



THE UNIVERSITY  
*of* ADELAIDE

CENTRE FOR AUTOMOTIVE  
SAFETY RESEARCH

# Alternative injury response functions for evaluating head accelerations, with application to pedestrian headform testing

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
at  
The University of Adelaide  
Centre for Automotive Safety Research

by  
Jeffrey Kym Dutschke

June 2012

---

# Contents

---

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>Declaration</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction . . . . .	2
1.2 Safety testing . . . . .	3
1.2.1 Purpose of safety testing . . . . .	3
1.2.2 Properties of a test protocol . . . . .	4
Test conditions in the ANCAP head impact test . . . . .	4
Biofidelic surrogate . . . . .	5
1.3 Head injury . . . . .	6
1.3.1 Types and prevalence of head injury . . . . .	6
1.3.2 Measuring impacts that lead to head injury . . . . .	8
1.4 Injury Response Functions (IRFs) . . . . .	9
The Head Injury Criterion . . . . .	10
Other IRFs . . . . .	11
1.5 Consequences of safety testing . . . . .	12
1.6 Comparison of the IRFs . . . . .	13
1.6.1 Theoretical evaluation of the IRFs . . . . .	13
Effect of impact velocity and stopping distance . . . . .	13
Coefficient of restitution . . . . .	14
Effect of pulse shape . . . . .	14
1.6.2 Comparison of practical testing data . . . . .	15
1.7 Aims of the thesis . . . . .	15
1.8 Organisation of the thesis . . . . .	16
1.8.1 Preparatory information – Chapters 2 and 3 . . . . .	16
1.8.2 Theoretical pulse shape analysis – Chapters 4 and 5 . . . . .	17
Normalisation of the theoretical pulse shapes . . . . .	17

Comparison of the value of each IRF with each theoretical pulse shape . . . . .	18
Effect of impact velocity, headform stopping distance and coefficient of restitution . . . . .	18
1.8.3 Empirical pulse shape analysis – Chapters 6 and 7 . . .	19
Correlation of the data . . . . .	19
Effect of the threshold . . . . .	20
Comparison with rank correlation . . . . .	20
Investigation of pulse shapes with discrepant rankings . . . . .	20
1.8.4 Concluding chapter – Chapter 8 . . . . .	21
1.9 Limitations of the thesis . . . . .	21
<b>2 Injury Response Functions</b>	<b>23</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	24
2.1.1 Wayne State Tolerance Curve . . . . .	24
2.2 Injury Response Functions used in this thesis . . . . .	26
2.2.1 Head Injury Criterion . . . . .	26
2.2.2 3 millisecond clip . . . . .	27
2.2.3 Peak Acceleration . . . . .	28
2.2.4 Peak Virtual Power . . . . .	29
2.3 Injury Response Functions not examined in this thesis . . . . .	31
2.3.1 IRFs based on rotational acceleration . . . . .	31
Hybrid linear and angular acceleration IRFs . . . . .	32
2.3.2 IRFs based on finite element models . . . . .	33
2.3.3 IRFs based on lumped parameter models . . . . .	33
2.4 Concluding remarks . . . . .	34
<b>3 Data</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1 Introduction . . . . .	36
3.2 Test methods . . . . .	40
3.2.1 Apparatus . . . . .	40
The headforms . . . . .	40
Accelerometers . . . . .	42
Data Acquisition . . . . .	42
Firing Apparatus . . . . .	42
3.2.2 Test Procedure . . . . .	44
Test conditions . . . . .	44
Motion of the headform during free flight . . . . .	45
Normal impact velocity . . . . .	46
Acceleration . . . . .	47
3.3 Distributions of measured data . . . . .	47
3.3.1 Impact Speed . . . . .	47
3.3.2 Impact angle . . . . .	48
3.3.3 Impact velocity normal to the surface . . . . .	49

