

---

# Improvement of Pedestrian Safety: Response of detection systems to real accident scenarios

---

Hédi HAMDANE

September 2016

## Jury

Mr.	Reinoud	BOOTSMA	President
Mr.	Johan	DAVIDSON	Reviewer
Mr.	Remy	WILLINGER	Reviewer
Mr.	Robert	ANDERSON	Co-supervisor
Mr.	Thierry	SERRE	Co-supervisor
Mr.	Matthew	BALDOCK	Examiner
Ms.	Catherine	MASSON	Invited

An internationally joint supervised thesis between the University of Aix-Marseille and the University of Adelaide under an agreement signed by both parties including the PhD student and the supervisors.

# Contents

<b>CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>FIGURES</b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b>TABLES</b> .....	<b>VI</b>
<b>PREFACE</b> .....	<b>VII</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>VIII</b>
<b>ABSTRACT IN FRENCH</b> .....	<b>IX</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY</b> .....	<b>X</b>
<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b> .....	<b>XI</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....	<b>XII</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>XIII</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. STATE OF ART OF PEDESTRIAN SAFETY SYSTEMS.....	1
1.2. AIM AND OBJECTIVES .....	4
1.3. THESIS OUTLINE .....	5
<b>2. BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1. ACCIDENTOLOGY: IN-DEPTH ACCIDENT INVESTIGATIONS .....	7
2.1.1. CASR.....	9
2.1.2. IFSTTAR-LMA.....	11
2.2. PEDESTRIAN SAFETY .....	13
2.2.1. <i>Mechanism of an accident</i> .....	13
2.2.2. <i>Prototypical accident scenarios</i> .....	14
2.2.3. <i>Pedestrian kinematics at impact</i> .....	15
2.2.4. <i>Injury patterns</i> .....	17
2.2.5. <i>Safety solutions for pedestrian protection</i> .....	18
2.3. PRIMARY OR ACTIVE SAFETY SYSTEMS .....	19
2.3.1. <i>Architecture of a system</i> .....	19
2.3.2. <i>Assessment of primary safety systems</i> .....	24
2.4. PASSIVE SAFETY.....	27
2.4.1. <i>Understanding injury mechanisms</i> .....	27
2.4.2. <i>Enhancing passive safety</i> .....	28
2.4.3. <i>Assessment of passive safety systems</i> .....	29
2.5. INTEGRATED SAFETY .....	30
2.6. SYNTHESIS .....	30
<b>3. METHOD TESTING THE RESPONSE OF PED-CAMS</b> .....	<b>32</b>
3.1. GENERAL PRESENTATION OF THE METHODOLOGY .....	32
3.2. ACCIDENT MODELLING.....	33
3.2.1. <i>Modelling the crash environment</i> .....	34
3.2.2. <i>Modelling the kinematics of the vehicle</i> .....	35
3.2.3. <i>Modelling the kinematics of the pedestrian</i> .....	37
3.2.4. <i>Validating the reconstruction of the accident</i> .....	37

