation to loudness or other psychoacoustic features.

The perception-influenced design approach (Rizzi, 2016) aims to incorporate human response into the process of creating low-noise aircraft. Metrics that correlate well with human response to noise can potentially be incorporated into the aircraft design cycle to effectively reduce community noise impact (Krishnamurthy et al., 2018). Current noise certification metrics do not necessarily reflect the characteristics of noise signatures of unconventional aircraft designs (Rizzi, 2016; Christian and Cabell, 2017; Torija et al., 2019), and therefore may not be able to predict human response. Torija et al. (2019) found that the Effective Perceived Noise Level (EPNL) is unable to account for the perceptual effect of series of complex tones spaced evenly across the frequency spectrum with relatively even sound levels, which is typical of multi-rotor vehicles (Cabell et al., 2016; Torija et al.,
2019). Other metrics, such as the Sound Exposure Level (SEL), do not account for the effects of
tonal noise, which is a major contributor towards the perceived annoyance due to aircraft noise
(Angerer et al., 1991; Berckmans et al., 2008; More, 2011; White et al., 2017). Therefore, the use of
current noise certification metrics for aircraft design might lead to suboptimal solutions.

Psychoacoustic metrics have been widely applied to improve the sound quality of different
consumer products, especially in the automotive industry (Lyon, 2003). Psychoacoustic metrics, such
as loudness, sharpness, tonality, roughness and fluctuation strength, are good indicators of how the
human auditory system reacts to different features of acoustic stimuli (Zwicker and Fastl, 1999).
Loudness measures the sensation of sound intensity. Sharpness and tonality describe the perceptual
effects of spectral imbalance of the sound towards the high frequency region, and the presence of
spectral irregularities or tones respectively. Fluctuation strength and roughness describe how slow
and rapid fluctuations, respectively, of the sound level are perceived. The psychoacoustic metrics
sharpness, tonality and fluctuation strength have been suggested as good indicators of rotorcraft noise
annoyance (Krishnamurthy et al., 2018; Boucher et al., 2020). Investigating the performance of
different psychoacoustic metrics to account for the perception of different aspects of aircraft noise,
Barbot et al. (2008) found fluctuation strength as a good indicator of perceptual effects of turbulence
and sharpness as a good indicator of the perceptual effects of high frequency noise. Torija et al. (2019)
found that Aures/Terhardt tonality (Aures, 1985b) improves on the EPNL Tone Correction in terms
of accounting for the presence of complex tones in aircraft noise.

Perception of mechanical sounds is a complex process due to the amount of noise features
involved (e.g. tonal components, amplitude modulated sounds, etc.). To address this issue, Zwicker
and Fastl (1999) proposed a model for combining several psychoacoustic metrics into one model to
quantify annoyance (hereinafter called Zwicker’s model for short). Using the Zwicker’s psychoacoustic
annoyance (PA) model, relative annoyance degrees of different noise samples can be estimated from
measures of loudness, sharpness, fluctuation strength and roughness. However, Zwicker’s PA model
does not include a factor accounting for the influence of the tonality on noise annoyance. To improve
accuracy in the estimation of relative annoyance degrees caused by several types of tonal/atonal noises,
Di et al. (2016) carried out an update of Zwicker’s PA model aiming at tonal noises. More (2011)
developed a modified version of Zwicker’s PA model based on the results of seven psychoacoustic
tests for several aircraft sounds with varying psychoacoustic parameters. The modified PA model
developed by More, which includes a term based on Aures/Terhardt tonality and loudness to account
for the perceptual effect of tonal noise, was found able to accurately predict aircraft noise annoyance.

The aim of this paper is to perform a psychoacoustic analysis of a single static contra-rotating
propeller mounted in an anechoic chamber. A set of psychoacoustic metrics are calculated for a series
of far-field microphone measurements with different separation distance between the contra-rotating
propellers. The contribution of each noise source component on the co-axial propeller under study is
evaluated from a perceptual standpoint, using relevant psychoacoustic metrics. Working towards the
development of a framework for the psychoacoustic optimisation of novel aerial vehicles, this paper
investigates the optimal distance between contra-rotating propellers to minimise psychoacoustic
impact. The performance of PA models to predict noise annoyance for propeller systems is evaluated
and discussed. The main assumption in this paper is that PA models optimized for propeller noise
annoyance can be used to inform propeller design for lower psychoacoustic impact.

