



HAL
open science

Numerical optimization of a bicylindrical resonator impedance: differences and common features between a saxophone resonator and a bicylindrical resonator

Tom Colinot, Philippe Guillemain, Jean-Baptiste Doc, Christophe Vergez,
Michael Jousserand

► To cite this version:

Tom Colinot, Philippe Guillemain, Jean-Baptiste Doc, Christophe Vergez, Michael Jousserand. Numerical optimization of a bicylindrical resonator impedance: differences and common features between a saxophone resonator and a bicylindrical resonator. *Acta Acustica united with Acustica*, 2019, 105 (6), pp.1217-1227. 10.3813/AAA.919398 . hal-02434371

HAL Id: hal-02434371

<https://hal.science/hal-02434371v1>

Submitted on 10 Jan 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Numerical optimization of a bicylindrical resonator impedance: differences and common features between a saxophone resonator and a bicylindrical resonator

Tom Colinot^a, Philippe Guillemain^a, Jean-Baptiste Doc^b, Christophe Vergez^a, Michael Jousserand^c

^a Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, Centrale Marseille, LMA, Marseille, France

^b Laboratoire de Mécanique des Structures et des Systèmes couplés, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, Paris, France

^c Buffet-Crampon, Mantes-la-Ville, France

1 Summary

This paper explores the analogy between a saxophone resonator and a bicylindrical resonator, sometimes called transverse saxophone or cylindrical saxophone. The dimensions of a bicylindrical resonator are optimized numerically to approximate a saxophone impedance. The target is the impedance measured on an usual saxophone. A classical gradient-based non-linear least-square fit function is used. Several cost functions corresponding to distances to the target impedance are assessed, according to their influence on the optimal geometry. Compromises appear between the frequency regions depending on the cost function. It is shown that the chosen cost functions are differentiable and locally convex. The convexity region contains the initial geometrical dimensions obtained by crude approximation of the first resonance frequency of the target. One optimal geometry is submitted to further analysis using descriptors of the impedance. Its deviations from the target saxophone are put into perspective with the discrepancies between the target saxophone and a saxophone from a different manufacture. Descriptors such as harmonicity or impedance peak ratio set the bicylindrical resonator apart from saxophone resonators, despite a good agreement of the resonance frequencies. Therefore, a reed instrument with a bicylindrical resonator could be tuned to produce the same notes as a saxophone, but due to differences in the intrinsic characteristics of the resonator, it should be considered not as a saxophone but as a distinct instrument.

1 Introduction

This work deals with the bicylindrical approximation of a conical geometry, where two cylinders are put in parallel. As a purely academic approximation of a conical instrument such as the saxophone, a "cylindrical saxophone" model permits to obtain analytical results on the produced sound [1, 2] and dynamic behavior [3, 4]. A patent describing bicylindrical resonators to be used for saxophone-like instruments [5] shows that industrial interest exists for such innovative resonator shapes. This paper presents a bicylindrical resonator numerically optimized to replicate the acoustic impedance of an existing saxophone, and compares it to the target saxophone and another "control" saxophone. The goal is to judge whether bicylindrical resonators may be considered as saxophones or not.

Traditionally, instrument makers design new products by trial and error, drawing on empirical knowledge acquired over years of practice. They adjust the manufacturing parameters to maximize the "quality" of successive prototypes in terms of complex criteria involving not only sound characteristics such as intonation and timbre features, but also ergonomics, playability, and feeling of the musician. Given the complexity of this task, as well as the large number of parameters involved, the process is long and requires building several prototypes, amounting to a significant overall cost before the production begins. Numerical optimization may take simple criteria into account to offer geometrical dimensions for new resonators in a quick, repeatable and cheap manner. The optimized resonators would probably have to be fine-

64 tuned to satisfy the more complex criteria, but there
 65 is hope that overall, the prototyping stage would be
 66 accelerated.

67 From the point of view of an acoustician, the opti-
 68 mization of a musical instrument could, at first, use
 69 some criteria pertaining directly to the characteris-
 70 tics of the produced sound, such as the playing fre-
 71 quency. Predicting the sound produced by the in-
 72 strument for various excitation conditions is possible
 73 by numerical synthesis, and has been applied to opti-
 74 mization problems with up to five optimization vari-
 75 ables [6]. However, this method is time consuming,
 76 hence incompatible with the optimization of dozens
 77 of parameters. Consequently, many wind instrument
 78 optimization methods adjust the resonance frequen-
 79 cies of the resonator, for instance using an analytic
 80 model accounting for small modifications of the bore
 81 of a trumpet [7]. Similarly, acoustical considerations
 82 were used to adjust iteratively the positions and di-
 83 mensions of the holes in a quena to obtain a de-
 84 sired tuning profile [8]. Recent works also propose
 85 a method to compute the eigenfrequencies of a va-
 86 riety of multi-cylindrical resonators [9, 10, 11], with
 87 instrument design in mind. For problems with many
 88 parameters, computerized optimization strategies are
 89 the preferred choice. For example, the complete tone
 90 hole geometry of a clarinet was optimized by a gradi-
 91 ent descent based on the first and second impedance
 92 peaks [12], and the geometry and control of a clarinet
 93 model was optimized to reproduce signals obtained
 94 with an artificial blowing machine [13]. It is also pos-
 95 sible to use the input impedance deduced from a time-
 96 domain discretization of the Euler equations in the
 97 optimization of a saxophone bore [14]. Some authors
 98 take into account the complete input impedance in the
 99 cost function, rather than the resonance frequencies
 100 alone. This type of objective was applied to trumpets
 101 [15] and trombones [16], with Rosenbrock’s numer-
 102 ical optimization method [17], and saxophones [18]
 103 using the CMA-ES (Evolution Strategy with Covari-
 104 ance Matrix Adaptation) optimization method [19].
 105 In previous work, numerical optimization has mostly
 106 served as a tool to adjust or redesign existing instru-
 107 ments, but it can also be seen as a means to explore
 108 innovative geometries.