3.3.	EXAMPLES OF ACCIDENT RECONSTRUCTION .....	39
3.3.1.	<i>Example 1: Accident case in a curve</i> .....	40
3.3.2.	<i>Example 2: Accident case with masked pedestrian</i> .....	44
3.4.	CAMS MODELLING.....	47
3.4.1.	<i>Detection sensor modelling</i> .....	47
3.4.2.	<i>Modelling the system actuation</i> .....	48
3.5.	SIMULATION OF THE ACCIDENT WITH THE CAMS INTERACTION.....	48
3.5.1.	<i>Time frame for the simulation</i> .....	49
3.5.2.	<i>Pedestrian detection</i> .....	50
3.5.3.	<i>Actuation of autonomous emergency manoeuvres</i> .....	51
3.5.4.	<i>Estimation of system response</i> .....	53
3.6.	SYNTHESIS.....	54
<b>4.</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF THE ACCIDENT DATABASE .....</b>	<b>55</b>
4.1.	METHOD FOR ESTABLISHING THE ACCIDENT DATABASE .....	55
4.2.	DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE .....	57
4.2.1.	<i>Crash period</i> .....	57
4.2.2.	<i>Road environment and conditions</i> .....	58
4.2.3.	<i>Vehicle types</i> .....	59
4.2.4.	<i>Vehicle speeds</i> .....	59
4.2.5.	<i>Pedestrian age and speed</i> .....	60
4.2.6.	<i>Injury characteristics</i> .....	61
4.2.7.	<i>Impact configurations</i> .....	63
4.2.8.	<i>Pedestrian kinematics relative to that of the vehicle</i> .....	64
4.3.	DISCUSSION.....	65
4.3.1.	<i>Representativeness</i> .....	65
4.3.2.	<i>Challenges in pedestrian primary safety</i> .....	67
4.3.3.	<i>Limitations</i> .....	69
<b>5.</b>	<b>ESTIMATING THE RESPONSE OF CAM SYSTEMS .....</b>	<b>71</b>
5.1.	ASSESSMENT METHOD.....	72
5.1.1.	<i>Description of the selected Ped-CAM systems</i> .....	72
5.1.2.	<i>Factors relating to detection</i> .....	73
5.1.3.	<i>Brake actuation</i> .....	74
5.1.4.	<i>Estimation of system response</i> .....	75
5.2.	RESULTS OF THE SIMULATIONS .....	76
5.2.1.	<i>Position of the pedestrian 2.5 s before the impact</i> .....	76
5.2.2.	<i>Position of the pedestrian 1s before the impact</i> .....	77
5.2.3.	<i>Maximum detection rate</i> .....	79
5.2.4.	<i>Estimation of speed reduction</i> .....	82
5.3.	DISCUSSION.....	84
5.3.1.	<i>Implications</i> .....	84
5.3.2.	<i>Limitations of the methodology</i> .....	85
<b>6.</b>	<b>CHALLENGES IN PEDESTRIAN ACTIVE SAFETY .....</b>	<b>87</b>
6.1.	METHOD 1: PARAMETRIC ANALYSIS .....	88
6.1.1.	<i>General approach</i> .....	88
6.1.2.	<i>Definition of the generic Ped-AEBS</i> .....	88
6.1.3.	<i>Description of the method</i> .....	89
6.1.4.	<i>Results of the parametric analysis</i> .....	90
6.2.	METHOD 2: ACCIDENT ANALYSIS RELATIVE TO A FIXED TIME .....	94
6.2.1.	<i>General approach</i> .....	94
6.2.2.	<i>Definition of the model</i> .....	95
6.2.3.	<i>Estimation of AEB response</i> .....	96
6.2.4.	<i>Results of the analytical method</i> .....	97
6.3.	DISCUSSION.....	97

<b>7. PERSPECTIVES: EFFECT OF SPEED REDUCTION .....</b>	<b>100</b>
7.1. GENERAL APPROACH .....	101
7.1.1. <i>Methodology description</i> .....	101
7.1.2. <i>Passive safety assessment</i> .....	102
7.2. MULTIBODY SYSTEM MODELLING .....	103
7.2.1. <i>Vehicle model</i> .....	103
7.2.2. <i>Pedestrian model</i> .....	104
7.2.3. <i>Modelling the impact configuration</i> .....	105
7.3. CASE ANALYSIS.....	105
7.3.1. <i>Description of the accident case</i> .....	105
7.3.2. <i>Accident case modelling</i> .....	106
7.3.3. <i>Reconstruction of the case</i> .....	107
7.4. AEB EFFECT ON CASE STUDY .....	109
7.4.1. <i>Description of the AEB</i> .....	109
7.4.2. <i>Reconstruction of the accident with AEB</i> .....	109
7.5. ANALYSIS OF CHANGES INDUCED BY AEB IN AN ACCIDENT SCENARIO.....	111
7.5.1. <i>Impact configurations</i> .....	111
7.5.2. <i>Kinematics analysis</i> .....	112
7.5.3. <i>Head injury analysis (risk injury assessment)</i> .....	113
7.6. DISCUSSION .....	113
7.6.1. <i>Findings</i> .....	113
7.6.2. <i>Limitations</i> .....	114
7.7. EXTENSION .....	115
7.7.1. <i>Improve of the assessment methodology</i> .....	115
7.7.2. <i>Analysis of the ground impact</i> .....	116
7.7.3. <i>Broaden the risk injury assessment</i> .....	116
<b>8. GENERAL DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>117</b>
8.1. SYNTHESIS .....	117
8.2. COMPARISON TO OTHER METHODS .....	119
8.2.2. <i>Method</i> .....	121
8.2.3. <i>Data selection</i> .....	121
8.2.4. <i>Accident modelling</i> .....	122
8.2.5. <i>System modelling</i> .....	123
8.2.6. <i>Outcomes</i> .....	124
8.3. LIMITS AND PERSPECTIVE .....	125
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>LISTING DATA OF THE SELECTED ACCIDENT CASES .....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>ASSESSING THE PEDESTRIAN DETECTION .....</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>137</b>