This paper is structured as follows: Section II describes the experimental setup for acoustic
measurements and the metrics for psychoacoustic analysis; Section III presents and discusses the
experimental results and are followed by the main conclusions of this work in section IV.
II. EXPERIMENTAL AND PSYCHOACOUSTIC METHODS

A. Experimental set-up and procedure

The overlapping rotor test rig designed and manufactured at the University of Southampton consisted of two FOXTECH W61-35 brushless DC (BLDC) (16 poles) 700W motors mounted on a carbon fibre beam as shown in Fig. 1. A commercially available T-Motor 16 inch 5.4 inch rotor was used for this overlapping rotor propulsion system analysis. Two Hyperion HP-EM2-TACHBL sensors were used to measure the precise Rotations Per Minute (RPM). Two Maytech 40A-OPTO speed controllers were used to accurately control the BLDC motors. The overlapping rig allowed manipulation of the propulsion system in both rotor horizontal separation distance d/D (with D as the rotor diameter) and rotor axial separation distance z/D. z/D rotor separation was achieved by a custom linear actuator traversing the upper rotor. All of the tests for this study were achieved when the lower rotor plane was at least three rotor diameters away from the ground with anechoic wedges beneath. The selected lead screw and stepper motor configuration allows for z/D variations varying of 0.05 to 1. Sixteen z/D positions were tested: 0.05, 0.075, 0.1, 0.125, 0.15, 0.175, 0.2, 0.25, 0.3, 0.35, 0.4, 0.45, 0.5, 0.6, 0.8 and 1. The combined thrust of the dual-rotor propulsion system is varied from 2 to 20N in steps of 2N. Although 10 thrust settings were measured, the results shown in this paper refer to a thrust of 10 N (varying thrusts lead to changes in magnitudes, but do not alter the trends shown below). A detailed description of the rig is presented by Brazinskas (2019).
FIG. 1. (Color online). Photograph of overlapping propeller rig within the anechoic chamber of the Institute of Sound and Vibration Research at the University of Southampton.

B. Far-field noise measurements

The overlapping far-field noise measurements were carried out at the Institute of Sound and Vibration Research's open-jet wind tunnel facility. The overlapping rotor test rig was located within an anechoic chamber, of dimension 8 m × 8 m × 8 m as shown in Fig. 1. The walls, acoustically treated with glass wool wedges, allow a cut-off frequency of 80 Hz.

Far-field noise measurements were made using 10, ½ in. condenser microphones (B&K type 4189) located at a constant radial distance of 2.5 m from the centre of the propellers. These microphones were placed at emission angles of between 12 and 102 degrees measured relative to the bottom
propeller. Measurements were carried out for 10 s duration at a sampling frequency of 50 kHz, and
the noise spectra was calculated with a window size of 1024 data points corresponding to a frequency
resolution of 48.83 Hz and a Bandwidth-Time (BT) product of about 500, which is sufficient to ensure
negligible variance in the spectral estimated at this frequency resolution. Please note that the data
analysed in this paper is same as the data presented in Chaitanya et al. (2020).

C. Psychoacoustic data analysis

Unlike physical quantities (e.g. sound pressure level), psychoacoustic metrics provide a linear
representation of human hearing perception (HEAD Acoustics, 2018). Psychoacoustic metrics have
been found to outperform conventional noise metrics (e.g. EPNL or SEL) in predicting noise
annoyance of fixed-wing aircraft (Rizzi et al., 2016; Torija et al., 2019). Recently, several authors
(Krishnamurthy et al., 2018; Boucher et al., 2020) have explored the potential of psychoacoustic
metrics for the modelling of human annoyance to rotorcraft noise, and assessed the performance of
each psychoacoustic metric to account for rotorcraft noise annoyance response.

The psychoacoustic metrics (including loudness in sone, sharpness in acum, fluctuation strength
in vacil, roughness in asper, impulsiveness in IU, and tonality in TU) of all sound samples were
calculated with ArtemiS software (HEAD acoustics GmbH). Loudness was calculated according to
DIN 45631/A1 (2010), which is based on Zwicker loudness model and includes a modification for
time varying signals. The calculation of sharpness was made according to the standard DIN 45692
(2009). This sharpness method does not take into account the influence of absolute loudness on the
sharpness perception. There are no standard methods for calculating roughness and fluctuation
strength. These two metrics were calculated according to the hearing model given by Sottek (1993).
Sottek’s hearing model simulates the signal processing of human hearing and accounts for its
limitations to track fast temporal changes within a critical band (Boucher et al., 2020). Tonality was
calculated according to Aures/Terhardt tonality model (Aures, 1985b).
Three PA models were implemented to discuss their performance in assessing propeller noise annoyance. The Zwicker PA model, accounting for the relation between annoyance and hearing sensations loudness \( N \), sharpness \( S \), fluctuation strength \( F \) and roughness \( R \) is given by

\[
P A = N_5 \left(1 + \sqrt{w_S^2 + w_{FR}^2}\right)
\]  

(1)

where

\[
N_5 \text{ is the 5th percentile of the loudness (in sone)}
\]

\[
w_S = \{(S - 1.75) \cdot 0.25\lg(N_5 + 10), \ S > 1.75; \ 0, \ S \leq 1.75\} 
\]  

(2)

\[
W_{FR} = \frac{2.18}{N_5^{0.4}} (0.4F + 0.6R)
\]  

(3)

Note that although non-specified by Zwicker in the original form of eq. 1, the 5th percentiles of sharpness, fluctuation strength and roughness metrics were used for calculating PA.

