



INSERTION LOSS OF HEARING PROTECTION DEVICES FOR MILITARY IMPULSE NOISE

Ann Nakashima

Defence Research and Development Canada – Toronto Research Centre, Canada

Sadri Sarray

Quality Engineering Test Establishment, Department of National Defence, Canada

Nir Fink

Israel Defence Forces Medical Corps, Israel

Canadian Acoustics

148 - Vol. 45, No. 3 (2017)

Date of Publication from Ext Publisher: September 2017

Defence Research and Development Canada

External Literature (N)

DRDC-RDDC-2018-N001

January 2018

CAN UNCLASSIFIED

IMPORTANT INFORMATIVE STATEMENTS

Disclaimer: This document is not published by the Editorial Office of Defence Research and Development Canada, an agency of the Department of National Defence of Canada, but is to be catalogued in the Canadian Defence Information System (CANDIS), the national repository for Defence S&T documents. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Department of National Defence) makes no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, of any kind whatsoever, and assumes no liability for the accuracy, reliability, completeness, currency or usefulness of any information, product, process or material included in this document. Nothing in this document should be interpreted as an endorsement for the specific use of any tool, technique or process examined in it. Any reliance on, or use of, any information, product, process or material included in this document is at the sole risk of the person so using it or relying on it. Canada does not assume any liability in respect of any damages or losses arising out of or in connection with the use of, or reliance on, any information, product, process or material included in this document.

This document was reviewed for Controlled Goods by Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) using the Schedule to the *Defence Production Act*.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Department of National Defence), 2018

© Sa Majesté la Reine en droit du Canada (Ministère de la Défense nationale), 2018

CAN UNCLASSIFIED

INSERTION LOSS OF HEARING PROTECTION DEVICES FOR MILITARY IMPULSE NOISE

Ann Nakashima, Sadri Sarray and Nir Fink

1 Introduction

Military operators are exposed to a broad range of complex noises from various types of equipment. In particular, impulse noise from different weapons can vary greatly in terms of level, temporal and spectral characteristics. The American National Standards Institute/Acoustical Society of America (ANSI/ASA) S12.42 describes methods for measuring the impulse peak insertion loss (IPIL) of hearing protection devices (HPDs) [1]. The IPIL is a single number that gives the overall reduction of the peak sound pressure level that is provided by a HPD. However, the measurement methods in the standard are difficult to achieve in practice, and it is unknown if the results can be applied to non-idealized impulse noise sources and realistic operational conditions [1]. In addition, recent studies have shown that the IPIL does not completely describe the performance of HPDs, and that the frequency-domain impulse spectral insertion loss (ISIL) must be considered [2]. In a previous study, IPIL measurements for different types of HPDs for one type of noise source were reported [3]. The current paper presents insertion loss measurements using different HPDs with several different weapons used as noise sources.

2 Method

Three types of Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) weapons were used as noise sources for the HPD insertion loss (IL) measurements: a 5.56 mm semi-automatic rifle, a 7.62 mm medium machine gun and a 12.7 mm heavy machine gun. IL data were acquired using a GRAS 45 CB acoustic test fixture (ATF), a 67S blast probe and a Sinus Soundbook data acquisition system with Samurai software (204.8 kHz sampling rate), or a HBM Genesis high-speed transient recorder and data acquisition system (1 MHz sampling rate). Two types of Israel Defense Forces (IDF) weapons were used as noise sources: a grenade launcher and a mortar. Data were acquired using an ATF produced by the French-German Institute of Saint-Louis (ISL) and a Soundbook with Samurai software. The equipment met ANSI/ASA S12.42 requirements for measuring IPIL, but the noise sources were not ideal. Since our objective was to study HPDs for specific weapons, we accepted this limitation and refer to our results as IL and ISIL rather than IPIL. Several types of earplugs and earmuffs were used, alone and in combination. The results shown here will be limited to two passive earplugs and one electronic earmuff: 3M EAR Classic (level-independent passive earplug), Etymotic ETY Plug (linear attenuation passive earplug), 3M Peltor Tactical 6-S (electronic level-dependent earmuff) and the EAR Classic in combination with the Peltor earmuff.

3 Results

The pressure-time signals of the CAF rifle and machine guns are shown in Fig. 1. The rifle noise was measured with the blast probe in front of the weapon to reduce reflections. The shockwave seen in Fig. 1 (top) was removed for the analysis. The peak level of the 5.56 mm muzzle blast was 153 dB SPL. The 7.62 mm and 12.7 mm machine gun signals in the middle and bottom of Fig. 1 were measured at the blast probe 0.5 m behind and to the left of the gunner. The peak levels were 154 and 152 dB SPL, respectively.




Fig. 1: Time signal of a 5.56 mm rifle (top) and 21-round bursts from 7.62 mm (middle) and 12.7 mm (bottom) machine guns.

The pressure-time signals of the IDF grenade launcher and mortar, measured in-ear with the ATF, are shown in Fig. 2. The ATF was placed 0.5 m to the right of the gunner for the grenade launcher, and 0.5 m behind the mortar. These signals have been modified by the ear transfer function, but they clearly have different temporal characteristics than those shown in Fig. 1. The in-ear peak levels were 175 and 173 dB SPL for the grenade launcher and mortar, respectively. Free-field levels can be estimated at 8 to 12 dB lower than the in-ear levels [4].




Fig. 2: Time signals of the grenade launcher (top) and mortar (bottom) measured inside the ear of the ATF.

For the 12.7 mm heavy machine gun, the overall peak IL results were 20.0 dB (Peltor Tactical 6-S), 41.7 dB (EAR Classic), 49.2 (ETY plugs) and 54.7 dB (EAR Classic earplug with Peltor earmuff). The 1/3 octave band ISIL for are shown in Fig. 3. The Peltor muff provided the least

overall insertion loss. For the earplugs, bone conduction limits were exceeded in several frequency bands.