# Figures

Figure 1.1. Illustration of event sequences of a crash .....	2
Figure 2.1. Map of pedestrian accidents investigated by CASR (2002-2005) .....	10
Figure 2.2. Map of accidents investigated by IFSTTAR-LMA (1999-2011) .....	12
Figure 2.3. Diagram illustrating the sequence of events (timeline) of an accident .....	13
Figure 2.4. Pedestrian kinematics at impact (Eubanks and Haight, 1992).....	16
Figure 2.5. Distribution of injuries by body segment according to a range of severities (Helmer et al. 2010, quoted by Hu and Klinich, 2012) .....	18
Figure 2.6. Diagram of the safety needs for each phase of an accident .....	18
Figure 2.7. Components of a Pedestrian-CAM system (Eckert et al., 2013) .....	19
Figure 2.8. A stereo sensor configuration (Suard, 2006).....	21
Figure 2.9. Same scene captured using an FIR-NVS (Left) and an NIR-NVS (Right) (Luo et al., 2010) .....	22
Figure 2.10. Data flow diagram of a pedestrian detection system .....	22
Figure 2.11. Patterns of a sensor response (Seiniger et al., 2014).....	25
Figure 2.12. Scoring method assessing Ped-AEB system established in the ASPECSS project (Seiniger et al., 2014) .....	27
Figure 2.13. Pedestrian protection test procedures according to Euro NCAP (top) and to European directive (bottom) (Carhs, 2012).....	30
Figure 3.1. The method Framework .....	33
Figure 3.2. Brake model for the crash reconstruction .....	36
Figure 3.3. Pedestrian speed relative to its age and pace From Huang et al. (2008).....	37
Figure 3.4. Overview of the time and space reconstruction of an accident.....	38
Figure 3.5. Accident data of a case collected from the database of IFSTTAR-LMA .....	41
Figure 3.6. Data from crash reconstruction of the accident case n°1 .....	43
Figure 3.7. Accident data of a case collected from the database of CASR.....	45
Figure 3.8. Data from crash reconstruction of the accident case n°2 .....	47
Figure 3.9. Scheme illustrating a crash representation including an example of CAMS..	49
Figure 3.10. Pedestrian position relative to the vehicle.....	50
Figure 3.11. Illustration of an obstacle masking an on-board sensor's line of sight.....	50
Figure 3.12. Modelling of the emergency steering trajectory .....	52
Figure 3.13. Diagram of the different Ped-CAMS responses.....	54
Figure 4.1. Turning configurations.....	57
Figure 4.2. Distribution of the crash period.....	57
Figure 4.3. Cumulative distribution function of the vehicle's clearance from obstacles...	59
Figure 4.4. Vehicle speed distribution.....	60
Figure 4.5. Comparison between travel speeds and the speed limits .....	60
Figure 4.6. Pedestrian age distribution according to the pace .....	61
Figure 4.7. Pedestrian speed distribution according to the pace .....	61
Figure 4.8. Frequency of injured body regions for pedestrians.....	62
Figure 4.9. Distribution of the injury severity according to the pedestrian age .....	63
Figure 4.10. Description of the configuration of the crash dataset.....	63
Figure 4.11. Distribution of pedestrian position in longitudinal (Top) and lateral (Bottom) .....	64