The use of 5th percentiles in psychoacoustic analysis is a standard approach widely accepted in the literature. However, these percentile values are dependent on the recording time and the fluctuation of the psychoacoustic parameter in question. This makes that the 5th percentile values for psychoacoustic metrics cannot be compared without appropriate background information. In this research, there is a steady sound pressure during the 10 s duration of each sound sample analysed.

For instance, the 5th percentile and arithmetic mean of the loudness for the rotor spacing \( z/D = 0.05 \) at azimuthal angle = 12 degrees is 98.5 and 96.4 sones respectively. Therefore, the findings of this research can be argued to be non-dependent of the statistical parameters used to describe the psychoacoustic magnitudes. Furthermore, to avoid the transient effect of the digital filters (used for the computation of the psychoacoustic metrics evaluated) at the start of the audio signal analysis, the
first 0.5 s of the sound sample was ignored in the calculation of the 5th percentile of each
psychoacoustic metric.

As described above, the Zwicker’s PA model does not include a factor for accounting for the
perceptual effects of tonal sounds. Di et al. (2016) derived a tonality factor (eq. 5) to develop a PA
model able to account for the annoyance response of sounds with strong tonal components. The
updated PA model developed by Di et al. (2016) \( PA' \) is given by

\[
PA' = N_5 \left( 1 + \sqrt{w_S^2 + w_{FR}^2 + w_T^2} \right)
\]  

(4)

where

\[
w_T = \frac{6.41}{N_5^{0.52}} T
\]  

(5)

More (2011) developed a modified version of Zwicker PA model optimised to predict aircraft
noise annoyance. The More’s PA model \( PA_{mod} \) is given by

\[
PA_{mod} = N_5 \left( 1 + \sqrt{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 w_S^2 + \gamma_2 w_{FR}^2 + \gamma_3 w_T^2} \right)
\]  

(6)

where

\[
w_T^2 = \left[ (1 - e^{-\gamma_4 N_S})^2 \cdot (1 - e^{-\gamma_5 T})^2 \right]
\]  

(7)

The estimates for the More’s PA model were optimised for aircraft noise on the basis of a
series of psychoacoustic tests. The value of these estimates for eqs. 6 and 7, i.e. \( \gamma_0 = -0.16, \gamma_1 = 11.48, \gamma_2 = 0.84, \gamma_3 = 1.25, \gamma_4 = 0.29 \) and \( \gamma_5 = 5.49 \), show the significant emphasis of the
More’s PA model on sharpness and tonality. Note that 5th percentile of Aures/Terhardt tonality was
used for calculating PA in Di et al.’s and More’s models.
None of these PA models account for the impulsiveness of the audio signal. Although there is no agreement in the literature, some authors advise that the prevalence of annoyance due to rotorcraft is influenced by its impulsiveness (Mestre et al., 2017). The impulsiveness (measured in IU) of all sound samples were calculated using the Sottek’s hearing model. This psychoacoustic metric accounts for the perception caused by short and sudden changes in sound pressure level (Boucher, et al., 2019). A full description of the calculation of the impulsiveness metrics and its computation in the Sottek’s hearing model can be found at Sottek et al. (1995) and Sottek and Genuit (2005) respectively. McMullen (2014) suggested that a combination of different psychoacoustic metrics, including loudness, sharpness, tonality and impulsiveness might provide an accurate assessment of human response to helicopter noise. All this suggests that impulsiveness might need to be considered for developing a PA model for rotorcraft noise.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Directivity and spectra patterns

