Injury Mechanisms and Outcomes in Lead Vehicle Stopped, Near Side, and Lane Change-Related Impacts: Implications for Autonomous Vehicle Behavior Design

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Lauren Eichaker

Graduate Program in Biomedical Engineering

The Ohio State University

2017

Dissertation Committee:

John Bolte IV, PhD, Advisor

Amanda Agnew, PhD

Amy Ferketich, PhD

Alan Litsky, MD, PhD

Copyrighted by

Lauren Rebecca Eichaker

2017

Abstract

Lead vehicle stopped (LVS) impacts, near-side impacts (NSI), and impacts that occur while changing lanes on a highway (CLH) are top contributors to traffic and health care expenditures. They represent a combined 22% of the total economic cost and 18% of the functional years lost out of NHTSA's 37 pre-crash scenarios. It is important to better understand how these crashes occur, so that evolving autonomous vehicle technologies may be tailored towards injury mitigation in crash-imminent scenarios. Additionally, as autonomous vehicle technologies increase in prevalence and usage, out of position seating and distracted driving behaviors may also increase. In order to analyze injury patterns in real-world crashes, the public portal of Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN) was surveyed for LVS impacts, NSI, and CLH related impacts. The review found that the thorax and lower extremity body regions were most often severely injured (P<0.05) in LVS impacts. In NSI, the head and thorax were found to be most frequently severely injured (P<0.05). In CLH crashes, the thorax was found to be most frequently severely injured. Autonomous vehicle behaviors have the potential to augment passive and active safety systems to potentially decrease the occurrence of injuries by improving a vehicle's response to the crash scenario. In all three scenarios, secondary impacts, and suboptimal rebounding of the occupant around the cabin might be minimized using smart braking and veering, as well as improved active and passive safety feature deployment timing and duration.

Acknowledgments

My transition from a Wisconsin Bucky to an Ohio State Buckeye has been guided by several individuals and entities, to which I would like to extend gratitude. First, I would like to thank my advisor, John Bolte IV, PhD. I am honored to have been given the magnanimous opportunity to learn in the positive, supportive environment he created at the Injury Biomechanics Research Center (IBRC). Second, I want to thank David Emerling. Without his introduction to both the IBRC and The Ohio State University, I would not have completed this study. Both John and David guided my growth as a scientist and as a person in order to better embody the strength, persistence, positivity, and vision of an Ohio State Buckeye.

Next, I would like to thank the researchers at the University Transportation Center. Umit Ozguner, PhD, Keith Redmill, PhD, and Arda Kurt, PhD provided perspectives on autonomous vehicle standards and directions. Without them, I would not have been able to carry out this study. My three committee members Amanda Agnew, PhD, Amy Ferketich, PhD, and Alan Litsky, MD, PhD allowed me to expend my perspective and broaden my skill set in order to complete this interdisciplinary work. Their contributions, both to my project and to my development as a researcher were greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank the staff and students of the IBRC. Their support and friendship has been instrumental to my growth as a researcher. In addition to the individuals I have already mentioned, I would like to thank Rakshit Ramachandra and Julie Bing for being great mentors within the IBRC. Last, but not least, Arvin Eichaker deserves to be mentioned; he silently and consistently provided moral support during my time spent working from home.

Vita

2011	.B.S. Biomedical Engineering, University of
	Wisconsin-Madison
2013	.M.S. Biomedical Engineering, University of
	Memphis/University of Tennessee Health
	Science Center
2014 to present	.Graduate Research Associate, Biomedical
	Engineering, The Ohio State University

Fields of Study

Major Field: Biomedical Engineering

Table of Contents

Abstractii
Acknowledgmentsiii
Vitav
Table of Contents
List of Tablesiix
List of Figures x
Chapter 1: Background 1
Three Scenarios and their Importance to Safety Technology Research
Injury Mechanisms
Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS)9
Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN)13
Tasks-Research Objectives17
Chapter 2: Analysis of Injury Mechanisms within Lead Vehicle Stopped Impacts:
Impliations for Autonomous Vehicle Behvior Design
Abstract

Introduction	
Methods	
Results	
Discussion	
Chapter 3: Analysis of Injury Mechanisms within Near Side Impacts: Implica	tations for
Autonomous Vehicle Behavior Design	46
Abstract	46
Introduction	
Methods	50
Results	53
Discussion	65
Chapter 4: Lane Change and Merging Related Crashes Have Diverse Outcom	es: A
CIREN Case Review	73
Abstract	73
Introduction	74
Methods	77
Results	80
Discussion	89
Conclusions	

Chapter 5: Conclusions	93
Tasks-Research Objectives	93
Suggestions for Autonomous Vehicle Behavior Design	95
Expected Contributions to the State of the Art and Literature	96
Limitations	97
Broader Impact on This Topic Area, the field of Epidemiology, and the Society	97
Future Directions and Applications	98
References	. 102
Appendix A: Society of Automotive Engineering Standard J3016	. 109
Appendix B: Case Numbers for Three Cohorts	. 110
Appendix C: Distribution of Injuries by Body Region Data	. 113
Appendix D: Example Chi-squared Tables	. 115

List of Tables

Table 1. Example Injury Descriptions and Corresponding AIS Severity Codes	. 11
Table 2. Inclusion Criteria for CIREN	. 14
Table 3. Example Injury Descriptions and Corresponding AIS Severity Codes	.79

List of Figures

Figure 1. Lead Vehicle Stopped Crash Scenario	3
Figure 2. Near Side Impact Crash Scenario	5
Figure 3. Melocchi et al. (2010) CIREN Study	6
Figure 4. Vehicles Changing Lanes on a Highway or Merging Crash Scenario	7
Figure 5. Example of femur fracture AIS code	13
Figure 6. Six CIREN centers are located across the US	16
Figure 7. Lead Vehicle Stopped Crash Scenario	21
Figure 8. NASS Projections of Injury Risks in Lead Vehicle Stopped Crashes	27
Figure 9. Demographic Population Comparison (LVS)	28
Figure 10. AIS Severity Distribution (LVS)	29
Figure 11. Distribution of AIS Severities by Body Region (LVS)	30
Figure 12. Distribution of AIS Severities by Body Region (AIS 3-6, LVS)	31
Figure 13. Rib Injuries in Belted and Unbelted Drivers (LVS)	34
Figure 14. Injury Distribution for Unbelted and Belted Occupants (LVS).	35
Figure 15. CIREN case 537106994	41
Figure 16. CIREN case 338117581	42
Figure 17. CIREN case 904429225	44
Figure 18. Near Side Impact Crash Scenario	48

Figure 19. NASS Projections of Injury Risks in Near-Side Crashes	54
Figure 20. Study Population Comparison (NSI)	56
Figure 21. PDOF Distribution (NSI)	58
Figure 22. Delta V range for PDOF	59
Figure 23. Distribution of AIS Severities	60
Figure 24. Distribution of AIS Severities by Body Region (NSI)	61
Figure 25. Distribution of AIS Severities by Body Region (AIS 3-6, NSI)	62
Figure 26. Rib Fracture Patterns by PDOF (NSI)	64
Figure 27. CIREN Cases: 842003316, 842005510, 591153089	71
Figure 28. Lane-change or merging related crashes	75
Figure 29. Predicted Occurance of Injuries by Body Region from NASS (CLH)	80
Figure 30. Distribution of Injuries by Body Region from CIREN (CLH)	82
Figure 31. Distribution of Injuries by Body Region from CIREN (AIS 3-6, CLH)	83
Figure 32. CIREN case 120380	84
Figure 33. CIREN case 590123577	87
Figure 34. CIREN case 119946	88

Chapter 1: Background

As a starting point and for the creation of a collaborative research project to investigate bio-injury mechanisms in crash imminent scenarios for automotive applications, the University Transportation Center (UTC) and the Injury Biomechanics Research Center (IBRC) at The Ohio State University chose three crash scenarios. Of NHTSA's 37 pre-crash scenarios, which are based on 6 million police reported crashes documented in the 2004 General Estimates System, they represent \$26 billion of \$120 billion in economic cost and 17% of the total functional years lost (Najm, 2007). The boundary conditions for the three crash scenarios were chosen to isolate common, yet relatively straight-forward crash physics. A population-based database (National Automotive Sampling System – Crashworthiness Data System (NASS-CDS)) and a realworld crash database (Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN)) were chosen as data sources. This study identified injury mechanisms and outcomes in lead vehicle stopped (LVS), near-side (NSI), and lane-change related (CLH) crashes and posed suggestions for ways that autonomous vehicle behaviors could be designed to mitigate injuries in crash-imminent scenarios.

Three Scenarios and their Importance to Safety Technology Research

Despite the many improvements seen in safety technology standards and implementation, lead vehicle stopped (LVS) and near-side impact (NSI) crash scenarios are among the top five traffic accidents in terms of frequency, years lost, or economic cost (Najm, 2007). Highway lane change (CLH) errors also frequently lead to complicated crashes and property damage (Najm, 2007). Together, these crashes represent \$120 billion in economic cost and 3 million functional years lost. Current passive and active restraint technologies have focused on preventing occupant injuries during a crash, but it may be possible to implement changes to crash-imminent scenarios, immediately before the impact to further improve safety.

In the LVS crash scenario a vehicle is going straight, at an intersection-related location and closes in on stopped lead vehicle (Figure 1) (Najm, 2007). LVS accidents represent 15 billion of the total economic cost and 9% of functional years lost (approximately 240,000 years). It is the most frequent of the 37 crash scenarios (Najm, 2007). The engine block/front of the car is most often the primary energy crash absorbing structure. The frontal airbag and seatbelt aid in controlling the deceleration of the occupant. Although these restraint systems have been shown to greatly reduce occupant injury, thoracic and abdominal injuries still occur in this crash modality. Rib injuries, for example, are often still caused by the restraint systems (Hendey, 1994; Newgard, 2004). It is important to note the tradeoff: the restraint systems may cause injuries not previously observed because they prevented the death of the occupant or may not have been documented properly in the case of a fatality. The occupant compartment

is designed to resist intrusion by vehicle components (e.g. the car's windshield) and outside objects. When cars impact trucks or larger vehicles however, the height and mass difference of the vehicles may lead to increased occurrence of injury (Acierno, 2004). Furthermore, off-center impacts or driver reactions may result in angled lead vehicle stopped impacts, which allow the case vehicle to proceed forward following the initial impact and potentially impact other cars or objects.



Figure 1 Lead vehicle stopped (LVS) crash scenario (modified from Najm, 2007)

The third most frequent and costly of NHTSA's 37 pre-crash scenarios are near side impact (NSI) crashes or t-bone type impacts (referred to as "vehicles turning at non-signalized junction" by NHTSA) (Figure 2). This type of pre-crash scenario accounts for 5% of the functional years lost and \$7 billion in economic cost (Najm, 2007). In T-bone type crashes, there is not a lot of space in between the occupant and the intruding vehicle/door panel; in this case, intrusion may contribute to severe abdominal, thoracic

and head injuries (Augenstein, 1999). Melocchi et al. utilized the Crash Injury Research Engineering Network to find the most frequently severely injured body regions in this crash scenario: thorax, lower extremity, and head (Figure 3)(Melocchi, 2010). Although it is standard to reinforce the doors to protect against these types of impacts, high delta-V crashes often result in significant intrusion levels. Additionally, oblique angle impacts can result in the occupant rebounding off of internal structures (e.g. steering wheel) that were not designed for near-side impacts (e.g. the frontal airbag is not available for the occupant during an oblique angle, near-side impact). Side airbags, when present, have been found to be effective in reducing injuries in side-impact crashes (Yoganandan, 2007).



Figure 2 Near side impact (NSI) crash scenario (modified from Najm, 2007)



Figure 3 The results of a study carried out by Melocchi et al show that the most frequently severely injured body regions in the NSI scenario are the Thorax, head, and lower extremity.

CLH accidents occur when a vehicle attempts to merge or change lanes going at a

high speed and encounters the front end of another vehicle (Figure 4). CLH crashes,

although not as frequent or as costly as LVS and NSI crashes, represent a contribution to

property loss and can result in complicated, multi-vehicle crashes (Wang, 2007). CLH crashes represent 3% of the functional years lost and \$4 billion in economic cost to society (Najm, 2007). Due to the high delta-V and the potential presence of multiple impacts that may occur during this type of crash occupant compartment intrusion may potentially occur in any direction. The injuries that occur in this type of crash are therefore more diverse.



Figure 4 Vehicles changing lanes on a highway or merging crash scenario (CLH) (modified from Najm, 2007)

In each of these scenarios, once the initial crash occurs, vehicular crumple zones may be exhausted, safety technologies that deployed during the first impact are unavailable for subsequent impacts, and occupants may be out of position (Bahouth, 2005). This means that injuries sustained during the first impact may be exacerbated by secondary impacts (Bahouth, 2005). For example, multiple rear-end (LVS) impacts have been found to carry an elevated risk of injury compared to single rear-end impacts. Multiple LVS impacts are the most frequent and most harmful crash modality. Additionally, crash record analyses using NASS-CDS and CIREN have found that, the risk of an AIS 3+ injury to the head and trunk increase in multiple impact, NSI crashes compared to single impact crashes (Bahouth, 2005). Driver over-reaction, or lack of response to the crash could also contribute to crash outcomes (Staubach, 2009). For instance, once a frontal airbag deploys in a lead vehicle stopped crash, the occupant may not be able to further respond to mitigate the crash scenario. By studying the injuries that occur in each of these crash scenarios, it is possible to suggest focal points for improving autonomous vehicle behavior designs. Occupant-centric autonomous vehicle behavior designs would help to potentially, optimally align energy absorbing structures, reduce crash delta V and improve active and passive safety systems to reduce injuries.

Injury Mechanisms

Injury mechanisms are mainly defined by the contact point/cause of injury, a body region or organ, and an injury severity. Most occupants will be positioned in the driver side of the vehicle; this is referred to as the front-left and near-side (270-360 degrees). For this study, only drivers are included in the near side position. The passenger side of the vehicle is referred to as front-right and far-side (0-90 degrees). Rear-seat passengers will not be included in this study, but oblique angle impacts that intrude into the front seat occupant compartments may be included (e.g. a 240 - 270 degree impact).

8

An example of a vehicle component encountered by an occupant in a near-side crash is the "b-pillar". The b-pillar is a vertical support structure of the car. Another common component that causes injury is the steering wheel and frontal airbag, for example. Side airbags and knee bolster airbags are not present in all of the vehicles for this study, but their effects (when present) will be investigated. The airbags seek to not only cushion the occupant from intruding vehicle components and impacts, but to help decrease erratic, potentially injurious body movements. For example, side impact airbags may come in multiple formats; torso bags and head bags are not standard. Studies have shown that combination torso and head side airbags better cushion occupants (Yoganandan, 2007).

Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS)

Initially sponsored by the American Medical Association (AMA), the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE), and the Association for the advancement of Automotive Medicine (AAAM) in 1969, the abbreviated injury scale (AIS) is an anatomically-based, consensus-derived, global severity scoring system that classifies each injury by body region according to its relative importance on a 6-point ordinal scale. It is intended to standardize terminology so that injuries may be studied in fields such as: clinical/trauma, motor vehicle crash investigation, and heath research. It may be referred to as a "severity of injury" scale which, in addition to threat to life, includes dimensions such as: tissue damage, quality of life, treatment cost, and complexity of treatment and impairment (Table 1) (AIS Course Training Manual). Severity is determinable once and is not contingent on outcome in this system and severity is invariant with time. For example, a femur fracture is an AIS-3, no matter the long term outcome. The severity does not decrease on day 3 of treatment compared to day 1 (AIS Course Training Manual). Death is not a part of the severity scale because a patient with an injury that is either minor, moderate, or maximum severity could die; a patient who dies is not automatically assigned the maximal severity score (6) (Table 1). For simplicity, the rainbow color designation shown in Table 1 will be used to designate the AIS severities shown throughout this study.

Table 1. Example Injury Descriptions and

Corresponding AIS Severity Codes (AIS Course

Training Manual)

Injury Description	AIS Severity Scale
Minor	1
Moderate	2
Serious	3
Severe	4
Critical	5
Maximum (currently untreatable)	6

The AIS single digit severity number indicates the relative severity of injury in an "average patient" who sustains the coded injury as the only injury. Severities vary for children; if the severity varies, it is listed within the coding dictionary. An "average" patient is initially described as an adult, 25-40 years of age, free of pre-existing conditions free of treatment complications receiving timely, appropriate care for the injury (AIS Course Training Manual).

AIS codes are updated periodically as medical treatments improve. An AIS number contains 7 digits that represent region of injury and severity of injury (Figure 5). The 6 numbers before the dot are referred to as "pre-dot codes" and each 6-digit identifier is unique. The number after the dot is the severity code. For this study, the first and last numbers, representing region of injury and injury severity respectively will be most important. There are 8 AIS body regions. In order of their number: head, face, neck, thorax, abdomen, spine, upper extremity, lower extremity. The pelvis is included in the lower extremity body region. It is not possible to obtain an AIS 6 for every body region. For example: the upper extremity body region does not contain an AIS 6 severity injury. AIS as a system has been widely studied and has found to be highly correlated with the dimensions described (Richter, 2001; Daly, 2013).



Figure 5. Example of femur fracture AIS code.

Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN)

CIREN teams are comprised of medical and engineering professionals that work together with crash investigators to determine injury causation and data accuracy in severe crashes. It serves as a sentinel in that initial detection of environmental, technical or human factors that are related to injury causation in motor vehicle crashes are included in its cases. Over 1,000 data points on every crash are investigated and reported. The severity of occupant injuries and restraints available on the vehicles determine inclusion in CIREN (Table 2).

Table 2: Inclusion Criteria for CIREN	
	At least one AIS 3+ injury
Injury requirements	AIS 2 injury in two different AIS body regions
	Significant articular injury to a lower extremity (AIS
	2)
Vehicle requirements	Vehicle model year no older than 6 years
	Sister and clone platforms may extend vehicle age
Restraint requirements	Frontal crash – airbag and/or belt required
	Side impact – unbelted is acceptable
	Rollover – 100% eject occupants are excluded

Six CIREN centers are located across the US (Figure 6). The crashes entered into CIREN represent 12% of the crashes that comprise 77% of the nation's economic crash burden. There are no control (non crashes) in CIREN. Combinations of search criteria can be used to narrow the list of cases displayed by CIREN. CIREN data may be downloaded into an Excel file, or searched manually using the interface criteria (e.g. principal direction of the force (PDOF), change in velocity (deltaV), occupant age, vehicle characteristics). For example, PDOF may be used in order to obtain a list of certain crash modalities. For example, filtering for only 0-30 degree PDOF would result in mainly far-side, frontal impacts. Because some of the details of the injury mechanisms may be present in the paragraph descriptions of the crash, CIREN was manually searched.



Figure 6. Located across the US are 6 CIREN centers (as of 2017) (from CIREN website, NHTSA).

Within CIREN cases, multiple injuries are documented by name and 7-digit AIS code. They are generally ordered from most severe to least severe. Multiple injuries can occur per occupant, but no injuries are counted twice. The BioTab provides a systematic, evidence-based method for analyzing, describing, and documenting injury causation in motor-vehicle crashes (Schneider, 2011).

Tasks-Research Objectives

This dissertation seeks to achieve the following four tasks and address the following tasks and hypotheses:

Task 1: Lead vehicle stopped (LVS)

Aim: To better understand and communicate the injury mechanisms of LVS scenarios so that autonomous vehicle behaviors may be designed to reduce the occurrence of common and severe injuries.

Hypothesis 1: Severe (AIS 3-6) injuries will occur most frequently to the thorax, abdomen, and lower extremity regions.

Hypothesis 2: Thorax and abdomen injuries will be most frequently caused by the steering wheel.

Task 2: Near side impact (NSI)

Aim: To better understand and communicate the injury mechanisms of NSI scenarios so that autonomous vehicle behaviors may be designed to reduce the occurrence of common and severe injuries.

Hypothesis 1: Severe (AIS 3-6) injuries will occur most frequently to the head, thorax, and abdomen regions.

Hypothesis 2: These injuries will be most frequently caused by the intruding door.

Task 3: Changing lanes on a highway or merging (CLH)

Aim: To better understand and communicate the injury mechanisms of CLS scenarios so that autonomous vehicle behaviors may be designed to reduce the occurrence of common and severe injuries.

Hypothesis 1: Severe (AIS 3-6) injuries will occur most frequently to the Thorax and Head regions.

Hypothesis 2: These injuries will be most frequently caused by the steering wheel.

Task 4: Compare catchment areas of CIREN to US census averages

Aim: To determine if the demographics of the 6 catchment areas of CIREN differ from the demographics of the aggregate population of the US.

Hypothesis: The average population of CIREN will not be different from the average population of the US.

Chapter 2: Analysis of Injury Mechanisms within Lead-Vehicle Stopped Impacts: Implications for Autonomous Vehicle Behavior Design

Abstract

Lead vehicle stopped crashes are a top contributor to traffic and health care expenditures out of NHTSA's 37 pre-crash scenarios. It is important to better understand how these crashes occur, so that evolving autonomous vehicle technologies may be tailored towards injury mitigation in crash-imminent scenarios. Additionally, as autonomous vehicle technologies increase in prevalence and usage, out of position seating and distracted driving behaviors may also increase. In order to analyze injury patterns in real-world lead vehicle stopped crashes, the public portal of Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN) was surveyed for lead vehicle stopped impacts. The review found that, of all the body regions, the thorax and lower extremity body regions frequently sustained AID 3+ injuries (P<0.01). Additionally, the upper extremity frequently sustained AIS 3+ injuries in some scenarios. Steering wheel contact (often times through a deployed airbag) was the source of 62% of the thorax injuries and the knee bolster was the source of 76% of the lower extremity injuries. Truck impacts, and complicated crashes accounted for over 50% of the cases in the cohort. Autonomous vehicle behaviors have the potential to augment passive and active safety systems to potentially decrease the occurrence of AIS 3+ injuries by improving a vehicle's response to lead vehicle stopped, crash-imminent scenarios.

Introduction

Lead vehicle stopped (LVS) impacts are among the top five traffic crashes in terms of frequency, years lost, or economic cost (Najm, 2007). In this crash scenario a vehicle is going straight, at an intersection-related location and closes in on a stopped lead vehicle (Figure 7). Speeding and inattention are important factors in this impact type (Najm, 2007). Lead vehicle stopped impacts represent 12.84% of the economic cost of all crash scenarios (approximately 15 billion US dollars) and 8.69% of functional years lost (approximately 240,000 years) based on NHTSA's study of the 2004 General Estimates System. Both passive and active safety research in this area has been ongoing with respect to this crash scenario (NHTSA, 1996; Brumbelow, 2015; Lee, 2015; Najm, 2007). Preventing and/or mitigating this type of motor vehicle crash would greatly decrease the overall cost of motor vehicle crashes and functional years lost.



Figure 7 In a lead vehicle stopped scenario, the lead vehicle hits a slowed or stopped vehicle.

As technology improves and access to technology increases, distracted and out of position behaviors by the occupants may also increase. Distracted and possibly out of position drivers may not be able to optimally respond to pre-crash and crash scenarios. Bahouth et al. describes a study of belted drivers, and found that 48% of multiple impact crashes begin as a frontal impact (Bahouth, 2005). Furthermore, this study found that 17% of all multiple impact crashes involve a frontal followed by another frontal impact (Bahouth, 2005). This suggests that a veering or off-center impact allowed the vehicle to proceed into another object or vehicle. During the first impact, crumple zones may have been exhausted and the airbag may have deployed, leaving the occupant relatively

vulnerable to injury further during the second impact. Togawa et al. described that the probability of higher injury levels is more likely to occur in multiple impact crashes than in single impact crashes (Togawa, 2011).

Additionally, an out of position and/or distracted occupant may not align with the vehicle's safety technology as they are currently tested in current laboratory and bench top environments. Hand position on the steering wheel, leg and pelvis position, and spinal alignment are all tested relatively consistently in laboratory crash tests. When the occupant is not in the expected position during the crash, the safety technologies may not be able to optimally protect the occupant from the impact. Unexpected rebounding of the occupant within the cabin may thus occur even in the absence of a veering event or an off-center crash. Furthermore, at-risk populations, such as small females and older occupants may not optimally align with safety technologies due to differences in their body proportions and natural posture. It is therefore necessary to expand the study of injury mechanisms and outcomes within these populations in order to explore the possibility of more personalized safety technologies and autonomous vehicle behaviors. Semi-autonomous and autonomous vehicle behaviors could be used to optimize the deployment of passive and active safety measures in order to ensure the protection of the occupant in diverse impact scenarios. For example, air bag deployment timing and duration may be altered based on the movements of the vehicle in response to the impact scenario.

There were three main objectives of this study. The first was to identify which body regions were at risk for the most severe injuries in lead vehicle stopped crash

22

scenarios. Next, patterns in injury mechanisms and outcomes were sought using a cohort of real-world, lead vehicle stopped crashes. Finally, these two results were analyzed to create suggestions for autonomous vehicle behavior design directions that could potentially mitigate the injury mechanisms found in the first two objectives.

Methods

A. Data Collection Methods

In order to identify the risk and patterns of injury caused in lead vehicle stopped impacts, the National Automotive Sampling System (NASS-CDS) was analyzed. The NASS is composed of two systems. The Crashworthiness Data System (CDS) focuses on passenger vehicle crashes. It may be used to investigate injury mechanisms to identify potential improvements to vehicle design (NHTSA). The second part, called the General Estimates System (GES) is geared towards problem size assessment and tracking bigger picture crash trends (NHTSA). The NASS-CDS is regarded as a population based sample, which allows for the calculation of risk figures. Crashes are collected from across the US.

The NASS-CDS dataset used in this study included crashes for the range 1998-2011, with vehicle model years from 1998 onwards. Drivers (seat position 1,1) over the age of 16 that encountered "crash types"20-31 (lead vehicle stopped and lead vehicle slowed) on a dry road were included. All belt statuses and crash changes in velocity (deltaV) were included. Pregnant occupants and end over end rollovers were excluded. Calculations were performed in Statistical Analysis System (SAS) 9.3 PROC SURVEYLOGISTIC (SAS Institute Inc, North Carolina, USA) workstation for Teaching and Research, which accounts for the sample weights for NASS-CDS using ratio inflation factor.

In order to investigate real-world injury mechanisms and outcomes, the Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN) was surveyed via the public portal. CIREN is a public accessible database which is not population-based, but contains detailed injury mechanisms. Crash diagrams, pictures of the vehicles involved, and injury mechanisms are documented by teams of crash reconstructionists, engineers, physicians, nurses, and epidemiologists. Surveillance centers for CIREN are located in six centers across the US. Only crashes that resulted in a severe (AIS 3+ injury, or AIS 2+ articular injury) injury to the occupant were included in CIREN. The crashes entered into CIREN represent 12% of the crashes that comprise 77% of the nation's economic crash burden.

While surveying the CIREN data, the acceptance criteria for this lead vehicle stopped cohort included: an indicated principal direction of the force (PDOF) equal to 340-10 degrees for driver side impacts, drivers over the age of 16, front airbags on the case vehicle, dry road surface, and discernible injury causations. Occupant injury causations were organized by both AIS severity score and vehicle component contact points. This part of the study focused on AIS 3+ injuries, hereafter referred to as "severe". No longitudinal/end over end rollover crashes were included, but overturns (right/left) that did not contribute to AIS 3+ injuries were included. Pregnant occupants
were excluded. Example cases that illustrate results and trends were chosen for the discussion section from the final cohort.

Because CIREN is not considered population-based, information about the demographic factors of the six catchment areas of CIREN were collected from the US census website (census.gov). The demographic factors of the study population were also documented when available within the CIREN cases. The overall US population (from the US census), the average population demographics of the six catchment areas of CIREN, and the demographic percent of the reporting population were compared in order to elaborate on any of the qualities of the injury mechanisms determined in this study.

B. Data Classification Methods

The abbreviated injury scale (AIS) is an anatomically-based, standardized, global severity scoring system that classifies injuries by body region according to its relative importance on a 6-point scale (1 being least severe, 6 being maximal). The body regions defined by AIS and analyzed in this study included: head, face, neck, thorax, abdomen, spine, upper extremity, and lower extremity (AIS 2005 Abbreviated Injury Scale 2005 Update 2008 Course Book). The pelvis is included in the lower extremity body region. The NHTSA injury coding manual for 2005 with the 2008 update was used to determine the injury severities to unify AIS severity codes when different versions of the dictionary were used in CIREN cases.

C. Statistical Methods

In order to determine which body regions were more frequently severely injured compared to all other body regions, chi-squared analyses were conducted. Injuries were grouped as AIS 3-6 (severe) and AIS 1-2 (not severe) into 6 chi-squared tables from the 6 body regions which had AIS 3+ injuries. Bonferroni corrections were made for the body regions' chi squared calculations depending on the number of body regions that had AIS 3+ injuries. Within this restriction, p needs to be less than 0.05/6=0.008 (α) in order to be considered significant at the 0.05 level. Chi-squared analyses were also used to compare AIS 3-6 injury incidence to AIS 1-2 injury incidence (i) with or without airbag deployment and (ii) with or without seatbelt use. For these comparisons, a significance level of $\alpha=0.05$ was used.