3.4	Retrospective Analysis . . . . .	51
3.4.1	Rotational dynamics of the headform . . . . .	51
3.4.2	Estimation of maximum stopping distance . . . . .	56
	Calculation of deformation for the example test . . . . .	56
3.4.3	Estimation of coefficient of restitution . . . . .	56
3.5	Distributions of estimated data . . . . .	58
3.5.1	Stopping distance . . . . .	58
3.5.2	Coefficient of restitution . . . . .	60
3.6	Evaluation of each IRF . . . . .	61
3.6.1	HIC . . . . .	61
3.6.2	PVP . . . . .	63
3.6.3	3 millisecond clip . . . . .	63
3.6.4	Peak acceleration . . . . .	63
3.7	Descriptions of pulse shape . . . . .	66
3.7.1	Front and rear loaded pulse shapes . . . . .	66
3.7.2	Peaked and flat pulse shapes . . . . .	67
3.7.3	Pulse shapes with multiple peaks . . . . .	67
3.8	Summary and discussion . . . . .	70
<b>4</b>	<b>The effect of a particular IRF on design decisions: analysis with theoretical test pulses</b>	<b>71</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	72
4.2	Pulse shapes used for analysis and a strategy for normalisation	74
4.2.1	Pulse shapes . . . . .	74
4.2.2	Normalising these pulse shapes . . . . .	74
	Normalisation parameter — impact velocity . . . . .	76
	Normalisation parameter — stopping distance . . . . .	78
4.3	Normalisation – no restitution . . . . .	79
	Analytical values for impact velocity . . . . .	79
	Analytical values for stopping distance . . . . .	80
4.3.1	The normalisation of pulse shapes that produce no rebound . . . . .	80
4.4	Normalisation of pulse shapes with rebound . . . . .	82
	Expressions for impact velocity in terms of $A$ , $T$ , and $R$	84
	Expressions for stopping distance in terms of $A$ , $T$ , and $R$ . . . . .	85
4.4.1	The normalisation of pulse shapes for impacts with non-zero restitution . . . . .	90
4.5	The value of each IRF for each analytical pulse shape . . . . .	95
4.5.1	HIC . . . . .	95
4.5.2	PVP . . . . .	95
	Half-sine pulse . . . . .	96
	Triangular pulse . . . . .	96
	Square pulse . . . . .	97

4.5.3	Peak acceleration . . . . .	98
4.5.4	3 millisecond clip . . . . .	98
	Half-sine pulse . . . . .	99
	Triangular pulse . . . . .	99
	Square pulse . . . . .	99
4.5.5	Summary of analytical values of each IRF . . . . .	100
4.6	Evaluation of each IRF for the normalised pulse shapes . . . . .	100
4.6.1	HIC . . . . .	101
4.6.2	PVP . . . . .	103
4.6.3	Peak acceleration . . . . .	105
4.6.4	3 millisecond clip . . . . .	107
4.6.5	Combining the results . . . . .	111
4.7	Effect of IRF on design outcomes . . . . .	111
<b>5</b>	<b>Relating each IRF to impact velocity, stopping distance, coefficient of restitution and pulse shape</b>	<b>115</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	116
5.2	Theory . . . . .	117
5.2.1	Effect of impact velocity and stopping distance on value of each IRF . . . . .	117
5.2.2	Effect of a coefficient of restitution on the value of each IRF . . . . .	119
	Effect of a coefficient of restitution for the square pulse shape . . . . .	119
	General expression for each IRF for the square pulse shape . . . . .	120
	General expression for each IRF for half-sine and triangle pulse shapes . . . . .	121
	Estimating the effect of the coefficient of restitution . . . . .	122
	Estimating the effect of pulse shape . . . . .	122
5.2.3	A general expression for each IRF suitable for linear regression . . . . .	128
5.3	Data used in the linear regression . . . . .	129
	Impact velocity . . . . .	129
	Headform stopping distance . . . . .	130
	Coefficient of restitution . . . . .	130
5.4	Linear regression of test data for each IRF . . . . .	130
5.4.1	HIC . . . . .	131
	Difference between the predicted and obtained regression coefficients . . . . .	131
	Differences between headforms . . . . .	133
	Magnitude of the effect of the pulse shapes in the test data . . . . .	133
	Independent effect of each regressor . . . . .	135