Figure 2 shows the 5th percentile of loudness (Fig. 2C) and sharpness (Fig. 2D) as a function of azimuthal angle (i.e. emission angles between 12 and 102 degrees measured relative to the rotor axis), for rotor spacings z/D=0.05, 0.2 and 1 and a thrust setting of 10 N. Maximum noise emission (i.e. loudness) is found at the rotor axis. Loudness decreases with azimuthal angle, reaching minimum values at 82-92 degrees (Fig. 2C). The same directivity pattern is observed for all rotor spacing evaluated. This is consistent with Chaitanya et al.’s (2020) previously observed optimum separation distance based on overall sound power level (see Figs. 2A and 2B for equivalent sound pressure level (SPL) and equivalent A-weighted SPL as a function of emission angle). Equivalent SPL, equivalent A-weighted SPL and loudness are lower at rotor spacing z/D=0.2 than at rotor spacings z/D=0.05 and z/D=1.
For all rotor spacings, maximum values of sharpness are observed at azimuthal angles of 82 to 92 degrees (Fig. 2D). Sharpness at rotor spacing $z/D=0.2$ is higher than sharpness at rotor spacings $z/D=0.05$ and $z/D=1$. Directivity patterns of loudness and sharpness metrics seem to be in line with the initial hypothesis that the highest contribution to measured sounds is the noise emission of potential field interaction tones. McKay et al. (2019) found that potential field interaction tones in co-axial propellers have a dipole directivity with a null at 90 degrees. In this research, the dip in the value of equivalent SPL, equivalent A-weighted SPL and loudness at about 82-92 degrees (as shown in Figs. 2A, 2B and 2C) can be attributable to a decline in the noise emission of potential field interaction tones. As the coaxial distance between the two contra-rotating propellers was varied during this experimentation, it was decided to position the 10 microphones (see Section II) at azimuthal angles relative to the bottom propeller (see Fig. 1). Hence, the slight shift in the dip of noise radiation from 90 degrees to 82 degrees. However, more work is required to better understand directivities of contra-rotating propellers due to the numerous noise sources involved (Chaitanya et al., 2020).

The decline in amplitude of potential field interaction tones at about 82-92 degrees also leads to an important increase in the relative contribution of higher harmonics of the blade passage frequencies (BPFs) and high frequency broadband noise, which is accounted for by an increase of sharpness as shown in Fig. 2D.
FIG. 2. (Color online). The equivalent SPL (A), equivalent A-weighted SPL (B), and the 5th percentiles of loudness (C) and sharpness (D) as a function of azimuthal angle, for a thrust setting of 10 N and for rotor spacings \( z/D = 0.05, 0.2 \) and 1.

To continue with the investigation of the individual noise sources in the contra-rotating propeller under study, a narrow band frequency analysis was conducted. Figure 3 shows the narrow band frequency spectra for the rotor spacings \( z/D = 0.05, 0.2 \) and 1 for azimuthal angles 12 deg (Fig. 3A) and 82 deg (Fig. 3B), and a thrust setting of 10 N. These two azimuthal angles allow the comparison between the narrow band frequency spectra for high loudness (i.e. 12 deg) and high sharpness (i.e. 82 deg).
FIG. 3. (Color online). Narrow band frequency spectra for the rotor spacings $z/D=0.05$, 0.2 and 1 for a thrust setting of 10 N, and for azimuthal angles 12 deg (A) and 82 deg (B). Note that BPF$_l$ and BPF$_u$ are the Blade Passing Frequencies (BPFs) of the lower and upper propeller respectively; and
nBPF_l and nBPF_u are their harmonics. Also shown the dominant potential field interaction tones (nBPF_l + nBPF_u).

As shown in Fig. 3, the noise signatures of the contra-rotating propeller measured are dominated by tonal components distributed along the frequency spectrum (between 0.1 and 2 kHz). These tonal components include potential field interaction tones at frequencies that are the summation of rotor BPFs. Fig. 3 displays the BPFs of the lower and upper propeller respectively, and their harmonics (nBPF_l and nBPF_u); and also, the dominant potential field interaction tones (nBPF_l + nBPF_u). An analysis carried out by McKay et al. (2019) and Chaitanya et al. (2020) demonstrated that interaction tones are predominantly caused by potential field interactions, and therefore, they decay rapidly with rotor spacing. This decay in amplitude of potential field interaction tones is observed by comparing frequency spectra of rotor spacings z/D=0.05 and 0.2. The decrease in amplitude of potential field interaction tones as rotor spacing increases, leads to a sound signature with higher relative contribution of high frequency components (broadband and tonal components over 2 kHz). As the rotor spacing continues increasing, from z/D=0.05 and 0.2 to z/D=1, the contribution of broadband noise increases. This increase can be attributed to the enhanced interaction between the turbulence generated by the upper propeller tip vortex and the lower propeller as demonstrated by Chaitanya et al. (2020).

At an emission angle of 82 degrees, the amplitude of potential field interaction tones significantly decays (especially for rotor spacing z/D=0.2), due to their dipole directivity (as described above). A decrease of about 20 dB is observed in the amplitude of potential field interaction tones at 82 degrees compared to the amplitude at 12 degrees (see Fig. 3). For the specific case of rotor spacing z/D=0.05 at 82 degrees, the amplitude of potential field interaction tones is of the same order of magnitude as the amplitude of BPF tones (Fig. 3B). This is due to both the dipole directivity of potential field interaction tones with a null at about 90 degrees and the maximum emission of BPF tones in the plane.
of the propeller (McKay et al., 2019). At an emission angle of 82 degrees there is a reduction of high
frequency broadband noise (compared to 12 degrees), and a series of tonal components of important
magnitude are observed in the high frequency region, i.e. 2-12kHz. The precise reason for this
behaviour is currently not known and more work is required to understand this phenomenon.