109 This article presents the optimization of the ge-
 110 ometry of a bicylindrical resonator to match the
 111 impedance measured on a saxophone, which has a

112 predominantly conical resonator. These geometries
 113 being fundamentally different, the fit cannot be per-
 114 fect. The acoustical differences between the optimum
 115 and the target are analyzed. The optimization is per-
 116 formed numerically, relying on an impedance model of
 117 the designed instrument. Objective criteria depend-
 118 ing only on linear acoustics considerations are used.
 119 This allows to maintain a moderate computational
 120 cost. Since our purpose is to compare the bicylindri-
 121 cal resonator with existing saxophones, the target of
 122 the optimization relies on impedances measured on a
 123 professional alto saxophone (see 2.1). The impedance
 124 is measured for several fingerings of the first regis-
 125 ter, the optimization is performed for these finger-
 126 ings. By choice, the optimization is limited to a given
 127 frequency range: the impedance of the bicylindrical
 128 resonator is fitted to the target impedance between
 129 70 and 1200 Hz, which contains the main impedance
 130 peaks. The fit is done according to a given norm (see
 131 3.2). The effect of the choice of this norm on the re-
 132 sult of the optimization is studied. Moreover, since
 133 the optimization algorithm is local, the initial condi-
 134 tion is modified to check if the procedure still con-
 135 verges to the same optimum (see 3.3). The influence
 136 of each design parameter on the cost function is re-
 137 vealed around the optimum. Finally, the optimized
 138 geometry for the example studied here is presented
 139 in section 4. The numerical optimization procedure
 140 yields the bicylindrical resonator that is as close as
 141 possible to a saxophone – considering our criterion
 142 and our degrees of freedom. The purpose of this pro-
 143 cess is to better define the limit of the approximation
 144 of a saxophone resonator by a bicylindrical resonator,
 145 when it is conducted on several fingerings of the sax-
 146 ophone. The deviations between the impedances of
 147 the optimized geometry and the target saxophone are
 148 computed, and they are compared with the discrep-
 149 ancies between the target saxophone and a saxophone
 150 of another brand.

2 Input impedance of the saxophone and the bicylindrical resonator

154 In order to optimize the dimensions of the bicylin-
 155 drical resonator (see figure 1), it is necessary to
 156 use a model giving the impedance of such resonator

157 based on its geometrical dimensions. The computed
 158 impedance is then fitted to the target impedance : the
 159 impedance measured on a saxophone, for 16 fingerings
 160 of the first register.

161 2.1 Saxophone impedance measure- 162 ment: target and control

163 Impedance measurements were performed on two sax-
 164 ophones. The first produces the target impedance.
 165 The second saxophone, of a different model and dif-
 166 ferent brand, is called the “control saxophone”. It
 167 serves as reference in the analysis of the difference
 168 of characteristics between the bicylindrical resonator
 169 resulting from the optimization and the target instru-
 170 ment. This way, we aim to check whether the opti-
 171 mized resonator is as close to the target saxophone
 172 as another saxophone. If the differences between two
 173 saxophones are of the same order than the differences
 174 between the bicylindrical resonator and a saxophone,
 175 then the bicylindrical resonator may be considered as
 176 a saxophone, at least from the input impedance point
 177 of view. The details of this comparison are presented
 178 in section 4. The target instrument and the control
 179 instrument are commercial models of alto saxophones.

180 Impedance measurements are carried out using the
 181 impedance sensor apparatus developed in [20] on the
 182 first register (closed register hole) of the target and
 183 control saxophones. All the measurements are carried
 184 out in a semi-anechoic room. In total, 16 fingerings of
 185 the first register are measured. In written pitch for the
 186 alto saxophone, the fingerings range from the low B \flat
 187 to the C \sharp 2 of the first register – which correspond to
 188 the notes D \flat 3 (138.59 Hz) to E4 (329.63 Hz) in concert
 189 pitch. The written pitch notation is kept throughout
 190 the rest of this paper.

Since the apparatus does not allow impedance mea-
 surements of the instrument with its mouthpiece, a
 cylindrical mouthpiece chamber of typical dimensions
 (radius 12 mm and length $L_m = 60$ mm) is added
 in post-treatment, such that the dimensionless target
 impedance writes

$$Z_{tar} = \frac{Z_{c,m}j \tan(k_m L_m) + Z_{mes}}{Z_{c,m} + Z_{mes}j \tan(k_m L_m)}, \quad (1)$$

191 where Z_{mes} is the input impedance measured with-
 192 out the mouthpiece. In order to eliminate the noisy
 193 parts of the measurement, the target impedance is
 194 truncated at low frequencies, below 70 Hz. To de-

195 crease the computation time of the optimization, the
 196 target impedance is also truncated above 1200 Hz.
 197 For the fingerings considered, the main impedance
 198 peaks fall between 70 and 1200 Hz. Beyond 1200 Hz
 199 the combined effect of the conicity of the resonator
 200 and the tone hole network contribute to lowering the
 201 impedance peaks. The actual target impedance is dis-
 202 crete vector with 1413 samples, the frequency step
 203 between two samples being 0.8 Hz.

204 2.2 Impedance of a bicylindrical res- 205 onator

The bicylindrical resonator, as defined in [21], is com-
 posed of a cylindrical mouthpiece (i.e. a mouthpiece
 with cylindrical chamber) followed by the parallel
 association of two cylinders (see figure 1). There-
 fore, the entire instrument’s dimensionless input
 impedance writes

$$Z_{des} = \frac{Z_{c,m}j \tan(k_m L_m) + Z_{ts}}{Z_{c,m} + Z_{ts}j \tan(k_m L_m)}, \quad (2)$$

where L_m is the length of the cylindrical mouthpiece,
 $Z_{c,m} = \rho c / S_m$ is its characteristic impedance depend-
 ing on its cross section S_m , the ambient air density ρ ,
 the sound velocity c . It is worth noting that the pa-
 rameter L_m should be understood as the equivalent
 length of the chamber of the mouthpiece, not includ-
 ing the length of the reed. Z_{ts} is the input impedance
 of the parallel association of two cylinders. The wave
 number k_i [22] depends on the equivalent radius r_i of
 each section such that

$$k_i(\omega) = \frac{\omega}{c} - (1 + j)3.10^{-5} \frac{\sqrt{\omega/2\pi}}{r_i}, \quad (3)$$

where ($i = \{b, m\}$) associates with the long cylinder b
 or the mouthpiece m . The short pipe a is defined by
 its equivalent radius

$$r_{eq,a} = \sqrt{S_a/\pi}, \quad (4)$$

where S_a is the annular cross-section between the in-
 ner wall of cylinder a and the outer wall of cylinder
 b (see figure 1). Since this pipe is ring-shaped, losses
 are adjusted by a factor μ' corresponding to the ratio
 of the internal wall surface of the ring a to the internal