Results

A. NASS-CDS Results

The analysis of occupants included in this part of the study was based on 6,143 raw cases from NASS CDS crash investigations representing 3,091,951 occupants with the national sampling weights applied. All of the analysis in this study used weighted data and not data from raw cases. The projection of injury risks in LVS crashes from NASS-CDS is presented in Figure 8. The spine and upper extremity had the highest risk of AIS 1+ injury. However, when looking at AIS 2+ injuries, the highest risk of AIS 2+ injury (1.5%) was to the lower extremity body region. For AIS 3+, thorax, and lower extremity had the highest risk of injury.



NASS Projection of Injury Risks In Lead Vehicle Stopped Crashes

Figure 8 The NASS-CDS projection suggests that the head, thorax, spine, upper and lower extremity have a risk of AIS 2+ injury.

B. CIREN Results

A total of 52 cases were analyzed from the CIREN database; 2,500 cases were assessed. The study population differs from that of the US Census and average of the 6 catchment areas of CIREN (Figure 9). Fewer women were present in this sample. People over the age of 65 were overrepresented and people under the age of 18 were underrepresented. The Hispanic/Latino population is also much smaller than that of the US census. High school graduates were over represented within this population.



Demographic Population Comparison

Figure 9 The United States Census data is compared to the population averages of the 6 catchment areas of CIREN as well as the current study population (where data was reported). There are fewer female people in the current study compared to the US Census figure.

Within the distribution of AIS severities, 17% of injuries were categorized as AIS 3+. The distribution of AIS severities is given in Figure 10. The distribution of injuries by body region shows that the thorax and lower extremity body regions were significantly (P<0.01) different from the other body regions (Figure 10). Additionally, the upper extremity region had a few AIS 3+ injuries and a significance level of P<0.01. Bonferroni corrections were made to the body-region calculations, where the significance level corresponding to 95% confidence (α =0.05) was corrected to α =0.008 (0.05/6=0.008) in order to account for the 6 different body regions with severe injuries (Figure 11).



Figure 10 Less than 2% of the injuries were AIS 2. Nearly 20% of the injuries were AIS 3+.



Figure 11 Within the lead vehicle stopped cohort, 6 body regions had AIS 3+ injuries. Chi-squared analyses were conducted comparing AIS 3-6 (severe injuries) to AIS 1-2 (not severe injuries) and the p-values for each body region are reported. The thorax, upper and lower extremities were considered significant.



Distribution by Body Region (AIS 3-6)

Figure 12 This plot shows the severe injuries in isolation as a percent of the total.

Of all injuries, 8% were AIS 3+ Lower extremity injuries (Figure 12). Lower extremity injuries were sourced to contact with the knee bolster and/or toe pan (76% and 17% respectively). Femur injuries were the most common lower extremity injury (40%) followed by pelvis (29%), and tibia (21%) injuries. The knee-thigh-hip complex is a linked chain and when contact with the knee bolster occurs via the distal end of the femur, failure may occur along the length of the femur, or at the acetabulum of the pelvis.

Of all injuries, 4.2% were AIS 3+ thorax injuries (Figure 12). Most of the thorax injuries (62%) were due to steering wheel contact sometimes through the airbag and/or

seat belt contact. The seatbelt was sourced as the primary injury mechanism in 33% of thorax injuries. A majority of the AIS 3+ thorax injuries were to the ribs (67%). Of the occupants that experienced AIS 3+ thorax injuries, 43% were elderly (age 65+) and 52% were belted. Focusing on the rib injuries (Figure 13), steering wheel (through airbag) loading accounted for the injuries in the unbelted occupants. Steering wheel and seatbelt loading combined occurred in many of the belted cases. Ribs 5 and 6, followed by ribs 4,7, and 8 fractured most in unbelted occupants. Ribs 5-8 on the right side of the occupant broke most often in belted occupants. The frontal airbag deployed in 6/7 belted cases and all of the unbelted cases. In the one case where the frontal airbag did not deploy, the deltaV was 12 km/h, and all of the injuries were sourced to seatbelt contact. In the belted group, 5/7 cases sourced injuries to seatbelt contact; one rib fracture set was sourced to steering wheel contact and one rib fracture set was sourced to left forward upper door contact. Door contact occurred with PDOF of 350 degrees.

Abdomen injuries occurred in both belted and unbelted occupants predominantly due to steering wheel contact (82%). Seatbelt contact was sourced as the primary injury mechanism in 9% of abdomen injuries. Liver (36%), spleen (27%), and mesentery lacerations (18%) were the most common abdominal injuries. Of the cases that experienced AIS 3+ abdominal injuries, 81% collided with a truck. None of the occupants were elderly (age 65+).

Upper extremity injury (AIS 3) mechanisms were diverse. Many were caused by contact with the interior of the vehicle when the hands were removed from the steering wheel during airbag deployment. In some cases, flying glass or instrument panel contact

caused the upper extremity injury. The clavicle is included in the AIS 7 (upper extremity body region); the seatbelt was responsible for a few clavicle injuries.

Different patterns of AIS 3+ injuries to the thorax, abdomen, spine, upper extremity, and lower extremity body regions were observed with seatbelt use. Seatbelt use was observed to significantly affect injury severity at the 0.05 level and changed the distribution of injuries (Figure 14). Upper extremity injury percent increased in belted occupants compared to unbelted occupants. For the other body regions mentioned, the proportion of AIS 3+ injuries to AIS 1-2 injuries decreased with seat belt use. Additionally, AIS 3+ rib injury patterns varied with seatbelt use (Figure 13). Unbelted occupants had more even distributions of rib injuries compared to belted occupants.

a) Unbelted Drivers (N=4) b) Belted Drivers (N=7)

	Thorax	Side
Rib Level	Right	Left
1	0.25	0
2	0.25	0
3	0.25	0.25
4	0.75	0.5
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	0.75	0.75
8	0.5	0.75
9	0	0.25
10	0	0
11	0	0
12	0	0

Figure 13 Red represents more fractures and green represents fewer fractures. All numbers are percent occurrence among sample. Distribution of AIS 3+ rib injuries in a subset of a) unbelted and b) belted occupants. Rib injury percents are normalized to the number of occupants. Data was analyzed when it was present.



Injury Distribution for Unbelted (U) and Belted (B) Occupants

Figure 14 Seat belt use was observed to significantly reduce the overall severity of injuries (p<0.05). Additionally, the proportion of AIS 3+ injuries within each body region changed. This can be especially observed in the thorax, abdomen, and lower extremity body regions. Of the 53 occupants, 20 were unbelted.

Within the lead vehicle stopped cohort, 58% of crashes involved a truck impact, rebounding and/or multiple impact crash. Veering during or after an impact offered in 32% of cases. Of the 52 occupants, 20 were unbelted also the frontal airbag deployed in all but 2 of the cases.

Discussion

NASS-CDS predicted that the head, thorax, and lower extremity regions have the highest risk of AIS 3+ injury. The CIREN data compares well to this prediction: the thorax and lower extremity body regions were the most frequently, severely injured

compared to the other body regions (P<0.01). The injury patterns observed in the NASS-CDS and CIREN were consistent with literature (Lee, 2015; Brumbelow, 2015). Consistent with the literature as well, over 40% of the cases involved a complicated crash or truck impact. The case reviews showed that truck impacts, veering/off center impacts occur in many frontal impact scenarios that result in AIS 3+ injuries.

Thorax injuries (specifically rib injury patterns) in belted and unbelted occupants were consistent with the literature (Lee, 2015). The seatbelt was found to mitigate the overall occurrence of AIS 3+ injuries within this cohort, but there is room for improvement. In belted occupants, rib fractures approximately followed the path of the seatbelt. Older occupants have been found to sustain more AIS 3+ rib fractures thanyounger occupants (Lee, 2015). Older occupants were over represented in this cohort, and 43% of the rib injuries occurred in older occupants. CIREN only contains crashes that result in severe injuries and has been reported to have more elderly occupant profiles compared to the general population. Nevertheless, this highlights the need for progress in protecting this at-risk population. Changes in seatbelt design and morphology may improve outcomes for this at risk group (Ekambaram, 2015) (Brown, 2013). Additionally, the timing of the airbag may be tuned using automated vehicle technologies already in use. Many of the injuries were found to occur even in the presence of a deployed airbag. For example, in Case 2 (338117581) the belted driver had the airbag deploy, but still sustained AIS 3 rib injuries. The fact that this was a collision with a truck could have played a role in both the severity of the crash and the timing of the airbag. Vehicles with semi-autonomous cruise control and self-parking functionality are

able to sense their environment. This technology could be used to augment the deployment of passive safety technologies within the vehicle with respect to timing and duration of deployment. Smart braking and veering functionality could also be employed to minimize multiple impacts that occur as a result of a suboptimal maneuver by the driver.

Lower extremity injuries (AIS 2+) were present in both belted and unbelted occupants in this study. This was demonstrated in all three case reviews. The third case (904429225) showed that multiple impact crashes can result in more severe lower extremity injuries. Although information about the presence or absence of knee bolster airbags was not presence, there is evidence within the literature that this technology could alter the biomechanics of the knee thigh hip complex (Weaver, 2013; Patel 2013). Occupants that are seated closer to the knee bolster, or in an out of position style may still be susceptible to AIS 2+ lower extremity injuries. The timing and deployment duration of knee bolster airbags should be tested to ensure that they are reducing knee-thigh-hip related injuries. Toward this goal, improvements to the anthropomorphic test devices' biofidelity could be made to better predict knee-thigh-hip related injuries, as the literature suggests that improvement is needed in this area (Weaver, 2013; Patel 2013).

Two regions of interest deserve further discussion: the abdomen, and the upper extremity regions. Abdominal injuries occurred in both older and younger occupants and regardless of belt status. The most often injured organs were the liver and spleen. The tuning of improved airbag timing and seatbelt characteristics may help to reduce the occurrence of these types of injuries. Additionally, this study highlighted that many upper extremity injuries occur in frontal crashes. Although few AIS 3+ upper extremity injuries occurred in comparison to the thorax and lower extremity, this body region was determined to be statistically significant (P<0.05). Hand position on the steering wheel is important in the injury potential of this body region (Huelke, 1994).

Laboratory crash testing with these automated technologies should be performed to represent diverse populations. This will allow for the tuning of safety technologies to better protect at-risk populations, such as elderly occupants, and those in "out of position" seating patterns. This study suggests that the thorax and lower extremity regions are most often severely injured in lead vehicle stopped crashes. Elderly occupants were over represented in the cohort. Additionally, truck collisions, complicated crashes, and veering events happened relatively frequently within this cohort, suggesting that vehicles should be prepared for non-traditional car-car collisions. Autonomous vehicle technologies could be employed to better detect truck collisions, and mitigate secondary impacts. Better alignment of the occupant with safety technologies and the vehicle during the impact scenario could improve injury outcomes.

As autonomous vehicle technologies increase in prevalence, out of position seating and distracted driving behaviors may increase. Out of position seating could contribute to rebounding of the occupant around the cabin, even in the absence of multiple impacts. This study focused on the outcomes of frontal impacts. Multiple impacts initiated with a frontal impact have been found to account for a large proportion of crashes (about 24%) (Kildare, 2013). Offset impacts and sideswipes or collisions with narrow objects have been found to carry higher rates of multiple frontal impacts when compared to single frontal impacts (Kildare, 2013). In multiple frontal impacts in which the most severe impact occurred first in the collision sequence, extremity injuries were seen more often than head/face/neck injuries compared with single frontal impacts. This contrasts with collisions where the second impact is the most severe; more head/face/neck injuries were seen in this type of collision (Kildare, 2013).

The findings of this study compare well with the literature, where approximately half of the multiple frontal impacts had impacts after the initial collision (Togawa, 2011). Additionally, the literature suggests that secondary impacts occur less than 2 seconds after the initial impact (Kildare, 2013). The proportion of kinetic energy remaining after the first impact has been identified as a possible predictor of the likelihood of multiple impacts (Kildare, 2013). Methodologies exist for the implementation of calculated semiautonomous breaking technologies (Kusano, 2010). Future work should investigate how autonomous vehicles may react to the pre-crash and crash scenario in order to better align energy absorbing structures, and decrease veering/off-center crashes. Truck impacts and complicated crashes should not be overlooked in this endeavor (Abdel-Aty, 2004; Gabler, 2000). CIREN's real-world crash records presented some potential avenues for the implementation of autonomous vehicle technologies in the mitigation of injuries in crash-imminent scenarios.

C. Case Reviews

In order to illustrate the potential for autonomous technologies, three case examples from this cohort will be presented in detail. The differences of the later two cases from the first case were meant to show how small variances in the expected condition, may result in different AIS 3+ injuries.

Case 1: 537106994

This crash involved a 39 year old (165 cm, 47 kg) female, unbelted driver that impacted the rear end of a Ford F250 extended cab pickup at a PDOF of 0 (Figure 14). The truck was stopped. The airbag deployed in response to the impact. Although the occupant, a 165cm, 47 kg, 39 year old female, was unbelted, her most severe injuries were to the lower extremity. She sustained AIS 3 fibula and tibia fractures, an AIS 2 talus fracture and an AIS 2 meniscal tear. Additionally, she sustained a loss of consciousness less than 1 hour (AIS 2). The case description states that the driver did not recognize that the lead vehicle had stopped.

→ N	
Speed limit = 35 mph)
	Traffic Signals
V2 and V3 stopped at intersection	

Figure 15 CIREN case 537106994. The driver of V1 did not recognize that v2 was stopped and the front of V1 struck and under rode V2. V2 was then pushed into V3.

Case 2: 338117581

This CIREN case describes a 47 year old (163 cm, 121kg) female, belted driver that impacted the rear end of a truck (Figure 15). The airbag deployed in response to the impact. The case occupant sustained an AIS 3 rib fracture due to steering wheel and seatbelt contact (with pneumothorax, AIS 2). She also sustained an AIS 2 foot injury due to toe panel contact and an AIS 2 sternum fracture due to steering wheel and seatbelt contact. Her upper extremity injuries include an ulna fracture, a radius fracture (both AIS 2), and a phalange fracture (AIS 1) and were sourced to contact with the left instrument panel.



Figure 16 CIREN case 338117581. V2 was stopped and waiting for traffic to proceed. The driver of V1 impacted the rear of V2 and under rode V2.

