U.S. DEPARYMENT OF COMMERCE National Technical Information Service

AD-A025 735

A PREDICTION OF RESPONSE OF THE HEAD AND NECK OF THE U.S. ADULT MILITARY POPULATION TO DYNAMIC IMPACT ACCELERATION FROM SELECTED DYNAMIC TEST SUBJECTS

\_\_\_\_\_

MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

PREPARED FOR OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

May 1976

175178

UM-HSRI-76-10

12 Month Technical Report NR 105-832

AD 1025785

A Prediction of Response of the Head and Neck of the U.S. Adult Military Population to Dynamic Impact Acceleration from Selected Dynamic Test Subjects

L. W. Schneider B. M. Bowman R. G. Snyder L. S. Peck

May 1976

Providence of the second

ういていたいのかのうちょうろう

Prepared for: Office of Naval Research Department of the Navy Arlington, Virginia 22217 Contract no,. N00014-75-1077

> NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE SPEINGFIELD, VA. 22161

Highway Safety Research Institute/University of Michigan

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Deta Entered)

1

REPORT DOCUMENTATION	PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
I REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3 RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
<ul> <li>A Prediction of Response of the He the Adult Military Population to E</li> </ul>	ad and Neck of Dynamic Impact	5 TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED 12 Month technical report April 1975 to April 1976
Acceleration.		S PERFORMING ONG. REPORT NUMBER
AUTHON(2) L. H. Schneider, B. M. Bowman, R. L. S. Peck	G. Snyder,	S. CONTRACT OR SRANT NUMBER(+)
<ul> <li>PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ACOMESS Highway Safety Research Institute University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109</li> </ul>		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research Biomedical Modical Sciences Division	icion	12 REPORT DATE May 1976
Arlington, Virginia 22217	15100	13 RUMBER OF PAGES
14 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS/II differen	t from Controlling Offico;	18 SECURITY CLASS (of this report) Unclassified
		154. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISYRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		) 
Distribution of this report is un	limited.	TL TL TRANCENT F
IS. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WONDS (Continue on reverse elde li necessary on Dynamic Response of Head and Neck Physical Characteristics of Head Mathematical Model Simulation Parameter Correlation	d Identify by block number; and Neck	,
20. ABSTRACT (Combine on rivered under it mecuatory and Physical characteristics of Navy volunteers who had previousl facility at Michoud Station, New anthropometric measures, 32 anthr three dimensional head and neck r times in response to head jerks,	the head and nec y undergone test Orleans. Measur opomet.ic measur ange of motion, and neck muscle	k were measured on 18 male ing on the NAMRL sled ements include 55 standard es of the seated subject, neck muscle reflex voluntary isometric
DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EPITION OF 1 NOV 65 15 OBSOL L/N 0102-014-6601	ETE U	NCLASSIFIEd ISSIFICATION OF TH'S PAGE (Then Date Entered

. 0

岸

strength. These latter measurements were taken in both the sagittal and lateral planes.

Measurement results were used to establish parameter values for the MVMA-2D Crash Victim Simulator data set in an attempt to reproduce the dynamic response of these volunteers to  $-G_X$  sled acceleration at 6 and 15 G's. Procedures used for computing the various parameter values and comparisons between predicted and experimental results are presented. In addition, measurement data for 18-24 year females taken previously have been utilized to predict the dynamic response that would be expected if these subjects were tested at 6 and 15 G's.

Further work in studying the significance and relation of various physiological and biomechanical parameters and of stimulus and experimental test conditions to the dynamic response is planned using both modeling and correlation techniques. Measurement data for other segments of the adult population will be used to extend the NAMRL results to the general adult occupant population.



An and the second s

CFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH CONTRACT NOOO14-75-C-1077 Task No. NR 105-832 Technical Report No. 1

A PREDICTION OF RESPONSE OF THE LEAD AND NECK OF THE U. S. ADULT MILITARY POPULATION TO DYNAMIC IMPACT ACCELERATION FROM SELECTED DYNAMIC TEST SUBJECTS

Χ.

10.00

히

¥.

) and

đ

100

4

Test man.

by

L.W. Schneider B.M. Bowman R.G. Snyder L.S. Peck

Highway Safety Research Institute The University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

May 1976

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government,

Distribution of this Report is Unlimit d

ib

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The resparch work reported on herein was supported by the Office of Naval Research, Medical and Dental Division and was conducted with the cooperation and supervision of the Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory (NAMRL), Michoud Station, New Orleans.

The authors would like to acknowledge the professional assistance and advice offered during the past year by Dr. Channing L. Ewing, Dr. Daniel J. Thomas, and Mr. Leonard Lustick of NAMRL and of Dr. Hurley Robbins, Head, Biomathematics Department, HSRI and Dr. Don Chaffin, Professor of Industrial Engineering, The University of Michigan. The authors are also grateful for the professional assistance of Dr. Herbert M. Reynolds, physical anthropologist, HSRI, who took the anthropometry measurements, for the time and effort of those personnel at NAMRL involved with the preparation of the experimental data, and for the expert and unique talents of Dan Golomb, programming analyst, who performed all of the computer programming for data handling and graphical displays of results used in this study and report.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

De

ACIENCIA	LEDGEMENTS	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	i
LIST O	P TABLES	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	vii
LIST C	P PIQUES	••••••	ix
SUMMAR	¥	••••••	1
CEAPTE	RS		
1.	INTROPUCTION AND	OBJECTIVES	3
	A. Statement of	Project Goal	3
	B. Background	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	3
	C. Objectives	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	7
2.	MEASUREMENT OF PH	INSIGAL CHARACTERISTICS	11
	A. General	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	11
	B. Anthropometry 1. Methods . 2. Results .	,	14 14 14
	C. Range of Moti 1. Methods . 2. Results .	on	19 19 21
	D. Reflex Times 1. Methods . a. Refle b. Stren 2. Results .	and Strength	23 23 23 26 28
	E. Comparison of Results 1. Anthropom 2. Range of 3. Reflex Ti	Measurement Results with IIRS Study Metry Motion mes and Muscle Strength	29 29 29 32
3.	COMPUTER SIMUL	ATIONS OF NAMEL SLED TESTS	34
	A. The MVMA-2	D Crash/Victim Simulator	34

à,

÷

1.317

				Page
	В.	Dete	ermination of Model Parameters	36
		1.	Segment Specifications	37
			a. Torso and Extremities	37
			b. Head and Neck Mass and Moment of	
			Inertia	42
			c. Neck Length and Location of Head c.g	43
		2.	Head and Neck Range of Motion	44
		3.	Passive Joint Torques and Joint Stops	47
		4.	Neck Muscle Model	49
		5.	Neck Stretch and Compression Parameters	55
		б.	Neck and Head Initial Angles	56
		7.	Restraint System	56
			a. Lap Belt	5 <b>6</b>
			b. Upper and Middle Torso Belts	57
			c. Chest Compliance	57
			•	
	c.	NAMH	L Simulations	61
		1.	General	61
		2.	Results Using T <sub>1</sub> Acceleration Input	62
			a. General	62
			b. Effects of Muscle Tension	67
		3.	Results with Sled Acceleration Input and	
		÷.	Restraint System	72
			a. General	72
			b. Neck Forces and Torques	81
			c. Belt Forces	84
			d. Effect of Increasing Joint Stop	
			Stiffness	84
			e. Effect of Chest Compliance	84
			f. Effect of Reducing Condyle Joint Stop	
			Stiffness in Extension	90
			g. Effect of Adding Upper Torso Flexion	101
			j	
4.	SIM	ILATI	CONS FOR 18-24 YEAR FEMALES	105
	А.	18-2	24 Year Female Data Set	105
		1.	Segment Specifications	105
			a. Torso and Extremities	105
			b. Head and Neck Mass and Moment of	
			Inertia	106
			c. Neck Length and Location of Head Center	
			of Gravity	106
		2.	Head and Neck Range of Motion	107
		3.	Passive Joint Torques and Joint Stops	107
		4.	Neck Muscle Parameters	108
		5.	Neck Stretch and Compression Parameters	109
		6.	Head and Neck Initial Angles	109
		7.	Restraint System and Chest Compliance	109
	в.	Sim	ulations for 18-24 Year Females	110

10

1

-

÷

¢

1.10

4

**.**,

48

THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O

ALC: NOT STATE

19001233

		Page
5. DISCU	USSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	119
REPERENCES		123
APPENDIX A	CROSS REFERENCE TABLES FOR MEASUREME CODE NAMES	2NT 127
APPENDIX B	MEASUREMENT RESULTS BY SUBJECT	133
APPENDIX C	EXPERIMENTAL SLED TEST RESULTS	153

.

23. 5. 5.

ي به د

> • •

> > ٩.

.

\*\*\*\* 4 :

. \*

'n

ń.

**er**5 (

÷

.

.

•

\$

•

5.16

. . .

.....

## LIST OF TABLES

d Ka

ė

\$

Table No.	Title	Page
2.1	HSRI and NAMRL Subject Numbers	13
2.2	Anthropometry Statistics	16,17
2.3	Three Space Coordinates for Upper Torso and Head Landmarks	18
2.4	Sequence of Range-of-Motion Positions	20
2.5	Range-of-Motion Statistics	22
2.6	Average Euler Angles for 18 NAMRL Subjects	24
2.7	Reflex Time and Strength Statistics	28
2.8	Comparison of NAMRL and IIHS Study Range-of-Motion Results	30
2.9	Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations of Range-of-Motion Results for NAMRL Subjects and 18-24 Year Males from IIES Study	31
2.10	Comparison of NAMRL and IIHS Study Reflex Time and Strength Results	33
3.1	Selected Measurements for 5 NAMRL Subjects	38,39
3.2	Selected Measurement Statistics for 5 Navy Subjects	40
3.3	Torso and E~tremity Segment Specifica- tions for NAMRL Data Set	42
3.4	Muscle Parameter Values Used in NAMRL Simulations	53
4.1	Torso and Extremity Segment Specifica- tions for 18-24 Year Pemale Data Set	106
4.2	Suscle Parameter Vallas Nged in 18-24 Year Female Data Suc	109
A.1	Anthropometry Code Name Cross Reference	128-129

STATISTICS.

6.6

.

101

## LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

•

•

أترتك

,

\$

ć

ø.

•

Table No.	Title	Page
λ.2	Upper Torso and Head Landmark Code Name Cross-Reference	130
λ.3	Range-of-Motion Code Name Cross Reference	131
λ.4	Reflex Times and Strength Code Name Cross Reference	132
B.1	Anthropometry by Subject	134-143
B.2	Three-Space Locations of Upper Torso and Head Landmarks by Subject	144-14ŏ
B.3	Range-of-Motion Angles by Subject	147-150
B.4	Reflex Time and Voluntary Strength Results by Subject	151, 152

viii

### LIST OF FIGURES

Ξ.

.

ń

.

•

.