5.4.2	PVP . . . . .	137
5.4.3	Peak acceleration . . . . .	140
5.4.4	3 millisecond clip . . . . .	142
5.5	Discussion . . . . .	145
5.5.1	Interpretation of the coefficients predicted with the theory and obtained from the regression . . . . .	146
5.5.2	Context . . . . .	148
<b>6</b>	<b>Quantification of the similarities between four IRFs</b>	<b>149</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	150
6.2	Comparison among IRFs using test data . . . . .	150
6.3	Dichotomous classification of tests into ‘safe’ and ‘unsafe’ cat- egories using criteria formed with each IRF. . . . .	153
6.3.1	Definition of a conservative criterion . . . . .	155
6.3.2	Conservative criteria compared with $HIC > 1000$ . . . . .	156
6.4	Comparison among IRFs using ranked test data . . . . .	159
6.5	Comparison among IRFs using the ranked contribution of pulse shape to the IRF value of each test . . . . .	166
6.5.1	Rank correlation of stopping distance with pulse shape coefficient . . . . .	168
6.5.2	Rank correlation of pulse shape coefficients with IRF values . . . . .	170
6.5.3	Rank correlation among the pulse shape coefficients for each IRF . . . . .	172
6.6	Discussion . . . . .	175
<b>7</b>	<b>Examination of discrepant pulse shapes in the test data</b>	<b>177</b>
7.1	Introduction . . . . .	178
7.2	Identifying the tests with the most discrepant ranks of pulse shape coefficients . . . . .	179
7.3	Analysis of the discrepant pulse shapes between $HIC$ and 3 millisecond clip . . . . .	180
7.3.1	Tests with a higher $\mathbb{P}_{HIC}$ rank than $\mathbb{P}_{a_3}$ rank . . . . .	180
	Tests with a narrow acceleration peak . . . . .	181
	Tests with a double peak in acceleration . . . . .	188
7.3.2	Tests with a lower $\mathbb{P}_{HIC}$ rank than $\mathbb{P}_{a_3}$ rank . . . . .	188
7.3.3	Analysis of the pulse shapes that are discrepant be- tween $\mathbb{P}_{HIC}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{a_3}$ . . . . .	192
7.4	Analysis of the discrepant pulse shapes between $HIC$ and PVP	194
7.4.1	Tests with a higher $\mathbb{P}_{PVP}$ rank than $\mathbb{P}_{HIC}$ rank . . . . .	194
	Pulse shapes with a late acceleration pulse . . . . .	199
	Tests with a late rise in the acceleration . . . . .	199
7.4.2	Tests with a higher $\mathbb{P}_{HIC}$ rank than $\mathbb{P}_{PVP}$ rank . . . . .	200
7.4.3	Analysis of the differences between $HIC_\infty$ and PVP . . . . .	203

7.5	Analysis of the discrepant pulse shapes between HIC and peak acceleration . . . . .	204
7.5.1	Tests with a higher $\mathbb{P}_{\text{HIC}}$ rank than $\mathbb{P}_{a_m}$ rank . . . . .	204
7.5.2	Tests with a lower $\mathbb{P}_{\text{HIC}}$ rank than $\mathbb{P}_{a_m}$ rank . . . . .	206
7.5.3	Analysis of the differences between HIC and peak acceleration . . . . .	212
7.6	Summary . . . . .	213
<b>8</b>	<b>Discussion, recommendations and conclusions</b>	<b>217</b>
8.1	Summary . . . . .	218
8.1.1	Theoretical examination of each IRF . . . . .	220
8.1.2	Effect of impact velocity, stopping distance and coefficient of restitution . . . . .	222
8.1.3	Effect of the IRF on the testing result . . . . .	224
	Linear correlation . . . . .	225
	‘Safe’ and ‘unsafe’ classification . . . . .	225
	Rank correlation . . . . .	227
	Rank correlation of pulse shape coefficients . . . . .	227
8.1.4	Comparison of individual discrepant tests . . . . .	227
8.2	Discussion . . . . .	229
8.2.1	Macroscopic view of the trends . . . . .	229
8.2.2	Microscopic view of the detail . . . . .	230
	Influence of the differences . . . . .	231
8.2.3	Other factors to consider . . . . .	231
	Choice of a threshold . . . . .	231
	Choice of the physical testing parameters . . . . .	232
8.2.4	Summary . . . . .	233
8.3	Discussion of the limitations and future work . . . . .	234
8.4	Importance of this thesis for various stakeholders . . . . .	235
	Regulatory and consumer testing organisations . . . . .	235
	Design engineers . . . . .	236
	Members of the public . . . . .	236
8.5	Conclusion . . . . .	236
<b>A</b>	<b>Test results</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Realistic pulse shapes</b>	<b>263</b>
B.1	Deformation at the end of the impact is less than zero . . . . .	263
B.2	Peak acceleration occurs before time of maximum stopping distance. . . . .	266
<b>C</b>	<b>Assumption that <math>\text{HIC}_\infty</math> and <math>\text{HIC}_{15}</math> are the same</b>	<b>269</b>

