Suitability of the Available Mechanical Neck Models in Low Velocity Rear End Impacts

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Lövsund, P., Svensson, M. (1996). Suitability of the Available Mechanical Neck Models in Low Velocity Rear End Impacts. ELASIS International Conference on Active and Passive Automobile Safety, CNR-PFT2: 155-162

(article starts on next page)

Suitability of the Available Mechanical Neck Models in Low Velocity Rear-End Impacts

Per Lövsund and Mats Y. Svensson
Dept of Injury Prevention, Chalmers University of Technology,
S-412 96, Göteborg, Sweden

Abstract

Neck injuries in car accidents are usually classified as AIS 1 but they often cause long term pain and disability. The number of these injuries is on the increase and the costs for the society and the insurance companies are significant. Rear-end impacts give the largest contribution to the number of neck injuries.

Head-restraints offer little protection against neck injuries in rear-end collisions and there is no established method for performance testing. The injury symptoms are well documented but the actual injury, causing the symptoms, has not yet been established. Consequently the relationship between head-neck motion and injury risk is unknown.

A research program to address these problems is ongoing at Chalmers University and one of the main activities is the development of new dummy components for improved rear-end impact testing. Several investigators have noted limitations of the commonest crash test dummy, the Hybrid III. It has a too stiff neck and torso response in rearward sagittal bending.

As a first step, a new RID-neck (Rear Impact Dummy-neck) was designed and validated. This dummy neck has been used to investigate the head-neck motion in various standard car seats during rear-end impacts. TNO have now started producing a more durable and well defined version (TRID-neck). As more test data from volunteer tests have become available, further evaluation of the RID-neck has been undertaken and a need for a decreased resistance to retraction-protraction motion of the head-neck system has been revealed. It has also become evident that realistic stiffness and shape of the whole spine needed to attain .

At the moment a new RID-neck with less resistance to retraction-protraction and a more realistic spinal shape is under development. In parallel, a mathematical model (MADYMO) of the new RID-neck is being developed. A first generation articulated thoracic and lumbar spine for rear-impact testing has been developed and with further refinement it is expected that a complete dummy spine from pelvis to head will result in a dummy with significantly improved biofidelity in the rear-end impact situation.

INTRODUCTION

Neck injuries in rear-end collisions mostly occur at very low impact-velocities, typically less than 20 km/h (Kahane, 1982; Olsson et al., 1990) and are mostly classified as ”minor injury” (AIS 1) on the abbreviated injury scale (AIS) (Foret-Bruno et al., 1991; James et al., 1991; Ono and Kanno, 1993). In spite of this low AIS rating, these injuries lead to permanent disability (disability-degree ≥10%) in some 10% of the cases (Nygren, 1984). This can be compared with other AIS 1 injuries where the risk of permanent disability is 0.1% (Nygren et al., 1985).

According to Ono and Kanno (1993), 50% of all car-to-car accidents in Japan lead to neck-injuries and the number of neck injuries are on the increase. In the Netherlands, the annual number of neck injuries increased by 54% during the period 1983 to 1991 (Kampen, 1993).

Women were found to be up to twice as vulnerable as men in rear-end accidents (Kihlberg, 1969; States et al., 1972; Kahane, 1982; Otremski et al., 1989; Foret-Bruno et al., 1991; vKoch et al., 1995; Spitzer et al., 1995).

Nygren et al. (1985) found that the use of head-restraints decreased the risk of neck injury in a rear-end collision by about 20% on average. Fixed head-restraints gave a 24% reduction and adjustable ones gave a 14% reduction. Similar findings have been presented by O'Neill et al. (1972) and by Huelke and O'Day (1975). However, Nygren et al. (1985) also found that the risk of whiplash injury was not reduced in newer cars. In fact the study disclosed great differences in protective performance between different designs of seats and headrests, which is a clear indication of the need for further research in this area.