ę

. 🕯

•

1

•

Figure No.	Title	Page
2.1	Anthropometry Measurements	15
2.2	NAMRL Subject Performing Range-of- Motion Testing	19
2.3	Euler Angle Reference Frame and Angle Directions	21
2.4	NAMRL Subject Ready for Sagittal Reflex Time Test	23
2.5	Typical EMG and Acceleration Signals in Response to Reflex Test Weight Prop	26
2.6	NAMRL Subject Performing Isometric Strength Testing in Flexion (Top), Extension (Middle), and Lateral Bending (Bottom)	27
2.7	Typical EMG and Force Results from Isometric Strength Tests	28
3.1	MVMA-2D Simulated Sled-Test Subject Snowing Approximate Body Segment Lengths and Ellipses, Centers of Masses, and Joint Locations.	35
3.2	Range-of-Motion "Stop" Angles Used in Crash Victim Simulator.	44
3.3	Muscle Element	49
3.4	Simplified Free-Body Diagram of Head and Neck Showing Major Forces Involved During Isometric Strength Testing	50
3.5	Front and Side Photographs of NAMRL Subject in Sled Chair Showing Restraint System	58
3.6	MVMA-2D Simulated Occupant Showing Simulated Restraint System Con- figuration	59

## LIST OF FIGURES (CONTINUED)

Figure No.	Title	Page
3.7	Force C dection Specifications for Upper Jorso Belts	60
3.8	Averaged Experimental T <sub>1</sub> Accelerations from Five NAMRL Subjects at 6 G's	63
3.9	Averaged Experimental $T_1$ Accelerations from Five NAMRL Subjects at 15 G's	64
3.10	Simulation Results Using 6 G T Accelerations - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum	65
3.11	Simulation Results Using 15 G T <sub>1</sub> Accelerations - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum	66
3.12	Simulation Results Using 6 G $T_1$ Accelerations - Muscle Tension = 0% Maximum	68
3.13	Simulation Results Using 6 G T <sub>:</sub> Accelerations - Muscle Tension = 100% Maximum	69
3.14	Simulation Results Using 15 G T <sub>1</sub> Accelerations - Muscle Tension = 0% Maximum	70
3.15	Simulation Results Using 15 G T <sub>i</sub> Accelerations - Muscle Tension = 100% Maximum	71
3.16	6 and 15 G Sled Acceleration Profiles	73
3.17	Simulation Results for 15 G Sled Acceleration - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum, Chest Compliance = 1750 N/cm	75-77
3.18	Simulation Results for 6 G Sled A_celeration - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum, Chest Compliance = 1750 N/cm	78-80
3.19	Neck Joint Torques in 6 G Simulation	82

,

X

1

4

î٦

х

### LIST OF FIGURES (CONTINUED)

Figure No.	Title	Page
3.20	Neck Joint Torques in 15 G Simulation	83
3.21	Longitudi.al Neck Forces in 6 and 15 G Simulations	85
3.22	Belt Forces from 6 and 15 G Simu- lations	86
3.23	Simulation Results for 15 G Sled Acceleration - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum, Joint Stop Coeffi- cients increased	87-89
3.24	Simulation Results with 15 G Sled Acceleration - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum, Chest Compliance = 3500 N/cm	91-93
3.25	Simulation Results with 15 G Accel- eration - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum, Chest Compliance = 875 N/cm	94-96
3.26	Simulation Results for 15 G Sled Acceleration - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum, Chest Compliance - 1750 N/cm, Condyle Joint Stop Stiffness in Ex- tension Decreased to .0261 N-m/deg <sup>2</sup>	97-99
3.27	Head/Nock Angle Versus Time for Con- dyle Joint Stop Stiffness of .0261 N-m/deg <sup>2</sup> and 1.0 N-m/deg <sup>2</sup>	100
3.28	Simulation Results for 15 G Sled Acceleration - Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum, Chest Compliance = 1750 N/cm, Condyle Joint Stop Stiffness = .0261 N-m/deg <sup>2</sup> , Joint 3 Linear Stiffness Coefficient Reduced to 75 N-m/deg <sup>2</sup>	102-104
4.1	6 G Simulation Results for 18-24 Year Females	112-114
4.2	15 G Simulation Results for 18-24 Year Females	115-117

## LIST OF FIGURES (CONTINUED)

.

.

R.C.

2.1

.

. . . .

Figure No.	Title	Page
c.1	6 G Experimental Head Angular Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	154
C.2	6 G Experimental Head Angular Velocity Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	155
C.3	6 G Experimental Head Angular Position Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	156
C.4	6 G Experimental Head Resultant Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	157
C.5	6 G Experimental T <sub>1</sub> Resultant Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	158
C.6	15 G Experimental Head Angular Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	159
C.7	15 G Experimental Head Angular Velocity Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	160
C.8	15 G Experimental Head Angular Position Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	161
C.9	15 G Experimental Head Resultant Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	162
C.10	15 G Experimental T <sub>1</sub> Resultant Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects	163

•

.

Sector States

#### SUMMARY

Physical characteristics of the head and neck were measured on 18 young adult male Navy volunteers who had previously undergone tests on the NAMRL sled facility in New Orleans. Measurements taken include 55 standard anthropometric measures, 32 anthropometric measures of the seated subject, three dimensional head and neck range of motion, neck muscles reflex times in response to head jerks, and neck muscle voluntary isometric strength. The reflex time and strength tests were performed in both the sagittal and lateral planes. The range of motion results for this group of 18 NAMRL subjects were in good agreement with results for 18-24 year males and females from the general population. In the sagittal plane, the average range of motion angles in extension were 79.0 and 60.5 degrees respectively as measured from the Frankfort Plane position. Reflex times were similar for flexion, extension, and lateral bend, being 53.5, 55.5, and 51.5 msec respectively. In strength, the group of NAMRL subjects was similar to 35-44 year males of the general population. The greatest strengths were in extension where the average is about 33% greater than in flexion or lateral bend.

Where appropriate, these measurement results for 5 of the 18 subjects were utilized in establishing a data set for the MVMA-2D Crash Victim Simulator. Simulations of NAMRL sled tests at -Gx impact accelerations of 6 and 15 G's were made using either the experimental  $T_1$  accelerations as input to the neck or experimental sled acceleration profiles as input to the sled. Simulation results for head angular acceleration, head angular velocity, head angular position, head resultant acceleration, and  $T_1$ resultant acceleration are compared with average experimental results out to 300 msec for the group of five

1

agreement between experimental and simulation curves at both 6 and 15 G's. Further work is needed, however, to improve certain aspects of the model such as joint stop characteristics, passive tissue modeling, and restraint system modeling. Effects of changing muscle tension, chest compliance, joint stop stiffness coefficients, and upper torso joint stiffness (i.e., amount of torso flexion) have also been examined using the MVMA-2D model. Results obtained with varying amounts of muscle tension indicate that muscle effects are more predominant at 6 G's than at 15 G's.

Simulations for 18-24 year remales at 6 and 15 G's were made using measurement data obtained in previous studies at HSRI. Results were not dramatically different from the NAMRL simulations, the primary difference being an increase in the maximum flexion angle of the head by about 40 and 25 ercent at 6 and 15 G's respectively.

AND A DESCRIPTION OF A

#### Chapter 1

#### INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

#### A. Statement of Project Goal

Measurements of dynamic responses to impact accelerations which have been taken on a selected male military population at the Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory (NAMRL) at Michoud Station, New Orleans, represent the most comprehensive source of information available related to the dynamic response of the human head and neck. To what extent these data represent the total adult U.S. population is unknown, however. In recent studies sponsored by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) and conducted by the Highway Safety Research Institute (HSRI), basic information which is believed to be representative of neck physical characteristics for the adult U.S. population from 18 to 75 years has been obtained. Included in these data are anthropometry, head/neck range of motion, neck muscle strength, and neck muscle reflex time measurements. The primary purpose of this study is to determine to what extent these data may be used with mathematical modeling techniques in order to extend and project the NAMRL dynamic response results to the general adult U.S. population.

B. Background

Response of the human head and neck to impact accelerations is a matter of major concern in the design

The rights, welfare and informed consent of the volunteer subjects who participated in this study were observed under guidelines established by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare policy on protection of human subjects and accomplished under medical research design protocol standards approved by the Committee to Review Grants for Clinical Research and Investigation Involving Human Beings, Medical School, The University of Michigan.

No. of Concession, Name

of biomechanical models, anthropomorphic dummies, and occupant crash protection devices.

There are a large number of studies which have attempted to determine the relationships of head injury and concussion to impact forces, but only recently has attention been given to the respective influences of the effects of head motion upon injury. It is still unclear what the respective effects of rotational and translational forces may be. Results of experiments reported by researchers such as Holbourn (14), Pudenz, et al. (19), Martinez (16), and Ommaya (18) have indicated that rotation alone can cause brain injury and concussion in whiplash. However, Hodgson (13), Gurdjian (12) and others contend that other factors such as resultant intracranial pressure gradients may cause trauma by high shear stress concentration in the brain stem and upper spinal cord. Young, et al. (26) have recently demonstrated concussion to the fixed primate head without translational movement. Clarke (4), studying human volunteers in dynamic tests of adult males at paak sled velocities of 26.2 ft/sec and 7.8 to 10 G, concluded that peak head angular accelerations and linear resultants may have less traumatic consequences than the degree of head-neck hyperextension.

This disagreement among researchers as to the mechanisms of injury in head impact and whiplash is also seen in consideration of critical values of xotational velocity and acceleration at which concussion occurs in man. Recent work by Ewing and Thomas (8) using male human volunteers in dynamic sled tests found no clinically observable effects. due to acceleration on a subject in which the peak mouth angular velocity exceeded 30 rad/sec (at 10 G, 250 G/sec), although this level had been previously considered by M.hone, et al. (15) and Ommaya to be the critical level for human concussion.

Similarly, although there has been considerable effort to realistically simulate the human neck in various versions of an "improved" anthropomorphic dummy, the lack of valid human bioengineering data has remained a major problem and much controversy in this area continues.

Thus the continuing series of .mpact acceleration tests being conducted by Ewing, et al. (5-10) using human volunteer subjects have been of particular significance since this effort has resulted in an extensive body of kinematic experimental data under dynamic conditions. This work, which has involved precise measurement of the complete input acceleration to the head and neck (measured at the first thoracic vertebra), precise measurement of the dynamic response of the head and neck to he input acceleration, and development of date acquisition and automatic processing systems, must be characterized as producing the most extensive dynamic data using the most sophisticated experimental techniques and precise instrumentation to date for the impact range under study.

Primary objectives of the NAMRL research effort are to acquire data that can be used to 1) develop design criteria for construction of dummies which will closely reproduce man's response to crash acceleration, and 2) define the envelopes of impact acceleration which result in the injury. If these results are to include concern for the total population who may be involved in crash situations in both military and non-military vehicles, then it becomes important to be able to extend these dynamic response data to the general U.S. adult population.

In two studies by Snyder, et al. (22,23) and reported by Foust, et al. (11) and Schneider, et al. (21), basic data concerning physical characteristics of the head and neck were obtained on a sample of subjects designed to represent the adult vehicle occupant population. These

studies were, to our knowledge, the most comprehensive attempt to relate such physical measurements such as muscle isometric strength, muscle reflex time, cervical range of motion, and anthropometry to the age, sex, and stature of a population representative of U.S. adults.

While subjects were tested in both sagittal and lateral planes, the general relationships of the measured physical characteristics to age and sex were the same in both. Cervical range of motion was greatest in the rotational plane and smallest in the lateral plane, and showed an average decrease with age of 20-45 percent from young to elderly subjects. Neck muscle reflex times ranged from about 30 to 75 msec, were generally smaller for lateral head movements, showed an increase with subject age, and were slightly shorter on the average for females. Muscle strength was found to be about 33% greater in extension than in flexion or lateral bend, showed a decrease with age, and was on the average 1-1/2 to 2 times greater in males than in females. No significant correlations between these measurements and subject anthropometric measures were found.

A basic assumption underlying the application of these data to studies on human impact tolerance is that there is a relationship between the differences in physical characteristics of individuals and differences in dynamic response to impact. If this assumption is valid, a potentially productive research program would involve bridging the gap between the dynamic studies of a highly selected population on the one hand, and the essentially static measurements representative of the U.S. adult population on the other. The present study was undertaken out of these considerations.

4

1

#### C. Objectives

ж.́

Æ

In order to accomplish the goals of this study, two principal objectives must be achieved. First, it must be shown that the static measurements can be utilized in a mathematical model to give accurate simulations of experimental impact results, and that this validated model can be used across a range of impact accelerations and conditions. Secondly, it must be demonstrated that reasonable correlations exist between measured physical properties and experimental dynamic response characteristics. In order to attain these objectives; the following tasks were established.

1) Conduct all of the HSRI sagittal plane and lateral plane testing on a group of NAMRL subjects who have previously undergone acceleration impact testing over a range of acceleration levels. Data collected would include standard anthropometry, seated anthropometry, three dimensional voluntary range of motion of the head and neck, neck muscle stretch reflex times and acceleration in response to head jerk, and maximum voluntary neck muscle isometric strength.

2) Compare NAMRL measurement results all results from the U.S. adult population obtained in the 1.273 sagittal and lateral plane studies (11, 21).

3) Use the NAMRL measurement results to establish parameter values where appropriate in the data set of the MVMA-2D Crash Victim Simulator.

4) Run the MVMA-2D model with this data set, appropriate initial conditions, and stimulus inputs in an attempt to reproduce the experimental results from NAMRL subjects at several acceleration levels. Adjust or "tune" other parameters for which no data are available in order to obtain optimal matching to experimental curves. 5. Determine if and when any relationships exist between static measurements and dynamic response, and confirm that these relationships are supported by the model by:

ñ

de la

a) correlating various static measurements with various peak parameter values in experimental response curves for the group of NAMRL subjects measured. 1

b) examining changes in response curves for subjects with different physical characteristics and using these different measurements in the model to see if the changes are predicted.

6. Use the measurements obtained in the IIHS studies to predict the dynamic response results that would be obtained if other segments of the population were tested at the NARML sled facility.

7. Use the validated MVMA-2D model to predict the response of occupants subjected to more realistic and practical crash situations.

8. Use the validated MVMA-2D model to predict the response of NAMRL subjects to sled tests where the acceleration vector is of a greater magnitude than can be safely used with volunteer subjects.