B. Psychoacoustic metrics vs. rotor spacing

To investigate the optimum rotor spacing configuration for the contra-rotating system under
study, the value of the different psychoacoustic metrics described above in Section II.C has been
calculated. The value of psychoacoustics metrics (5\textsuperscript{th} percentile) as a function of rotor spacing at an
azimuthal angle of 12 and 82 degrees is shown in Fig. 4. As described above (Section III.A), at 12 and
82 degrees the contra-rotating system measured has the highest and lowest noise emission respectively.

As the rotor spacing increases, the amplitude of the potential field interaction tones distributed
along the mid to high frequency regions decays significantly (see Fig. 3). Consequently, as shown in
Fig. 4A, loudness decreases with an increase in rotor spacing, reaching the lowest values at the region
z/D=0.2-0.4 at 12 degrees and z/D=0.2-0.3 at 82 degrees. This decay is more significant at 12 degrees
(approximately 30 sone reduction between rotor spacings z/D=0.05 and 0.2) where the emission of potential
field interaction tones is maximum, compared to 82 degrees (about 10 sone reduction between rotor
spacings z/D=0.05 and 0.2). At small rotor spacings, the decrease in loudness is due to a reduction
in the potential field interactions between the two contra-rotating propellers. This interaction noise
is primarily tonal, and hence tonality drops significantly as rotor spacing increases (see Fig. 4B). These
results are in line with existing literature (McKay et al., 2019; Chaitanya et al., 2020), where blade
spacing optimization has been demonstrated to lead to important reductions in tonal noise (Anghinolfi
et al., 2016). Figure 4B shows that, at 12 degrees, there is a significant drop in tonality at a rotor
spacing z/D=0.35, to remain almost constant regardless rotor spacing onwards. At 82 degrees, this
significant drop in tonality is found at a rotor spacing z/D=0.2 (Fig. 4B). This might be due to the
directivity characteristics of potential field interactions, as described in Section III.A. With higher amplitude of potential field interaction tones at emission angles about 0 degrees relative to the rotor axis, a greater rotor spacing is needed at 12 degrees for tonality to drop to minimum values (compared to 82 degrees). At both emission angles, 12 and 82 degrees the same minimum value of tonality is observed at a rotor spacing $z/D=0.35$ (Fig. 4B).

Fluctuation strength accounts for the low frequency amplitude modulation consequence of the closely spaced potential field interaction tones, as shown in Fig. 3. As rotor spacing increases beyond $z/D=0.15-0.2$, potential field interactions are reduced (i.e. amplitude of interaction tones decays), and consequently a significant drop in fluctuation strength is observed (Fig. 4C).

With increase in rotor separation distances, interaction noise between rotors increases due to enhanced turbulence-propeller interactions because of unsteadiness in the tip vortex as previously demonstrated by Chaitanya et al. (2020). This added turbulence-propeller interaction noise, which is tonal and broadband in nature (see Fig. 3), causes an increase of loudness after rotor spacing $z/D=0.4$ (Fig. 4A). Modulated broadband noise reaches higher roughness values than modulated discrete tones, and even unmodulated broadband noise attains considerable roughness values due to random envelope fluctuations (Daniel, 2008). Therefore, the increase in unsteady turbulence-propeller interaction noise as rotors are moved apart might explain the gradual growth of roughness shown in Fig. 4D. At 12 degrees, the highest emission of broadband noise due to unsteady turbulence-propeller interaction noise leads to a higher rate of increase in roughness with rotor spacing (as observed in Fig. 4D).

As seen in Fig. 4E, impulsiveness significantly increases as the rotor spacing grows. This is observed for both azimuthal angles of highest and lowest noise emission, although the highest values of impulsiveness are at 12 degrees. As discussed by Krishnamurthy et al. (2018), impulsiveness and roughness metrics are strongly linked to each other. This is observed in this paper by comparing Figs.
Noise caused by enhanced turbulence-propeller interactions is highly impulsive, and therefore, the added turbulence-propeller interaction noise as the contra-rotating rotors move apart from each other leads to an increase in the impulsiveness metric. This suggests that the impulsiveness metric should be considered, along with roughness, to account for the perceptual response to propeller-turbulence interaction noise in the development of a PA model for rotorcraft noise.
FIG. 4. (Color online). The 5th percentiles of loudness (A), tonality (B), fluctuation strength (C), roughness (D), impulsiveness (E) and sharpness (F) as a function of rotor spacing at azimuthal angle 12 deg and 82 deg, for a thrust setting of 10 N.