Case 3: 904429225

This CIREN case describes a 46 year old (173cm, 109 kg) male, belted driver that was involved in a severe frontal impact (Figure 16). The airbag deployed in response to the impact scenario. Traffic had stopped in response to ducks obstructing the road. The crash sequence involved two impacts to the case vehicle. CIREN's crash diagram shows

that the driver attempted to veer, but impacted the rear of another vehicle with a PDOF of 0 degrees. The driver sustained multiple lower extremity injuries, including a pelvic ring fracture (AIS 5), acetabulum fracture (AIS 2), hip dislocation (AIS 2), femur fracture (AIS 3), rib fractures with flail (AIS 4), sternum fracture (AIS 2), and upper extremity injuries (AIS 3). His upper extremity injuries included an open ulna fracture and an open humerus fracture. The lower extremity injuries were sourced to the lower instrument panel including knee bolster. The rib fractures were sourced to the left forward upper quadrant of the cabin and the sternum fracture was sourced to the seatbelt. The upper extremity injuries were sourced to the seatbelt. The upper extremity injuries were sourced to the seatbelt.



Figure 17 CIREN Case 904429225, four events were documented as follows in order of occurrence. Ducks crossing the road caused V2 and V3 to slow down. V4 rear-ends V3. V1 rear-ends V4 (swiping impact). V4 strikes jersey barrier. V1 rotates and V1's right side impacts V2's back.

The implications of this study are only based on the CIREN and NASS-CDS populations described. As CIREN is not a population-based sample, the findings of this

study may only be expanded to the population within CIREN. CIREN is a sample of the crashes that resulted in the most severe injuries. The statistical significance of the upper extremity is based on very few AIS 3+ injuries to this region. Nevertheless, this study shows that, within this population that experienced a crash that resulted in serious injuries, there is room for improvement in the reduction of thorax and lower extremity injuries especially in elderly occupants.

Chapter 3: Analysis of Injury Mechanisms within Near-Side Impact Scenarios: Implications for Crash-Imminent Autonomous Vehicle Behavior Design

Abstract

Despite many improvements in safety technology standards and implementation, further improvements may be made in the area of side impact safety. With the advent of semi-autonomous vehicles, which have the capability to rapidly acquire and process, there is the possibility of optimizing crash configurations to minimize injuries. In order to analyze injury patterns in real-world lead vehicle stopped crashes, the public portal of Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN) was surveyed for near-side impacts. It is critical that autonomous vehicle behaviors take into account the biomechanics of the occupants. This study of 134 side-impacts found that the head, and thorax regions are most frequently severely injured (P<0.05). The crashes that produce these injuries most often occur at an angle greater than 270 degrees, which is considered oblique angle. If the vehicle perceived an impact is imminent, it may be possible to change the principal direction of the force, decrease the impact severity, and prevent secondary impacts utilizing autonomous vehicle technologies.

Introduction

Near-side impacts that occur at non-signalized intersections are the third most frequent crash type (Figure 18). They account for \$7 billion in economic cost and 5% of functional years lost out of all of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) 37 pre-crash scenarios based on the 2004 general estimates system (GES) (Najm, 2007). Additionally, the risk of a serious injury in a near-side impact is 83.8%, for change in velocity (deltaV) equal to 30 mph/48 km/h (Augenstin, 2003). This is significantly elevated compared to all other crash types. Furthermore, a near-side impact has the potential to escalate. If the case vehicle does not optimally brake and/or veer, it could hit, or be hit by other vehicles, people, and/or structures before coming to rest. In some cases, even in the absence of a secondary impact, the physics of the crash can cause whipping or rebounding motions, which could potentially injure occupants.



Figure 18 Near-side impacts that occur at non-signalized intersections are the third most frequent crash type according to NHTSA DOT HS 810 767.

For multiple impact crashes with serious injuries, 15% of cases begin as a nearside impact (Bahouth, 2005). Multiple impact, near side crashes account for 35% of the Maximum Abbreviated Injury Scale (MAIS) 3+ injured, belted drivers from the cohort studied (Bahouth, 2005). Near-side impacts were found to be followed by another near side (6%), frontal (4%), and far-side (4%) impact (Bahouth, 2005). In a cohort of multiple impact crashes that produced serious injuries however, the 44.9% of initial impacts were found to be near side (Digges, 2003). Then, for this cohort that sustained serious injuries, the most serious secondary impact was side (48.4%) followed by frontal (27.5%) (Digges, 2003). The most harmful sequences were found to be side-side (27.7%) (Digges, 2003). An epidemiologic study conducted in the UK found that among twoimpact crashes with Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) 3+ injuries, the less severe impact is relevant to serious injury in around 10-12% of cases (Lenard, 2003). Once the initial crash occurs, vehicular crumple zones may be exhausted, passive safety technologies that deployed during the first impact are unavailable for subsequent impacts, and occupants may be out of position (Bahouth, 2003). Injuries sustained during the first impact may therefore be exacerbated by secondary impacts (Bahouth, 2003).

Driver distraction or inattention has the potential to increase the risk of a serious crash (Young, 2013). Treat et al.'s study on crash-related factors found that some form of recognition failure by the driver was involved in 56% of the in-depth crash cases analyzed. The leading human direct causes were: improper lookout (looking, but not processing the information) (23%), excessive speed (17%), inattention (15%), improper evasive action (13%), and internal distraction (9%) (Treat, 1979). Cell phone usage, drowsiness, and secondary tasks (such as cabin condition adjustment) are some of the factors that contribute to driver distraction today (Wang, 1996; DOT HS 819 594, 2006). Crashes were secondarily found to be caused by environmental factors, such as view obstructions and slick roads (Treat, 1979). Additionally, misuse of information errors (e.g. incorrect responses, orientation and expectation errors and misjudgments) by the driver have the potential to increase driver error and contribute to crash outcomes

(Stauback, 2009). Serious injuries to the occupant also have the potential to significantly decrease driver awareness, alter occupant seating position, and or cause panic to the driver. During a crash sequence, these events could prevent a driver from reacting optimally to a crash scenario. If a misuse of information error occurs, a suboptimal crash configuration and/or secondary impacts can result from: confusion between brake and accelerator, overcorrection and/or errors in vehicle maneuvering.

Methods

A. Data Collection Methods

In order to identify the risk and patterns of injury caused in near-side impact crashes, The National Automotive Sampling System (NASS) Crashworthiness Data System (CDS) was analyzed. The NASS is composed of two systems. The CDS focuses on passenger vehicle crashes. It may be used to investigate injury mechanisms to identify potential improvements to vehicle design (NASS website). The second part, called the General Estimates System (GES) is geared towards problem size assessment and is used to track bigger picture crash trends (NASS website). The NASS-CDS is regarded as a population based sample, which allows for the calculation of risk figures. Crashes are collected from across the US.

A dataset of crashes from 1998-2011 from the NASS-CDS, with vehicle model years from 1998 onwards was pulled from the NASS-CDS. Drivers (seat position 1,1) over the age of 16 that encountered "crash type" 77 or 89 (near side) on a dry road were included. All belt statuses and crash changes in velocity (deltaV) were included.

Pregnant occupants and end over end rollovers were excluded. Calculations were performed in Statistical Analysis System (SAS) 9.3 PROC SURVEYLOGISTIC (SAS Institute, Inc, North Carolina, USA) workstation for Teaching and Research.

In order to investigate real-world injury mechanisms and outcomes, Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN) was surveyed via the public portal. CIREN is a database which is not population-based, but contains detailed injury mechanisms. Crash diagrams, pictures of the vehicles involved, and injury mechanisms are documented by teams of crash reconstructionists, engineers, physicians, nurses, and epidemiologists. Surveillance centers for CIREN are located in six centers across the US. Only crashes that resulted in a severe (AIS 3+ injury, or AIS 2+ articular injury) injury to the occupant are included in CIREN. The crashes entered into CIREN represent 12% of the crashes that comprise 77% of the nation's economic crash burden (CIREN website).

Acceptance criteria for CIREN data included: an indicated principal direction of the force (PDOF) equal to 240-340 degrees for driver side impacts, drivers over the age of 16, front airbags on the case vehicle, dry road surface, and discernible injury causations. In order to include more near-side impacts, crashes that occurred at signalized junctions and/or merging ramps was included as long as discernible injury causations were present. No longitudinal/end over end rollover crashes were included, but overturns (right/left) that did not contribute to AIS 3+ injuries were included. A total of 134 cases were analyzed. Cases that highlight ways in which autonomous vehicle behaviors could assist in mitigating injuries were chosen from the final cohort. Because CIREN is not considered population-based, information about the demographic factors of the six catchment areas of CIREN were collected from the US census website (uscensus.gov). The demographic factors of the study population were also documented when available within the CIREN cases. The overall US population (from the US census), the average population demographics of the six catchment areas of CIREN, and the demographic percent of the reporting population were compared in order to elaborate on any of the qualities of the injury mechanisms determined in this study.

B. Data Classification Methods

The abbreviated injury scale (AIS) is an anatomically-based, standardized, global severity scoring system that classifies injuries by body region according to its relative importance on a 6-point scale (1 being least severe, 6 being maximal). The pelvis is included in the lower extremity body region. The NHTSA injury coding manual for 2005 with the 2008 update was used for this study. When assessing the severity of injuries, both the frequency and severity of the injury was taken into account.

C. Statistical Methods

In order to determine which body regions were more frequently severely injured compared to all other body regions, chi-squared analyses were conducted. Injuries were grouped as AIS 3-6 (severe) and AIS 1-2 (not severe) into 5 chi-squared tables from the 5 body regions which had AIS 3+ injuries. Bonferroni corrections were made to the body regions' chi-squared calculations depending on the number of body regions that had AIS

3+ injuries. Chi-squared analyses were also used to compare AIS 3-6 injury incidence to AIS 1-2 injury incidence with or without airbags and with or without seatbelts. For these comparisons, a significance level of α =0.05 was used.

Results

A. NASS-CDS Results

The analysis of occupants included in this part of the study was based on 1,741 raw cases from NASS-CDS crash investigations representing 576,995occupants with the national sampling weights applied. All of the analysis in this study used weighted data from raw cases. The projection of injury risks in NSI crashes from NASS-CDS is presented in Figure 19. The highest risk of AIS3+ injury is projected to occur to the Head, Face, Thorax, and Lower Extremity body regions.



NASS Projection of Injury Risks in Near-Side Crashes

Figure 19 NASS-CDS projected risk of an AIS 1, AIS 2, and AIS 3+ injury in a near-side impact crash.

B. CIREN Results

A total of 134 cases were analyzed out of approximately 1,500 possible cases. Within the study population (134 cases), 87% were belted. When available, race, age, level of education, and income of the occupants were collected from CIREN. The population of the 6 catchment areas of CIREN, and the study population were compared to US Census data (Figure 20) (census.gov). Overall, the study population consisted of more elderly people than the US population and the population of the catchment areas of CIREN. There are fewer Hispanic or Latino identifying people within the CIREN and study populations compared to the US average, but the study population compares well to the CIREN population average. There are more female persons within the study population compared to both the US average and the CIREN catchment area average. Persons that achieved a level of education of high school or higher are present at a higher population within the study population. All other factors fall within the 95% standard deviation bars of the average of the six CIREN catchment areas and are similar to the figures collected from the US Census (Figure 20).



Study Population Comparison

Figure 20 Age and sex was always reported within the CIREN data. Individuals that specified racial identify and/or Hispanic or Latino identity (92/134) and level of education (63/134) were not universally present in the study population. Figures from the US Census were from the 2010 population.

Most of the 134 occupants (87%) were using their available seatbelt at the time of the crash. Side airbags did not deploy in 75% of cases. In some cases, vehicles were equipped with side airbags, but the airbag did not deploy; in other cases the vehicles did not have side airbags. A chi-squared analysis of the total number of injuries that occurred with or without a side airbag found no significant difference between the group where the side airbag deployed and the group where a side airbag did not deploy at the 0.05 level.

Most of the cases in this cohort experienced a PDOF of greater than 270 degrees (Figure 21). Additionally, most of the crash deltaVs were under 50 km/h (Figure 22). Crashes that occurred at 320 (N=2) and 340 (N=1) had deltaVs equal to 48 km/h. Although over half of the crashes documented had only one event, 46% had two or more events. This includes: side slap, impact with another car, impact with an object, or a right/left rollover event. The initial near-side impact was described to be the source of all of the AIS 3+ injuries for this group of cases.



Figure 21 Most of the occupants sustained a crash PDOF of greater than 270 degrees.



Figure 22 Distribution of average deltaVs by PDOF of reporting cases. Standard deviation bars are indicated. Most of the deltaVs are below 50 km/h. Error bars represent standard deviation.

In this NSI cohort, 24% of the injuries were AIS 3-6 severity. Less than 2% of these injuries were AIS 5-6 severity (Figure 23). The head, thorax, and lower extremity body regions were found to be severe compared to all the other body regions with a 0.05 significance level (Figure 24). Bonferroni corrections were made to the body-region calculations, where the significance level corresponding to 95% confidence (α =0.05) was corrected to α =0.008 (0.05/5=0.01) in order to account for the 5 different body regions with AIS 3+ injuries. Of the all the injuries, 5% of the injuries were AIS 3+ head inuries,

8% of the injuries were AIS 3+ thorax injuries, and 7% of the injuries were AIS 3+ lower extremity injures (Figure 25).



Distribution of AIS Severities

Figure 23 Of the injuries observed, 24% were categorized as AIS 3+. Less than 2% of the injuries are categorized as AIS 6.


Distribution by Body Region





Figure 25 This plot shows the percent of severe injuries in isolation.

Within the head injury category, 37% of the injuries were AIS 3+ and 72% of these severe injuries were brain injuries. This includes the cerebellum, cerebrum, and brain stem. Most of the skull and the brain injuries were due to door and b-pillar intrusion or door contact, even when an airbag was deployed. B-pillar contact or intrusion was specified for 26% of all AIS 3+ head injuries, 29% of AIS 3+ brain injuries, and 20% of AIS 3+ skull injuries.

Thoracic injuries (AIS 1-6) comprise 20% of all injuries; within the thorax body region, 40% of the thorax injuries were AIS 3+. Ribs were found to be the most frequently injured (47% of thorax injuries) AIS 3+ thorax component; the distribution of 62

rib injuries by PDOF is shown in Figure 26. Rib injuries were investigated by PDOF. The occupant count is as follows for each group: N=2 for the 270 PDOF, an N=11 for the 280 PDOF, an N=290 for the 290 PDOF, and an N=6 for the 300 PDOF. All occupants included in the rib injury by PDOF analysis were belted (Figure 24). This is followed by lung injuries (23% of AIS 3+ throax injuries), aorta (10% of AIS 3+ thorax injuries), and diaphragm (8% of AIS 3+ thorax) injuries. AIS 3+ thorax injuries were due to intruding door contact (77%), b-pillar (19%) and/or door contact, even in the presence of a deployed airbag.