At the time of this report, tasks 1 through 3 have been completed for a group of 18 NAMRL subjects who have undergone sled tests up to 15 G's in the -Gx direction. Considerable progress has been made with task 4 although further work and improvements in the model are needed. Measurement procedures and results are presented in Chapter 2 while Chapter 3 describes the procedures and results to date concerned with tasks 3 and 4. Chapter 4 gives the results obtained by using the IIHS data to predict sled test responses at 6 and

15 G's for 18-24 year femiles (task 6). Chapter 5 contains a brief discussion of the results to date and suggestions for future work on tasks 4 through 8.

-

-

Ą

ş.

#### Chapter 2

#### MEASUREMENT OF FURCICAL CHARACTERISTICS

A. General

¥.,

14

.

<u>م</u>،

Lighteen male Na : personnel who had previously undergone testing on the NAMRL sled facility were brought to the Highway Safety Research Institute (HSRI) for two to three days for measurements of physical characteristics related to the head and neck. The subjects were brought to HSRI in three groups of 7, 6, and 5 over a period of one month. They were assigned subject identification numbers consisting of a prefix code denoting the sex, age, and stature of the individual and a chronological testing number from 1 to 18. Table 2.1 is a list of these HSRI subject codes together with the corresponding NAMRL subject number. The letter N denotes NAMRL male subject (to distinguish from others previously tested); A indicates that the subject was between 18-24 years; while S, M, and T correspond to short, medium, and tall according to the 1-20th, 40-60th, and 80-100th percentiles of stature for this age and sex.

While the immediate concern in this study was to measure those physical characteristics which relate to head and neck movement in the sagittal plane (since NAMRL sled testing is with -Gx acceleration), the capability existed from previous studies to test in lateral bending and these measurements were also taken on each subject for future use. Measurements taken include standard anthropometry, anthropometry of the seated subject, head and neck range of motion, neck muscle stretch reflex times, and neck muscle isometric strength capability. The following sections describe briefly the testing procedures used (these are discussed in detail in references 22 and 23) and also present the measurement results for this group of 18 Navy subjects.

11

Proceeding page blank

	TAE	LE	2.	.1
--	-----	----	----	----

HSRI AND NAMEL SUBJECT NUMBERS FOR 18 NAVY SUBJECTS

HSRI	NAMRL
NAMC1	H-39
NAM0?	H-46
NAT03	H <b>-</b> 76
NAMOL	H-12
NAMOS	H=48
NAMOE	1-14
NASC7	E-38
NAMO8	H <b>-</b> 32
NAMC9	H-52
NAMLO	H-47
NATII	H-51
NAM12	H <b>-</b> 50
NAM13	H-53
NAT14	H-43
TATIS	H-35
NAMIG	<b>H-</b> 33
NAT17	H-40
NAT18	H-37

13

.

#### B. Anthropometry

A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL

Methods. A total of 87 anthropometric measure-1. ments were obtained on each subject during the initial phase of testing. Figure 2.1 is a list of these measurements divided into two groups. Group I contains 55 measurements taken by standard techniques to describe the general body characteristi the head and neck, location and sizes of body masses, and body somatotypes. Group IT contains 32 measurements taken to describe the position of the seated occupant. Of these 32, 7 were taken with standard equipment while 25 are measures taken or derived from orthogonal photogrammetry techniques. The photogrammetry setup consists of a set of three Pentax cameras oriented orthogonally to each other and aimed toward the subject from the front, left side, and top. The cameras are aligned such that the centers of their focal planes intersect at a common origin within the subject. The locations of high contrast markers placed on the subject's head and upper torso and visible in at least two cameras, may be determined in three dimensions by geometric relations and measurements from the films. The films are projected onto a tablet digitizer and the points are digitized in a specified sequence onto paper tape. The tapes are later analyzed by computer programs which compute the 3-dimensional location of the points.

2. <u>Results</u>. Table 2.2 presents the statistics of the anthropometric measurements for the 18 NAMRL subjects measured while Table 2.3 gives the statistics for the threespace location of the head and torso of the seated subject. In many cases, the names of measurements have been abbreviated for compactness and these abbreviations may be cross referenced with a more complete measurement name in Appendix A. Tables B.1 and B.2 in Appendix B contain the individual data for each subject from which these statistics were derived.

GENERAL BOI	ARCENCE ARCENT		SHATED ANTHROPOMETRY
Va(a):	Die Win Breidth (Standing Erect)	56.	Formal Sutting Height (Relative to Beat Reference Point
			Trivit Vitabi (Ba) SHP)
Stature	30. Mip Circumference	<u>.</u> ,	
Erect Sitting Height	31. Aprenden - Radiale Length	<u>8</u>	Tragion Depth (hel BNP)
licad Circumference	32. Upper Arm Circumference (At Axille	L) 59.	Glebelle Height (Rel SRP)
Bennett Ellipse Circumference	33. Upper Arm Circumference (above Elt	bov) 60.	Glabella Depth (Rel SRP)
Bitracion Dimneter	34. bleeps Fiexed Circumference	61.	Eye Ellipse Point Meight (Rel SNP)
Kead Breadth	35. Againte - Stylion Length	62.	Eye Ellipse Point Depth (Rel 8RP)
Mead Length	35. Furearm Circumference	63.	Eye Ellipse Point Width (Rel. Glabella)
Sarttal Arc Length	37. Wrist Circumference	64.	Cervicale Height (Rel SkP)
Coronal Arc Leneth	Bo. Hand Length	65.	Cervicale Depth (Rei SRP)
Bitrag on - Glabella Arc Leugth	39. Trochanten - Femoral Condyle Lengt	th 66.	Suprasternale Meight (Rel SRP)
Bitracion - Mentun Arc Length	40. Upper Thigh Circumference	67.	Supresternale Depth (hel SRP)
Bitragion - Infon Arc Length	41. Lover Thigh Circumference	66.	Shoulder Height (Rel SRP)
Facial Met. ht	42. Fibula Length	69.	Shoulder Depth (Rel SRP)
Lateral Neck Breadth	43. Fibular Height	70.	Shoulder Breadth .
Anterior - Posterior Neck Breadth	44. Calf Utreumference	71.	Anterior Superior Iliac Spine Meight (Mel SRP)
Superior Neck Circumference	45. Ankie Ctreumference	72.	Arterior Buperior Iliac Spine Depth (Rel 'RP)
Inferior Neck Circumference	46. Fost Length	73.	Bispinous Breadth
Posterior Neck Length	47. Hull of Fout Breadth	-7-	Trochanterion Meight (Rel BRP)
Blacromial Breadth	42. Euchral Bieptconlylar Diameter	75.	Trochanterion Depth (Rel Tragion)
Shoulder Breadth (Bideltoid)	49. Fem ral Biepicondylar Diameter	76.	<b>Bitrochunterior</b> , <b>Diameter</b>
Chest Height	50. Triters Skinfold	-17-	Mip Breadth (Seated)
Chest Breadth	51. Eltrapular Skinfold	78.	Infraorbitale Height (Rei Tragion)
Chest Circumference	52. Suprailine Shinfold	79.	Infraorbitale Depth (Rel Tragion)
Waist Height	53. Anterior Superior Iline Spine (ASI	IS) Breadth	
Walst Breadth	54. Right ASIS - Symphysion	80.	Tragion Height (Rel Cervicele)
Waist Circumference	55. Left ASIS - Symphysion	81.	Tragion Depth (Rel Cervicale)
Kip Kright	•	82.	Glabella Height (Rei.Tragion)
		83.	<b>Glabeila Depth (Rel Tragion)</b>
		84.	Eye Ellipse Point Height (Rel Tragion)
		85.	Eye Eilipse Point Depth (Kel Tragion)
		86.	Ectocanthus height (Rel Tragion)
		87.	Ectocanthus Lepth (Rel Tragion)

ţ

Figure 2.1 Anthropometry Measurements

and the second second

こうきょうるてもの ひいしいちょうぶん てい ひのひかかん かのの

# TABLE 2.2 ANTHROPONETRY STATISTICS

VABIABLE	N	EEAN	SIT DEV	NONTALLA	
	-			HINTION	BAXIMUN
WT (KG)	18	76 3	1. 5		
WI (LE)	18	169 1		67.1	105.2
STATICE	18	177 0	<b>4 1</b> • C	134.5	231.5
PONEINEX	18	37 0	4.3	165.5	134.4
ERSITES	18	ع م کر ت رن	1.0	28.7	34.3
EFALCIE	16	57 .:	3.0	62.3	39.8
EFACFLES	18	57.0	1.9	54.6	t 1. j
EITHODI	10	13 0	4.4	62.2	73.5
HEATES	14	13.3	L.C	ر . د ۲	14.8
EFFEIG	18	10.0	6.4	74.4	15.9
SAGALC	17	1700	6.8	18.0	23. B
CCRAKC	18	30.1	1.2	32.7	37. ó
HITECOTH	18	JJ•2	1.0	<b>9.</b> 0	30.7
BITEGEEN	18	27.0	1.6	27.7	31, 3
EITEGINE	18	39 C	1.5	27.4	34.5
FACEET	10 18	12 0	<b>∠</b> • 6	24.0	32. 3
LATEKEE	18	13.2	C.E	11.0	14.0
APNKES	10	14.3	6.7	11.3	13, 8
SUENKCTE	16	11.4 27 c	<b>U</b> • E	10.4	12.9
IN FARCTE	18	71.2	4.1	34.9	44.3
PESTAKIG	10	39.0	4.2	35.0	43.9
EIACHER	10		1.3	74.9	13.5
EIDEITER	18		1./	30.2	44.3
CEESTET	18	40.4 120 0	4.5	43.3	54.2
CHESTER	10	1 2 4 2	3.8	122.1	138.3
CHESTOTE	18		<b>∠</b> • 7	28.6	34.7
HAISTET	15	116 7	E. 1	63.2	111.8
WAISCAL	16	20 0	4.8	83.9	111.5
HAISTOTE	10 12	47.5	3.2	26.5	37. u
BIPHT	15	0 <b>0</b> .9	E . J	73.0	100.0
HIFESSTE	16	32 - 1	4.1	60.6	90.7
HIPCIN	18	ງ <b>ງ</b> .ເ ປມ ເ	<b>∠</b> • €	37.2	37.5
ACEBADIC	18	10.0	<b>C</b> • J	82.3	112.3
ARBCIRAY	18	77 G	(.C	33.2	35. d
ABHCIDEL	16	26 1	2.3	21.5	37.0
EICFICIE	18	2001	2.7	14.0	32.4
BADSTYLG	18	26.1		21.5	39.0
FRARECIS	18	28.4	1 2	24.9	23.2
WEISTCIE	16	17.4	ເ <b>ດ ເ</b>	20.2	32.4
HANDIG	18	18.9	•• a	10,3	13.3
INCEEBLG	16	41,7		18.7	19.9
UFIHICIE	18	57.5		38.4	43.4
LUTHICIF	18	39.3	2.3	40.3	69.2
FIEULALG	18	40.4	2 a 7 1 E	34.1	40.3
FIBULAHT	18	45.7	1 C	J D J	43.3
		<b>~ ~ * *</b>	1. 5	47.6	43.5

## TABLE 2.2 (continued)

VARIABLE	N	MERN	SIE DEV	WINIWUF	BAXIMUM
CALFCIA	 1ย	36.7	3.4	30.7	 h h
ANKLECIE	18	22.5	1.4	14.8	25 1
FOOTLG	18	26.6	С. Ь.	5.1	1.J.F.
FOOTBE	18	10.3	6.6	4.1	111
HUNDIA	18	7.1	6.3	5.5	7 5
FLEDIA	18	9. d	ú.5	्र य २	11 3
TRICPSF	18	14.6	7.8	57	30 5
SUBSCESE	18	15.9	8.8	7 (.	30.3
SUPILSE	18	16.5	8.3	5.Ú	בינר
LTIL-SYM-	18	13.1	6.9	11 1	1/1 7
AFIL-SYE	18	13.5	1.0	11.7	1 40 . / 1 // O
ASISBR	18	21.5	1.7	1	22 6
NERSITER	16	49.4	3.6	10.0 20 C	23.3
TRAGHT S	16	76.4	3.1	7. 5	37.0
TRAGDP S	1.5	-0.7	<b>у с</b> 1		3.•∡0 عد
GLAELHIJ	18	86.3			J.D 26 1
GLABLURS	10	5	2.5	13 <b>.</b> 3	1/1 3
EYELFHIS	18	78.0	1.2		14.2
LYELPDPS	10	7.e	<u>نا</u> د	72.0	12 0
EYELPWDG	1d	3.3			12.0
C7HT S	10	5.20	2.8		7(3)
C702 S	18	-9.1	1.7	-12.6	-7 1
SSTANHIS	10	57.1		52.3	- 1 - 1 6 2 - 7
SSTRNDPS	18	2.4	1.8	-1.7	ر <del>د</del> ک
SHIDLHIS	10	50.9	2.7	54.4	-•# 61 3
SHLDADPS	18	-4.7	1.4	-H.F	-1 2
SHLDEBR	17	41.4	2.1	30.0	u7 6
ILCSPHIS	18	19.5	0.4	1 - 2	21 2
ILCSPDP3	13	10.5	1.0	4.3	10 9
DISPNBR	10	25.3	1.4	23.2	28.2
TEOCHITS	10	9.2	1.3	7.1	11 7
IROCHDPS	10	16.0	1.4	7.e	17.1
BITECHEL	18	32.1	1.3	24.3	10.1
HIPBRSIT	18	37.7	<u>ن</u> ا با (	33.7	46.6
JABHI T	1 ೮	ί.3	).5	-u.7	1.0
GRBDP T	18	8.2	Jaci	7.4	107
TRAGHIC7	10	11.1	1.3	0.3	13.7
TRAGDPC7	18	٤.4	1.2	ь.7	11.1
GLABLHIT	10	3.9	υ <b>.</b> 7	b	5.1
GLABLDPT	18	16.2	3.9	9.1	12.7
EYELPHIT	10	1.5	J.5	Ú . E	2.5
LYLLPDPL	10	8.5	0.0	7.7	11.0
ECICNHTT	18	1.5	J . 5	. c	2.5
ECICNDEI	10	7.4	0.8	<b>0.</b> 6	10.0

2.1.15

.