Figure 1: Schematic layout of the optimized resonator : a bicylindrical resonator. Labels: mouthpiece chamber m , short cylinder a and long cylinder b .

wall surface of a cylinder of radius $r_{eq,a}$

$$k_a(\omega) = \frac{\omega}{c} - \mu'(1+j)3.10^{-5} \frac{\sqrt{\omega/2\pi}}{r_{eq,a}}, \quad (5)$$

$$\mu' = \frac{\sqrt{r_{eq,a}^2 + (r_b + e)^2} + r_b + e}{r_{eq,a}}, \quad (6)$$

e being the thickness of the wall of cylinder b , fixed at 1 mm for the rest of the article.

The impedance Z_{ts} of the parallel association of cylinders seen from the end of the mouthpiece L_m is written as

$$Z_{ts} = Z_{c,m} \left(\frac{Z_{c,a} + Z_{r,a}j \tan(kL_a)}{Z_{c,a}j \tan(kL_a) + Z_{r,a}} + \frac{Z_{c,b} + Z_{r,b}j \tan(kL_b)}{Z_{c,b}j \tan(kL_b) + Z_{r,b}} \right)^{-1}, \quad (7)$$

where L_i is the length of each cylinder ($i = \{a, b\}$), $Z_{c,i} = \rho c / S_i$ the characteristic impedance of cylinders a and b and $Z_{r,i}$ the radiating impedance (according to [23]) on the output of the equivalent unflanged cylinder i such that

$$Z_{r,i} = Z_{c,i} \left(jk_i \Delta \ell_i + \frac{1}{4} (k_i r_i)^2 \right). \quad (8)$$

In this expression, the length correction $\Delta \ell_i$ is taken as $0.6133r_i$, because both cylinders are assumed unflanged and the influence of their thickness at output is ignored. The influence of the long cylinder on the radiation of the short one is neglected, which corresponds to a plane-wave approximation. A comparison with a flanged impedance radiation model [24] for the output of the short cylinder yields almost no difference in the considered frequency range. These impedance models of the bicylindrical resonator are validated by comparison with impedance measure-

ment carried out on a bicylindrical resonator prototype in [21].

2.3 Initial geometrical parameters of the optimization

For the optimization on the 16 notes of the first register of the designed instrument, the 20 varying parameters of the model are

$$X = \{L_{b1}, \dots, L_{b16}, r_b, L_a, r_{eq,a}, L_m\}. \quad (9)$$

See figure 1 for a schematic representation of the geometry. L_{bn} corresponds to the length of the longest cylinder for the n^{th} fingering. This definition corresponds to a low frequency approximation of the tone holes: each fingering is represented by an effective length, that can be interpreted as the distance from the input of the instrument to the first open tone hole for this fingering. In this approximation, the effect of the other open tone holes and their interactions are ignored. Note that as a refinement, the optimization procedure is conducted taking into account the effect of the tone hole network in appendix B. The other parameters $r_b, L_a, r_{eq,a}, L_m$ are geometrical dimensions of the designed instruments that cannot be changed between notes.

At the start of the optimization, the parameters of the bicylindrical resonator are assigned initial values. For a gradient-based optimization procedure like the one used in this work (see section 3), the optimized geometry is obtained by adjusting this initial geometry. The initial set of parameters should be chosen in a vicinity of the optimal parameters. Here, based on our knowledge of the characteristics of a bicylindrical resonator, it is possible to suggest an initial geometry that is a coarse approximation of the target, as explained below.

Among the twenty parameters to initialize, two are chosen based on the geometrical dimensions of an alto saxophone: the initial length of the short cylinder L_a^0 is set at 200 mm, which corresponds to the missing length of the top of the conical resonator, and the initial mouthpiece length L_m^0 is set at 10 mm. The length of the long cylinder is based on the first-order approximation of the first resonance frequency for the bicylindrical resonator, taking into account the length corrections due to the radiation impedance. $L_{b,n}^0$ (for

all fingerings $n \in \{1, 16\}$) is set so that

$$\frac{c}{2(L_{b,n}^0 + L_a^0 + 2L_m^0 + 0.6133r_{eq,a}^0 + 0.6133r_b^0)} = f_n, \quad (10)$$

where f_n is the frequency of the n^{th} note based on the tempered scale. The initial cross sections of the tubes are taken equal, such that their initial equivalent radii are $r_{eq,a}^0 = r_b^0 = 4.3$ mm (see figure 1). The total input section of the initial geometry is the same as the one of the measured instrument (see 2.1). The choice of this initial geometry is not critical to the convergence of the optimization algorithm, as the robustness test of subsection 3.3 shows.

3 Optimization procedure

In this section, a set of geometrical parameters for the designed instrument is provided by a numerical fit of its input impedance to a target impedance, using a gradient-based, nonlinear least squares optimization procedure.

3.1 Optimization method

The optimization is performed through a gradient-based approach (trust-region reflective algorithm), using the `lsqnonlin` function from the Matlab Optimization toolbox. This function implements nonlinear least-square curve fitting with a convenient interface. The algorithm used is trust-region-reflective [25]. This algorithm is chosen because it allows bounds on the parameters: in our case, all parameters must remain positive. It is inherently local, which means it may converge to different local minima depending on initial conditions. Due to the size of the problem, the maximal number of evaluations of the cost function is set at 20000 and the maximal number of iterations at 1000. Stopping criteria are based on thresholds: the algorithm stops under a chosen variation of cost function per step, a chosen step length, a chosen optimality descriptor value or a chosen cost function value. In all the optimization procedures presented here, the algorithm stops because the variation of the cost function value at a given step is too low. This threshold may be lowered (from the default 10^{-6} to 10^{-12}) to give very precise value of the optimal parameters. Section 3.3 shows that the choice of

initial conditions is not critical for the case at hand, and the optimum found is valid over a large region of the parameter space. The convergence properties of this algorithm also depend on the derivability properties of the cost function [26]: the convergence of the algorithm is proven (with some assumptions on the problem) for a twice continuously differentiable cost function. This property is verified by the cost functions used in this work (see 3.2 and appendix A). In addition, the solver is rather fast: one optimization procedure lasts about 10 seconds on a laptop computer.