PDOF 270	Thorax Side		PDOF 280	Thorax Side		PDOF 290	PDOF 290 Thorax Side		PDOF 300 Thorax Sid		ax Side
Rib Level	Right	Left	Rib Level	Right	Left	Rib Level	Right	Left	belted	Right	Left
1	0.00	0.00	1	0.18	0.36	1	0.00	0.10	1	0.17	0.50
2	0.00	0.00	2	0.09	0.45	2	0.20	0.20	2	0.17	0.50
3	0.00	1.00	3	0.00	0.55	3	0.10	0.60	3	0.17	0.67
4	0.00	1.00	4	0.00	0.82	4	0.10	0.60	4	0.33	0.67
5	0.00	1.00	5	0.18	0.55	5	0.10	0.70	5	0.17	0.50
6	0.50	1.00	6	0.27	0.45	6	0.10	0.40	6	0.17	0.50
7	0.00	0.50	7	0.18	0.27	7	0.20	0.60	7	0.00	0.50
8	0.00	0.50	8	0.18	0.36	8	0.10	0.50	8	0.00	0.67
9	0.00	0.50	9	0.18	0.18	9	0.10	0.50	9	0.00	0.67
10	0.00	0.50	10	0.00	0.18	10	0.10	0.30	10	0.00	0.50
11	0.00	0.00	11	0.00	0.27	11	0.10	0.20	11	0.00	0.17
12	0.00	0.00	12	0.00	0.09	12	0.00	0.10	12	0.00	0.17

Figure 26 Red signifies more fractures and green signifies fewer fractures. Percent fractured ribs among the samples are given. Rib fracture patterns grouped by PDOF. Information on rib level was collected when available.

Within the abdomen body region, 31% of the injuries were AIS 3+. The spleen was the most injured, AIS 3+ abdominal organ; within the abdomen category, spleen injuries made up 52% of the injuries. Spleen injuries correlated with the PDOF distribution. In the oblique impacts that resulted in spleen injuries, the occupant was forced into the seatback/support by the intruding door or by rebounding off of the door structure. The second most injured abdominal organ was the bladder; it was injured in 20% of AIS 3+ abdominal injury occurrences.

Of the spinal injuries, 11% were AIS 3+. AIS 3+ spinal injuries include: cervical spine injuries (50% of AIS 3+ spinal injuries), vertebral body compressions (33% of AIS 3+ spinal injuries) and an odontoid fracture (16% of AIS 3+ injuries). These injuries were mainly attributed to a combination of forced flexion due to the acceleration of the

crash and some intrusion. Half of the occupants with spinal cord injuries were over the age of 65.

Of the lower extremity injuries, 23% were categorized as AIS 3+. Most of the AIS 3+ injuries were to the pelvis (78% of AIS 3+ lower extremity injuries). Of the AIS 3+ injuries, femur and tibia injuries were 12%. AIS 3+ pelvic injuries were sourced to intrusion. This was described as compression between the intruding door and center console (23%), as well as door/side panel contact (77%). Femur and tibia injuries were attributed to contact with the knee bolster for 78% of the injuries; this injury mechanism occurred in both belted and unbelted individuals.

Discussion

Fatalities are avoided with the use of seatbelts and airbags (DOT HS 812 218; Kahane, 2000; NHTSA, 1996). With the advent of these life-saving technologies, more people are surviving car crashes and the injuries observed in crashes are changing. It can be expected that energy absorbing structures (e.g. seatbelt, airbag) cause some low AIS severity injuries during automobile crashes (Dineen, 1989; Kulowsky, 1956; Hendy, 1994; Mohamed, 1998). It is important to observe these injuries so that seatbelts and airbags may be improved further. More severe AIS severity injuries tend to occur due to structural failure of the vehicle due to intrusion, or failure of energy absorbing structures to cushion occupants from forces present at the time of the crash (Hendy, 1994; Mohamed, 1998; Augenstein, 1999; Otte, 1984). Additionally, the deltaV and PDOF of the crash will heavily influence the injury biomechanics. For the near-side impact scenario studied, most severe injuries were found to occur in the head, thorax, and spinal regions. Intrusion of another vehicle/door intrusion, and b-pillar and/or door contact caused a majority of these AIS 3+ injuries. The presence of side airbags and/or seatbelts was not observed to significantly affect the severity of the injury outcomes. These findings correlate well with similar studies of the NASS-CDS and CIREN databases (Brumbelow, 2015; Stadter, 2008). Additionally, in some cases occupants were observed to be impacting vehicle interior components through airbags. This suggests that the timing and/or placement of the airbags could be improved. Furthermore, it was observed that 46% of the cases had two or more impacts or contacts during their crash sequence. Due to the timing of the impacts and the deployment of safety technologies, coupled with movements of the vehicle following the initial impact there could be secondary or rebounding impacts of the occupant within the cabin. Even when safety technology deploys correctly, secondary impacts and/or rebounding could be occurring following initial deployment of safety technology, when the occupant could be out of position due to the first impact (Newgard, 2005).

A. PDOF and Delta V

Active safety components are in early stages of development; both active and passive safety components could be enhanced by autonomous vehicle technologies. One of the primary design considerations for active safety features is to avoid and/or mitigate

crashes. Injury frequencies and severities vary with the use of safety technologies. For example, side airbags have the potential to reduce injuries in near side crashes, but have been found to deploy in only 43% of near-side impacts where a side airbag is available (Stadter, 2008). The airbag deployment varies with crash deltaV; a higher crash deltaV was correlated with a decreased side airbag deployment. Sensors on autonomous vehicles could augment the ability of these passive safety systems to detect an incoming crash by improving deployment timing and duration. Furthermore, the current study and others show that oblique PDOF crashes may lead to increased injuries (Brumbelow, 2015). The concept of improving safety feature deployment timing, and duration has also been proposed by (Brumbelow, 2015). The shape of the airbags may also be explored further. Active safety features (autonomous vehicle behaviors) could potentially enhance the ability of passive safety features to decrease injuries that occur in oblique angle crashes.

Although side airbags have been projected to decrease the risk of thorax injuries, this is not being observed, and the risk of a thorax injury has been shown to increase for occupants above the age of 50 (Augenstein, 2003;Griffin, 2012). This is, in part, due to the larger intrusion into the occupant compartment present in near side crashes. Thorax injuries also tend not to occur in isolation for AIS 4+ severities; thorax injury prevention could therefore prevent injuries to other body regions (Scarboro, 2007;Yoganandan, 2007). For example, it is common to find lung injuries, such as pneumothorax, associated with rib fractures. Relevant to other body regions, laboratory tests have shown that out of position occupants can sustain more severe craniocervical loads and chest deflections compared to occupants in normal seating positions (Yoganandan, 2007). Furthermore, airbag coverage and energy absorbing vehicle structures may not be optimized for every PDOF (Brumbelow, 2015). Airbag deployment timing may also need improvement to account for variances in PDOF and deltaV.

Consistent with the literature, the crashes in this CIREN cohort were below the deltaV of those performed in many laboratory tests (e.g. IIHS's crash test protocol with movable deformable barrier 31 mph/50 km/h) (Brumbelow, 2015). This suggests a larger contribution of PDOF to the injury outcomes than deltaV. Even though the near-side impacts included in this study were at a lower deltaV than crash tests, 46% of the vehicles travelled into two or more vehicles or objects following the initial impact (this includes a side slap event). Avoiding secondary impacts would not only minimize damage to people, vehicles, and objects in the vicinity of the case vehicle, but could minimize movement of the case occupant about the cabin during the crash. Each of the crashes here produced AIS 2+ injuries, which could distract or disable the driver; distracted and/or disabled drivers may be unable to optimally stop or veer to avoid secondary impacts.

B. Injury Distribution

Head, thorax, and lower extremity injuries were overwhelmingly caused by door contact, even in the presence of an airbag. Pelvic injuries may be caused by door intrusion, or crush between the door and the center console. These findings are consistent

with the literature (Brumbelow, 2015; Stadter, 2008; Nirula, 2008; Tencer, 2005). In cases where an airbag deployed, injuries often occurred through the airbag. Airbag deployment could be tailored to better respond to impending impacts using sensors employed by autonomous capabilities. Side-airbags, can alter the distribution of injuries across body regions, but studies show that there is room for improvement in this area (Brumbelow, 2015; Stadter, 2008). For example, Scarboro et al. show that side airbags designed for thorax injury mitigation may not be very effective in preventing AIS 3+ severity thorax injuries. One possible explanation (given by Scarboro) is multi-trauma injury patterns, where one body region may benefit from side airbag availability, but others do not (Scarboro, 2007). Side airbags also do not perform as well in guarding against head injuries in oblique angle, near side crashes (Brumbelow, 2015; Scarboro, 2007). The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety has also suggested that vehicles rated well for side impact are not adequately protecting occupants as would be expected for conditions that differ from those of current laboratory tests (e.g. oblique angles) (Brumbelow, 2015). These findings may explain what was observed in this case review and the lack of significant effect of the airbag in this crash mode.

Also consistent with the literature, crashes included in this study were mostly oblique angle crashes (greater than 270 degrees). The spleen was the most injured abdominal organ. The spleen is anatomically located on the left side of the abdomen, towards the back of an occupant. A spleen injury in a side impact crash suggests an oblique angle impact or intrusion, which would force the occupant backwards into a seatback/support structure. Altering the PDOF of the crash using an autonomous vehicle behavior, or an airbag function could possibly be used to decrease the severity of this type of injury. In order to verify this finding, crash tests should be altered to better replicate occurring variety of PDOFs instead of just one (270 degree). Brumbelow et al. advocate for the expansion of crash test PDOFs, as well as changes that include: impacting the vehicle farther forward, greater test severity, and more restrictive injury criteria.

This study is limited to entries within CIREN. Because CIREN has a minimum requirement for severe injuries the data presented only represents severe crash scenarios. As the focus of safety research is to reduce the occurrence of severe injuries, this feature makes CIREN a good candidate for studying injury mechanisms. Literature studies of the National Automotive Sampling System-Crashworthiness Data System (NASS-CDS).

C. CIREN Case Reviews

Examples of cases from CIREN where optimal braking and/or veering did not occur is shown in Figure 25. Figure 27(a) is a 2 event crash with an initial PDOF of 300 degrees. The crash sequence resulted in cervical spine facet fracture due to A-pillar contact and AIS 2 rib fractures due to steering wheel contact. The frontal airbag deployed. In Figure 27(b) B-pillar contact as a result of the initial impact caused numerous AIS 3+ head injuries, an aortic injury, and multiple rib fractures. The case vehicle then impacted a tree. In Figure 27(c) The initial impact caused an AIS 3+ brain and lower extremity injuries. The crash was fatal. Note the trajectory of the vehicle off the road and through a barbed wire fence.



Figure 27 CIREN cases (a) 842003316, (b) 842005510, and (c) 591153089 are examples of multiple impact crashes. Figures are drawn from the CIREN database.

Corrections in the vehicle's velocity and PDOF in crash-imminent, pre-crash scenarios could be programmed to reduce driver overcorrection and/or error in response to the pre-crash scenarios and primary impacts as seen in Figure 25. This study showed that oblique angle crashes occur more often than perpendicular crash configurations. In

addition to expanding upon these laboratory test conditions and modifying safety technologies accordingly, autonomous vehicle technologies have the potential to mitigate the severity of both primary and secondary impacts by using braking and steering sequences to better align energy absorbing structures and reduce driver error in response to the crash configurations described here.

D. Limitations

Driver behavioral studies (e.g. driving simulation studies) and other NHTSA data may be used as a means for comparing these findings to those of other researchers. The findings of the study may only be extended to severe crash scenarios. The study population was found to consist of more older adults, and more females than the US census and CIREN catchment areas would suggest. This feature highlights that older females may be at a higher risk of sustaining an AIS 3+ injury in a NSI crash compared to other groups. It is also important to note that it is not possible to have an AIS 3+ injury in every body region, but the distribution of AIS 3+ injuries by body region compares well to a similar study conducted in 2010 (Melocchi, 2010).

Chapter 4: Lane Change and Merging Related Crashes Have Diverse Outcomes: A CIREN Case Review

Abstract

Although lane-change or merging related crashes result in a small percentage of traffic fatalities in the U.S., this initial crash-scenario can result in more complicated crashes that result in severe injuries. Lane-change crashes which result from a lane change impact between vehicle bumpers may not result in injuries, but the reaction of the driver to the abrupt yaw of the vehicle can cause diverse outcomes. A review of 19 lane change or merging related crashes documented in Crash Research Engineering Network (CIREN) was used to describe real-world outcomes of lane change or merging related crashes. Injures were not always due to the initial crash, but may result from secondary impacts. Attempts to correct the vehicle's trajectory may result in a near side, far side, or frontal impact with another vehicle and/or object. The case study suggests that it would be beneficial for the vehicle to take full control rather than the driver if such an accident becomes imminent, thereby minimizing injuries to the occupants.

Introduction

"Vehicle(s) changing lanes-same direction" (here referred to as CLH) is sixth in terms of frequency (for light-vehicle crashes) out of 37 pre-crash scenarios described in the Department of Transportation 810 767 report (Figure 28)(Najm, 2007). Ideal lane change-related crashes, involving two cars, usually result in loss of property and not injury, however when they take place at high speeds these scenarios have the potential to turn into multi-vehicle crashes (Figure 28) (Najm, 2007; Wang, 1994; Sen, 2003). The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) reported that highway lane change crashes represent \$4 billion in economic cost and 3% of functional years lost based on a review of the 2004 General Estimates System (Najm, 2007). Multi-vehicle crashes that occur on the highway may start out as lane-change or merging crashes and evolve into near side impacts, frontal impacts, and rollover crashes. Multiple impact crashes have been shown to have higher risk of injury than single impact crashes (Bahouth, 2005).



Figure 28 Lane-change or merging related crashes on the highway occur when a vehicle attempts to switch lanes, or deviates from its lane.

Varying levels of vehicle autonomy will co-exist on U.S. roadways for decades to come (IIHS, 2016). According to the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) out of the 6 levels of defined vehicle autonomy; human drivers should be ready to intervene in case of vehicle failure from levels 0 through 3. Level 4 automation specifies that an automated system may maintain control even if a human driver does not respond appropriately to a request to intervene. Level 4 automation is regarded as "high automation" and is one level below "full automation" (Appendix A) (SAE J3016_201609, 2014). During this time when vehicles on the road are not networked with each other and while many still rely on human drivers; human error could result in crashes. Even if the human driver is aware of an impending crash, the driver may not be

able to process information about his/her surroundings fast enough to react optimally. Also, human errors in surrounding vehicles (e.g. path cutoff or veering to avoid an object) could lead to situations where even automated vehicles cannot completely evade a crash. This suggests that relinquishing control of the vehicle over to a potentially distracted driver in case of automation failure could result in more severe injuries for the occupants. During the crash, airbag(s) and debris could potentially obscure the driver's view and an injury could incapacitate the driver. Following the crash, when crumple zones and safety technologies have deployed, the potentially injured driver may not be able to optimally stop the vehicle or maneuver to avoid further harm from additional impacts.