•• • •		COMDINA	LE STATIST	ICS (re S	RP)
VARIABLE	8	MEAN	SIL DEV	BINIHUH	RORIZEDH
SELDESY					and the second second second
CLIPECV	10	-4.)	1.9	- 8. ó	-1.2
-1 LUBEI	10	19.3	1.7	14.3	21.2
	18	50.9	2.7	52.2	61.3
	18	-3.1	1.7	-12.6	-7 4
C/ SY	18	-1.4	1.1	+3.3	
C/ SZ	78	65.3	2.8	44.2	76.7
SSTABSI	18	2.4	1.8	-1.7	··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
SSTERSY	18	-1.4	1.1		~ • 4 f: 7
SSTENSZ	14	57.1	2.4	· · · · ·	
TRAG SX	18	-0.7	2 4		00.1
TELG SY	18	5.7	1 2	~~~	31.0
TRAG SZ	16	70.4		4.1	11.7
CEFITSX	18	7 6		76.5	62.3
CEBITSY	18	7 (	4.3	2.1	11.6
CREELS2	18	76 5	1.2	÷1.√	3.9
GLARISY	19	10.0	3.2	70.3	82.3
GIZAISY	10	9.3	2.5	ت 🖬 ٿ	14.2
GILBIST	10	······································	1.2	-4.8	0.6
AALICGA	10	80.2	3. ž	73.9	b6 1
TVEICCU	10	1.8	<i>* • 4</i>	3.4	12.9
ELELEDI EVETOCA	16	1.9	1.2	-1.2	3.7
FIELREZ Section	78	76.Ŭ	3.2	72.0	
ECCANDX SCOLNEY	76	6.7	2.4	2.3	11 2
ELLANSY	18	3.∡	1.2	U . 2	• • • ∡ ఓ 0
LULANSZ	18	77.5	3.Z	7	т. л н т. л
					~ ~ ~ ~

## TAPLE 2.3 UPPER TORSO AND HEAD LANDMARK COORDINATE STATISTICS (re SRP)

. . . . . . . . .

#### C. Range of Motion

1. <u>Methods</u>. As described in references 21 and 22, orthogonal photogrammetry was also used to determine the subject's head and neck range of motion. Immediately following the seated anthropometry measurements the subjects were asked to perform the sequence of head movements shown in Table 2.4. In each position when the subject attained the limit of his voluntary movement, photographs were taken simultaneously by the three cameras. Figure 2.2 shows a subject performing the head and neck extension movement. The Euler angles describing each position



Figure 2.2 NAMRL Subject Performing Range-of-Motion Tests

relative to the Frankfort plane position were computed by digitizing the points on the coordinate system head piece worn by the subject throughout these movements. The vectors describing the orientation of these coordinate axes in space were determined in a manner similar to the seated anthropomatric measures and the Euler angles computed by appropriate equations (see appendix E of reference 22).

and the second second

## TABLE 2.4

#### SEQUENCE OF RANGE-OF-MOTION POSITIONS

- 1. Frankfort Plane
- 2. Normal
- 3. Extension
- 4. Flexion

¥.858.

¥

- 5. Right Rotation
- 6. Left Rotation
- 7. Right Lateral Bend
- 8. Left Lateral Bend
- 9. Left Rotation Plus Bend Toward Left
- 10. Left Rotation Plus Bend Toward Rear
- 11. Right Rotation Plus Bend Toward Left

In computing the Euler angles, the order of movements to attain a given position is assumed to be yaw (rotation), pitch (flexion or extension), and then roll (lateral bend) and the Euler angle reference frame axes are as shown in Figure 2.3 where positive x is forward, positive y is toward the right, and positive z is down.



Figure 2.3 Euler Angle Reference Frame and Angle Directions

2. <u>Results</u>. While the measures of sagittal plane range of motion are of primary significance to this study, presentation of all the results is given here for completeness and future reference. Table 2.5 gives the statistical summary for these 18 subjects showing the mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum value for each Euler angle at each position. The significant number is the value for the ang'e related to the plane of primary movement (e.g., the pitch angle in flexion) but the other angles give an indication of the deviations from this plane which might be caused by performing the

# TABLE 2.5 RANGE-CF-NOTION STATISTICS

- ----

VARIABLE	Ы	RETE	SIL CEV	HANIGUS	MAJINUH
	-			*****	
FINEUTY	18	-0.7	2.5	~7.1	2 5
P2NEUTF	18	-2.0	3.4	- 3 - 4	11 C
P2NEUIE	18	Ú.1	1.2	-1.4	
PJEXTY	Ċ	0.0	0.0	¥. D.	<i>u</i> n
PJEXTP	1d	79.C	6.6	63.0	「あった」 下す こ
PJEXTE	C	Ú.C	0.0	ST D	V N
P4PLEXY	19	1.2	5.3		<i>N.U.</i> 11 7
PHEIEXP	1d	-60.5	£. 4	-64 5	11.7
P4Flexe	16	-2.1	5.6	-10-2	
F5RIBOIY	18	76.1	С. С. К. Д	- 10 - 3	4 <b>5</b> - 5
PSEIBCIP	18	-2.1	1000 1000		68.4
PSKIRCIE	17	5 6	ц Б	- 3. 3	0.0
PELTECTY	18	-77.5	F C		14.0
PELIRCIP	17	-2.7	<u> </u>	-03.2	-00.2
POLTACIA	18	-9.5	ц я	-11.4	5.3
P791BNCY	18	4.1	7.4		-0.2
P7R1Bhdp	18	Û. 4	г. с	-0.1	20.1
P7BIBNCK	18	45.0	75	- 10 - 7	
FELIBNDY	18	-4.6	5.5	34.9	0/. U
PELIBNIP	18	-0.7	£ 2	-11	1.9
FSLIBNCE	17	-47.1	6 J		(2.3
P91HCF1Y	18	-71. 3	6 G		- 12. 8
FSLROFLP	18	- 31 1	67	-03.5	- 28.4
FALRCELL	18	-127		-44.1	- 19.4
PIULRCHY	18	-73 /	10.2	~31.6	12.0
PIGIRCHA	18	-15.0	C . 3	~00.0	-01.3
FICIRORE	18	-40.5	1.4	-10.7	13. )
F11ARCYY	ور به ور به	- 40 . J 77 /		ان ، ما ۲۰۰	-24.4
FITEROYN	18		E./	04.1	いう. 〇
PIIERCYA	14	تو دید ۲/۱ ت	7.4 6 4	<b>b</b> • Y	43.0
PSIGHON	10 1 H	14.C 120 ~	<b>C.</b> 1	4 . 3	26.1
PROTRON	10	137,0	2.1	170.1	155.7
	. 7	33.0	10.4	136.6	171.0
		32.6	1∡.0	71.3	121.4

100

movement incorrectly or forcing against the physiological "stops." As with the anthropometry, the abbreviated names can be cross referenced with the list in Appendix A. Table 2.6 is an attempt to simplify these results and shows only the average Euler angles for the group. Individual rangeof-motion results can be found in Table B.3 of Appendix B.

#### D. Reflex Times and Strength

#### 1. Methods.

a. Reflex time. Neck muscle reflex times were measured by recording both head acceleration and neck muscle electromyograph (EMG) signals in response to a head jerk produced by dropping a 1 lb. weight approximately 6 to 8 inches. The set-up for testing of the extensor muscles (splenius capitus) is shown in Figure 2.4. A line attached to a hand placed about the subject's



Figure 2.4 NAMRL Subject Ready for Sagittal Reflex Time Test

head is draped over a pulley and threaded through the drop weight which is held in position by an electromagnet. When a switch on a control console is depressed, the weight is released and caught by the small pretension or stop weight
# TABLE 2.6

, i

1

# AVERAGE EULER ANGLES FOR 18 HAMRL SUBJECTS

..

	AVERAGE EUL	ER ANGLE RE FRANKFO	ORT POSITION
POSITION	YAW	PITCH	ROLL
Normal	7	-2.0	.1
Extension	-	79.0	-
Flexion	1.2	-60.5	-2.1
R. Rotation	76.1	-2.1	5.9
L. Rotation	-77.5	-2.7	<del>-</del> 9.5
R. Lateral Bend	4.1	- <u>)</u>	45.0
L. Lateral Bend	-4.6	7	-47.1
L. Rot. + Flexion	-71.3	-31.1	-12.7
L. Rot. + LLB	-73.8	3.5	-40.5
R. Rot + Extension	77.0	23.3	14.8

Art mant of

W.

producing a "tug" to the subject's head. Two surface electrodes placed over the muscle group of interest (the splenius capitus for extensors, the sternamastoids for flexion and lateral bend) measure the electrical activity resulting from the stretch reflex response of the muscle produced by the jerk. Head acceleration was measured by a set of 4 linear accelerometers which were oriented in the plane of the head jerk in a configuration which allows for calculation of resultant head angular and linear accelerations. These accelerometers are mounted to a bar and fixed to a bite plate held in the subject's mouth during testing. The plate is fitted to each subject using a thermoplastic moldable dental compound.

Each subject was tested in sagittal flexion (extensor muscles), sagittal extension (flexor muscles), and lateral flexion to the left. A series of six or more drops were performed in each position and the average reflex time computed. Prior to each test the subject was instructed to relax and close his eyes, but to attempt to maintain his head erect when the tug was felt.

Figure 2.5 shows a typical result produced by the weight drop where only one accelerometer signal is needed and used to compute the reflex time. The beginning of muscle electrical activity is indicated by a sharp spike in the relaxed EMG signal, followed by intermittent electrical activity. The time from onset of head accelezation to this first spike is called the muscle reflex time. It is not, however, the time required to develop maximum muscle force which must include a contraction time of approximately 100 msec. The total time from initial head movement to maximum muscle force is therefore the sum of the reflex time and the contraction time and could be called a reaction time.

3

Ŀ

Ŗ



Figure 2.5 Typical EMG and Acceleration Signals in Response to Reflex Test Weight Drop.

b. Strength. Maximum voluntary isometric neck muscle strength was measured on each subject as a measure of the strength capability of the neck muscles for restraining the head during impact. Tests were performed in extension, flexion, and left and right lateral bend exertions with the subject seated in the same test seat as used for range of motion and reflex testing. Pigure 2.6 shows a subject being tested for flexor, extensor, and lateral muscle strengths. A band placed about the head is attached by an adjustable length inelastic rope to the rigid test frame via a force transducer (i.e., a strain The subject was instructed to pull on the rope ring). using only his neck muscles, to build rapidly but smoothly to a maximum level, and to hold that level for a count of 4 seconds. The subject's feet were placed flat on the floor and the subject was not allowed to rise up from the seat or use his torso except to maintain his position. Three maximum exertions were made in each of the four



1

÷ .

