Research to Determine Causes of Aortic Injury in Near-Side Crashes
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Research Objectives

• Define Crash Characteristics Causing Aortic Injury
• Determine Aortic Injury Mechanisms
• Recommend Injury Criteria
• Recommend Critical Test Procedures and Test Dummies
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Typical Cases with Aortic Injuries

Cases from the William Lehman Injury Research Center (WLIRC)
14 MPH - FATALITY

• Driver, 62 Y/O Male
• 68” Tall; 174 Lbs
• 10 O’clock
• 13” Max Crush
• Injuries:
  AIS-6 Aorta
  AIS-5 Rib/Lung
  AIS-4 Lower X
• Alert on Scene

Case Vehicle - 1990 Lexus 250
Bullet Vehicle - 1983 Olds Cutlass

Case 96-008S
19 MPH - NON FATAL

• Driver 49 Y/O Female
• 67” Tall; 240 Lbs.
• 10 O’clock
• 20” Max Crush
• Injuries:
  AIS-5 Aorta
  AIS-4 Rib
• Alert on Scene

Case Vehicle - 1987 Buick Park Ave.
Bullet Vehicle - 1992 Lincoln Continental

Case 97-003S
21 MPH CRASH - FATALITY

• Driver
• 27 Y/O Male
• 69” Tall; 164 Lbs
• 11 O’clock
• 19” Max Crush
• Injuries:
  AIS-6 Aorta
  No Serious Rib Fx

Case Vehicle - 1985 Nissan Sentra
Bullet Vehicle- 1987 Dodge Caravan

Case 97-024S
Significance of AIS 4+ Aortic Injury

- Occur in low severity near-side crashes
- Frequently occult (no physiological cues)
- Frequently fatal
- Usually complete recovery when successfully treated
Significance of AIS 4+ Aortic Injury

- **NASS**
  - 2964 per year
  - 26% in near-side crashes
  - Most frequent AIS 6
  - 88% Fatal

- **WLIRC**
  - 12 Cases per year
  - 85% Fatal in near-side
  - 50% Alive on-scene - potentially survivable
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WLIRC/GW Aortic Injury Research

Individual CIREN Cases ➔ Documented Crashes & Injuries ➔ Studies of Aortic Injuries

![Vehicle crash scene and medical images of aortic injury](image-url)
WLIRC/GW
Aortic Injury Research

CIREN + NASS Data

Individual CIREN Cases

CIREN + NASS Data

Documented Crashes & Injuries

Studies of Aortic Injuries

Regression Analysis

Regression Analysis

Regression Variables

Regression Variables

Injury Patterns Crash Patterns

Simulation Conditions

Computer Reconstruction
- Vehicle Dynamic Model
- Vehicle FEM Model
- Occupant Model
- Human Aorta Model

Critical Crash Conditions
Injury Mechanisms & Criteria
Test Conditions & Countermeasures

Vehicle Crash Tests

Cadaver Tests

Model Validation and Assessment

Regression Variables

Cadmaver Tests
Computer Modeling

Typical Crashes with Aortic Injury

Crash Reconstruction - Vehicle Dynamics Model (HVE)

Crash Direction & Pulse

Vehicle Structural Model (Neon FEM)

Intrusion and Acceleration Environment

Occupant Model (MADYMO)

Occupant Response & Injury Measures

Human Organ Model – (Chest/Aorta FEM)

Injury Measures vs. Critical Strain
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Results of CIREN Case Analysis

Significant Variables in Near Side Crashes:
- Intrusion
- Age
- Y Damage Pattern

Typical Vehicle Damage  Y Damage Location
Data for Regression Analysis

- WLIRC + CIREN + NASS-CDS 1997-2000
- Front seat occupants only
- Case occupant sitting on the struck side of the vehicle
- Vehicle was struck by another vehicle, not a fixed object

- 679 total occupants
- 58 occupants with aortic injury
## Results of Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>≤0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta-v</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusion</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>≤ 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Damage Location</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Crash Reconstruction
HVE Model

- Determined Crash Pulse & Direction for Y-damage
- Velocity of Struck Vehicle Not a Predominate Factor
- Simulation of Stationary Struck Vehicle is OK
The Next Step:

• Compare 214 (or SNCAP) Test with Y-damage Crash
Crash Reconstruction

Neon FEM Model

214/SINCAP

Y-Damage

Purpose: Determine Differences in Acceleration and Intrusion Time History
Door Intrusion from FEM Model
Front View

214/SINCAP

Y-Damage
For Y-damage:
- Intrusion starts in the front part of the door
- Intrusion is more uniform along the height of the door
MADYMO Human Model Response
Y-Damage Pattern

- Thorax is impacted by a force component from the front
- Head z acceleration increased – more spinal stretching
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Y-Damage Crash Test

Conducted May 8, 2003
By GW University, NCAC
At FHWA Test Facility
McLean Va.
Y- Damage Test

Chevy S-10 Pickup into Ford Taurus at 30 mph
Y Damage Crash and Test

Real Crash With Aortic Injury

Y- Damage Crash Test
Door Intrsion Measurements by String Pots
Door Intrusion vs. Time

-250 -200 -150 -100 -50 0 50

Intrusion, mm.
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Time, Seconds

Pot 18 Top Rear Door
Pot 19 Top Middle Door
Pot 20 Top Front
Pot 21 Bottom Front Door
Pot 22 Bottom B-Pillar
Door Intrusion vs. Time

Intrusion, mm.

Pot 18 Top Rear Door
Pot 19 Top Middle Door
Pot 20 Top Front
Pot 21 Bottom Front Door
Pot 22 Bottom B-Pillar

Static Intrusion
Test Results – Y Damage Crash

• Static and dynamic displacement determined
• Time history of door displacement available for model validation
• Model predictions of door displacement confirmed
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Summary of Findings - Triage

• Predictors of aortic injury in all near-side crashes include
  – age,
  – delta-v
  – greater than 6” of door intrusion

• For non-catastrophic crashes:
  – damage beginning forward of the A-pillar
    and extending into the occupant compartment
  – 2.4 times more likely to result in aortic tear
Summary of Findings - Critical Test Conditions

- **Y-damage** most likely to produce injury
- Loading of the thorax that produces **longitudinal** components in addition to **lateral** may contribute to aortic injury
- Y-Damage results in **higher axial head acceleration** indicating higher spinal stretching
- **Intrusion timing** is later than in SINCAP
NHTSA’s current side impact regulation and testing program may not address the issue of aortic injury

- 214 crash configuration produces less lateral and longitudinal loading to the chest than Y-damage crash
- Current side impact dummies unable to measure multidirectional chest compression
Summary of Findings – Injury Criteria

- Based on limited cadaver tests, $V^*C$ was best injury criteria.
- Conditions that produced aortic injury in cadavers unclear.
- Injury criteria needs to be verified by FEM modeling.
Future Work – Wayne State Model of Aorta

- Examine effects of near-side crash characteristics on loading locally at the aorta
The Next Steps

• Validate Wayne State aortic model
• Validate FEM & MADYMO Models for Y-damage
• Apply above to reconstruct crashes with aortic injuries
• Compare critical aorta stress with dummy injury measures
• Recommend critical tests and injury criteria