States et al. (1969) suggested that the elastic rebound of the seat back could be an aggravating factor for the whiplash extension motion. The rebound of the seat-back can push the torso forward relative to the vehicle at an early stage of the whiplash extension motion when the head begins rotating rearward. This in turn increases the relative linear and angular velocity of the head relative to the upper torso at the same time as it delays contact between the head and the head-restraint. Subsequent studies support this theory (McKenzie and Williams, 1971; Prasad et al., 1975; Romilly et al., 1989; Foret-Bruno et al., 1991; Svensson et al., 1993; Svensson et al., 1996). If the seat-back of the front-seat collapses or yields plastically during a rear-end collision, the elastic seat-back rebound is likely to be reduced. In fact, Foret-Bruno et al. (1991) reported that seat-back collapse decreased the risk of neck injury in rear-end collisions.

The relation between different kinematic and kinetic parameters of the head-neck motion and the risk of sustaining an AIS 1 neck-injury in a rear-end impact are not fully known. SAE (1986) published limits for neck loads at the occipital condyles for volunteers and cadavers (Table 1) based on the work by Mertz and Patrick (1967; 1971).

Table 1: Neck reactions calculated at the occipital condyles for dynamic neck extension tests (SAE, 1993).

Subject	Bending moment (Nm)	Shear force (N)	Axial Force (N)	AIS rating	Comments
Volunteer	30.5	231	249	0	No injury
Cadaver	47	-	-	0	No damage
Cadaver	57	-	-	3	Ligamentous damage

The risk of neck injury to rear seat occupants was only about 50% of the risk of neck injury for front seat occupants in rear-end collisions (Kihlberg, 1969; States et al., 1972; Carlsson et al., 1985; Lövsund et al., 1988; Otremski et al., 1989).

The injury symptoms following neck trauma in rear-end collisions include pain, weakness or abnormal response in the neck, shoulders and upper back as well as vision disorders, dizziness, headaches, unconsciousness, and neurological symptoms in the upper (States et al., 1972; Nygren et al., 1985; Hildingsson, 1991; Watkinson et al., 1991; Spitzer et al., 1995). Spangfort (1985) used Figure 1 to describe the stages of the symptoms. Findings similar to those of Spangfort (1985) were reported by Deans et al. (1987).

According to Svensson (1993), a synthesis of findings by Mertz and Patrick (1967; 1971) and by McConnell et al. (1993) indicate that AIS 1 neck injuries during a rear-end impact are prevented if the displacement between head and torso are eliminated. The injury can on the other hand occur without hyperextension of the complete cervical spine.



Figure 1: The stages of the neck injury symptoms sustained in a rear-end collision (adapted from Spangfort, 1985).

CURRENT NECK DESIGNS

Until recently there has been no adequate tool for testing the performance of car seats and head-restraints in rear-impacts. The currently best available dummy is the Hybrid III. The neck and spinal structure of this dummy is stiff and unlikely to interact with the seat-back in the same compliant way as would the human spine.

Seemann et al. (1986) found the Hybrid III neck far too stiff to respond in a human-like manner in the sagittal plane. Deng (1989) reported that results from a mathematical model of the Hybrid III neck indicated that the neck has a torque response similar to that of the human neck but has a higher shear response. Foret-Bruno et al. (1991) compared the Hybrid III dummy with a cadaver in simulated rear-end impact using a headrest closely fitted to the head, to minimise the relative movement between head and torso. The cadaver showed no sign of injury. In spite of this, very large shear forces at occipital level were registered in the Hybrid III test. The authors concluded that the human head can be moved relative to the torso with no stresses in the neck, but this is not the case for the dummy. In volunteer tests, McConnell et al. (1993) found that during the acceleration phase of a rear-impact, when the occupants body was pressed against the seat-back, the spinal curvature straightened. This in turn caused an upward motion of the head and thus an elevated head contact point on the head-restraint. In a comparative study using volunteers and a Hybrid III-dummy, Scott et al. (1993) found that the dummy was less prone to ramp up along the seat-back than were the volunteers.