Figure 2.6 NAMRL Subject Performing Isometric Strength Testing in Flexion (Top), Extension (Middle), and Lateral Bending (Bottom).

directions with 2 minutes of rest between trials, and the average force of each set computed. Figure 2.7 shows typical force curves and the EMG signal resulting from these tests.



Figure 2.7 EMG and Force Signals Resulting from Isometric Strength Tests

2. <u>Results</u>. Table 2.7 gives the strength and reflex time statistical results for the 18 Navy subjects. The abbreviated variable names may be cross referenced in Appendix A for a more complete title.

#### TABLE 2.7

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	SIL DEV	MUMIAIE	HAXIMUH
	-			*****	
RFL LAT	18	51.5	7.5	37.0	73.0
RFL FLXB	17	55.5	7.6	43.3	68.8
RFL EXIE	18	53.2	٤.5	37.6	6ö.J
RFL AVG	18	53.6	t.1	44.8	6.60
SIE SIL	18	35.7	5,9	22.7	50.0
STE LTI	18 ľ	35.5	٤.4	19.3	53.7
SIRLATAV	18	35.8	٤.9	21.0	51.7
STR EXTR	18	46. C	9.2	32.3	57.3
STE FLXR	18	34.3	t.7	10.7	42. 3
STRSAGAV	18	40.2	7.1	24.3	4d.7
SAGLATAV	18	38.C	7.6	22.3	50.0

# REFLEX TIME AND STRENGTH STATISTICS

It will be noted that the average reflex times for the three pull directions are nearly the same, being between 51 and 56 msec, while the range in reflex times is from 37 to 70 msec. This is in contrast to the results of two previous studies ( 22 and 23) where the data suggested that the reflex times in lateral bending were significantly less than in sagittal bending. The strength results indicate nearly identical values for right and left lateral pulls and these are nearly the same as the results for flexion, although the maximum forces achieved in lateral bending are significantly higher than achieved in flexion (56.0 lbf. to 42.0 lbf.). The greatest strengths were in extension where the average of 46.0 lbf. is about 33% greater than the average in lateral bend or flexion. The maximum strength in extension was similar to that for lateral bend, however. Table B.4 in Appendix B shows the individual strength and reflex values from which these statistics were derived where each strength value is the average of three trials and each reflex time is the average of at least 6 tests.

### E. <u>Comparison of Measurement Results with IIHS Study</u> <u>Results</u>

1. <u>Anthropometry</u>. As indicated by the third letter in the prefix code of the HSRI subject numbers (S,M, or T), eleven of the eighteen subjects tested are of medium stature, six are tall, and only one is short according to U.S. population data on stature for 18-24 year males. Thus, the group of subjects used in this study is biased toward tall individuals. The mean stature for the group is 177.0 cm as compared to 174.86 cm and 174.95 cm for young male medium stature subject groups in the sagittal and lateral studies respectively.

2. <u>Range of Motion</u>. Table 2.8 summarizes the average range of motion results for the primary Euler angles in the planar head movements and compares these results with

RESULTS
RANGE-OF-MOTION
STUDY
IIHS
AND
NAMRL
OF
CONFAISON
ۍ. ۳
TABLE

Group	N	Flexion	Extension	Total Sag.	L. Rot	R. Rot	Total Rot.	L. Lat	R. Lat	Total Lat.
Navy	18	60.5	0°64	138.4	5.75	76.1	153.6	47.1	45.0	92.0
18-24 Yr. Females	16	59.3	1 - 1 1	1.451	76.5	74.1	150.6	45.6	40.4	86.0
35-44 Yr. Females	16	51.5		104.6	72.0	71.6	143.6	42.2	31.6	73.9
62-74 Yr. Females	16	7.04		84.3	63.8	<b>5</b> 9.1	123.6	33.1	23.1	56.3
18-24 Yr. Males	16	56.2	72 <b>.</b> 3	129.0	76.2	73.2	149.5	44.6	7.14	86.3
35-44 Yr. Males	16	50.5	5.5	162.7	68.6	68.5	137.1	38.2	34.8	73.0
62-74 Yr. Males	16	38.8	(1) (1) (1)	76.6	56.5	57.3	113.9	25.8	22.2	48.8

average results from the different subject groups in the IIHS lateral plane study. It can be seen that for every position, the average range of motion for the NAMRL subjects is greater than for all other groups and this difference is particularly significant in extension. As expected, the results are most similar to the 18-24 year male and female groups. A t-test for comparison of population means shows the NAMRL results to be not significantly different from the 18-24 year male results at the .10 level of significance. It is interesting, however, that the standard deviation for the Euler angles is consistently and considerably smaller for the NAMRL population than for the IIHS study population. This is illustrated in Table 2.9 which compares the NAMRL results with the results from 18-24 year males from the IIHS lateral study. Perhaps this is due to the difference in subject motivation, level of training, and subject conditioning which results from experience as subjects for human experiments.

#### Table 2.9

				1 (1 ) Y - 1		<u> </u>		
				Pr	imary	/ Euler	Angle	(deg
and	1 18-24	Year	Males	From	IIHS	Study.		
of	Range-	of-Mot	tion Re	esults	for	NAMRL	Subject	5

Com	parison	of i	Means	and	Sta	ındar	d Devi	ations
of	Range-c	of-Mc	tion 1	Resul	ts	for	NAMRL	Subjects
and	18-24	Year	Males	s Fro	m I	IHS	Study.	

		<u> </u>	mary Euler	Angle	(degrees)
		IIKS Late	ral Study	N/	MRL
	Position	Mean	S.D.	Mean	<u>S.D.</u>
Ex	tension	72.8	18.2	79.0	6.6
Fl	exion	56.2	11.6	65	5.4
R.	Rutation	73.2	9.4	76.1	5.8
L.	Rotation	76.2	7.2	77.5	5.9
R.	Lateral Bend	41.7	12.6	47.1	6.4
L.	Lateral Bend	44.6	11.3	45.0	7.5

Ahuse the sheet the first

Reflex Times and Muscle Strength. Table 2.10 3. compares the average NAMRL results for measured muscle reflex times and isometric pull force with veraged results from the IIHS lateral and sagittal studies. With regard to reflex times, there is no particular group that the NAMRL subjects match particularly well or consistently for all planes. As mentioned previously the NAMRL data show similar reflex times for all directions while IIHS study results show longer times for sagittal movements than for lateral movements. This discrepancy is unexplained at this time. In lateral bending, the NAMRL results match best with the 62-74 year females, the 18-24 year males, and the 35-44 year males. In sagittal bending, NAMRL average reflex times are closest to the young and middle aged females.

Concerning strength results, it is seen that the NAMRL subjects match extremely well with the 35-44 year males. A t-test for comparison of population means for these two groups shows no significant difference at a significance level of .05.

TABLE 2.10 COMPARISON OF NAMEL AND IIHS STUDY REFLEX TIME AND STRENGTH RESULTS

	Ref.	lex Time (n	nsec)	Ind	l Strength (]	(bf)
Group	Laterel	Flexors	Extensors	Lateral	Extensors	Flexors
Navy	51.5	55.5	53.3	35.8	46.0	34.3
18-24 Yr. Females	1. 1	62.3	57.0	18.8	27.0	ή.91
35-44 Yr. Femalcs	43.6	62.0	58.8	17.3	26.7	9.91
62-74 Yr. Females	53.0	7.17	73.5	8.11	22 <sup>4</sup> 8	13.8
18-24 Yr. Males	48.9	68.2	59.0	28.0	37.7	32.4
35-44 yr. Males	52.8	17.1	62.2	32.1	45.1	3ù. A
52-74 Yr. Aalea	58.3	88.1	77.8	18.9	33.9	20.3

33

COLUMN T

1.00

ASTHORS)

### Chapter 3

### COMPUTER SIMULATIONS OF NAMEL SLED TESTS

This chapter is divided into three major sections. In Section A, a brief description of the characteristics and capabilities of the MVMA-2D model is given. In section B, these characteristics as they apply to this study are developed further in a description of how the measurement data described in Chapter 2 have been used to determine model parameter values and how other parameters for which there are no data available were determined. Section C presents the simulation results for 6 and 15 G sled tests and is divided into two parts. The first part describes simulation results obtained by using experimental  $T_1$  acceleration signals as direct input to  $T_1$ . In the second part, results obtained by using sled acceleration data and including restraint system and torso characteristics are presented.

### A. The MVMA-2D Crash Victim Simulator

All simulation work in this study has utilized the MVMA-2D Crash Victim Simulator, Version III. This model, in its current form, is a result of HSRI extensions and improvements made upon the original CAL 2-D model (1966), later modified to the ROS (Revised Occupant Simulation) in 1971 and MODROS (Modified Revised Occupant Simulation) in 1972. Pertinent to the modeling in this study is the use of a two-joint extensible neck. The human occupant is constructed of 9 body segments (head, neck, upper torso, middle torso, pelvis or lower torso, upper leg, lower leg, upper arm, and lower arm) divided by 8 pivot joints as shown in Figure 3.1. For each segment except the neck, the mass, location of the center of mass, and mass moment of inertia are specified. For the neck, the mass is distributed as desired at the upper and lower neck pivot points.



Figure 3.1 MVMA-2D Simulated Sled-Test Subject Showing Approximate Body Segment Lengths and Ellipses, Centers of Masses, and Joint Locations.

. . . . .

1

The equation of motion describing the dynamic behavior of the articulated occupant were derived using Lagrangian formulations. Energy dissipation at the joints may be through the mechanisms of friction and/or viscosity while the moments acting at each of the simulated joints may be derived from up to five sources including biodynamic muscle tension, elasticity, viscous damping, coulomb friction, and non-linear energy-dissipating motion-restrictive stops. Interaction of the occupant with vehicle structures and restraint systems may be established by specifying contact ellipses with desired material properties (including force deformation and energy absorbing characteristics) and contacting surfaces and belts with specified properties. The restraint system can utilize up to four belts - two attaching to the hip segment, one to the upper torso, and one attaching arbitrarily to any torso segment. In addition, options for free slip between belt pairs (force equalization) or for percentage force limits of one belt relative to another for simulating friction are also available. A more detailed description of these features may be found in references 2 and 20.

# B. Determination of Model Parameters

----

AN SOLD STORY & CALIFORN

A valuable feature of the MVMA-2D model as it relates to this study is that it has been developed based upon attempts to consider and simulate the individual physical factors which have an influence on the dynamic response of the occupant. For example, instead of lumping all neck properties into a general visco-elastic element with two parameter constants, the model is general enough to allow separation of some of the factors, such as muscle versus passive tissue, which physically act to affect the response. Thus, it is possible to use experimental data where available to simulate these factors and to

36

gain a better understanding through the model of the relative importance of each.

At the beginning of the modeling phase of the project, it was decided to match simulation results with the sled test results from a closely matched subgroup of the 18 subjects rather than to match with all 18 subjects or with an individual subject. An examination of the anthropometric and strength measurements for those properties judged to have the most significant effects on head and neck dynamic response in sagittal flexion was made and resulted in a selection of 5 subjects (NAMO1, NAMO4, NAMO6, NAMO8, and NAT18) whose measurement data would be used for establishing model parameter values and whose sled test results would be used for comparison. Tables 3.1 and 3.2 give the individual data and group statistics for selected measurements used in establishing the data set of the NAMRL simulations. While these results were used to establish model parameter values, the manner in which these data are used depends upon certain modeling assumptions and other nonobvious procedures. In addition, for other parameters used in the model there are no experimental data from which to derive reliable parameter constants. For these reasons, the following subsections are included to docament the procedures used to date in this study.