It is critical that autonomous vehicle crash-imminent behaviors be occupant protection centric in design, meaning they take into account the capabilities of the vehicle's safety technology to crash in a way that best protects the occupant. In order to project body regions of interest, the National Automotive Sampling System (NASS) was analyzed. Next, to better determine how injuries occur in lane change and merging related crashes, the Crash Injury Research Engineering Network (CIREN) was searched for real-world lane-change crashes with discernible injury mechanisms. This case review provides some insight into injury mechanisms and outcomes of lane-change and merging related crashes.

Methods

A. National Automotive Sampling System

The National Automotive Sampling System (NASS) Crashworthiness Data System (CDS) database was used to identify the frequency and patterns of injuries occurring in lane change crashes. The occupants who sustained injuries to a specific body region were compared to the occupants involved in a similar crash with no injuries to that body region.

Data from 1998 through 2011 (13 case years) were used in this study including occupants of passenger vehicles of model years 1998 and later. Only crashes corresponding to lane change on a trafficway (Crash Type = 46 or 47) were included. Occupants were restricted to drivers of ages 16 and over only and pregnant occupants were excluded from this analysis. The database was analyzed using SAS 9.3 PROC SURVEYLOGISTIC (SAS Institute Inc, North Carolina, USA) which accounts for the sample weights for NASS CDS using ratio inflation factor.

B. Crash Injury Research and Engineering Network

There are six CIREN centers located across the US. The crashes entered into CIREN represent 12% of the crashes that comprise 77% of the nation's economic crash burden (Stauback, 2009). CIREN is not considered a population-based sample. For this case review, the injuries were pooled. Regions of interest were identified based on their frequency and severity of injury. In order to be included in CIREN, adult occupants must have sustained a serious or disabling injury based on the AIS. This means an AIS 2+ articular or other AIS 3+ injury must have occurred. Vehicles in CIREN are no more than 6 years old from the current manufacturing year. Single event crashes are preferred (Stauback, 2009).

CIREN was manually surveyed for lane change and merging crash scenarios via the public portal (Young, 2013). Specifically, cases were selected based on the impact scenario. Crash scenarios that began as lane change impacts between two cars were include. Injury mechanisms that resulted from lane change or merging – related impacts were included. Acceptance criteria included: occupant age of 16 or older, front airbags on the case vehicle, dry road surface, and discernible injury causations. In order to include more cases, crashes that occurred at or merging ramps were included as long as discernible injury causations were present. Only drivers were considered for this study because it provides a worst-case scenario; the steering wheel is an additional vehicle component that the occupant may impact during a crash. Both belted and unbelted occupants were included in this study. A total of 19 cases were analyzed. Occupant injury causations were organized by both AIS severity score and vehicle component contact points.

C. Data Classification Methods

The abbreviated injury scale (AIS) is an anatomically-based, standardized, global severity scoring system that classifies injuries by body region according to its relative importance on a 6-point scale (1 being least severe, 6 being maximal) (AIS manual 2005 with 2008 update). The consensus-driven descriptors for the severity scores are in Table

3. AIS scores also define the body region affected. In AIS, eight separate body regions are defined and were analyzed in this study: head, face, neck, thorax, abdomen, spine, upper extremity, and lower extremity. The NHTSA injury coding manual for 2005 with the 2008 update was used for this study.

Table 3. Example Injury Descriptions andCorresponding AIS Severity Scores (AISCourse Manual).

Injury Description	AIS Severity Scale
Minor	1
Moderate	2
Serious	3
Severe	4
Critical	5
Maximal	6

Results

A. NASS Predictions

The NASS results predicted a risk of an AIS 2+ injury to the head, thorax, spine, upper extremity, and lower extremity during a lane change impact event (Figure 29).



Figure 29 There is a risk of injury to all body regions, but the error bars for the AIS 3+ injuries overlap zero.

B. CIREN Overview

Lane change crashes often result in property damage and minor injuries to the occupant. When these crashes occur at high speeds however, an abrupt yaw caused by a lane change may result in secondary impacts (e.g. near side or frontal) and/or loss of control of the vehicle. Loss of control of the vehicle may result in impacts with other vehicles and/or objects. The following cases were chosen because they demonstrate how initial lane change crashes can escalate into multiple impact crashes using real-world examples from CIREN.

Of the 148 documented injuries, 26 were AIS 3+ in severity. Injuries are described as percent of total injuries (Figure 30). Severe thorax injuries accounted for 5% of all the injuries (Figure 31). Door and/or b-pillar contact caused most of these thorax injuries, which were mainly injuries to the ribs and lungs. The case reviews and discussion will elaborate on some of injury mechanisms and possible sequelae of lane change related primary impacts. Driver over reaction, or lack of reaction played a part in the outcome of these cases.



Distribution of Injuries by Body Region

Figure 30 For the 19 Cases studied, there were 148 total injuries; 122 of the injuries were categorized as not severe (AIS 1-2) while 26 were categorized as severe (AIS 3-6). Of the severe injuries 7 were to the thorax and 12 were to the lower extremity.



Distribution of AIS 3-6 Injuries

Figure 31 The 26 severe injuries are shown above.

C. CIREN Case Reviews

1. Case 1 - 120380

As the case vehicle reached a convergence area with a posted speed limit of 70 mph, the driver merged suddenly to his left and into the path of another vehicle (Figure 32). The other driver was unable to avoid the case vehicle and the front of the other vehicle struck the left side of the case vehicle. This impact caused the case vehicle to rotate counterclockwise approximately 250 degrees while continuing to travel downstream and partially enter the lane that contained a third vehicle. This third vehicle was also unable

to avoid the case vehicle and struck the right, rear end of the case vehicle. All three of these vehicles were towed due to disabling damage.



Figure 32 The initial impact for CIREN case 120380 was to the left rear of the vehicle by V2 in an oblique L-type configuration. The second impact was to the right rear of the vehicle by V3 also in an L-type configuration. The total deltaV of this crash was 24 km/h.

The case occupant was a 39 year old, 183 cm, 91 kg male driver of a 2000

Hyundai Sonata, 4-door sedan. The available seat belt was being utilized at the time of

the crash. The setback-mounted side-impact air bag deployed as a result of the impact. The case occupant sustained a loss of consciousness from contact with the air bag (AIS 2). He also sustained six left rib fractures (#4-9) posterior-lateral (AIS 3) probably from contact with the air bag. Additionally, he sustained five right posterior rib fractures (#3-7) (AIS 3) probably from contact with the center armrest. He sustained a multiple thoracic and lumbar vertebral fractures (AIS 2) from torso lateral bending over the center armrest and torso rotation.

The impact to the left side of the case vehicle most likely resulted in the severe injuries. Rotation and lateral bending may also have occurred at this time. While the case occupant was being injured, he may not have been able to optimally control the vehicle and a second impact occurred.

2. Case 2 - 590123577

A vehicle merged left into the eastbound number-one lane just as the case vehicle changed lanes to the right (Figure 33). The front right of case vehicle struck the back left of the other vehicle in a minor impact. However, "the incident caused the subject to begin a left-right, over corrective steering maneuver that put the case vehicle into a clockwise yaw" as it traveled off of the right side of the interstate. The vehicle also overturned longitudinally once off the highway. The case vehicle, leading with its left side, struck down a chain-link fence and began to overturn. The case vehicle came to rest on its right side facing south.

The occupant was a 23 year old, 165 cm tall, 67 kg female and was driving a 2005 Toyota Scion tC. She was wearing her seatbelt and had frontal airbags available, but they did not deploy during this crash. Her most serious injury was bilateral lung contusion (AIS 3) due to the belt restraint webbing/buckle. She also sustained an open and displaced radius fracture due to steering wheel contact (AIS 2). The injuries most likely occurred in the impacts following the initial lane change event as the lane change event was noted to be minor.



Figure 33 The initial impact for CIREN case 590123577 was minor, but the driver of the case vehicle initiated a left-right steering maneuver that led to a rollover crash. The deltaV of this crash was listed as unknown.

3. Case 3 - 119946

The case vehicle entered an access ramp with greater than 2% grade that curved to the right as it merges with the freeway (Figure 34). The driver of the case vehicle entered the right curve at too great a speed and the driver was unable to merge into the right lane in a controlled manner. The case vehicle therefore ran under the trailer of a 2006 Freightliner, tractor-trailer. No airbags deployed.



Figure 34 In CIREN case 119946, V1 drove under the tractor-trailer. The deltaV of this crash was listed as unknown.

The 24 year old, 193 cm, 82 kg, male was belted and driving a 2002 Honda accord. On impact, he moved to the left, relative to the vehicle interior. He sustained a loss of consciousness (AIS 2), a comminuted basilar skull fracture (AIS 3), a left C1 inferior articular facet fracture (AIS 2), and a thoracic spine (T2) fracture (AIS 2) from contact with and loading by the left roof side rail at the grab handle (compression and lateral bending). He also sustained a left upper lobe pulmonary contusion (AIS 2) from contact with the left b-pillar. Multiple fractures to the lower extremity regions (AIS 3) were recorded. The crash was not fatal and all injuries were sustained as a result of the impact with the tractor-trailer.

Discussion

Crash preventive technology (e.g. lane change notifications) has the potential to reduce lane change crash outcomes. However, adaptation of this technology will not be universal for decades (IIHS, 2016). Semi-autonomous behaviors need to be able to mitigate crashes initiated by cars around the case vehicle. Although the literature and the NASS study showed a lesser degree of risk to the occupants in a lane change scenario, it may not have accounted for chaotic events such as secondary impacts. Such a scenario may be better explained using CIREN cases, which may be used to review injury mechanisms. This CIREN review showed that lane change crashes can quickly escalate if the vehicle is not controlled before, during and after the impact. Furthermore, this case review has shown how similar pre-crash scenarios may lead to diverse crash scenarios that result in a number of serious injuries and varying mechanisms of those injuries. A unifying trend throughout the cases reveals that the drivers may not optimally respond to the pre-crash and/or crash scenario. This may be due to unsafe driving practices, misuse of information errors, and/or overcorrection that places the vehicle in a crash-imminent trajectory. This is supported by studies on distracted driving (Stauback, 2009). Additionally, drivers may become incapacitated or lose consciousness during a crash, which may render them unable to respond. It is important to realize that autonomous vehicle behaviors designed to mitigate crash scenarios will need to be able to control the vehicle through every stage of a potential crash. These behaviors should optimally brake and steer to decrease driver-over correction or lack of reaction. Similar behaviors exist in stability control and lane-keeping semi-autonomous behaviors (NHTSA, 2017; Pohl, 2003). These example behaviors sense instability (e.g. sliding and lane-deviation respectively) and aid the driver in maintaining control of the vehicle by sensing the environment.

Although many of the severe injuries were found to be thorax injuries due to safety technology contacts or intrusion of vehicle structures, whipping or bending motions caused by erratic vehicle motions also resulted in injuries. It is important to take into account that serious injuries are not always a result of contact with a structure. As shown in case 1 (120380), some injuries were caused by non-contact motion (rotation) of the occupant. Additionally, steering/speed control could have been used to avoid the impact that caused the initial impact, which initiated many of the injuries. For case 2 (590123577), the left-right overcorrective steering maneuver caused the occupant to encounter the roll over events that caused most of the severe injuries. If stability were

maintained following the initial minor crash, the injuries may have been avoided. Finally, in case 3 (119946), the entry speed of the case vehicle onto the merge ramp was cited as a factor in the crash with the trailer. An autonomous vehicle could potentially know that there is a trailer approaching and brake or veer to avoid driving under the trailer. Occupant-centric behaviors must take into account the complex nature of the human body in order to better protect occupants from harm during crashes. Additionally, these behaviors should be prepared to compensate for the reactions (or lack thereof) of the driver to crash imminent scenarios.

Autonomous vehicle behaviors could seek to optimize the principal direction of the force to allow energy absorbing structures and vehicle safety features to reduce the energy transfer perceived by the occupant. Smart braking behaviors could also reduce impacts, by making sure the vehicle is clear of other traffic before applying the brakes to prevent secondary impacts. Autonomous technologies could also be applied to airbag deployment by utilizing input about the occupant's movement around the vehicle during a crash and data about events outside of the vehicle.

The results of this study only apply to severe crashes and are not based on a population-based sample. Additionally, the occupants chosen for the in-depth case studies were not elderly. These results of this study should guide further investigations, along with driver simulations, human body modeling, and autonomous vehicle behavior design.

This case review is limited to entries within CIREN. Because CIREN has a minimum requirement for severe injuries, the data presented only represents severe crash

scenarios. We have therefore used literature studies focused on data from the National Automotive Sampling System-Crashworthiness Data System (NASS-CDS), driver behavioral studies (e.g. driving simulation studies) and other data as a means for comparing our findings to those of other researchers.

Crashes that occur during lane changes or merging may take place at high speeds and on busy highways. This leads to complicated, often multi-impact, multi-vehicle crashes. Overly complicated, multi-vehicle crashes were excluded from this study and may not be largely present in CIREN based on the aforementioned inclusion criteria.

Conclusions

An analysis of lane change crashes utilizing the NASS showed a risk of AIS 2+ injury to many body regions. The analysis of CIREN showed that lane change accidents may escalate into more chaotic crashes with secondary impacts. Autonomous vehicles may be able to perceive and process their environment faster than their human driver. Autonomous control could therefore potentially mitigate driver over corrections and/or reduce secondary impacts, such as those shown here.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

The objective of this project was to identify the injury mechanisms and outcomes in LVS, NSI, and CLH crashes for the purpose of advising autonomous vehicle behavior designs, which may mitigate injuries in crash-imminent scenarios. The approach taken involved a mixture of injury epidemiology and biomechanics techniques to identify crash related and occupant related factors that contributed to injury and crash outcomes. Three cohorts of representative crashes from CIREN (Appendix B) were gathered and analyzed using chi-squared tests (Appendix C and Appendix D). The conclusions of the analyses are summarized as follows.

Tasks-Research Objectives

This dissertation achieved the following four tasks and addressed the following tasks and hypotheses:

Task 1: Lead vehicle stopped (LVS)

Aim: To better understand and communicate the injury mechanisms of LVS scenarios so that autonomous vehicle behaviors may be designed to reduce the occurrence of common and severe injuries.

Hypothesis 1: Severe (AIS 3-6) injuries were hypothesized to occur most frequently to the thorax, abdomen, and lower extremity regions. The thorax and lower extremity

regions were shown to be most frequently severely injured at the 0.05 level. The abdomen was not significant at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis 2: Thorax and abdomen injuries were hypothesized to be most frequently caused by the steering wheel. Thorax injuries were most commonly found to be caused by steering wheel contact, even in the presence of an airbag. Lower extremity injuries were most often caused by knee bolster contact. The abdomen was not found to be frequently severely injured in this study, for this crash scenario.