3.2 Choice of the cost function

In this work, it is decided to use a cost function taking into account the complete input impedance, over a given frequency range. This choice is motivated by the lack of a priori knowledge on the relative importance of specific impedance descriptors, such as resonance frequency and peak height, for an unusual type of resonator. Still, an assumption is made that high-amplitude impedance peaks play a crucial role in the sound production (see for instance [27]). Therefore, we investigate norms under the form

$$J_p(\omega, X) = \left| |\mathcal{Z}_{des}(\omega, X)| - |\mathcal{Z}_{tar}(\omega)| \right|^p \quad (11)$$

where p is an integer, and \mathcal{Z}_{tar} and \mathcal{Z}_{des} are respectively the impedance of the target and designed instruments. The notation X stands for the vector of optimization variables. Another motivation for choosing this type of function is that a straightforward mathematical expression allows for easy demonstration of properties of the cost function, like derivability. For $\mathcal{Z}_{des} \neq 0$ (which is the case for $\omega \neq 0$), these cost functions are at least twice continuously differentiable with respect to the optimization variables (see appendix A), which is beneficial to the convergence properties of the optimization algorithm [26]. Figure 2 displays two cost functions (defined by eq. (11)) for $p = 2$ and $p = 5$. It can be seen on this figure that, as expected, the highest exponent gives more importance to the impedance peaks relative to the troughs. Indeed, a high exponent makes the cost function tend towards a infinite norm.

The optimization algorithm minimizes the sum of the cost function values over the whole frequency range for every considered fingerings: the cost func-




Figure 2: Comparison before optimization, between the target impedance (solid line) and initial impedance for the bicylindrical resonator (dashed line) for the A fingering. The area is cost function eq. 11 between the two impedances: (a) with $p = 2$; (b) with $p = 5$. Note that the magnitude of the cost functions values (right axes) is very different between (a) and (b).

tion that is effectively minimized is

$$J_p^{full}(X) = \sum_{n=1}^{16} \sum_{\omega=\omega_{min}}^{\omega_{max}} \left| |Z_{des,n}(\omega, X)| - |Z_{tar,n}(\omega)| \right|^p, \quad (12)$$

where $Z_{des,n}$ and $Z_{tar,n}$ are the impedances of the n^{th}

fingering, respectively for the bicylindrical resonator and the target instrument, and $\omega_{min} = 2\pi \times 70 \text{ rad.s}^{-1}$ and $\omega_{max} = 2\pi \times 1200 \text{ rad.s}^{-1}$ are the angular frequencies at which the impedances are truncated.

In order to explore the influence of the exponent p on the optimal geometry, several optimization procedures are launched using the `lsqnonlin` function, the only difference being the exponent p of the cost function. Five values of p are tested: 1, 2, 3, 5 and 10. The optimal sets of geometrical parameters are slightly different. As expected, the highest p exponents give a more accurate fit of the impedance peaks with the greatest modulus, at the expense of the lowest. The ratios between the frequency of the impedance peaks are conserved, which could be expected since the bicylindrical resonator has few geometrical degrees of freedom. For the target instrument, the first impedance peak, which corresponds to the first register, is lower than the next for the 12 first fingerings (from low Bb to high Bb). The value $p = 1$ is set aside because of the differentiability issue it entails and because the impedance minima are of lesser importance than the maxima. Therefore, the exponent $p = 2$ is chosen for the cost function so as not to reduce the importance of the first peak in the optimization too much.

3.3 Robustness of the optimization procedure

The chosen method is a local optimization procedure. As such, its result depends on the initial conditions, so we seek to further qualify the validity of the optimum, particularly its robustness to a change of initial geometry. As announced in subsection 3.2, the exponent in the cost function (eq. 11) is $p = 2$ from now on.

As a preliminary study, the optimization procedure is tested using a temporary target: a simulated impedance for a bicylindrical resonator with known geometry (the geometry of the optimum presented in section 4). The result of this optimization can then be assessed, by comparing it to the known geometry of the temporary target. A test is performed in which the optimization procedure starts with 50 different initial geometries placed around the geometry of the temporary target. Each parameter is placed at a certain initial distance from its value for the temporary target, yielding a set of extreme initial geometries.

367 The possible distances are ± 80 mm for each length
 368 $L_{b,n}$, ± 30 mm for the length of the short cylinder
 369 L_a , $[-2, +5]$ mm for the radius r_b and the equivalent
 370 radius $r_{eq,a}$, and $[-10, +30]$ mm for the mouthpiece
 371 chamber length L_m . With these extreme initial condi-
 372 tions, the algorithm converges to optimal dimensions
 373 within 10^{-3} mm of the dimensions of the temporary
 374 target. For this controlled problem, this procedure
 375 gives the order of magnitude of the size of basin where
 376 the optimized geometry converges to the correct op-
 377 timum.

378 We now apply a similar method to studying the
 379 main optimization problem: optimizing the bicylin-
 380 drical resonator to fit a target impedance measured
 381 on a saxophone. In this case, 50 initial geometries are
 382 generated, each parameter within a certain range of
 383 the value assigned to it in section 2.3. This range is set
 384 as $\pm 10\%$ for each $L_{b,n}$, $\pm 30\%$ for L_a and L_m , $\pm 50\%$
 385 for r_b and $r_{eq,a}$. The size of the range is inspired by
 386 the preliminary test with the temporary bicylindrical
 387 target and adapted to fill the convergence basin.