<b>D Comparison between rotational acceleration and linear acceleration based IRFs</b>	<b>275</b>
D.1 Peak rotational acceleration . . . . .	276
D.2 Peak change in rotational velocity . . . . .	279
D.3 Discussion . . . . .	279
<b>E Comparison of the PVP and HIP</b>	<b>283</b>
<b>F Contingency tables</b>	<b>289</b>
F.1 HIC with PVP . . . . .	290
F.2 HIC with 3 millisecond clip . . . . .	292
F.3 HIC with peak acceleration . . . . .	294
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>296</b>



---

## Abstract

---

Impact testing of vehicles and helmets is performed under the specifications of a test protocol to ensure that regulatory standards and community expectations are met in terms of head injury safety. Impact severity is usually measured using the acceleration of the impactor (or dummy head) that is recorded during the impact. A specification that is defined in these testing protocols is the injury response function (IRF) that is used to summarise the magnitude of the recorded acceleration. There are various IRFs that can be chosen to summarise the acceleration data. This thesis examines several of these IRFs that are based on linear acceleration. The aim was to describe the differences between the IRFs and examine what differences might arise in the designs in response to the requirements of the IRF. There has historically been disagreement on the best way to assess injury risk, but the debate is only important to the extent that the design requirements are affected by the choice of IRF.

Four IRFs were examined in detail. These were the Head Injury Criterion (HIC), the Peak Virtual Power (PVP), the 3 millisecond clip ( $a_3$ ) and the peak acceleration ( $a_m$ ).

Simple acceleration pulse shapes were used to determine some of the properties of each of the IRFs. These included the role of the pulse shape, the stopping distance, the impact velocity and the coefficient of restitution on the value of each of the IRFs. The effect of the pulse shape on the value of the IRFs was examined using these simple pulse shapes that had been normalised for a constant impact velocity and stopping distance.

Equations predicting the value of each IRF were then derived that used the

---

stopping distance, the impact velocity and the coefficient of restitution as predictors.

The properties found using the simple pulse shapes were then examined using the real test data that included 247 tests obtained from a pedestrian testing protocol. The predictions of the equation for each IRF were compared to the test data using a linear regression. The remaining variation in the value of each IRF was attributed to the effect of the pulse shape.

In most cases, the measured relative severities of the impacts were not greatly affected by the choice of IRF, but there were some discrepancies. The characteristics of the pulse shapes that gave rise to these discrepancies were identified. These were identified by subtracting the effect of the stopping distance, the impact velocity and the coefficient of restitution from the value of the IRF for each test to determine an adjusted IRF value for each test. These adjusted IRF values were ranked and compared to determine the discrepant tests.

Differences in the magnitude of the effect of the pulse shape, the maximum stopping distance, the impact velocity and the coefficient of restitution on the value of each of the IRFs were found theoretically and these were verified in the experimental data.

The effect of the choice of threshold on determining the tests that were considered 'safe' and 'unsafe' was also examined. Sensitivity and Negative Predictive Value were used to determine thresholds that were conservative compared with  $HIC > 1000$ . The effect of the threshold was shown to be a very important parameter in a testing protocol.

It is concluded that there are some differences between the IRFs that were examined in detail. However, in general, the choice of IRF does not appear to greatly affect the ultimate design of crashworthy structures.

---

## Declaration

---

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 to Jeffrey K Dutschke and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, 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.

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, and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Jeffrey Dutschke  
June 2012

---

---

## Acknowledgments

---

I thank my supervisors Associate Professors Robert Anderson and Paul Hutchinson. Their encouragement for me to begin, change, persist with, and finish this thesis has been deeply appreciated. They are at this end of a long line of teachers I have had and to whom I am deeply indebted.

Thank you to Doctor Daniel Searson for his contributions to my working. Daniel shared his method and code for calculating the kinematics of the headform impacts described in Searson and Anderson (2008) with me and engaging in several enlightening discussions covering the various the topics of this thesis.

My thanks to the staff and students at CASR. I have appreciated your efforts in helping me to learn about academic research and road safety. In particular, Andrew van den Berg, Giulio Ponte, Daniel Searson and the others involved in performing the ANCAP pedestrian testing at the Centre for Automotive Safety Research impact lab. It was this data that I used in this thesis. Also to the Phd boys for their friendship and academic support.

Lastly, Mum, Dad and Amy. Thank you for your encouragement, support, assistance and love. You will be pleased to hear that I have submitted.