Task 2: Near side impact (NSI)

Aim: To better understand and communicate the injury mechanisms of NSI scenarios so that autonomous vehicle behaviors may be designed to reduce the occurrence of common and severe injuries.

Hypothesis 1: It was hypothesized that severe (AIS 3-6) injuries would occur most frequently to the head, thorax, and abdomen regions. The head and thorax were found to be most frequently severely injured at the 0.05 level. The abdomen was not found to be frequently severely injured at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis 2: These injuries were hypothesized to be most frequently caused by the intruding door. This hypothesis was shown to be true; additionally, oblique angle crashes occurred more often than perpendicular (PDOF=270 degree) crashes.

Additionally, b-pillar contact was noted as a contact point in many injuries. Door and bpillar contact occurred even in the presence of a deployed side airbag.

Task 3: Changing lanes on a highway or merging (CLH)

Aim: To better understand and communicate the injury mechanisms of CLS scenarios so that autonomous vehicle behaviors may be designed to reduce the occurrence of common and severe injuries. A case study was conducted for the CLH cohort and found that diverse injuries and mechanisms occurred in response to the initial lane change related crash.

Task 4: Compare catchment areas of CIREN to US census averages

Aim: To determine if the demographics of the 6 catchment areas of CIREN differ from the demographics of the aggregate population of the US.

Hypothesis: The average population of CIREN were hypothesized not be different from the average population of the US. This hypothesis was not true. The LVS and NSI cohorts were found to be more elderly in comparison to both the US census average and the average of the 6 catchment areas of CIREN. This highlights the concept that elderly individuals may be at a higher risk of severe injury in these crash scenarios than other groups. Females were over represented in the side impact (NSI) cohort, which suggests that this demographic is at a higher risk of injury in NSI crashes.

Suggestions for autonomous vehicle behavior design:

Within the LVS and NSI cohorts, nearly half of the crash scenarios involved multiple impacts or truck impacts. Because injuries occurred even in the presence of an airbag deployment and in belted and unbelted occupants, this provides room for autonomous vehicle behaviors to augment of passive and active safety systems. Smart braking and veering, as well as improvements to passive safety system deployment timing and duration could help to mitigate injuries in these three crash imminent scenarios. For the CLH cohort, the case review revealed that most of the crashes began as small bumps, but escalated into multiple impact crashes, or off-road scenarios. Autonomous vehicle technologies could contribute to better controlling the vehicle during these crash sequences in order to minimize secondary impacts. Experimental work should be done to corroborate the suggestion that safety technology deployment timing could improve injury mitigation.

Expected contributions to the state of art and literature

The three common crash scenarios presented here represent a significant societal cost. By gathering real-world cases via CIREN, this study will document and disseminate information about the injury mechanisms that occur in these crash scenarios. Statistical methods as proposed here have not yet been applied to CIREN data alone and will help to strengthen the case for more occupant-centric autonomous vehicle behaviors. Ultimately, this work will suggest semi autonomous vehicle behavior design concepts that could reduce crash severities as perceived by the occupant.

Serious injuries to the occupant have the potential to significantly decrease driver awareness, alter occupant seating position, and or cause panic to the driver. It is also important to demonstrate and communicate this concept to autonomous vehicle programmers and policy makers so that they can create vehicle behaviors and policies that minimize human injuries as well as loss of property.
Limitations

Because CIREN is comprised of 6 centers across the US, CIREN is not considered a population-based sample and traditional statistical methods have previously not been used with CIREN. The sample size is also fairly limited for this analysis, so caution must be taken to make analyses where sufficient groups of data are present (e.g. in belted vs unbelted groups). Although CIREN cases are constructed by trained engineers and medical personnel, the documented injury mechanisms may vary. In order to address this, injury mechanisms will be grouped into categories (e.g. an injury mechanism described as "intruding door" and "hood of intruding vehicle" would be in a group). Reports involving the results of this study will designate the conditions of the inclusion criteria and the CIREN database.

Broader impact on the topic area, the field of injury epidemiology, and the society

It is important to highlight that driver inattention and misuse of information errors by the driver have the potential to increase driver error and contribute to crash outcomes (Young, 2013; Stauback, 2009). Serious injuries to the occupant have the potential to significantly decrease driver awareness, alter occupant seating position, and or cause panic to the driver. As semiautonomous vehicle behaviors become more prevalent in civilian traffic, the potential for occupants to be out of position and/or distracted may increase. It is therefore important to advocate for the design of occupant-centric semiautonomous vehicle behaviors designed for crash imminent scenarios. It is important to note that the driver/occupant response will most likely vary, so the vehicle response should remain consistent.

Other researchers may potentially utilize this study format, to analyze trends in severe bioinjury mechanisms and outcomes. It is critical to note the unique applications of boundary conditions by manually surveying CIREN allowed for the identification of injury mechanisms and outcomes. The results of this study are comparable to other current surveys of crash data.

Future Directions and Applications

This study focused on three generalized crash scenarios and took into account only limited conditions on the road at the time of the crash. William Haddon, PhD has proposed that the study of injury epidemiology may be extended further in order to incorporate measures that contributed to the injury event and post-injury activities. In order to improve the study of injury biomechanics and apply the knowledge gained in these studies to a local stage, future work could be done to incorporate factors such as: road geometry, sign design, and driver behavior trends.

The goals of a localized injury epidemiology study could focus on the effects of road geometry on injury mechanisms. Some broad questions this study would seek to answer include, but are not limited to:

- Do roundabout installations in Ohio result in fewer injury crashes?
- What road signage around these intersections contributes to, or mitigates, crash scenarios?

• How do drivers react to roundabout installations?

The injury mechanisms analyses could not only help automotive engineers to design vehicles to respond better to crash scenarios, but could help improve road design, and how hospital workers triage injuries. If the hospital community could know which intersections result in certain injury patterns, they could be alerted about what to expect from an injury crash as patients are transported to hospitals. This could improve emergency room triage timing and outcomes. If certain intersections are consistently resulting in injury crashes with certain injury patterns, the geometry of that intersection could possibly be improved.

Data sources, such as Ohio emergency room records could be used in order to identify in-depth trends of injury mechanisms in real-world cases. Police reports, which have limited injury information, but may have location-related information may be used to identify intersections with high accident frequencies. The depth of the investigation would depend on the depth of information that is able to be gathered from both sources. Ideally, a snapshot of crash outcomes before and after intersection changes were made in Ohio could be gathered in order to predict how traffic geometry and traffic signage could be optimally altered in the future. Additionally, the study of the population demographics of those implicated in injury crashes could help to identify at-risk groups within the general population.

The results of this study would be reported to the government of Ohio and possibly published as a case report series. Collaborations with the University Transportation Center and the department of epidemiology at Ohio State would facilitate the application of epidemiologic techniques. Similar studies have been conducted within the state of Maryland and have been reported. For example, a systematic review of police crash reports for a set of roundabouts in Maryland by Mandavilli et al. categorized the type of crashes that occur at roundabouts and potential countermeasures (Mandavilli, 2009). The study found that one common crash pattern at both single- and double- lane roundabouts involved vehicles colliding with the central island; this accounted for almost half of all single-vehicle run-off-road crashes. Other major crash scenarios included rearend and sideswipe collisions. High approach speeds were an important driver crash factor (Mandavilli, 2009). The study suggested increasing the conspicuity of upcoming roundabouts using larger signage to help drivers recognize roundabouts and the need to yield to circulating traffic (Mandavilli, 2009). These findings suggest that modifying intersection geometry (e.g. from lighted intersection to a roundabout) and speeds has the potential to reduce the occurrences of injury crashes.

Additionally, a study by Retting et al. found that the conversion of 24 intersections from stop sign and traffic signal control to modern roundabouts reduced the numbers of fatal and incapacitating injury rashes by 90% (Retting, 2001). Roundabouts have been found to improve traffic flow and reduce vehicle idling, which reduces vehicle emissions and fuel consumption ion (Bergh, 2005; Safecar.gov). Furthermore, roundabouts are generally safer for pedestrians; pedestrians walk on sidewalks around the perimeter and cross only one direction of traffic at a time. The tight circle of a roundabout forces drivers to slow down, and helps avoid some of the most severe types of intersection crashes (e.g. head-on and near side impact) (IIHS website). The outcome of this study would help to seek to improve and decrease injury occurrences on the roads of Ohio. This study could potentially improve triaging timing in emergency room settings following car crashes. If successful, the results could be communicated and other states may adopt similar initiatives.

References

- Abdel-Aty, M. and Abdelwahab H. Modeling rear-end collisions including the role of driver's visibility and light truck vehicles using a nested logit structure. Accid. Anal. Prev. Vol. 36, no. 3, pp 447-456, 2004.
- Acierno S, Kaufman R, Rivara FP, Grossman DC, and Mock C. Vehicle mismatch: injury patterns and severity. *Acc. Anal. Prev.* 2004; 36:761-772.
- AIS 2005 Abbreviated Injury Scale 2005 Update 2008 Course Book Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine
- Augenstein J, Perdeck E, Bowen J, Stratton J, Singer M, Horton T, Rao A. Injuries in Near-Side Collisions. In 43rd, Annual Proceedings, Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine, Barclona, Spain., 1999.
- Augenstein J. et al. "Characteristics of Crashes that Increase the Risk of Serious Injuries," Proc. AAAM, Lisbon, Portugal, 2003.
- Bahouth J, Digges K. Characteristics of Multiple Impact Crashes that Produce Serious Injuries, Proc of the 19th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles, Washington D.C., USA, 2005.
- Bergh C, Retting R.A, Myers E. Continued reliance on traffic signals: the cost of missed opportunities to improve traffic flow and safety at urban intersections. *Insurance Institute for Highway Safety*. September 2005.
- Brown J, Coxon K, Fong C, Clarke E, Keay L. (May 2013) Seat belt wearing characteristics of drivers aged 75 years and older. Proc. ESV, Seoul, Republic of Korea.
- Brumbelow M.L., Mueller B.C., and Arbelaez R.A. "Occurrence of Serious Injury in Real-World Side Impacts of Vehicles with Good Side-Impact Protection Ratings," *Traffic Inj. Prev.* Vol 16, pp S125-S132, 2015.
- Crash Injury Research and Engineering Network (CIREN) Data Dictionary version 1.2, December 29, 2015.

Crash Injury Research and Engineering Network website:

https://one.nhtsa.gov/Research/Crash-Injury-Research-(CIREN)/Data:

CIREN case 120380: http://www-

nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=120380. Accessed [February 21, 2017].

CIREN case 590123577: <u>http://www-nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=590123577</u>. Accessed [February 21, 2017].

- CIREN case 119946: <u>http://www-</u> <u>nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=119946</u>. Accessed [February 21, 2017].
- CIREN case 537106994: <u>https://www-</u> <u>nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=537106994</u> Accessed [February 21, 2017].
- CIREN case 338117581: <u>https://www-nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=338117581</u>. Accessed [February 21, 2017].
- CIREN case 904429225: <u>https://www-</u> <u>nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=904429225</u>. Accessed [February 21, 2017].

CIREN case 842003316: <u>https://www-nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=842003316</u>. Accessed [February 21, 2017].

- CIREN case 842005510: <u>https://www-nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=842005510</u>. Accessed [February 21, 2017].
- CIREN case 591153089: <u>https://www-nass.nhtsa.dot.gov/nass/ciren/CaseForm.aspx?xsl=main.xsl&CaseID=591153089</u>. Accessed [February 21, 2017].
- Daly B, Abboud S, Zabiullah A, Sliker C, and Fowler D. Comparison of whole-body post mortem 3D CT and autopsy evaluation in accidental blunt force traumatic death using the abbreviated injury scale classification. *Forensic Sci. Int.*, 2013; 225: 20-26.

- Digges K, and Bahouth G. "Frequency of Injuries in Multiple Impact Crashes," Proc. AAAM, Lisbon, Portugal, 2003.
- Dineen M.D., Wetter L.A., and Orr N.M. "Traumatic indirect inguinal hernia: a seatbelt injury," *Injury: the British Journal of Accident Surgery*. vol. 20, no. 3. 1989.
- Elliott MR, Resler A, Flannagan CA, Rupp JD. Appropriate analysis of CIREN data: Using NASS-CDS to reduce bias in estimation of injury risk factors in passenger vehicle crashes. *Acc. Anal. Prev.*, 2010; 42: 530-539.
- Ekambaram K, Frampton R, Bartlett L. Improving the Chest Protection of Elderly Occupants in Frontal Crash Load Limiters. *Traffic Inj. Prev.* vol 16, pp. S2:S77-86, 2015.
- Gabler H. and Hollowell W. The crash compatibility of cars and light trucks. J. Crash Prev. Inj. Control. Vol. 2, no. 1, pp 19-31, 2000.
- Griffin R, Huisingh C, McGwin G, Reiff D, "Association between side impact airbag deployment and risk of injury: A matched cohort study using the CIREN and the NASS-CDS," *J Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, vol. 4, 2012.
- Hendey G, Votey S. "Injuries in Restrained Motor Vehicle Accidents." Ann. Emerg.Med., 1994; 24(1): 77-84.
- IIHS website [<u>http://www.iihs.org/iihs/topics/t/roundabouts/topicoverview</u>] [Accessed April, 2017].
- Huelke D. et. al, (September, 1994) Upper Extremity Injuries Related to Air Bag Deployments. Proc. AAAM-IRCOBI Special Session, Lyon, France. [Presented].
- Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Status Report Vol. 51, No 8. Special Issue: Autonomous Vehicles November 10, 2016
- Kahane C.J. Fatality reduction by safety belts for front-seat occupants of cars and light trucks: updated and expanded estimates based on 1986-99 FARS data. Washington, DC: US Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; 2000. Publication no. DOT-HS-809-199.
- Kildare S, and Digges K. (May 2013) Characteristics of Crashes with Multiple Frontal Impacts. Proc. ESV. Seoul, Republic of Korea, Paper number 13-0061.
- Kulowski J, and Rost W. "Intra-abdominal injury from safety belt in Auto Accident," *JAMA Surgery, case report,* vol. 73, no. 6, pp. 970-971, Dec. 1956.