Svensson and Lövsund (1992) developed and validated a Rear Impact Dummy-neck (RID-neck) that can be used on the Hybrid III dummy (Fig. 2). The new neck was meant to be used in rear-end collision testing at low impact-velocities. It consisted of seven cervical and two thoracic vertebrae. It was designed to resemble the human anatomy to enable a trajectory, and angular range of motion similar to that of the human in the sagittal plane. The RID-neck was validated using data from a test series with volunteers published by Tarriere and Sapin (1969) after a French study by Tisserand and Wisner (1966). These validation data only included the angular displacement of the head relative to the torso but did not allow for validation of the initial rearward translational motion of the head (head lag). A later validation study by Geigl et al. (1995) indicated that the head lag is too small with the RID-neck. This problem could probably be solved if the RID-neck design was supplemented with anterior and posterior muscle elements (Svensson and Lövsund, 1992) and this type of design was also proposed for the next generation frontal impact dummy (Eppinger et al., 1994).



Figure 2: The RID-neck with a Hybrid III head.

Thunnissen et al. (1996) developed a new rear impact dummy neck, the TRID-neck (TNO Rear Impact Dummy-neck) based on the RID-neck design. The TRID was subjected to a more extensive validation work involving new validation data from tests with volunteers and human cadavers, but validation was still restricted to the angular displacement between head and torso. The number of pin joints was reduced from nine (RID) to seven (TRID) and efforts were made to attain adequate repeatability and reproducibility which had turned out to be weak points in the RID-neck design. The dynamic response of the two neck types appears to be very similar. The TRID-neck is likely become a valuable tool for assessing the performance of car seats and head-restraints.

FUTURE DUMMIES

To get a more detailed assessment of the occupant body motion and interaction with the car seat and head-restraint it will not be enough to replace the neck of the Hybrid III-dummy. In order to get a realistic interaction with the seat-back, the dummy torso must have a bending stiffness similar to that of the human torso. The dummy spine must further have a realistic spinal shape in order to allow for correct conditions (timing and contact height) in the contact with the head-restraint. A currently ongoing project at Chalmers University is aiming at developing a new Rear Impact Dummy according to the concept in Figure 3. A Hybrid III- dummy is equipped with an articulated spine with a realistic spinal shape.



Figure 3: A rear Impact Dummy concept with an articulated spine and with a realistic spinal shape.

The current rear impact dummy-neck designs (RID-neck and TRID-neck) have not been validated regarding head lag. Several studies indicate that head lag has significant influence on the head-neck kinematics in the rear-end collision situation (Severy et al. 1955; Clemens and Burow, 1972; Huelke et al, 1979; Geigl et al., 1995; McConnell et al., 1995). Figure 4 shows a schematic view of the neck in Figure 3 supplemented with anterior and posterior muscle substitutes in the form of straps between the head and the torso. With this type of muscle elements it will be possible to increase the head lag to more realistic levels.



Figure 4: Dummy head and neck concept with anterior and posterior muscle substitutes.

REFERENCES

Carlsson, G.; Nilsson, S.; Nilsson-Ehle, A.; Norin, H.; Ysander, L.; Örtengren, R. (1985): Neck Injuries in Rear End Car Collisions. Biomechanical considerations to improve head restraints. Proc. Int. IRCOBI/AAAM Conf. Biomech. of Impacts, Göteborg, Sweden, pp. 277-289

Clemens, H.J.; Burow, K. (1972): Experimental Investigation on Injury Mechanisms Of Cervical Spine at Frontal and Rear-Front Vehicle Impacts. Proc. 16th STAPP Car Crash Conf., SAE paper no. 720960, SAE Inc., New York, USA, LC 67-22372

Deans, G.T, Magalliard, J.N.; Kerr, M.; Rutherford, W.H. (1987): Neck sprain - a major cause of disability following car accidents. Injury, Vol. 18, pp. 10-12

Deng, Y.-C. (1989): Anthropomorphic Dummy Neck Modelling and Injury Considerations. Accid. Anal. & Prev. Vol. 21, No 1, pp. 85-100