1. <u>Segment specifications — lengths, masses</u>, centers of masses, and moments of inertia.

a. Torso and Extremities. Torso length was computed as the distance from trocanterion height to cervicale height as measured in the seated position. As shown in Figure 3.1, the torso is divided into three segments. Initially, the lengths of these individual segments were determined by proportioning them the same relative to total torso length as is used in the MVMA-2D

37

- Ł
- 2
÷,
e pe
E
2
- 5
- 2
- 2
- 14
- >
- 14
~
- <b>X</b>
2
_
20
- 14
- ×
- 14
2
- 14
E
R
- 24
2
딫
_
0
H
Ū.
- 69
н
19
40
est.
7
ຕັ
- •
м
1
9
5
<b>2</b> 1

a serve a contraction of the line of the state of the server

/•

1

1 SELECTED MEASUREMENTS FOR FIVE NAMEL SUBJECTS	(CB) EASITHT HEADCIR PACEHI AFMKBA SUFWRCIA INFWRCIA	۴.20 53.50 55.8J 13.30 11.10 37.9ù 38.4C	6.E0 91.90 59.13 14.10 11.7C 38.7U 39.3U	5-80 52.30 54.70 <b>13.8</b> 0 10.40 35.40 35.40	6.00 51.40 57.10 11.90 11.10 36.90 37.30	1.70 34.90 ¢1.60 13.50 10.60 37.30 J0.7C		ITLG MARDLG TACREALG FABULALG MARSITHE TEAGHT S GLAMLHTS	5.20 18.34 39.00 39.50 91.40 77.40 82.4G	£.10 18.40 40.60 39.9J d7.70 73.90 78.30	8.9.3 18.7.0 80.00 40.00 89.10 76.10 79.6.0	5.10 19.10 41.23 4U.43 6d.80 75.60 79.70	
AR FIVE NAM	PACENI	13.30	14.10	13.80	11.90	13. S <i>ù</i>			39.50	19.91	40.03	4 U - 6U	
UREMENTS FO	HLACCE	55. 80	59.13	54.73	57.10	<b>e 1.</b> 60		TACEENLG	00.96	40.60	40.00	41.23	
LECTED NEAS	<b>LASITHT</b>	63.50	91.90	52.30	51.40	06 • HE		HAFDLG	18.30	16.40	: 8.7.0	19.10	
3FE 3.1 8E	ES Stat (CB)	174.20	176.60	175.80	176.00	181.70	57		25.20	26.10	24.93	26.10	
TV.	VAKIAHL WT (KG) 	50.47	75.45	65.6E	75.45	24.65	V AR L ABL	ACERADLG	30.50	31.90	31.60	32.10	•
		H-39	H-46	5 F - A	H-42	9 <b>#</b> - 4			<b>H-</b> 39	6 - 4 C	5 <b>4</b> - R	7728	
	SUEJE	AEC 1	ARC4	ARC 6	AEC 6	AT 18		SUEJE	ABC 1	ABU4	A E U 6	ABCB	

7011 ICM

TABLE 3.1 (continued)

د

رې هر

ż.

	44.70	5 <b>5.</b> 00	37.CC	5 <b>J.</b> vî	54.70
kel avg	50.30	62,90	63.3 <sup>0</sup>	54.70	51.10
TRAG SL	77.83	34.40	76.13	75.60	75.70
TRAG SX	-4.73	-3.40	(6.4-	1.40	2.5
CT 52	64.1)	63. 13	t 2. 5 <i>1</i>	67.34	65. NU
c] 54	- 11. 40	-7.40	-12.60	-7.60	-7.10
EC TRCCBHTS	10.60	6.50	04 * 5	9.10	16. 80
VARIAUL CTHT S	64. 1U	63.10	63.50	67.30	65.00
De Eo	6 - 9 9	8-46	6 <b>2 -</b> 1	h=4.2	8 t - 4
SUBJE	MAEC 1	MANCU	MARC6	KANC 8	NAT 16

		VARIAEI	LES			
SGEJE	CI NC	STR FLKS	E 2 M 2 U T E	P3411P		PSAGACA
KANO 1	5E - A	39.30	C. EQ	63.00	-66.43	144.30
404AN	H-46	30.00	- 3. 10	67.50	-68.20	155.70
AANUÓ	5 <b>8</b> - 4	33.30	3.70	8j.80	- 50. 60	136.43
NARG E	1 1 1	36.70	1. 60	76.50	-57.87	134.30
RAI18	H - 4 8	34.70	1.00	62.00	-65.13	147.13

いたますが

39

CONTRACTOR OF AN

ALC: NO

THE REPORT OF

741.4

7.0

14 SOL 28 ST

10164.15

TABLE	3.	2
-------	----	---

SELECTEL BEASUFEKENT STATISTICS FOR 5 NAVY SUBJECTS

Sector States and

- N - - -

1

VARIABLE	ы	MEAN	SIE DEV	HIBIAUA	HAXIHUH
******	-				
WT (KG)	5	73.0	4.1	£5.7	75.5
STAT (CH)	5	176.9	2.3	174.2	181.7
EBSITHI	5	92.9	1.3	91.s	94.3
EEADCIF	5	5 <b>7.7</b>	2.7	54.7	61.6
FACEHT	5	13.3	C.0	11.9	14.1
AFNKBR	ċ	11.0	0.5	10.4	11.7
SUPNKCIH	5	37.2	1.2	35.4	38.7
INFNKCIR	5	38.0	1.1	36.5	39.3
ACEBADLG	5	32.1	1.3	30.5	34.1
BADSTYLG	5	25.8	0.7	24.9	26.7
EANDLG	5	18.5	ζ.6	18.3	19.9
TRCFEBLG	5	46.7	1.4	39.0	42.8
FIBULALG	5	42.7	1.5	39.5	+3.2
NPESITET	5	89.5	1.5	87.7	91.4
IBAGUT S	5	75.8	1.4	73.9	77.3
GLABIHIS	5	79.7	1.6	78.3	82.4
C7HI S	5	64.6	1.7	63.1	67.3
TROCHETS	5	9.6	6.8	ð.3	10.9
C7 SX	5	-9.2	2.6	ن.12-	-7.1
C7 SZ	5	64.E	1.7	63.1	67.3
TRAG SX	5	-1.2	3.4	-4.9	2.5
TFAG SZ	5	75.8	1.4	73.9	77.8
SPL AVG	5	56.5	6.3	50.3	63.3
STE EXTR	5	48.3	7.6	ز.37	55.0
STR FLXR	5	36.0	2.3	33.3	39.3
F2NEUTE	5	0.8	2.5	-3.1	3.7
PJEXTE	5	83.0	4.2	76.5	87.5
FUPLEXE	5	-61.5	7.3	-68.2	-50.6
FSAGECE	5	144.5	9.0	134.3	155.7

40

1 -

baseline data set<sup>1</sup> for 50th percentile males. In this data set the lower-most segment corresponds to the pelvic mass and is 20% of the torso length. The middle and upper torso segments are about 25 and 55 percent of the torso length respectively. These proportions are somewhat arbitrary, however, and were later changed in this study to 44 and 36 percent respectively in order to provide for torso bending above the chest restraint belt. In most of the results presented later in this chapter, however, the upper and middle torso joints (joints 3 and 4) have been made essentially rigid so that the torso bends only at the hip joint (see section 7).

Extremity segment lengths were determined directly from the averaged anthropometric measures taken in this study. Initially, trocanter-femoral length was used for upper leg length, fibula length for lower leg, radiale-stylion plus hand length for lower arm, and acromion-radiale for upper arm length. At a later point in the study, the arm segments were removed and one half of the upper arm mass was added to the upper torso mass. This was done when it was realized from the high speed films that the arms were restrained by straps.

Mass and moment of inertia values for the torso were also scaled in proportion to segment values in the baseline data relative to total body mass minus the mass of the head and neck. Segment masses were scaled in direct proportion to segment length while moments of inertia were scaled to the baseline data, by proportions of mass times segment length squared.

Distances from link ends (i.e., joints) to segment centers of mass were scaled to the baseline data proportions. These values were all adjusted appropriately when

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This baseline date set for the MVMA-2D model has been established and modified over the years from existing and newly acquired data and continues to be updated and improved as the model is used.

the upper torso joint (joint 3) was moved up. The values shown in Table 3.3 are those used in the NAMRL data set for the results of this report.

### Table 3.3

#### Torso and Extremity Segment Specifications For NAMRL Data Set

Segment	Length(cm)	End of Link to Center of Mass(cm)	Mass(kg)	$\frac{1 \text{ yy}}{(\text{Kq}-\text{m}^2)}$
Upper torse (includes 1/2 upper arm mass)	0 20.3	10.15	15.3	.1433
Middle tor:	so 23.9	8.8	9.5	.1343
Hip	10.8	4.2	8.4	.1995
Upper leg	40.7	18.5	17.62	.2705
Lower leg	40.7	28.8	9.5	.3412

b. Head and Neck Mass and Moment of Inertia. A correlation of anthropometric dimensions with head mass and moment of inertia measurements on five male cadavers from a study by Chandler, et al., 1975 (3) showed that head mass is highly correlated with head circumference and that moment of inertia is highly correlated with the quantity [(menton to vertex)<sup>2</sup> + (head length)<sup>2</sup>] x [head circumference]. Accordingly, these anthropometric measures from the five NAMRL subjects were used with these measures from cadavers to obtain estimates for head mass and head moment of inertia. Neck mass was obtained by scaling to the head mass in proportion to the MVMA baseline data, and was distributed with 33 percent at the condyles and 67 percent at the lower neck joint. To the head mass and moment of inertia were added the mass and 'oments of inertia due to the instrument packages given as .522 kg and .0075 kg-m<sup>2</sup> respectively by Ewing and Thomas (9). These calculations resulted in the following

42

values for the NAMRL data set.

Instrumented Head Mass = 4.615 KgInstrumented Head Iyy =  $.024 \text{ Kg-m}^2$ Neck Mass = 1.194 Kg

c. Neck length and location of head c.g. While x-rays of the NAMRL subjects were not available, an estimate of neck length and location of the head center of gravity relative to the occipital condyles was obtained by using x-ray films from young male subjects of the IIHS studies. The X and Z distances from tragion to the condyles were measured and scaled and added to the average distances of tragion to head center of gravity determined by Ewing, et al. (8) (i.e., the head c.g. lies 2.1 cm above and 1.3 cm forward of tragion). To this was added the distance the head c.g. is shifted by the instrumentation package which is given by Ewing and Thomas (9) as .35 cm forward and .2 cm down. Neck length was estimated by using anthropometry results for the five NAMRL subjects in order to locate tragion and cervicale in two dimensions. X-ray measurements from the IIHS young males were utilized in order to locate the condyles and  $C_7-T_1$  relative to these external anatomical points. The neck length was then computed as the straight line distance from  $C_{7}-T_{7}$  to the occipital condyles. The results of these measurements and calculations gave the following values:

- x distance condyles to head c.g. = 2.47 cm
- z distance condyles to head c.g. =-4.16 cm neck length =11.2 cm

where the positive x axis is forward in the Frankfort plane and positive z is down.

2. Head and Neck Range of Motion. Since the physical situation being simulated involved primarily sagittal plane movements, only the sagittal plane range of motion results need to be considered here. These results give a measure for the maximum head angle forward (flexion) and maximum head angle rearward (extension) from the Frankfort plane position achieved by voluntary effort. While these angles are the cumulative result of bending at several articulations along the length of the neck (i.e., at each cervical disk) and at the condyles, the MVMA-2D model considers only two neck joints connected by a straight-line segment neck. While these joints may be positioned as desired, it was considered most reasonable to initially consider the upper neck joint to be at the occipital condyles and the lower neck joint to be at the  $C_7-T_1$  disk. For range-of-motion input specifications, then, the model requires that joint stop angles for movement of the neck relative to the torso and movement of the head relative to the neck be specified. Figure 3.2 illustrates these required stop angles where the



Figure 3.2 Range-of-Motion "Stop" Angles used in MVMA-2D Crash Victim Simulator.

maximum flexion and extension of the neck relative to the torso are labeled  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$  respectively, and the maximum angle of the head beyond the neck angle in full flexion and extension are  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  respectively. The problem, then, is to determine these angles from the range-of-motion results. Two possible solutions were considered.

The first approach considered was to measure  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\delta$  directly from y-camera photographs. The difficulty, of course, is to locate the condyles and the  $C_7-T_1$  disk. These points were estimated, however, by using average measures of the x and z distances from  $C_7 - T_1$  to cervicale and tragion to the condyles obtained from x-rays of young males in the IIHS study. These distances were then scaled appropriately and marked off from cervicale and tragion on the projected NAMRL range-of-motion photographs. In this way, the angle of the neck relative to the torso live (assumed to be vertical) was measured directly in flexion, extension, and Frankfort positions. The angle of the head relative to the neck was measured as the angle between the perpendicular to the Frankfort plane and this neck angle line. While there is some inaccuracy in the measurements due to the difficulty in locating cervicale in extension and the uncertainty of the change in orientation of C, during flexion and extension, some consistency in the method was found and average values for  $\alpha_i$ , 3, y, and  $\delta$  were determined to be:

L	3	-3.5°
3	-	64.9°
ſ	4	€4.4°
5	z	19.0°

The sum of these angles should equal the total sagittal range of motion and is 144.8 degrees compared to 144.5 degrees determined by orthogonal photogrammetry techniques for these five subjects.