- Kusano K, and H. Gabler H. "Potential Occupant Injury Reduction in Pre-Crash System Equipped Vehicles in the Striking Vehicle of Rear-end Crashes." *Ann. Adv. Automot. Med.*, vol. 54, pp. 20-3214, 2010.
- Lee E.L., Craig M., and Scarboro M. "Real-World Rib Fracture Patterns in Frontal Crashes in Different Restraint Conditions," *Traffic Inj. Prev.* vol 16., pp.S115-S123, 2015.
- Lenard J.A., and Frampton R.J. "Two-impact crashes- implications for occupant protection technologies". Loughborough University, UK Paper 512.
- Mandavilli, Srinivas; Retting, Richard A.; McCartt, Anne T. Crash patterns and potential engineering countermeasures at Maryland roundabouts. *Traffic Inj. Prev.*, February 2009.
- Melocchi, A., Van Horn, M., Faust, D., Fowler, G. et al., U of Michigan CIREN Side Impact Field Crashes and Injury Patterns. SAE Technical Paper 2010-01-1157, 2010, doi:10.4271/2010-01-1157.
- Mohamed A., and Benerjee A. "Patterns of injury associated with automobile airbag use," *Postgrad Med. J.*, vol 74, pp 455-458, 1998.
- National Automotive Sampling System Crashworthiness Database System. <u>https://one.nhtsa.gov/Data/National-Automotive-Sampling-System-(NASS)</u> [Feb, 21, 2017].
- Najm WG, Smith JD, Yanagisawa M. Pre-crash scenario typology for crash avoidance research. National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, DOT-HS-810, 767., 2007.
- Newgard CD, Lewis RJ, Kraus JF. "Steering Wheel Deformity and Serious Thoracic or Abdominal Injury Among Drivers and Passengers Involved in Motor Vehicle Crashes." Ann. Emerg. Med., 2005; 45(1)
- Newgard CD, Lewis RJ, Kraus JF, McConnell KJ. "Seat position and the risk of serious thoracoabdominal injury in lateral motor vehicle crashes." *Acc Anal Prev*, 2005; 37(4): 668-674 25.
- Nirula R., and Pintar F.A., "Identification of vehicle components associated with severe thoraic injury in motor vehicle crashes: A CIREN and NASS analysis," *Acc. Anal. Prev.*, vol._40, pp 137-141, 2008.

- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Third report to Congress: effectiveness of occupant protection systems and their use. Washington, DC: US Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; 1996. Available at http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/airbags/208con2e.htm
- National Highway Traffic Safety. The Impact of Driver Inattention on Near-Crash/Crash Risk: An Analysis using the 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study Data. DOT HS 810 594, 2006.
- National Highway Transportation Safety Association (NHTSA) Injury Coding Manual using AIS 2005/ update '08. Gennarelli T.A. and Elaine Wodzin. Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine, Barrington, IL, 60011-4172. 2008.
- National Highway Transportation Safety Association (NHTSA) Injury Coding Manual using AIS 2005/ update '08. Gennarelli T.A. and Elaine Wodzin. Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine, Barrington, IL, 60011-4172. 2008.
- National Highway Transportation Safety Association. "Crash Injury Research and Engineering Network." Internet: <u>https://one.nhtsa.gov/Research/Crash- Injury-Research-Engineering</u> Network (CIREN)/Data:. [Feb. 21, 2017].
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Lives saved in 2014 by restraint use and minimum-drinking-age laws. Washington, DC: US Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; 2015. Publication no. DOT-HS-812-218. Available at <u>http://wwwnrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/812218.pdf</u>.
- NHTSA. "Crash Injury Research and Engineering Network." Internet: <u>https://one.nhtsa.gov/Research/Crash-Injury-Research-Engineering</u> Network (CIREN)/Data:. [Feb. 21, 2017].
- Ossiander, E.M., Koepsell, T.D., McKnight, B. Crash fatality and vehicle incompatibility in collisions between cars and light trucks or vans. *Inj Prev.* vol. 20, no. 6, 2014.
- Otte D., Suren E., Appel H, and Nehmzow J, (1984) Vehicle Parts Causing Injuries to Front-Seat Car Passengers in Lateral Impact. Proc of the 28th Stapp Car Crash Conference, pg. 13-26, SAE 841651.
- Patel V., Griffin R, Eberhardt A, McGwin G. The Association between knee airbag deployment and knee-thigh-hip injury risk in motor vehicle collisions: A matched cohort study. *Accid Anl Prev.* vol. 50, pp 964-967, 2013.

- Pohl J, Ekmark J. A Lane Keeping Assist System for Passenger Cars- Design Aspects of the User Inteface. *Proc. of the 18th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*, Nagoya, Japan, May 2003.
- Retting, Richard A.; Persaud, Bhagwant N.; Garder, Per E.; Lord, Dominique Crash and injury reduction following installation of roundabouts in the United States. *Am. J. Public Health.* April 2001.
- Richtter M, Krettek C, Otte D, Wiese B, Stalp M, Ernst S, Pape H. Correlation between Crash Severity, Injury Severity, and Clinical Course in Car Occupants with Thoracic Trauma: A Technical and Medical Study. *J. Trauma*, 2001: 50(1): 10-16.
- Safecar.gov [<u>https://www.safercar.gov/Vehicle-Shoppers/Rollover/Electronic-Stability-</u> <u>Control</u>]
- SAS software. 9.3 PROC SURVEYLOGISTIC. SAS Institute Inc, North Carolina, USA.
- Scarboro M. Rudd R, Sochor M. Nearside Occupants in Low Delta-V Side Impact Crashes: Analysis of Injury and Vehicle Damage Patterns. Enhanced Safety Vehicles 07-0225, Lyon, France. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2007.
- Schneider LW, Rupp JD, Scarboro, M, Pintar F, Arbogast K, Rudd R. et al. BioTab A New Method for Analyzing and Documenting Injury Causation in Motor-Vehicle Crashes. *Traffic Inj. Prev.*, 2011; 12: 256-265.
- Sen B, Smith JD and Najm Wassim. Analysis of Lane Change Crashes. NHTSA DOT HS 809 571, 2003.
- Society of Automotive Engineers International Standard J3016_201609, 2014.
- Staubach M. "Factors correlated with traffic accidents as a basis for evaluating advanced driver assistance systems." *Acc. Anal. Prev.*, 2009; 41(5): 1025-1033
- Stadter G, et al. "Injury and Side Impact Air Bag Deployment in Near and Far Side Motor Vehicle Crashes, United States, 2000-2005," J. Trauma, vol. 65, no. 6, pp 1333-1339, 2008.
- Tencer A.F., Kaufman R., Mack, C. Mock, C, "Factors affecting pelvic and thoracic forces in near-side impact crashes: a study of US-NCAP, NASS and CIREN data," Acc. Anal. Prev., vol. 37, no. 2, pp 287-293, 2005.

- Treat et al. Tri-Level Study of the Causes of Traffic Accidents Executive Summary. Institute for Research in Public Safety, Indiana University. DOT HS-034-3-535, 1979.
- US Census Website https://www.census.gov/ [Feb. 21, 2017]
- Wang J-S and Knipling RR. Lane Change/Merge Crashes Problem Size Assessment and Statistical Description. NHTSA DOT HS 808 075, 1994.
- Wang J.S., Knipling R.R., Goodman M.J. "The Role of Driver Inattention in Crashes; New Statistics from the 1995 Crashworthiness Data System," Proc. AAAM, Vancouver, BC, 1996.
- Weaver, K. Loftis, J. Stitzel. Investigation of the Safety Effects of Knee Bolter Air Bag Deployment in Similar Real-World Crash Comparisons. *Traffic Inj. Prev.*, vol. 14, pp 168-180, 2013.
- Young K, Salmon P, and Cornelissen M. "Distraction-induced driving error: An on-road examination of the errors made by distracted and undistracted drivers," *Acc. Anal. Prev.*, vol. 58, pp. 218-225, 2013.
- Yoganandan N, Pinar F, Zhang J, Gennarelli T. "Lateral Impact Injuries with Side Airbag Deployments-A descriptive study." Acc. Anal. Prev., 2007; 39(1): 22-27

Appendix A: Society of Automotive Engineers Standard J3016: Levels of Automated Driving.

SAE level	Name	Narrative Definition	Execution of Steering and Acceleration/ Deceleration	<i>Monitoring</i> of Driving Environment	Fallback Performance of Dynamic Driving Task	System Capability (Driving Modes)
Huma	Human driver monitors the driving environment					
0	No Automation	the full-time performance by the <i>human driver</i> of all aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i> , even when enhanced by warning or intervention systems	Human driver	Human driver	Human driver	n/a
1	Driver Assistance	the <i>driving mode</i> -specific execution by a driver assistance system of either steering or acceleration/deceleration using information about the driving environment and with the expectation that the <i>human driver</i> perform all remaining aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i>	Human driver and system	Human driver	Human driver	Some driving modes
2	Partial Automation	the <i>driving mode</i> -specific execution by one or more driver assistance systems of both steering and acceleration/ deceleration using information about the <i>driving</i> environment and with the expectation that the <i>human</i> <i>driver</i> perform all remaining aspects of the <i>dynamic driving</i> <i>task</i>	System	Human driver	Human driver	Some driving modes
Autor	mated driving s	<i>ystem</i> ("system") monitors the driving environment				
3	Conditional Automation	the <i>driving mode</i> -specific performance by an <i>automated</i> <i>driving system</i> of all aspects of the dynamic driving task with the expectation that the <i>human driver</i> will respond appropriately to a <i>request to intervene</i>	System	System	Human driver	Some driving modes
4	High Automation	the <i>driving mode</i> -specific performance by an automated driving system of all aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i> , even if a <i>human driver</i> does not respond appropriately to a request to intervene	System	System	System	Some driving modes
5	Full Automation	the full-time performance by an <i>automated driving system</i> of all aspects of the <i>dynamic driving task</i> under all roadway and environmental conditions that can be managed by a <i>human driver</i>	System	System	System	All driving modes

Appendix B: List of Cases used in Lead Vehicle Stopped, Near Side Impact, and Changing Lanes on the Highway Cohorts

Cohort for Lead Vehicle Stopped				
<u>(N=52)</u>				
431480755	100113806			
38558	100119659			
44229	397081152			
71155	781125607			
120013	160136572			
439039180	160137605			
558006079	160139523			
558012205	781127800			
397081151	591152124			
317105241	352168965			
160118897	317096305			
904429225	317105615			
360204683	317105886			
852126191	431216222			
338117581	352179656			
338103473	352181723			
159356	352205827			
155539	431222896			
558016035	431419289			
100101231	431438203			
160124205	537106994			
857085889	537107148			
608031730	135859			
608032497	99637			
160128852	852117940			
160132402	109176			

338115944 591153036

Cohort for Near Side Impact (N=134)

Cohort for Changing Lanes on the Highway (N=19)
385114419
551079532
608040015
120380
100082440
160116065
160141361
591143203
385112903
829095522
110162286
590123577
781128512
100343
119946
397091830
100097205
100105153
352180112

Lead Vehicle							
<u>(LVS)</u>	AIS 1	AIS 2	AIS 3	AIS 4	AIS 5	AIS 6	Total
Head	7	13	3	0	0	0	23
Face	35	3	0	0	0	0	38
Neck	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
Thorax	25	30	17	3	1	0	76
Abdomen	16	12	8	1	2	0	39
Spine Upper	1	22	2	0	0	1	26
Extremity	76	22	2	0	0	0	100
Extremity	85	50	41	0	1	0	177
Total	249	152	74	4	4	1	484

Appendix C: Distribution of AIS Injuries by Body Region Data (Raw)

Near Side							
Impact (NSI)	AIS 1	AIS 2	AIS 3	AIS 4	AIS 5	AIS 6	Total
Head	47	53	31	22	7	1	161
Face	80	9	0	0	0	0	89
Neck	11	0	4	0	0	0	15
Thorax	49	97	75	17	8	1	247
Abdomen	35	52	24	13	3	0	127
Spine	7	49	4	0	1	1	62
Upper							
Extremity	142	40	0	0	0	0	182
Lower							
Extremity	154	113	77	5	0	0	349
Total	525	413	215	57	19	3	1232

Changing Lanes on the Highway							
(CLH)	AIS 1	AIS 2	AIS 3	AIS 4	AIS 5	AIS 6	Total
Head	7	7	2	0	0	0	16
Face	14	2	0	0	0	0	16
Neck	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Thorax	6	11	6	1	0	0	24
Abdomen	4	1	2	0	0	0	7
Spine	2	9	2	1	0	0	14
Upper							
Extremity	18	6	0	0	0	0	24
Lower							
Extremity	16	18	12	0	0	0	46
Total	68	54	24	2	0	0	148

Appendix D: Example Chi-Squared Tables

Lead Vehicle Stopped (LVS)

		Disease		
Data		Severe (AIS 3-6)	Not Severe (AIS 1-2)	Total
Exposure	Thorax Injury	21	55	76
	Not Thorax Injury	62	346	408
	Total	83	401	484
	proportion with exposure	0.157024793		
	proportion without exposure	0.842975207		
Current and		Disease		
Expected		Disease		
		Severe (AIS 3-6)	Not Severe (AIS 1-2)	
	Thorax Injury	13.03305785	62.96694215	
	Not Thorax Injury	69.96694215	338.0330579	
	chi^2 test statistic	6.973056622	p-value is 0.008275	significant at p<0.05
	Degrees of freedom	1		significant at p<0.01

Data		Severe (AIS 3-6)	Not Severe (AIS 1-2)	Total
Exposure	Lower Extremity	42	135	177
	Not Lower Extremity	41	266	307
	Total	83	401	484
expected		Severe (AIS 3-6)	Not Severe (AIS 1-2)	Total
	Lower Extremity	30.35330579	146.6466942	177
	Not Lower Extremity	52.64669421	254.3533058	307
	Total	83	401	484
	chi^2	8.503688135	p-value=0.00469	significant at p<0.05
	degrees of freedom	1		significant at p<0.01

Near Side Impact (NSI)

		Disease			
Data		Severe (AIS 3-6)	Not Severe (AIS 1-2)	Total	
Exposure	Thorax Injury	101	146	247	
	Not Thorax Injury	193	792	985	
	Total	294	938	1232	
		Disease			
expected		Severe (AIS 3-6)	Not Severe (AIS 1-2)	Total	
Exposure	Thorax Injury	58.94318182	188.0568182	247	
	Not Thorax Injury	235.0568182	749.9431818	985	
	Total	294	938	1232	
	Chi^2	49.29712554	p-value<0.00001	significant	t at p<0.05
	Degrees of freedo	1		significant	t at p<0.01

		Disease			
Data		Severe (AIS 3-6)	Not Severe (AIS 1-2)	Total	
Exposure	Head Injury	61	100	161	
	Not Head Injury	233	838	1071	
	Total	294	938	1232	
		Disease			
		Severe (AIS 3-6)	Not Severe (AIS 1-2)	Total	
expected	Head Injury	38.42045455	122.5795455	161	
	Not head injury	255.5795455	815.4204545	1071	
	Total	294	938	1232	
	Chi^2	20.04919767	p-value<0.00001	significant	t at p<0.05
	degrees of freedo	1		significant	t at p<0.01