Figure 4.12. Pedestrian position relatively to the vehicle at different TTC .....	65
Figure 4.13. Image illustrating the effect of sun glare .....	68
Figure 5.1. Space coordinate reference related to vehicle .....	75
Figure 5.2. Pedestrian location at 2.5s before impact.....	76
Figure 5.3. Pedestrian location at 1s before impact.....	78
Figure 5.4. Pedestrian location at the Last Time-To-Brake .....	80
Figure 5.5. Distribution of TTB for the six pedestrian AEB systems .....	82
Figure 5.6. Responses of the six pedestrian AEB systems.....	82
Figure 5.7. Distribution of the impact speed according to the system's reaction .....	83
Figure 5.8. Detection rate at different TTC .....	84
Figure 6.1. Scheme illustrating a stereo vision.....	88
Figure 6.2. Comparison between the current and conventional brake model .....	89
Figure 6.3. Scheme illustrating a crash representation including the active system .....	89
Figure 6.4. Rate of visible pedestrians for each kinematics parameter according to different FOVs.....	91
Figure 6.5. Pedestrian avoidance rate in function of kinematic parameters according to the camera FOV and the vehicle braking .....	93
Figure 6.6. Complementary cumulative frequencies of the avoided accidents in function of the elapsed time from the visibility of the pedestrian to the LTTB for different FOV. 93	93
Figure 6.7. Modelling a pedestrian AEB system.....	95
Figure 6.8. Diagram illustrating the different responses of a Ped-AEB system.....	96
Figure 6.9. Performance of an AEB system with a time horizon of 1.5s, 0.5 s reaction time and a braking deceleration of 8 m/s <sup>2</sup> .....	97
Figure 7.1. Methodology testing the response of AEB systems.....	102
Figure 7.2. Measurement of a front shape vehicle (Serre et al., 2004) .....	104
Figure 7.3. Multibody model of a pedestrian (Serre et al., 2004) .....	104
Figure 7.4. An illustration of the site diagram of the accident and a picture of the involved vehicle.....	106
Figure 7.5. Development of the vehicle multibody system model based on a finite element model .....	106
Figure 7.6. Characteristics for a) the bumper-to-leg contact, b) the leg-leading edge and leg/pelvis-lower bonnet contact c) the bonnet, d) windscreen and (e) A-pillar to head contact.....	107
Figure 7.7. Different pedestrian postures .....	108
Figure 7.8. Configuration of the real accident.....	108
Figure 7.9. Simulation of the pedestrian kinematics at impact for the original accident	109
Figure 7.10. Sequence diagram of the pre-crash scenario of the accident with AEB effect .....	110
Figure 7.11. Configuration of the accident with AEB effect .....	110
Figure 7.12. Pedestrian kinematics at impact for the accident with AEB effect.....	111
Figure 7.13. Configurations of the accidents with and without the AEB effect .....	112
Figure 7.14. Post-impact kinematics of the pedestrian for the accidents with and without AEB effect.....	112
Figure 7.15. Head acceleration signals recorded through the simulation of the accidents with and without AEB effect.....	113

# Tables

Table 2.1. Sources of IHRA pedestrian AIS 2+ injuries by body region for all ages (Mizuno, 2005) .....	17
Table 2.2. ASPECSS test scenario Protocol (Lubbe and Kullgren, 2015).....	26
Table 3.1. Pedestrian speed estimation.....	37
Table 3.2. Components properties required for modelling a pre-crash scenario.....	39
Table 3.3. Components properties required for CAMS modelling .....	48
Table 4.1. Distribution of vehicle type for the French, Australian and all cases of the database .....	59
Table 4.2. Distribution of AIS2+ injuries according to body regions .....	62
Table 5.1. Characteristics of Pedestrian Detection Systems .....	73
Table 5.2. Detection rate at 2.5 sec before impact .....	77
Table 5.3. Detection rate at 1sec before impact .....	78
Table 5.4. Maximum detection rate.....	79
Table 5.5. Detection rate at LTTB.....	81
Table 8.1. Key features of comparable studies related to pedestrian active safety systems .....	119
Table A.1. Listing data of the accident cases from the database of IFSTTAR .....	129
Table A.2. Listing data of the accident cases from the database of CASR.....	131

# Preface

Through common activities shared in the field of pedestrian safety, collaboration has been materialised between two institutes, the French institute of science and technology for transport, development and networks (IFSTTAR) in France, and the University of Adelaide (through its research centre, the Centre for Automotive Safety Research – CASR) in Australia. This collaboration started in 2007 through the framework of the IHRA (International Harmonization Research Activities) that aims to develop standard safety evaluation procedures in vehicle technologies. Based on these events, a Memorandum of Understanding has been signed by both institutes in 2009<sup>1</sup>.

Over the years, IFSTTAR and CASR have been performing common research activities such as comparison of accident investigation methods, accident reconstruction modelling and numerical simulation of pedestrian accidents. Exchange of researchers and students have been realized resulting in effective work and several articles published in common.

This PhD project is a continuation of this collaboration between the two institutes IFSTTAR and CASR. It is enrolled within a "cotutelle agreement" signed between the University of Aix-Marseille and the University of Adelaide. It is performed in cooperation with CASR and two research laboratories of IFSTTAR (the LMA –Accident mechanism laboratory– and the LBA –Applied biomechanics laboratory–).