Fig. 3: Insertion loss of passive earplugs and electronic earmuff for the 12.7 mm machine gun noise.

The ISIL for the EAR classic earplug are shown in Fig. 4 for the five weapon noise sources, as well as continuous pink noise. The earplug was least protective for the mortar and most protective for the 7.62 mm medium machine gun. Bone conduction limits were exceeded at frequencies from 1000 Hz and higher for several of the weapons and the pink noise.




Fig. 4: Impulse spectral insertion loss of EAR Classic plug for different noise sources.

4 Discussion and Conclusions

The weapon noise signatures shown in Figs. 1 and 2 do not meet the ANSI/ASA standard for measuring IPIL. The A-duration, or duration of the impulse from its initial sharp increase in positive sound pressure to the time when the pressure becomes negative, is required to be between 0.5 and 2.0 ms [1]. The A-duration can only be clearly identified for the 5.56 mm rifle, and it is shorter than 0.5 ms. Although we have not strictly followed the standard, it is important to know which HPDs work best for each weapon. The EAR classic is a very well-known example of a passive

level-independent HPD. However, with different noise sources with free-field peak levels ranging from about 152 to 165 dB, different ISIL results are clearly shown in Fig. 4. In general, less protection was obtained for the heavier weapons (12.7 mm and mortar), particularly at low frequencies. This could be a concern because the noise from large calibre weapons has more energy at low frequencies [5]. However, the passive linear-attenuation earplug (ETY Plugs) provided good insertion loss for the 12.7 mm at low frequencies (Fig. 3).

An additional advantage of looking at the ISIL rather than the IPIL is that bone conduction exceedances can be seen. As shown in Figs. 3 and 4, bone conduction limits were exceeded for earplugs and double protection at frequencies of 1000 Hz and above. The IPIL can overestimate the amount of protection because bone conduction corrections are not part of the calculations [2].

It was recommended previously that the IPIL could be used account for HPDs in the assessment of noise exposure for small calibre weapons, but not large calibre weapons and blasts [6]. The current data show the importance of measuring ISIL for specific noise sources, rather than relying on IPIL data which are measured with an idealized source. We will continue collecting data for different types of weapons in order to provide better recommendations for HPD use. Additional results for more weapon types and HPDs will be presented in a follow-up paper.

References

- [1] ANSI/ASA S12.42-2010. (2010). American National Standard Methods for the measurement of insertion loss of hearing protection devices in continuous or impulsive noise using microphone-in-real-ear or acoustic test fixture procedures. New York: American National Standards Institute.
- [2] Fackler CJ, Berger EH, Murphy, WJ and Stergar ME. (2017). Spectral analysis of hearing protector impulsive insertion loss. *International Journal of Audiology* 56:S13-21.
- [3] Nakashima, A. (2015). Comparison of different types of hearing protection devices for use during weapons firing. *Journal of Military, Veterans and Family Health*, 1(2):43-51.
- [4] Murphy WJ, Fackler CJ, Berger EH et al. (2015). Measurement of impulse peak insertion loss from two acoustic test fixtures and four hearing protector conditions with an acoustic shock tube. *Noise and Health*, 17(78):364-373.
- [5] NATO-HFM-022. (2003). Reconsideration of the effects of impulse noise. North Atlantic Treaty Organisation RTO Technical report TR-017.
- [6] Nakashima, A. (2015). A comparison of metrics for impulse noise exposure: Analysis of noise data from small calibre weapons. Defence Research and Development Canada Scientific report DRDC-RDDC-2015-R243.

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA		
(Security markings for the title, abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the document is Classified or Designated)		
1. ORIGINATOR (The name and address of the organization preparing the document. Organizations for whom the document was prepared, e.g., Centre sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, are entered in Section 8.) DRDC – Toronto Research Centre Defence Research and Development Canada 1133 Sheppard Avenue West P.O. Box 2000 Toronto, Ontario M3M 3B9 Canada	2a. SECURITY MARKING (Overall security marking of the document including special supplemental markings if applicable.) CAN UNCLASSIFIED	
	2b. CONTROLLED GOODS NON-CONTROLLED GOODS DMC A	
3. TITLE (The complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification should be indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C or U) in parentheses after the title.) INSERTION LOSS OF HEARING PROTECTION DEVICES FOR MILITARY IMPULSE NOISE		
4. AUTHORS (last name, followed by initials – ranks, titles, etc., not to be used) Nakashima, Ann; Sarray, Sadri; Fink, Nir.		
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (Month and year of publication of document.) January 2018	6a. NO. OF PAGES (Total containing information, including Annexes, Appendices, etc.) 2	6b. NO. OF REFS (Total cited in document.) 6
7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (The category of the document, e.g., technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.) External Literature (N)		
8. SPONSORING ACTIVITY (The name of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development – include address.) DRDC – Toronto Research Centre Defence Research and Development Canada 1133 Sheppard Avenue West P.O. Box 2000 Toronto, Ontario M3M 3B9 Canada		
9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.)	9b. CONTRACT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.)	
10a. ORIGINATOR'S DOCUMENT NUMBER (The official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.) DRDC-RDDC-2018-N001	10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NO(s). (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.)	
11a. FUTURE DISTRIBUTION (Any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.) Public release		
11b. FUTURE DISTRIBUTION OUTSIDE CANADA (Any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.)		

12. **ABSTRACT** (A brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), (R), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual.)

13. **KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS** (Technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g., Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

impulse noise, hearing protection