Eppinger, R.; Kleinberger, M.; Morgan, R.; Khaewpong, N.; Bandak, F.; Haffner, M. (1994): Advanced Injury Criteria and Crash Evaluation Techniques. Paper no. 94-S1-O-11, Proc. Fourteenth Int. Conf. Enhanced Safety of Vehicles, Munich, May 23-26, NHTSA, Washington, USA

Foret-Bruno, J.Y.; Dauvilliers, F.; Tarriere, C.; P. Mack (1991): Influence of the Seat and Head Rest Stiffness on the Risk of Cervical Injuries in Rear Impact. Proc. 13th ESV Conf. in Paris, France, paper 91-S8-W-19, NHTSA, USA, DOT HS 807 991

Foster, J.K.; Kortge, J.O.; Volanin, M.J. (1977): Hybrid III - A Biomechanically Based Crash Test Dummy. Proc of 21st STAPP Car Crash Conf., pp. 973-1014, SAE Inc., New York, USA, LC 67-22372

Geigl, B.C.; Steffan, H.; Dippel., C.; Muser, M.H.; Walz, F.; Svensson, M.Y. (1995): Comparison of Head-Neck Kinematics During Rear End Impact Between Standard Hybrid III, RID Neck, Volunteers and PMTO's. Proc. 1995 Int. IRCOBI Conf., Brunnen, Switzerland, pp.261-270

Hildingsson, C. (1991): Soft Tissue Injury of the Cervical Spine. Umeå University Medical Dissertations, New Series No 296, ISSN 0346-6612, ISBN 91-7174-546-7

Huelke, D.F.; O'Day, J. (1975): The Federal Motorvehicle Safety Standards: Recommendations for Increased Occupant Safety. Proc. Fourth Int. Congr. on Automotive Safety, pp. 275-292, NHTSA, USA

Huelke, D.F.; Mendelsohn, R.A.; States, J.D.; Melvin, J.W. (1979): Cervical Fractures and Fracture-Dislocations Sustained without Head Impact. In: The Human Neck-Anatomy, Injury Mechanisms and Biomechanics, pp. 17-23, SAE paper no. 790132, SAE/SP-79/438, LC 78-75236

James, M.B.; Strother, C.E.; Warner, C.Y.; Decker, R.L.; Perl, T.R. (1991): Occupant Protection in Rear-end Collisions:1. - Safety Priorities and Seat Belt Effectiveness. Proc. 35th Stapp Car Crash Conf., SAE/P-91/251, SAE paper no 912913, ISBN 1-56091-190-5

Kahane, C.J. (1982): An Evaluation of Head Restraints - Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 202. NHTSA Technical Report, DOT HS-806 108, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161, USA

Kampen, L.T.B. van (1993): Availability and (Proper) Adjustment of Head Restraints in The Netherlands. Int. IRCOBI Conf. on the Biomech. of Impacts, Sept. 8-10, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, pp. 367-378

Kihlberg, J.K. (1969): Flexion-Torsion Neck Injury in Rear Impacts. Proc. 13th AAAM Ann. Conf., The Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA, pp. 1-17

vKoch, M.; Kullgren, A.;Lie, A.; Nygren, Å.; Tingvall, C. (1995): Soft Tissue Injury of the Cervical Spine in Rear-End and Frontal Collisions. Proc. IRCOBI Conf., Switzerland, pp. 273-284

Lövsund, P.; Nygren, Å.; Salen, B.; Tingvall, C. (1988): Neck Injuries in Rear End Collisions among Front and Rear Seat Occupants. Proc. Int. IRCOBI Conference Biomech. of Impacts, Bergisch-Gladbach, F.R.G., pp. 319-325

McConnell, W. E.; Howard, R. P.; Guzman, H. M.; Bomar, J. B.; Raddin, J H.; Benedict, J. V.; Smith, L. H.; Hatsell, C. P. (1993): Analysis of Human Test Subject Responses to Low Velocity Rear End Impacts. SP-975, SAE paper no. 930889, pp. 21-30, SAE Inc., ISBN 1-56091-360-6