At rotor spacings in the region z/D=0.2-0.4, the contribution of potential field interaction tones reaches a minimum. This leads to an increase in the relative contribution of high frequency tonal and broadband components (i.e. shaper sounds). Therefore, at rotor spacings z/D=0.2-0.4, the spectral centroid is located at a higher frequency (compared to audio signals of rotor spacings with dominant potential field interaction tones), and therefore higher values of sharpness are observed (Fig. 4F). The same pattern of sharpness as a function of rotor spacing is observed for both 12 and 82 degrees, although sharpness values are higher at 82 degrees due to the lowest emission of potential field interaction tones at these emission angles. Cabell et al. (2016) found important emissions of high frequency tones between 3.5 and 5 kHz for a series of multi-copters driven by brushless DC motors. The noise generated by brushless DC motors is primarily due to both force pulses as the magnets and armature interact and forces caused by phase changes in the motor drive signal (Brackley and Pollock, 2000). Alexander et al. (2019) observed high frequency humps in a series of multi-copters measured at hover configuration. Although the authors state this noise being broadband in nature, its origin is still under investigation.
C. Models for psychoacoustic annoyance

To identify the optimal rotor spacing configuration for the contra-rotating propeller under evaluation, PA as a function of rotor spacing has been calculated according to PA models developed by Zwicker and Fastl (1999), Di et al. (2016) and More (2011). As shown in Fig. 5, as expected from the value of the psychoacoustic metrics analysed in section III.B, the lowest values of PA are found for rotor spacing in the range of z/D=0.2-0.4 for both 12 and 82 degrees.

At 12 degrees, i.e. the emission angle with the highest amplitude of potential field interaction tones, three main results are observed in Fig. 5A: (i) A significant decay in PA is observed at the optimal rotor spacing area, compared to rotor spacings below z/D=0.2 and above z/D=0.4. (ii) As rotor interaction noise at this rotor spacing is tonal in nature (i.e. potential field interaction tones), Di et al.’s PA model and especially More’s PA model (both of which include a tonal factor) lead to lower psychoacoustic annoyance at optimal rotor spacing than Zwicker’s PA model. (iii) While Zwicker’s and Di et al.’s PA models give the minimum value of psychoacoustic annoyance at rotor spacing z/D=0.2, the lowest psychoacoustic annoyance according to More’s PA model is at z/D=0.35. This seems to be due to the higher contribution of the tonal factor in the PA model developed by More (see Fig. 6).
FIG. 5. (Color online). Psychoacoustic annoyance (PA) calculated with Zwicker’s, Di et al.’s and More’s PA models as a function of rotor spacing, for azimuthal angle 12 deg (A) and 82 deg (B) with a thrust setting of 10 N. Normalised to PA = 100 at z/d=0.05.

At 82 degrees, i.e. the emission angle with the lowest amplitude of potential field interaction tones, it is observed that the three models implemented give similar values of PA (Fig. 5B). The PA model developed by Di et al. (2016) gives the lowest values of PA among the three models used. The values of PA calculated according to the model developed by More are higher than the values calculated with Di et al.’s PA model for the rotor spacing range z/D=0.15-0.6. This seems to be due to the higher contribution of the sharpness factor in the PA model developed by More (see Fig. 4F for sharpness vs. rotor spacing). At this emission angle, the range of variation of PA as a function of rotor spacing is significantly more reduced than at an emission angle of 12 degrees. This finding suggests that a suboptimal rotor spacing between contra-rotating propellers can lead to a significant increase in PA at emission angles in line to the rotor axis. These emission angles are typical for an observer on the ground interacting with a hovering contra-rotating UAV.

Zwicker’s and Di et al.’s PA models (Zwicker and Fastl, 1999; Di et al., 2016) were derived for a series of mechanical sounds, and More (2011) modified Zwicker’s PA model to account for characteristics of fixed-wing aircraft noise. However, none of these PA models have been optimised
for propeller noise, and therefore might not be able to account for the complex perceptual interactions between individual noise sources (e.g. tonal components, roughness due to interactions between closely spaced tones, broadband noise in high frequency region due to unsteadiness in the wake, propeller-turbulence interaction noise, etc.). This might lead to important uncertainty in the prediction of PA with current models available. Furthermore, in the three PA models implemented in this work, loudness is included as a first order term, and the other psychoacoustic metrics are just second order factors. For this reason, the calculations of PA with these psychoacoustic models are mainly driven by loudness, and the contribution of other psychoacoustic factors is quite reduced. Sharpness has been found to be an important contributor to aircraft noise annoyance (Torija et al., 2019). Sharpness, tonality and fluctuation strength were found to be important predictors of annoyance for rotorcraft-like sounds (Krishnamurthy et al., 2018; Boucher et al., 2020). Roughness has been found, for instance, an important factor to describing sound quality of electric motors (Mosquera-Sanchez et al., 2014; Ercan, 2019). The relative contribution of psychoacoustic features to annoyance for propeller noise is unknown. A process of listening tests and optimization of coefficients for psychoacoustic terms in PA models, similar to the one carried out by More (2011) for fixed-wing aircraft, is needed for propeller noise.