---

<sup>1</sup> At that time, IFSTTAR was named INRETS. A renewal of the Memorandum of Understanding has been signed in 2013 to extend the duration to 4 years.

# Abstract

The scope of this research concerns pedestrian active safety. Several primary safety systems have been developed for vehicles in order to detect a pedestrian and to avoid an impact. These systems analyse the forward path of the vehicle through the processing of images from sensors. If a pedestrian is identified on the vehicle trajectory, these systems employ emergency braking and some systems may potentially employ emergency steering. Methods for assessing the effectiveness of these systems have been developed. But, it appears difficult to determine the relevance of these systems in terms of pedestrian protection. The general objective of this research was to test the response of these systems in many accident configurations.

The first step consisted of gathering a sample of a hundred of accidents involving vehicles with pedestrians. These accidents were provided from accident databases of two laboratories LMA and CASR. Data of these accidents were recorded in sufficient detail from in-depth investigation which enables reconstructing the trajectory of the vehicle and pedestrian prior to the collision.

The second step was to analyse qualitatively and quantitatively the data of the selected accidents. These accidents were reconstructed to simulate the pre-crash conditions. From this accident reconstruction, factors relevant to the primary safety of pedestrians were deduced.

The next step consisted of coupling the vehicle dynamic behaviour with a primary safety system in order to confront these systems to real accident configurations. The potential of these systems is studied by verifying the feasibility of deploying an autonomous emergency manoeuvre during the timeline of the accident and according to the vehicle dynamic capabilities: i.e. verifying the possibilities in terms of crash avoidance. Based on this procedure, three modelling methods were developed: a first method testing a system to each accident configuration and two others using graphs of evaluation from a parametric study realised on a generic system. The results of the three methods were then discussed.

Finally, as a perspective, the last study will approach crash mitigation. As a consequence of an active safety system response, the vehicle impact speed is reduced. The effect of speed reduction on variations in impact conditions will be then addressed to measure the potential safety impact of these systems on pedestrian protection.

# Abstract in French

Le contexte général de cette recherche concerne la sécurité active des piétons. De nombreux systèmes embarqués dans les véhicules sont actuellement développés afin de détecter un piéton sur la chaussée et d'éviter une collision soit par une manœuvre de freinage d'urgence soit par une manœuvre de déport. La plupart de ces systèmes d'aide à la conduite sont basés sur des systèmes de détection (caméras, radars, etc). Ils analysent la scène en temps réel, puis effectuent un traitement d'images dans le but d'identifier un potentiel danger. Or il apparaît difficile de déterminer la pertinence de ces systèmes en termes de sécurité routière. L'objectif général de ce travail est ainsi d'estimer cette pertinence en confrontant les systèmes à de multiples configurations d'accidents réels.

Une première étape a consisté à sélectionner une centaine de cas d'accidents réels impliquant des piétons percutés par des véhicules motorisés. Ce recueil s'est effectué à la fois dans les laboratoires LMA et CASR. Ces deux laboratoires ont des méthodes similaires d'investigation des accidents de la route. La qualité et la quantité d'information sur chaque accident recueilli permet de récupérer les données nécessaires pour la reconstruction cinématique d'un accident.

Dans une seconde étape, une analyse qualitative et quantitative est réalisée sur l'échantillon d'accidents sélectionnés. Ces accidents ont été par la suite reconstruits cinématiquement modélisant avant impact les trajectoires des véhicules et piétons impliqués. Une analyse de ces reconstructions a permis de dégager les enjeux dans l'espace et dans le temps qui influencent la sécurité primaire du piéton.

L'étape suivante a pour but de tester les systèmes de détection des piétons dans les configurations d'accidents reconstruits en les associant à la cinématique des véhicules. Le test de performance de ces systèmes a été alors réalisé en vérifiant leurs compatibilités au regard de la chronologie des accidents; i.e. vérifier la possibilité d'évitement des accidents. À partir de cette procédure, trois différentes méthodes de modélisation ont été développées : une première méthode évaluant un système pour chaque configuration d'accidents et deux autres méthodes utilisant des graphes tracés à partir d'une étude paramétrique d'un système générique. Ces méthodes ont été par la suite évaluées.