388 With 50 different initial geometries, the optimiza-
 389 tion converges every time to similar optimal geome-
 390 tries: less than 0.002% of variation for each optimal
 391 parameter, except for the optimal mouthpiece lengths
 392 L_m which has a 0.01% spread (less than $2 \mu\text{m}$). This
 393 larger spread on the parameter L_m can be explained
 394 by looking at its influence on the cost function (figure
 395 6, detailed below). The dispersion on optimal value
 396 is due to the stopping criterion of the optimization
 397 procedure and can be reduced by restricting the condi-
 398 tions under which the algorithm stops. One of the
 399 conclusion that can be drawn from this result is that
 400 even though the optimization procedure is local, the
 401 initial geometry is not critical: when it is changed the
 402 resulting optimal geometry remains the same.

403 In order to appreciate the evolution of the cost func-
 404 tion, the history plot of its value during the optimiza-
 405 tion is plotted in figure 3. In this figure, the different
 406 fingerings are separated (inner sum in equation (12)).
 407 Most of the improvement is accomplished during the
 408 first five iterations. During the rest of the optimiza-
 409 tion, compromises between fingerings appear. It can
 410 be seen that for some fingerings, one of the earlier it-
 411 erations has a better cost function value than the final
 412 iteration. The fit of those fingerings is then degraded
 413 to improve the global value of the cost function.

414 To gain information on the convergence behavior




Figure 3: Evolution of the cost function values during the optimization: partial sums over each fingering (inner sum in Eq. 12).

415 that can be expected from the algorithm, it is useful
 416 to study the projection of the cost function around the
 417 optimal set of parameters. Here, it is chosen to com-
 418 pute the cost function over the complete frequency
 419 range and the 16 fingerings by varying one or two
 420 of the parameters around the optimum (all the other
 421 parameters are left at their optimal values).

422 Figure 4 shows the variation of the cost function de-
 423 pending on each length of the long cylinder L_b , within
 424 100 mm of the initial lengths. All the other parame-
 425 ters are fixed at their optimal values. The cost func-
 426 tion appears locally convex, and the optimum cor-
 427 responds to the minimum of the cost function in the
 428 plotted range for each lengths: choosing any set of ini-
 429 tial lengths L_b in a 100 mm range from the optimum
 430 appears viable to obtain convergence. Initial points
 431 used in the robustness test are between brackets on
 432 figure 4. They are all in the convexity region accord-
 433 ing to the represented projections. This is coherent
 434 with the algorithm converging every time.

435 The projection of the cost function space on the pa-
 436 rameters r_b and $r_{eq,a}$ is displayed on figure 5. It may
 437 be noted, on figures 5 and 6, the initial conditions are
 438 not on the surface representing the projection of the
 439 cost function around the optimum. This is because
 440 all the parameters of the initial conditions differ from
 441 their optimal value, whereas the surface is constructed
 442 by varying only two parameters. Once again, the cost
 443 function appears convex, although there is a slope in-
 444 version for very small values of the radius r_b . It can
 445 be noted that the configuration where the two radii are
 446 equal seems privileged (a local minimum follows the




Figure 4: Variation of the cost function of Eq. (12) (solid lines) depending on each parameter L_b , around the optimum obtained for $p = 2$ in Eq. 11 (light dot). The displayed cost function values are normalized. All lengths are displayed with respect to the initial values (vertical black line). The brackets stand for the minimal and maximal initial lengths used in the robustness test.

447 main diagonal on the figure). This is the configura-
 448 tion of the usual cylindrical saxophone approxima-
 449 [1].

450 Figure 6 displays the projection along the length of
 451 the short cylinder L_a and the length of the mouth-
 452 piece L_m . There, two features may be noted: there
 453 is a slope inversion for lengths of the short cylinder
 454 above $L_a = 230$ mm and below $L_a = 50$ mm, and the
 455 length of the mouthpiece L_m appears to have small
 456 influence on the cost function value. This explains
 457 the larger dispersion in optimal mouthpiece lengths:
 458 a change in the parameter L_m amounts to a very small
 459 modification of the cost function value.

460 It can be seen on the figures 4, 5 and 6 that the
 461 cost function appears continuously differentiable, as
 462 announced in subsection 3.2. This is one of the nec-




Figure 5: Variation of the cost function of Eq. (12) (mesh) depending on the radii of the two cylinders r_b and $r_{eq,a}$ around the optimum obtained for $p = 2$ in Eq. 11 (clear dot). Black dots: initial conditions in the robustness test.




Figure 6: Variation of the cost function of Eq. (12) (mesh) depending on the lengths of the short cylinder L_a and the mouthpiece L_m around the optimum obtained for $p = 2$ in Eq. (12) (clear dots). Black dots: initial conditions in the robustness test.

463 essary hypotheses in the proof of the convergence of
 464 the trust-region reflective algorithm of the `lsqnonlin`
 465 function. Overall, this study on the profile of the
 466 cost function near the optimum contributes to justifying
 467 the use of a local, gradient-based optimization
 468 method.

4 Differences between the bicylindrical resonator and the saxophone resonators

The geometrical and acoustical characteristics of the optimized bicylindrical resonator are discussed, in relation with the target instrument. The target saxophone is also compared to the control saxophone, in order to observe the differences that can exist between two saxophones on various impedance descriptors. The differences between the bicylindrical resonator and the target saxophone are then compared with the differences between the two saxophones.

4.1 Optimization results

The optimization procedure yields geometrical dimensions for the designed instrument, summarized in table 1. Several comments can be made on the proposed values of the geometrical parameters, notably in relation to the dimensions of the target instrument. The length of the instrument L_b corresponds to the approximate length of the bore of an alto saxophone, ranging from 1000 mm to under 300 mm. In the coaxial configuration of the bicylindrical resonator (see figure 1) where the short cylinder is around the long cylinder, the total input radius of the optimized resonator is

$$r_m = \sqrt{S_m/\pi} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi r_{eq,a}^2 + \pi(r_b + e)^2}{\pi}} = 6.6 \text{ mm.} \quad (13)$$

It is very close to the input radius of the target instrument, 6.0 mm. However, the optimal mouthpiece is shorter than the mouthpiece added to the impedance measurements of the target instrument (12.5 mm versus 60 mm). This is consistent with the usual formulation of the cylindrical saxophone approximation, where a complete conical instrument including its mouthpiece is replaced by two parallel cylinders without any mouthpiece [4]. This suggests that the mouthpiece chamber should be as short as possible, which is possible in the coaxial configuration (see figure 1).