McConnell, W.E.; Howard, R.P.; Poppel, van J.; Krause, R.; Guzman, H. M.; Bomar, J. B.; Raddin, J H.; Benedict, J. V.; Hatsell, C. P. (1995): Human Head and Neck Kinematics After Low Velocity Rear-End Impacts: Understanding Whiplash. Proc. 39th Car Crash Conf., SAE paper no. 952724

Mendis, K.; Stalnacker R.L.; Pritz, H.B. (1989): Multi Directional Neck Prototype. Proc. Twelfth Int. Tech.. Conf. Experimental Safety Vehicles, pp. 645-649, US Dept. of Transp., National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, USA

Mertz, H.J.; Patrick, L.M. (1967): Investigation of the Kinematics and Kinetics of Whiplash. Proc. 11th STAPP Car Crash Conf., Anaheim, California, USA, pp. 267-317, SAE Inc., New York, USA, LC 67-22372

Mertz, H.J.; Patrick, L.M. (1971): Strength and Response of the Human Neck. Proc. of 15th Stapp Car Crash Conf., pp. 207-255, SAE Inc., New York, LC 67-22372

Nygren, Å. (1984): Injuries to Car Occupants - Some Aspects of the Interior Safety of Cars. Akta Oto-Laryngologica, Supplement 395, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, Sweden, ISSN 0365-5237

Nygren, Å; Gustafsson, H., Tingvall, C. (1985): Effects of Different Types of Headrests in Rear-End Collisions. 10th International Conference on Experimental Safety Vehicles, pp. 85-90, NHTSA, USA

Olsson, I.; Bunketorp, O.; Carlsson, G.; Gustafsson, C.; Planath, I.; Norin, H.; Ysander, L. (1990): An In-Depth Study of Neck Injuries in Rear End Collisions. Proc. 1990 Int. IRCOBI Conf. on the Biomechanics of Impacts, Bron, Lyon, France, pp. 269-282

O'Neill, B.; Haddon, W.; Kelley, A.B.; Sorenson, W.W. (1972): Automobile Head Restraints: Frequency of Neck Injury Insurance Claims in Relation to the Presence of Head Restraints. Am J Publ Health, Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 399-406

Ono, K. and Kanno, M. (1993): Influences of the Physical Parameters on the Risk to Neck Injuries in Low Impact Speed Rear-end Collisions. Int. IRCOBI Conf. on the Biomech. of Impacts, Sept. 8-10, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, pp. 201-212

Otremski, I.; Marsh, J.L.; Wilde, B.R.; McLardy Smith, P.D.; Newman, R.J. (1989): Soft Tissue Cervical Spinal Injuries in Motor Vehicle Accidents. Injury, Vol. 20, pp. 349-351

Prasad, P.; Mital, N.; King, A.I.; Patrick, L.M. (1975): Dynamic Response of the Spine During +Gx Acceleration. Proc. 19th STAPP Car Crash Conf., SAE Inc., USA, pp. 869-897

Romilly, D.P.; Thomson, R.W.; Navin, F.P.D.; Macnabb, M.J. (1989): Low Speed Rear Impacts and the Elastic Properties of Automobiles. Proc. Twelfth Int. Tech.. Conf. ESV, US Dept. of Transp., NHTSA, USA, pp. 1199-1205

SAE (1986): Human Tolerance to Impact Conditions as Related to Motor Vehicle Design. SAE J885 JUL86, In: 1993 SAE Handbook, Volume 4, On-Highway Vehicles and Off Highway Machinery, pp. 34.259-34.276, ISBN 1-56091-326-6

Scott, M.W.; McConnell, W.E.; Guzman, H.M.; Howard, R.P.; Bomar, J.B.; Smith, H.L.; Benedict, J.V.; Raddin, J.H.; Hatsell, C.P. (1993): Comparison of Human and ATD Head Kinematics During Low-Speed Rearend Impacts. SAE paper no. 930094, SAE/SP-93/945, SAE Inc., Warrendale, Philadelphia, USA, ISBN 1-56091-330-4, LC 92-63144