When the joint stop angles are determined in this way (where the orientation of the neck is considered to be that of the straight line segment connecting  $C_7-T_1$  to the condyles) some of the range of motion due to articulations at neck joints is attributed to the upper neck joint in the model. While this may be a reasonable way of dividing the range of motion between the two joints, it does have some drawbacks. If the upper neck joint is to represent the occipital condyles, which is an important articulation between the large mass of the head and the relatively small extensible neck, then it is perhaps more important that the joint stop angle specification for this joint be correct even though this means that the lower joint assumes the cumulative range of motion for all other neck joints.

As a result of these considerations, a second approach was used to determine the joint stop angles needed in the model. In the IIHS sagittal study, x-rays were taken while subjects performed full flexion and full extension movements. From these x-rays, the change in angle of  $C_2$  (this is nearly the same as the angle of  $C_1$ and easier to measure) relative to the vertical was used for the lower neck joint range of motion, while the change in head angle (as determined by the Frankfort plane) relative to  $C_2$  was used for the condyle range of motion. The results of these measures gave:

a	=	-5.0°
ê	z	25.5°
Ý	=	71.C°
ð	=	53.3°

While these values were not determined from the NAMRL subject data, the total range of motion which is the sum of these angles is 144.3 degrees compared to 144.5 for the fire NAMRL subjects. Also, a t-test between the IIHS

sagittal study range-of-motion results and the NAMRL rangeof-motion results showed no significant difference at the .10 level of significance.

The primary difference in these angles from those derived by the first method is in extension where the head-neck angle is 25.5° compared to 64.9° and the necktorso angle is 53.3° compared to 19°. For the first method, the total head flexion from vertical is  $\alpha + \gamma = 60.9°$ while for the second it is 66°. In extension, the first method gives  $\beta + \delta = 83.9°$  as compared to 78.3° for the second method.

While NAMEL simulations using stop angles determined by both of these techniques have been used, simulations presented in this report use the results of the second approach. Differences in occupant response due to the two sets of data depend upon stiffness values of the joint stops, however. As will be discussed in the next section, the values for joint-stop stiffness being used at this time result in only small differences in the model output from the two sets of data.

Passive Joint Torques and Joint Stops. There are virtually no data available from which to determine reasonable estimates for passive joint resistance and joint stop characteristics of the head and neck. While the MVMA-2D model has the capability to simulate these torques by several sources, initially all passive resistance coefficients within the range-of-motion angles were set to zero and torques due to movement beyond the joint stops were represented by a constant times the square of the angular deformation of the stop. Values which have been used previously in the MVMA-2D model for this quadratic angular deflection coefficient are 2.82 and 5.5 N-m/deg<sup>2</sup> for both neck joints at flexion and extension stops respectively. When the model was run

under these conditions (with muscle effects included), however, the results showed sharp peaks of acceleration produced by the joint stops which were clearly not present in the experimental sled test results (see Figure 3.23). It was clear that the joint stops were too stiff but intuitively the values used did not seem excessive for the range-of-motion angles measured on the subjects.

An attempt to remedy this problem was made by reducing the joint stop angular deflection coefficients by a factor of 100 and also adding some appreciable viscous damping to the joints throughout the range of motion. The results were much more reasonable. While little justification can be offered at this time for these values other than the fact that good results are obtained, the explanation perhaps lies in the inappropriateness of the term "joint stops." For the purposes of this study, the joint stop angles were defined to be those angles at which a human subject is unable or unwilling to move his head any further in a given direction. No measurements have been made, however, of the forces it took to achieve this final position. There is little doubt that for motivated subjects the torques required to go beyond their voluntary effort are compatible with the magnitude of the stiffness coefficients used in the MVMA-2D model, and that the assumption that the torque is proportional to the square of the angle beyond the stop is reasonable. But it is also reasonable to expect that the joint torgues have been increasing in some manner up to this final position. By reducing the quadratic coefficients and adding the viscous damping constant, it was possible in some suitable but still inexact way, to model the complex characteristics of the physiological joint. In addition, by adding the viscous damping coefficient, the resistive torque is made sensitive to angular velocity which also seems to be a reasonable attempt to model effects of passive tissue such

as ligaments. There is no doubt, however, that further research and study is needed in this area before confidence in this aspect of the model will be achieved. In any case, for the results presented, neck viscous damping coefficients have been set to .01 and .03 N-m-sec/deg. for the upper and lower neck joints respectively. For the joint stop quadratic deflection coefficients which become effective when the joint stop angles are exceeded, the following values have been used:

In choosing the value for the condyles in extension, consideration was given to the fact that the subject is initially positioned very close to his measured head-neck joint stop angle in extension (see sections 2 and 6) where the resistive torques are significant. Consequently, this constant was maintained reasonably close to the MVMA baseline value.

4. <u>Neck Muscle Model</u>. There are several models in the literature which attempt to simulate muscle based upon experimental observations, all of which have limitations and deficiencies and are simplified approximations of a complex mechanism. The MVMA-2D simulator models the active element by a spring and dashpot in series as shown in Figure 3.3.



Figure 3.3 Muscle Element

49



. . .

------

Figure 3.4 Simplified Free-Body Diagram of Head and Neck Showing Major Forces Involved During Isometric Strength Testing.

\$74

Here the coefficients K(M) and C(M) are considered simple functions of the voluntary static moment, M (i.e., of the "tightness" of the muscles), as given by the following equations:

> $K = a_1 + a_2 |M|$  $C = a_3 |M|$

From these equations it is seen that when the muscles are relaxed (i.e., M = 0), the muscle has no effect on joint torque since C = 0. The muscle tension is time-dependent and is input to the model in tabular form.

The values of  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $a_3$  in the above equations are joint parameters and are dependent on the particular muscle strengths of the occupant and the particular joints involved. Baseline data for these values have been determined by Bowman (1) and are derived from experimental data on the knee joint obtained by Moffatt, Hassis, and Haslam (17). For the lower neck joint and [M] max = 27.73 N-m, Bowman gives:

> $a_1 = .1668 \text{ N-m/deg}$  $a_2 = .153 \text{ deg}^{-1}$  $a_3 = .0129 \text{ sec/deg}$

For the NAMRL population, the actual forces in the neck muscles at the upper and lower neck joints were estimated from the measured isometric pull forces by summing moments about the condyles and  $C_7-T_1$  respectively as shown in Figure 3.4. The distance  $\ell_2$  was estimated from measurements taken from tragion to the head band during strength tests and by x-ray measurements from the condyles to tragion. Average values used for the NAMRL population were 3.32 cm and 2.1 cm respectively giving an  $\ell_2$  distance of 5.42 cm. The value for  $\ell_n$  was the neck length as computed in Section 1. For the extensor muscles,  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_3$  were estimated at 2" or 5.08 cm. from x-ray and skull measurements. Using these values and the average muscle pull force for the five subjects in extension (48.28 lbf.), the values of  $T_E$  and  $T'_E$  were calculated as:

> $T_E = 51.5$  lbf. = 229.1 N  $T_E = 157.96$  lbf. = 702.6 N

While the baseline values for  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $a_3$  were computed assuming a maximum joint torque of 27.73 N-m due to muscle, these values were used for the lower neck joint muscle model where the maximum estimated torque in extension is 5.08 cm times 702.6 N or 35.7 N-m and they were scaled to the condyle joint where the maximum estimated torque in extension is 11.6 N-m. Bowman (1) has shown that  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $a_3$  may be reasonably scaled as follows from joint to joint in an individual or from individual to individual:

(1) 
$$\mathbf{a}_{1}, \mathbf{n} = \left(\frac{\mathbf{L}_{11}}{\mathbf{L}_{1}}\right)^{2} \mathbf{a}_{1}, \mathbf{n} = \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}_{\max}, \mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{F}_{\max}, \mathbf{n}}\right)^{2}$$
  
(2)  $\mathbf{a}_{2}, \mathbf{n} = \left(\frac{\mathbf{L}_{11}}{\mathbf{L}_{1}}\right) \mathbf{a}_{2}, \mathbf{n}$   
(3)  $\mathbf{a}_{3}, \mathbf{n} = \left(\frac{\mathbf{L}_{11}}{\mathbf{L}_{1}}\right) \mathbf{a}_{3}, \mathbf{n}$ 

where the subscripts I and II refer to the two joints involved. Since the distances through which the extensors act are assumed the same for both neck joints, the only constant that is altered for the condyles is  $a_1$ . This is scaled by the ratio of the maximum muscle tensions which is:

$$\frac{T_{\rm E}}{T_{\rm E}} = \frac{230.0 \text{ N}}{702.6 \text{ N}} = .326$$

Table 3.4 gives the muscle parameter constants used in simulations of this report based upon these assumptions and calculations.

### Table 3.4

Muscle Parameter Values Used in NAMRL Simulations

Joint	Parameter			
	a <sub>l</sub> (N-m/deg)	$a_2 (deg^{-1})$	a <sub>3</sub> (sec/deg)	100% Muscle Torque(N-m)
Occ. Condyles	.053	.153	.0129	11.6
$C_7 - T_1$	.1668	.153	.0129	35.7

For neck stretch, these constants were converted to lineal coefficients (as opposed to angular) and scaled appropriately by considering the total muscle tension due to flexors and extensors. For computing flexor muscle tension a similar technique of taking moments about  $C_7$ -T<sub>1</sub> was used considering the primary muscle group (the sternomastoids) to act at an average distance of about  $1^{*}(\ell_{*})$  relative to the lower neck joint. For the average flexion pull strength for the 5 NAMRL subjects of 36 lbf. and the same values of  $k_p$  and  $k_n$  as for extension (see Figure 3.4), a maximum flexor tension of 235.5 lbf. or 1047.5 N is calculated. When added to the maximum extensor muscle tension of 702.6 N, the total neck muscle tension is estimated to be 1750.1 N or 393 lbf. Bowman (1) has shown that the muscle parameter constants in neck stretch,  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $a_3$ , are related approximately to the angular coefficients used above  $-a_1$ ,  $a_2$ ,  $a_3$  - by:

(4) 
$$a_1^{l} = 2a_1/l^2$$
;  $a_2^{l} = 2a_2/l$   
 $a_3^{l} = a_3/l$ 

where l is the moment arm distance for the angular constants, taken in this study to be the average for extension and flexion or 1.5". Using  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $a_3$  from the baseline data gives:

> $a_1^{\ell} = 131.7$  N/cm  $a_2^{\ell} = 2.3$  cm<sup>-1</sup>  $a_3^{\ell} = .193$  sec/cm

In addition to these parameter values which the model uses to compute K(m) and C(m), values for the maximum muscle tension and torque are required. In previous studies (22,23) it has been assumed that for the situation where there is prior warning of impact, an individual will be able to pretense his neck muscles to 100% or more of the tension measured in an isometric laboratory exertion. On further examination of this question in this study, it appears that this may be an inaccurate assumption. Based upon subjective feelings and a brief study of EMG signals, it appears that an individual is only able to develop about 1/4 to 1/2 of his maximum isometric pull strength when tensing without an external reacting surface. Thus, even for the NAMRL subjects who are fully prepared for the impact and are aware of the exact time it will occur, it is questionable whether they can be "fully" tensed at time t = 0. As a result of these considerations, muscle tensions and torques were set at 33% of maximum and maintained constant throughout the simulations. Whether the constant tension assumption is reasonable is unknown at this time. It may be that the muscles build quickly (in 50 msec or less) to their maximum tension once the head

begins to angulate, and this time may be even shorter than the reflex times measured in this study since the muscles are already in an active state. It may also be, however, that the muscle is somehow "cut out" by the violent stretching produced by the impact. The problem requires further study and experimental testing.

In any case, rather than attempting to guess some timedependent muscle input function, a constant muscle tension or torque of 33% of maximum was used. This resulted in the following values for the five NAMRL subjects:

> Maximum muscle torque about condyles = 3.87 N-m Maximum muscle torque about  $C_7-T_1$  = 11.9 N-m Maximum muscle force in neck stretch = 583.4 N

5. Neck Stretch and Compression  $Y_{L}$  imeters. The MVMA-2D model simulates the stretch and compression characteristics of the neck due to passive tissue by a spring-damper combination. von Gierke (24) has reported that the undamped natural frequency of the head caused by z-excitation of the upper torso is about 30 Hertz. A first-order spring rate for the neck can be approximated by:

> $K_s = 4\pi^2 f_o^2 (M_h + 1/3 M_n);$ where  $M_h$  = head mass and  $M_n$  = neck mass.

For NAMRL subjects  $M_h = 4.093$  Kg and  $M_n = 1.533$  Kg. Using  $f_n = 30$  Hz gives  $K_g = 1636$  N/cm.

For a mass-spring-damper model of the human body with spinal column, von Gierke (24) gives a range of .221 to .266 for the damping ratio for the composite spinal column. For lack of better data, an estimate of one fourth of this has been assumed reasonable for the cervical spine alone.