For further analysis of the optimum geometry, it is necessary to consider the input impedance of the designed instrument, computed from (2). For the sake of clarity, among the total of 16 fingerings in the opti-

Long cylinder	radius lengths	r_b L_b	4.2 mm [323.6; 1016.9] mm
Short cylinder	Eq. radius length	$r_{eq,a}$ L_a	4.1 mm 138.2 mm
Mouthpiece	length	L_m	12.5 mm

Table 1: Optimized geometrical parameters of the designed bicylindrical resonator.

mization procedure, 2 fingerings are displayed in figure 7. They correspond to the low B and the A in written pitch, or $D_3 = 146.83$ Hz and $C_4 = 261.63$ Hz in concert pitch. Even though the complete display of the impedance holds a quantity of information too large to be interpreted clearly, it is natural to look at it first in this context: the optimization procedure aims to match the impedance curves themselves (see Eq. (12)) and does not rely on impedance descriptors. In the frequency range where the optimization is performed, from $\omega_{min}/(2\pi) = 70$ Hz to $\omega_{max}/(2\pi) = 1200$ Hz, the impedance corresponding to the optimum shows good qualitative agreement with the target. The impedance peaks are slightly higher for the target. This phenomenon can be related to the difference in the geometry of the two instruments: the optimized geometry being composed only of cylinders, the losses and radiation mechanisms differ from those encountered in the mainly conical resonator of the target instrument. In terms of phase, the impedance of the designed instrument fits that of the target more accurately at the resonances (i.e. when the phase goes from positive to negative) than at the anti-resonances. The chosen cost function (see 3.2) appears to have emphasized the importance of these peaks in the optimization strategy. However, the bicylindrical resonator shows additional resonances in high frequency – between 1200 Hz and 2200 Hz – above the optimized region. This second group of peaks is inherent to the bicylindrical geometry, but it is worth noting that an adequate tone hole network could attenuate these peaks, by introducing a cutoff frequency [28]. In terms of global impedance shape, this phenomenon is the major difference with real saxophones. It is possible that these resonances would affect the production of sound.




Figure 7: Comparison between target impedance (solid line) and impedance for the designed bicylindrical geometry (dotted line) for (a) the A fingering and (b) the low B fingering.

4.2 Comparison between characteristics of the impedances

In order to quantify the difference between the impedance curves, we use a descriptor: the frequency of the first resonance, represented by the first

impedance peak, that plays a large role in determining the playing frequency for the first register. In practice, these resonance frequencies are detected as the points where the phase passes from positive to negative. Figure 8 compares the frequency of the first impedance peak for every note of the first register of the target instrument and the optimized geometry. The same descriptor is computed for the control saxophone: the differences between the two saxophones serve as references when comparing the optimized geometry to the target. A common reference is taken as the 12-tone tempered scale based on $A_4 = 440$ Hz. There is a shared global tendency along the first register: the discrepancy between the resonance frequencies and the reference frequencies becomes larger towards the top of the register. It appears on the figure that the two saxophones (target and control) are closer together than the target and the optimum. There is a good agreement between the optimized resonator and the target for the highest fingerings of the register (high B2, C2 and C#2). This is possibly due to the smaller number of impedance peaks in the frequency range taken into account for the optimization (70 Hz to 1200 Hz) for the highest fingerings. Indeed, when there is no third or fourth impedance peak in the frequency range, the geometrical degrees of freedom are entirely devoted to fitting the first and second peak. Otherwise, for the rest of the fingerings, a compromise must be made, that leads to a slightly poorer fit of the first peak.

Table 2 summarizes the difference for the first four peaks by averaging the difference over the studied fingerings. Although it is difficult to draw final conclusions from the mean value of an indicator over several fingerings, it is a simple quantitative way to qualify the global difference between target and optimum, and compare it with the difference between the two saxophones. There, we can see that except for the first peak, the average difference between the target and the optimized resonator is similar to the difference between the two real saxophones (target and control). Looking at this average descriptor only, the bicylindrical resonator could be assimilated to a saxophone resonator. However, other descriptors point out the limits of the cylindrical saxophone analogy in terms of impedance characteristics.

Another way to study the resonance frequencies of an instrument is to compare them with its first res-




Figure 8: First impedance peak frequency: target (cross, solid), the control saxophone (plus, dashed) and the optimum for the cost function Eq. (12) with $p = 2$ (circle, dotted). Discrepancy in cents versus the corresponding notes in the tempered scale.

Instrument	Optimum, $p = 2$ vs. Target	Control saxophone vs. Target
Peak 1	+12.5	-5.61
Peak 2	-7.47	-7.96
Peak 3	+5.77	+6.18
Peak 4	+16.5	+12.1

Table 2: Mean discrepancy to the resonance frequencies of the target, for the optimum ($p = 2$) and the control sax, in cents.

onance frequency. The ratio between the second and the first resonance frequencies has been shown to influence the tone color and tuning of the instrument [27]. A descriptor called harmonicity can be defined

$$\text{Harmonicity} = 100 \times \frac{f_2}{2f_1}, \quad (14)$$

expressed in percents, where f_1 and f_2 are the first and second resonance frequencies. A global reference when looking at this descriptor is the integer multiples of the first resonance frequency. For instance, if the second resonance corresponds to the octave of the first, the harmonicity for the second peak is worth exactly 100%. Figure 9 shows the harmonicity for the second resonance. The trend along the register clearly differs between the optimum and the two saxophones. It can be noted that the bicylindrical resonator has harmonicity closer to 100% for the second peak. This is one of the possible characteristics of

a bicylindrical resonator compared to a conical one. Doc [29] shows that a few percents of difference on the harmonicity conditions the production of certain regimes, quasi-periodic for example, on a saxophone. The high-frequency resonances that appear with the bicylindrical resonator (see figure 7) may also change the sound production behavior. Therefore, the bicylindrical resonator can be expected to play quite differently from a usual saxophone.