A recent study carried out by Gwak et al. (2020) has investigated the relationship between psychoacoustic metrics and the annoyance reported for a range of hovering UAVs of varying size. The authors found that the annoyance reported for medium and large drones is driven by loudness, sharpness and fluctuation strength; they also found that the annoyance reported for small drones cannot be explained by the three psychoacoustic metrics above, but tonality might play an important role. Based on the $\beta$-coefficients of a linear regression model of the annoyance for medium and large drones developed by Gwak et al. (2020, pp. 13), reported annoyance is mainly driven by loudness ($\beta = 0.908$) and sharpness ($\beta = 0.102$) and fluctuation strength ($\beta = 0.268$) are second order contributors.
Further, the standardised $\beta$-coefficients of the linear regression model indicate that an increase of 0.516 loudness units (i.e. sones) is needed to increase the annoyance in 1 unit\(^1\), while an increase of 9.902 sharpness units (i.e. acum) is needed for an increase in 1 unit of annoyance. Using the results of Gwak et al. (2020), the increase in the contribution of sharpness (relative to loudness) needed in order for it to dominate the psychoacoustic annoyance calculation is unrealistic. Based on this, one could argue that the optimal rotor spacing, in terms of psychoacoustic annoyance, suggested in this paper is not subjected to specific models but a more general finding.

![FIG. 6. (Color online). Di et al.’s tonality factor ($w_i^2$) and More’s tonality factor ($y_3 w_i^2$) in PA models as a function of rotor spacing, for azimuthal angle 12 deg (A) and 82 deg (B) with a thrust setting of 10 N.](image)

Although the perceived roughness and impulsiveness might be a factor due to unsteady turbulence-propeller interaction noise, annoyance might be assumed to be primarily driven by perceived tonality in the region of optimal rotor spacing as shown in Figs. 4B and 5 (i.e. sound is eminently tonal in nature in this region due to the contribution of potential field interaction tones). Several studies on a variety of noise sources, such as mechanical ventilation systems (Lee, 2016) and aircraft noise (More and Davies, 2010) have suggested a combination of loudness and tonality factors

\(^1\) Note that annoyance in Gwak et al. (2020) is assessed using a 11-point scale.
in multiple linear regression models as an accurate approach to predict annoyance. As seen in Fig. 6, both the tonality factors derived by Di et al. (2016) and More (2011) (accounting for the combined effect of loudness and tonality) suggest the optimal rotor spacing at \( z/D \geq 0.35 \) (note that the minimum value of both tonality factors is at \( z/D = 0.35 \)). Figure 6 shows the Di et al.’s tonality factor squared (eq. 5), and More’s tonality factor squared (eq. 7) multiplied by \( \gamma_3 = 1.25 \) (to account for the total contribution of tonality in More’s PA model). This figure also shows that More’s tonality factor emphasises more the contribution of tonality in the PA model than Di et al.’s. The value of both tonality factors as a function of rotor spacing demonstrates that More’s factor is more sensitive to variations in tonality, and therefore would lead to higher variation in PA for the same changes in tonality.

Future work for the development of PA models for propellers, and especially contra-rotating multiple blade propellers, will need to focus on psychoacoustic features such as perceived impulsiveness caused by propeller-turbulence interaction, and perceived roughness and perceived tonality of multiple tone complexes. Perceived roughness of superpositioned multiple pure tones (see Fig. 3) differs from perceived roughness of amplitude modulated tones, even with similar modulation strengths (Terhardt, 1974; Aures, 1985a). Perakis et al. (2013) found that the modulation index of an amplitude modulated tone must be lowered by 2/3 to be perceived as equally rough as a pair of superpositioned tones. This perceptual phenomenon should be taken into account when deriving a fluctuation strength/roughness function accounting for the perceptual interaction effect of closely spaced multiple tones. The perceived tonal strength of mechanical sounds containing series of harmonic or inharmonic complex tones can adversely influence the perception of these sounds (Lee et al., 2005). The prediction of annoyance from sounds containing multiple tone complexes requires not only accounting for the tonality of the most prevailing tone and signal loudness, but also the frequencies and the structure of the other tones in the noise signal (Lee and Wang, 2020).
Aures/Terhardt tonality model (Aures, 1985b) accounts for the presence of complex tones. However, Lee et al. (2005) found that Aures/Terhardt tonality model overestimates perceived tonality of complex tones. These authors modified Aures/Terhardt tonality with a factor accounting for the differences in tonality perception between harmonic complexes and single tones, and concluded that the perceived tonality of multiple tone complexes is a function of the pitch strength of the harmonic components. Therefore, pitch perception models, such as Terhardt’s virtual pitch model (Terhardt et al., 1982a;b) should be taken into account when deriving a function accounting for the perceived tonality of complex tones in propeller noise.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