Seemann, M.R.; Muzzy, W.H.; Lustick, L.S. (1986): Comparison of Human and Hybrid III Head and Neck Response. Proc. 30:th STAPP Car Crash Conf., paper 861892, pp. 291-312, SAE/P-86/189, ISSN 0585-086X, ISBN 0-89883-451-1

Severy, D.M.; Mathewson, J.H.; Bechtol, C.O. (1955): Controlled Automobile Rear-End Collisions, an Investigation of Related Engineering and Medical Phenomena. Canadian Services Medical Journal, pp. 727-759

Spangfort, E. (1985): Klinisk Bedömning av Whiplash patienten. In: Nackskadesymposium, Åre Sjukhus, 12 febr., pp. 71-77, FOLKSAM FoU, R 0619, S-106 60 Stockholm, Sweden.

Spitzer,W.O. et al. (1995): Scientific Monograph of the Quebec Task Force on Whiplash-Associated Disorders: Redifining "Whiplash" and Its Management. Spine, Supplement, Volume 20, Number 8S, ISSN: 0362-2436

States, J.D.; Korn, M.W.; Masengill, J.B. (1969): The Enigma of Whiplash Injuries. Proc. Thirteenth Ann. Conf. AAAM, Minnesota, USA, pp. 83-108

States, J.D.; Balcerak, J.C.; Williams, J.S.; Morris, A.T.; Babcock, W.; Polvino, R.; Riger, P., Dawley; R.E. (1972): Injury Frequency and Head Restraint Effectiveness in Rear-End Impact Accidents. Proc. 16th Stapp Car Crash Conf., pp. 228-245, Soc. of Automotive Eng., New York, LC 67-22372

Svensson, M. Y.; Lövsund, P. (1992): A Dummy for Rear-End Collisions - Development and Validation of a New Dummy-Neck. SAE paper no. 1992-13-0024, Proc. 1992 Int. IRCOBI Conf. on the Biomechanics of Impacts, pp. 299-310, Verona, Italy

Svensson, M.Y. (1993): Neck Injuries in Rear-End Car Collisions - Sites and Biomechanical Causes of the Injuries, Test Methods and Preventive Measures. Dept. of Injury Prevention, Chalmers Univ. of Techn., S-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden, ISBN 91-7032-878-1

Svensson, M. Y.; Lövsund, P; Håland, Y.; Larsson, S. (1993): Rear-End Collisions - A Study of the Influence of Backrest Properties on Head-Neck Motion Using a New Dummy Neck. SAE paper no. 930343, SAE/SP-93/963, SAE Inc., Warredale, PA, USA

Svensson, M.Y.; Lövsund, P.; Håland, Y.; Larsson, S. (1996): The Influence of Seat-Back and Head-Restraint Properties on the Head-Neck Motion During Rear-Impact. Accid. Anal. and Prev. Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 221-227

Thunnissen, J.G.M.; Ratingen, M.R. van; Beusenberg, M.C.; Janssen, E.G. (1996) A Dummy Neck for Low Severity Impacts. Proc. ESV Conf., paper no. 96-S10-O-12

Watkinson, A.; Gargan, M.F.; Bannister, G.C. (1991): Prognostic Factors in Soft Tissue Injuries of the Cervical Spine. Injury, 22, (4), pp. 307-309

Wismans, J. and Spenny, C.H. (1984): Head-Neck Response in Frontal Flexion. Proc. 28th STAPP Car Crash Conf., pp. 161-172, SAE paper no. 841666, SAE/P-84/152, ISBN 0-89883-7111

Wismans, J.; Phillippen M.; van Oorschot, E.; Kallieris, D.; Mattern R. (1987): Comparison of Human Volunteer and Cadaver Head-Neck Response in Frontal Flexion. Proc. 31st Stapp Car Crash Conf., pp. 1-14, ISBN 0-89883-462-7, SAE/P-87/202