Figure 9: Harmonicity between the second and first impedance peaks for the target (cross, solid), the control saxophone (plus, dashed) and the optimum for the cost function eq (12) with $p = 2$ (circle, dotted).

Another indicator of fundamental difference between a usual saxophone and the bicylindrical resonator studied here is the height of the impedance peaks, defined as the impedance modulus at the resonance frequency. As with the harmonicity, the first resonance for each fingering can be taken as reference to study the other, leading to a height ratio of the form

$$\text{Peak height ratio} = \frac{|Z(f_2)|}{|Z(f_1)|}. \quad (15)$$

The value of the ratio is very different for the bicylindrical resonator, as shown in figure 10. An analytical and numerical study [30] shows that this may also lead to differences in the sound production characteristics, in particular the ease of playing in the first register. The harmonicity and relative amplitude of the first two peaks may also change the timbre of the instrument, notably by affecting the harmonics of the produced sound.




Figure 10: Ratio between the height (modulus of the impedance) of the second and first impedance peak height for the target (cross, solid), the control saxophone (plus, dashed) and the optimum for the cost function Eq. (11) with $p = 2$ (circle, dotted).

5 Conclusion

The optimization of the bicylindrical resonator to fit impedance measurements performed on an usual saxophone shows that compromises on the optimum are inevitable, to fit certain impedance peaks or others. We have shown that choosing between cost functions allows to emphasize certain parts of the target impedance and control this compromise. Some practical properties of the type of cost functions chosen in this work, such as derivability and local convexity, have been exhibited. In the present case of optimization on a complete instrument with a rather simple geometrical model, a local, least-square method has proven sufficiently robust to initial conditions. The development of original resonators may particularly benefit from optimization procedures, to yield sensible geometrical parameters as a starting point in the design of completely new instruments. In this context, adding geometrical degrees of freedom – for instance the parameters of a tone hole network – would be a way to provide a more precise fit of the target impedance.

Here, the optimized resonator has characteristic trends along the register that are inherent to its cylindrical nature and differ from those of the (conical) target. On the second, third and fourth resonance frequencies alone, the bicylindrical resonator does not

differ from the target more than another saxophone does. However, descriptors like harmonicity and peak height ratio show notable differences. The interpretation that can be made from such results is that the bicylindrical resonator can be tuned to produce the same notes as a saxophone, like an oboe may produce the same notes as a saxophone, but intrinsic characteristics of the resonator differ. This means that, even in low frequency, a reed instrument with bicylindrical resonator should probably be envisioned as a new instrument rather than a pure copy of the existing saxophones, although they share some global acoustic features. The bicylindrical geometry requires further study in terms of sound production, to conclude on its similarity with existing saxophones and its viability as a musical instrument.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Buffet-Crampon for the loan of the target instrument, and Erik Petersen for his helpful comments. This work has been carried out in the framework of the Labex MEC (ANR-10-LABX-0092) and of the A*MIDEX project (ANR-11-IDEX-0001-02), funded by the Investissements d’Avenir French Government program managed by the French National Research Agency (ANR). This study has been supported by the French ANR LabCom LIAMFI (ANR-16-LCV2-007-01).

A Derivability and derivatives of the cost function

The cost function defined by Eq. (11) with $p = 2$ is twice continuously differentiable, as long as $|Z_{des}(\omega, X)| \neq 0$, which is true for strictly positive frequencies. The first order derivative with respect to a given parameter X_i writes

$$\frac{\partial J_2(\omega, X)}{\partial X_i} = 2Z_{des}(\omega, X) \frac{\partial Z_{des}(\omega, X)}{\partial X_i} \times \frac{|Z_{des}(\omega, X)| - |Z_{tar}(\omega)|}{|Z_{des}(\omega, X)|}, \quad (16)$$

where the derivative of the impedance Z_{des} with respect to each parameter can be computed from Eq. (2) and exists for nonzero values of the geometrical parameters. The expression in Eq. (16) may be differentiated a second time with respect to a geometri-

676 cal parameter, leading to a continuous function, still
677 under the assumption $|\mathcal{Z}_{des}(\omega, X)| \neq 0$.

678 B Optimization of a bicylindrical 679 resonator with tone holes

680 As a refinement, the impedance model may be mod-
681 ified to include tone holes. An optimization is per-
682 formed using this model, with tone holes whose radii
683 are identical and fixed at half the radius of the long
684 cylinder. The number of optimization parameters is
685 the same as in the case without tone holes : 1 total
686 length of the main cylinder, corresponding to the low-
687 est note, 15 positions of tone holes (one for each of the
688 other fingerings), the radius of the longest cylinder r_b ,
689 the equivalent radius $r_{eq,a}$ and length L_a of the short
690 cylinder and the mouthpiece length L_m . The opti-
691 mization is significantly longer (by a factor of 10) due
692 to the added complexity of the impedance model, but
693 the optimum is very close in terms of impedance. Fig-
694 ure 11 shows the comparison between the target and
695 the two optimums. The closeness of the impedances
696 may be explained by the fact that the tone-hole net-
697 work has a high frequency effect. On figure 11 the
698 impedances start to differ at about 2000 Hz, which
699 is beyond the frequency range taken into account in
700 the optimization. A calculation of the associated cut-
701 off frequency, as the Helmholtz frequency of the reso-
702 nators formed by each association of a tone hole and
703 the pipe section underneath, yields results between
704 3.4 kHz and 5 kHz, well above the frequency of the
705 main impedance peaks.