This paper presents the results of a psychoacoustic analysis carried out to investigate the optimal distance between contra-rotating propellers to minimise noise annoyance. On the basis of psychoacoustic annoyance, calculated with models available in the literature, it can be concluded that the optimal rotor axial separation distance for the contra-rotating propellers under study is at a range of $z/D=0.2-0.4$, instead of previously observed $z/D=0.25$ by Chaitanya et al. (2020) on the basis of overall sound power level. Similar optimal rotor spacing is found for azimuthal angles of maximum and minimum emission of potential field interaction tones, which are the highest contributors to the contra-rotating propellers sounds measured. These results are consistent with the rotor spacing with maximum aerodynamic efficiency for this contra-rotating system, measured at $z/D = 0.3$ by Chaitanya et al. (2020). Although the Aures/Terhardt tonality metric and More’s and Di et al.’s tonality factors suggest an optimal rotor spacing at $z/D \geq 0.35$, the psychoacoustic annoyance as calculated with the three models implemented in this work significantly increases for rotor spacings over $z/D = 0.4$. Furthermore, a rotor separation over $z/D = 0.4$ might be more impractical from a construction perspective.
Below the optimal rotor spacing, the noise generation is dominated by potential field interactions between the two contra-rotating rotors, which is consistent with previous observations (McKay et al., 2019; Chaitanya et al., 2020). As the rotor spacing increases towards the optimum, the magnitude of these potential field interactions lessens significantly, and therefore a decrease in loudness is observed. As this source of noise is tonal in nature, tonality also drops significantly at the optimum rotor spacing. This decrease in tonality, and especially loudness, lead to a minimum in psychoacoustic annoyance. Fluctuation strength accounts for the slow amplitude modulation due to closely spaced potential field interaction tones, and therefore drops importantly as the amplitude of these interaction tones decays.

With increased rotor separation distances after optimum, interaction noise between contra-rotating rotors increases due to enhance turbulence-propeller interactions, and this leads to an increase in loudness. Furthermore, as this is unsteady broadband noise in nature, roughness and impulsiveness increase when rotors move apart. This suggests that the perceptual effect of propeller-turbulence interaction noise could be accounted for by roughness and/or impulsiveness metrics.

A special case takes place when calculating sharpness as a function of rotor spacing. Sharpness reaches the highest values at the optimal rotor spacing region. As potential field interaction tones, distributed evenly along low-to-mid frequencies, decays significantly at the optimal rotor separation distance, the centroid of the spectrum moves towards the high frequency region (i.e. the relative contribution of high frequency tonal and broadband noise increases). Under these conditions of more dominant high frequency noise components, the values of sharpness are consequently higher.

The approach described in this paper, based on psychoacoustic methods available in the literature, provides a more sophisticated and comprehensive analysis than traditional sound power level analyses to inform the optimal design of rotating systems for lowest noise annoyance. Compared to sound power level based assessments, the proposed method is able to account for the key psychoacoustic features highly correlated to noise perception (e.g. tonality, roughness). Appropriately accounting for
the perceptual effects of key psychoacoustic factors is crucial for the optimisation of designs for lower
noise impact on potential exposed communities. As observed in this paper, minor deviations from
the optimal design (in terms of rotor spacing) of contra-rotating propellers can lead to substantial
increase in noise annoyance at emission angles typical for an observer on the ground interacting with
a hovering UAV.

The three models implemented in this research gives the minimum psychoacoustic annoyance at
similar rotor spacings. Despite differences in tonality, these models are mainly driven by loudness.
Analysing findings of recent literature, the increase in the contribution (relative to loudness) of some
secondary factors (e.g. sharpness) required to become dominant for psychoacoustic annoyance might
be unrealistic. Based on the above, it could be argued that other psychoacoustic annoyance models
might also lead to the same conclusion in terms of optimum rotor spacing, and therefore, the results
of this paper are more general and no specific to the three annoyance models implemented. However,
this cannot be demonstrated without extensive testing, as it is uncertain whether these psychoacoustic
annoyance models provide an accurate picture of actual noise perception for propeller noise (and
specifically contra-rotating rotor noise). The relative contribution to noise annoyance of different key
psychoacoustic features in a variety of rotor noise must be investigated to derive psychoacoustic
annoyance models optimised for rotating systems.

Further work is recommended to aid the design of rotating systems for lowest noise impact: (1)
additional noise testing should be carried out to gather a comprehensive database with sound samples
of different blade geometries, thrust settings, emission angles and single vs. coaxial propellers; (2)
further analyses will include other psychoacoustic factors, such as impulsiveness, relative approach
and additional tonality models; and (3) extensive subjective testing should be conducted to identify
the psychoacoustic factors mainly driving rotor noise annoyance, refine or compute coefficients
accounting for their relative contribution to noise annoyance, and thus, develop psychoacoustic annoyance models for rotor noise.
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