Enfin, une extension de la méthodologie précédemment décrite est proposée comme perspective pour aborder la phase d'impact du piéton contre le véhicule. En conséquence d'un déclenchement d'un système actif, la vitesse d'impact est réduite et donc les conditions du choc sont modifiées. Une méthode a été développée pour étudier les effets de cette réduction de vitesse en analysant les conséquences sur les risques lésionnels du piéton.

# Statement of originality

To the best of my knowledge and belief, this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution that was not mentioned in the agreement signed between the University of Adelaide and the Aix-Marseille Université. It contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed in the following page) resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Hédi HAMDANE

# List of publications

- H. Hamdane, T. Serre, C. Masson and R. Anderson (2016). Relevant factors for active pedestrian safety based on 100 real accident reconstructions. *International Journal of Crashworthiness*, Volume 21 (1), p. 51-62.
- H. Hamdane, T. Serre, C. Masson, R. Anderson (2015). Issues and challenges for pedestrian active safety systems based on real world accidents. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, Volume 82, September 2015, p. 53–60.
- H. Hamdane, T. Serre, R. Anderson, C. Masson and J. Yerpez (2014). Description of pedestrian crashes in accordance with characteristics of Active Safety Systems, *Proceedings of the 2014 IRCOBI conference*, Berlin, Germany, 10-12 September 2014.
- H. Hamdane, T. Serre, R. Anderson and J. Yerpez (2014). Accident simulation and reconstruction for enhancing pedestrian safety: issues and challenges, *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> ESAR conference*, Hannover, Germany, 20-21 June 2014.
- H. Hamdane, R. Anderson, C. Masson, M. Llari and T. Serre (2014). Assessment methodology of Active Pedestrian Safety Systems: an estimation of safety impact, *Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> SIMBIO-M conference*, Marseille, France, 19-20 June 2014.

# Acknowledgement

I would like to thank everyone who has contributed and helped me in achieving this research work:

Thierry Serre, my principal co-supervisor at IFSTTAR-LMA, for giving me the opportunity to carry out this work, for tutoring me and sharing knowledge and expertise in the field of traffic safety.

Robert Anderson, my principal co-supervisor at CASR, at the University of Adelaide, for guidance throughout my research work and for the valuable feedback provided during the writing process of the thesis.

Catherine Masson, my co-supervisor at IFSTTAR-LBA, at the University of Aix-Marseille, for the helpful assistance and support with the writing of my thesis and my papers.

Christophe Perrin, head of the in-depth crash investigation team at IFSTTAR-LMA, and Joël Magnin and Bastien Canu, two other members of this team, for sharing their expertise in the field of crash investigation.

Craig Kloeden, Tori Lindsay, Giulio Ponte and Sam Doecke, Research Fellows at CASR in charge of conducting in-depth crash investigation, for their valuable assistance with the use of data from the CASR crash database.

Andrew van den Berg, Impact Lab Manager at CASR, for his priceless insights about active safety systems.

Paul Hutchinson, Senior Research Fellow at CASR, for the valuable discussions we had about modelling active safety systems.

Thierry Brenac, Research Fellow at IFSTTAR-LMA, for sharing his expertise in the field of traffic safety.

Maxime Llari, Engineer at IFSTTAR-LBA, for always being available to assist me with the Madymo simulations.

Michèle Bidal, Library Assistant at IFSTTAR-LMA, and Jaime Royals, Information Manager at CASR, for their assistance with providing materials for my research.

All the colleagues of CASR for making me feel like home.

The colleagues of IFSTTAR-LMA/LBA for their support.

The PhD students encountered in the three research centres for making the work place more pleasant.

Special thanks to two colleagues/friends for their invaluable support pushing me forward to finish writing the thesis.

Last but not least, my family and my friends for their support.

# List of abbreviations

- ADAS: Advanced Driver Assistance System
- AEB: Autonomous Emergency Braking
- AES: Autonomous Emergency Steering
- AIS: Abbreviated Injury Scale
- CASR: Centre for Automotive Safety Research
- Euro NCAP: European New Car Assessment Program
- FoV: Field of View
- GIDAS: German In-Depth Accident Study
- IFSTTAR-LMA: French institute of science and technology for transport, development and network, Laboratory of accident mechanisms analysis
- LTTB: Last Time To Brake
- TTB: Time-To-Brake
- TTC: Time-To-Collision
- Ped-AEBS: Pedestrian Autonomous Braking System
- Ped-CAMS: Pedestrian Collision Avoidance and Mitigation System
- WAD: Wrap Around Distance