706 References

- 707 [1] A. H. Benade, “Equivalent circuits for conical
708 waveguides,” *The Journal of the Acoustical So-*
709 *ciety of America*, vol. 83, no. 5, pp. 1764–1769,
710 1988.
- 711 [2] S. Ollivier, J.-P. Dalmont, and J. Kergomard,
712 “Idealized models of reed woodwinds. Part I:
713 Analogy with the bowed string,” *Acta acustica*
714 *united with acustica*, vol. 90, no. 6, pp. 1192–
715 1203, 2004.
- 716 [3] S. Ollivier, J. Kergomard, and J.-P. Dalmont,
717 “Idealized models of reed woodwinds. Part II:
718 On the stability of ”two-step” oscillations,” *Acta*




Figure 11: Comparison between target impedance (solid line), impedance for the optimized bicylindrical resonator without tone holes (blue dotted line) and with toneholes (red dashed line), for (a) the A fingering and (b) the low B fingering.

acustica united with acustica, vol. 91, no. 1, 719
pp. 166–179, 2005. 720

- [4] J.-P. Dalmont, J. Gilbert, and J. Kergomard, 721
“Reed instruments, from small to large ampli- 722
tude periodic oscillations and the Helmholtz mo- 723

- tion analogy,” *Acta Acustica united with Acustica*, vol. 86, no. 4, pp. 671–684, 2000.
- [5] H. Masuda and Y. Suenaga, “Pipe structure of wind instrument,” Feb. 9 2011. US Patent App. 13/023,793.
- [6] R. Tournemenne, J.-F. Petiot, B. Talgorn, M. Kokkolaras, and J. Gilbert, “Brass instruments design using physics-based sound simulation models and surrogate-assisted derivative-free optimization,” *Journal of Mechanical Design*, vol. 139, no. 4, p. 041401, 2017.
- [7] C. A. Macaluso and J.-P. Dalmont, “Trumpet with near-perfect harmonicity: Design and acoustic results,” *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 129, no. 1, pp. 404–414, 2011.
- [8] C. Vauthrin, B. Fabre, and P. de la Cuadra, “The design of a chromatic quena: How can linear acoustics help ?,” in *Stockholm Music Acoustics Conference*, 2013.
- [9] G. Le Vey, “Graph modelling of musical wind instruments: a method for natural frequencies computation,” *Acta Acustica united with Acustica*, vol. 101, no. 6, pp. 1222–1233, 2015.
- [10] J.-P. Dalmont and G. Le Vey, “Discrete acoustical resonators with harmonic eigenfrequencies,” *Acta Acustica united with Acustica*, vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 94–105, 2017.
- [11] G. Le Vey, “A mathematical model for air columns in a class of woodwinds,” *Acta Acustica united with Acustica*, vol. 103, no. 4, pp. 676–684, 2017.
- [12] D. Noreland, J. Kergomard, F. Laloë, C. Vergez, P. Guillemain, and A. Guilloteau, “The logical clarinet: numerical optimization of the geometry of woodwind instruments,” *Acta Acustica united with Acustica*, vol. 99, no. 4, pp. 615–628, 2013.
- [13] V. Chatziioannou, S. Schmutzhard, M. Pàmies-Vilà, and A. Hofmann, “Investigating clarinet articulation using a physical model and an artificial blowing machine,” *Acta Acustica united with Acustica*, vol. 105, no. 4, pp. 682–694, 2019.
- [14] S. Schmutzhard, V. Chatziioannou, and A. Hofmann, “Parameter optimisation of a viscothermal time-domain model for wind instruments,” 2017.
- [15] W. Kausel, “Optimization of brasswind instruments and its application in bore reconstruction,” *Journal of New Music Research*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 69–82, 2001.
- [16] A. C. Braden, M. J. Newton, and D. M. Campbell, “Trombone bore optimization based on input impedance targets,” *The journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 125, no. 4, pp. 2404–2412, 2009.
- [17] H. Rosenbrock, “An automatic method for finding the greatest or least value of a function,” *The Computer Journal*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 175–184, 1960.
- [18] P. Guillemain and J. Kergomard, “Generic resonator models for real-time synthesis of reed and brass instruments,” in *6th Forum Acusticum*, 2011.
- [19] N. Hansen, “The cma evolution strategy: a comparing review,” in *Towards a new evolutionary computation*, pp. 75–102, Springer, 2006.
- [20] J.-P. Dalmont and J. C. Le Roux, “A new impedance sensor for wind instruments,” *The journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 123, no. 5, pp. 3014–3014, 2008.
- [21] J.-B. Doc, C. Vergez, P. Guillemain, and J. Kergomard, “Sound production on a “coaxial saxophone”,” *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 140, no. 5, pp. 3917–3924, 2016.
- [22] A. D. Pierce and P. Smith, *Acoustics: An introduction to its physical principles and applications*. Acoustical Society of America, 1981.
- [23] H. Levine and J. Schwinger, “On the radiation of sound from an unflanged circular pipe,” *Physical review*, vol. 73, no. 4, p. 383, 1948.
- [24] F. Silva, P. Guillemain, J. Kergomard, B. Mallaróni, and A. N. Norris, “Approximation formulae for the acoustic radiation impedance of a cylindrical pipe,” *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, vol. 322, no. 1-2, pp. 255–263, 2009.

- 809 [25] R. H. Byrd, R. B. Schnabel, and G. A. Shultz,
810 “A trust region algorithm for nonlinearly con-
811 strained optimization,” *SIAM Journal on Nu-*
812 *merical Analysis*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 1152–1170,
813 1987.
- 814 [26] T. F. Coleman and Y. Li, “An interior trust re-
815 gion approach for nonlinear minimization sub-
816 ject to bounds,” *SIAM Journal on optimization*,
817 vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 418–445, 1996.
- 818 [27] J.-P. Dalmont, B. Gazengel, J. Gilbert, and
819 J. Kergomard, “Some aspects of tuning and clean
820 intonation in reed instruments,” *Applied acous-*
821 *tics*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 19–60, 1995.
- 822 [28] E. Moers and J. Kergomard, “On the cutoff
823 frequency of clarinet-like instruments. geometri-
824 cal versus acoustical regularity,” *Acta Acustica*
825 *united with Acustica*, vol. 97, no. 6, pp. 984–996,
826 2011.
- 827 [29] J.-B. Doc and C. Vergez, “Oscillation regimes
828 produced by an alto saxophone: Influence of the
829 control parameters and the bore inharmonicity,”
830 *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of Amer-*
831 *ica*, vol. 137, no. 4, pp. 1756–1765, 2015.
- 832 [30] B. Ricaud, P. Guillemain, J. Kergomard,
833 F. Silva, and C. Vergez, “Behavior of reed wood-
834 wind instruments around the oscillation thresh-
835 old,” *Acta Acustica united with Acustica*, vol. 95,
836 no. 4, pp. 733–743, 2009.