Using a value of .243 from von Gierke's data, and with the critical damping value given by  $2\sqrt{K(M_h + 1/3 M_n)}$  the damping coefficient is given by:

$$\frac{1}{4(.243)} = \frac{C_{s}}{2\sqrt{K(M_{h} + 1/3 M_{n})}}$$

$$C_{s} = .0608 \times 2\sqrt{1636(4.093 + .511)}$$

$$C_{s} = 10.55 \text{ N-sec/cm}$$

6. Neck and Head Initial Angles. Initial neck angle was based upon the results of Ewing, et al., 1975 (10) in which the neck angle was calculated from the coordinates of the head anatomical and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  anatomical origin locations at first sled motion. By this procedure, the neck angle is estimated by a line drawn from the anterior-superid corner of  $T_1$  through tragion. For the five NAMRL subjects the average neck angle is approximately 20° to the vertical.

Head angle is determined by the pitch orientation of the Frankfort plane relative to the vertical. Initial head angle was determined from the sled test experimental curves for head pitch angle at time t = 0. For the 6 G runs the average head angle for the five subjects was calculated to be 95.54 degrees (head back) while for the 15 G runs the average head angle was calculated as 93.64 degrees (head back).

7. <u>Restraint System.</u> One of the most difficult aspects of the sled test simulation was in modeling the restraint system. While complete satisfaction in this area has still not been achieved, some reasonable progress has been made as reported in the results in Section C of this chapter. As an initial step, two pieces of the webbing material used in the restraint system were tested for stress-strain characteristics under static loading

conditions. From these tests a value of K = 112,000 N per unit strain was determined and used in the model.

Because of the manner in which the belts are placed during the sled tests and because actual belt loading curves are not measured, it is difficult to determine exactly how the belt forces interact with the torso ( i.e., where the belts grab or push on the torso). Figure 3.5 shows the actual belt configuration while Figure 3.6 shows the final belt configuration used in the simulations presented in this report and described below.

a. Lap belt. The lap belt was attached to the anterior-superior part of the hip segment and anchored to the sled behind and below the point of attachment to the occupant. The force strain characteristics were doubled from that determined above since there are effectively two lengths of webbing restraining the subject (i.e., the belt wraps around the subject and is anchored at two points on the sled).

Upper and Middle Torso belts. From repeated b. observations of high speed films, the impression was gained that the primary restraining of the torso is a result of belt forces applied to the chest in the region of or just below the sternum, and that the forces restraining at  $T_1$ and the shoulders are not sufficient to prevent some flexion of the torso above this point. Initially it was thought that these forces at the chest were due to the chest belt which wraps around from behind and passes just beneath the arms. Later in the study, Dr. Thomas indicated that this belt is only a backup safety belt and has too much initial slack to be of major importance. This point is academic to the simulation, however, since it only means that the shoulder belts have their primary restraining action on the chest rather than the shoulders. With these points in mind, the torso restraint system was modeled as shown in Figure 3.6.

57

A State State Company of the





Figure 3.5 Front and Side Photographs of NAMRL Subject in Sled Chair Showing Restraint System.


The shoulder belts are simulated by one belt (belt 2) which anchors slightly above and behind the shoulders and attaches to the superior-anterior region of the upper torso segment, and a second belt (belt 3) which attaches just below this belt on the upper torso and anchors vertically below near the hip. The chest restraining forces are simulated by a rigid contact surface<sup>1</sup> (line 4) which is specified such that it is initially in contact with a contact ellipse on the superior-anterior part of the middle torso segment, just below joint 3.

In order to simulate slipping of the shoulders relative to the shoulder belts, two techniques were used. First, a model option was implemented for belts 2 and 3 which limits the tension in belt three to 50% of the tension in belt 2. Second, in order to simulate slipping, the belt material properties of belt two were altered from the measured webbing properties for the first 5 centimeters of  $T_1$  movement as shown in Figure 3.7. As illustrated,



Figure 3.7 Force-Deflection Specifications for Upper Torso Belts.

<sup>1</sup>Since the belt system in the MVMA-2D model is not sufficiently general to represent the complex restraint system used in the NAMRL testing, a fake-belt was needed to simulate the chest restraint.

A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER

the slipping force is set equal to 70 N for the belts on the two shoulders. At 5 centimeters of slip, the measured belt properties (considering lengths and numbers of webbings) take effect.

As discussed in Section B.1, the option to include torso flexion resulting from belt slip at the shoulders is provided for by placing joint 3 just above the chest restraining belt. For most runs in this report, however, the stiffness coefficient of joint 3 is set to a value which makes the torso essentially rigid from joint 2 to joint 5.

Chest Compliance. In comparison to the chest с. compliance, the belt material may be considered essentially rigid and so, for simplicity, the contacting surface used to simulate the belt acting on the chest was made rigid. Values of chest compliance in the literature cover a wide range depending on the condition of the cadaver, the rate of force application, and the size and mass of the deforming disk. Most experiments use a disk of about 6" diameter applied to the sternal area of the chest, and it is doubtful that the compliance factor arrived at in this manner would agree with that obtained by using a belt of low mass which contacts a substantial surface of the chest. As a result of these considerations, a value for the chest compliance of 1000 lb./in. or 1751 N/cm was arbitrarily specified for the middle torso contacting ellipse. Effects of this varying compliance factor will be illustrated.

## C. NAMRL Simulations

1. <u>General</u>. This section contains the graphical comparisons of the MVMA-2D simulations and experimental results for 6 and 15 G sled runs. Unless otherwise noted, the simulations use the data set described in Section B of this chapter developed from physical measurements on the 5 NAMRL subjects (described in Chapter 2) and other available data and assumptions. For each run the time dependent

variables of head angular acceleration, head angular velocity, head angular position, head resultant acceleration, and where appropriate,  $T_1$  resultant acceleration are plotted and compared with experimental results. In all cases, a dashed line is used for simulations while a solid line is used for the average experimental curves. These average curves are shown by the dashed lines in each plot of Appendix C which illustrate the individual response curves from which these averages were obtained. Except for the  $T_1$  resultant accelerations at 15 G's, it is seen that all 5 subjects show very consistent and similar responses.

## 2. Results using $T_1$ acceleration input.

General. Initial attempts to simulate the NAMRL a. sled tests at 6 and 15 G's were less than satisfactory. Because of the uncertainty in modeling the restraint system, it was difficult to know whether adjustments were needed in occupant parameters or in the restraint system. In order to separate these two factors and allow "tuning" of head and neck parameters for optimal matching to sled test results, it was decided to fix  $T_1$  rigidly to the sled and use the experimentally determined linear  $T_1$ accelerations in the x and z directions as sled acceleration input curves. Use of  $T_1$  angular acceleration was also considered but a review of the NAMRL results for this signal and for  $T_1$  angular position suggested that this was not always a reliable measurement. Figures 3.8 and 3.9 illustrate these  $T_1$  acceleration curves obtained by averaging the data for the five NAMRL subjects.

Figures 3.10 and 3.11 illustrate the simulation results for head angular acceleration, velocity, and position, and head resultant linear acceleration in comparison to the averaged sled test results at 6 and 15 G's respectively. These results were obtained after some



a state of the second second

Net case



Figure 3.9 Averaged Experimental  $T_1$  Accelerations from Five NAMRL Subjects at 15 G's.

1. 1. M. M. N. N. N.

100



Figure 3.10 Simulation Results Using 6 G T $_1$  Accelerations-Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum.



Figure 3.11 Simulation Results Using 15 G T<sub>1</sub> Accelerations-Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum.

adjustments in parameters such as joint viscous friction, joint stop stiffness, and muscle tension as discussed in Section B of this Chapter. The initial neck angle is 70 degrees from the horizontal in both cases and the initial head angles are 95.4 and 93.6 degrees from the horizontal (head slightly back) for the 6 and 15 G runs respectively. From these curves, it is seen that the simulations match the experimental curves quite well. In both simulations, however, the initial spike in head angular acceleration is smaller and more rounded than in the experimental results and the head angular position curves rise earlier but at similar slopes. At 6 G's the angular velocity shows a plateau on the downward slope but this occurs later than in the experimental curve. While these results could perhaps be improved by further adjustments in the parameters, this was not considered justified due to the uncertainty of the T, signals themselves (i.e., review of the high-speed films indicate that the T<sub>1</sub> accelerometers have considerable movement relative to T,, especially in 15 G tests).

の時代の時代は行動に行動時代に、時代時代時代的に、など、転換

b. Effects of Muscle Tension. The question of the importance of muscle mechanics on the dynamic response of the head and neck has been of interest in recent years. While this study has not completely resolved the question, some preliminary insight has been gained and also the validity of the assumption of 33% maximum muscle tension has been tested by running the model while changing only the level of muscle tension. Figures 3.12 through 3.15 illustrate the results obtained if muscle tension is set and maintained at 0% and 100% of maximum. The general characteristics of the curves are not changed appreciably, except for head angular position.

At 0% of muscle tension (i.e., no muscle input) the angular positions are uncontrolled and become unrealistic, while at 100% muscle tension the angular position is



Figure 3.12 Simulation Results Using 6 G T $_1$  Acceleration-Muscle Tension = 0% Maximum



Figure 3.13 Simulation Results Using 6 G T $_1$  Acceleration-Muscle Tension = 100% Maximum.



Figure 3.14 Simulation Results Using 15 G T Acceleration - Muscle Tension = 0% Maximum.



, · · ·

Figure 3.15 Simulation Results Using 15 G T<sub>1</sub> Acceleration - Muscle Tension - 100% Maximum.

greatly reduced. It is interesting that at 15 G's the effects of changing the muscle tension are considerably less than at 6 G's. At 15 G's, the angular acceleration, angular velocity, and head resultant acceleration curves are changed little at 100% muscle tension and fit the experimental data extremely well at 0% muscle tension. At 6 G's the effects of muscle tension are more dramatic in head angular acceleration and particularly head angular velocity.

These results suggest that for the 6 G runs, the muscles play a major role and that the assumption of 33% muscle tension is reasonable. At 15 G's, the muscular effects are less important and they may in fact be eliminated by some protective reflex. The fact that the angular head position increases greatly at 0% muscle tension should not be a major consideration at this time since the joint stop resistance coefficients used probably do not represent the true physiological situation. Further, the condition of 0% muscle tension is also unrealistic and has been used only to dramatize the effects.

3. <u>Results with Sled Acceleration Input and Restraint</u> System.

a. General. Since satisfactory results were obtained from the model simulations with  $T_1$  fixed, it was assumed that established parameter values for the occupant head and neck were at least "in the ball park". Therefore, attempts at simulating the complete occupant with appropriate torso and restraint system modeling were undertaken. The final configuration of the restraint system used in the model is discussed in section B.7 of this chapter while Figure 3.16 shows the sled acceleration profiles used for 6 and 15 G runs.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>These profiles are for NAMRL's high rate of onset, long duration acceleration pulses.

72

- MARTING AND



Figure 3.16 6 and 15 G Sled Acceleration Profiles Obtained from NAMRL Maximum Rate of Onset-Maximum Duration Sled Runs.

Figures 3.17 and 3.18 show the simulation results and averaged experimental results at 15 and 6 G's respectively using a constant 33% maximum muscle tension, a nearly rigid torso (i.e., no bending at joint 3) and a chest compliance factor of 1750 N/cm (1000 lb/in). In addition to the four variables shown previously,  $T_1$  resultant accelerations are also compared.

At 15 G's, there is good agreement between experimental and simulated results. For angular acceleration, the initial positive spikes match extremely well in magnitude although in the simulation this spike occurs about 10 msec too soon. The initial negative spike is of considerably larger magnitude in the simulation. For angular velocity, the magnitudes of the peak velocities match well although the simulation curve reaches a peak about 5 msec earlier than the experimental curve and decreases to zero with a greater slope, reaching zero about 25 msec earlier. The angular position curves peak at the same time with the simulation peak being about .15 radians or 8.5 degrees greater. The two curves rise to their peaks with approximately the same slopes although the simulation curve precedes the experimental curve by about 10 msec. The T<sub>1</sub> resultant curves match extremely well considering the fact that there is probably some error in the experimental curve (due to the inability to attach the accelerometers rigidly to  $T_1$ ) and the fact that these curves are a result of the complex interactions of the restraint system with the torso and dynamic feedback from the head. Both curves show the bimodal nature with peaks of similar magnitude at similar times. The head resultant accelerations do not match quite as well but both curves are of a similar bimodal nature matching well in magnitudes but not as well in times.











L

ALL ADDITION



Figure 3.17 (continued)









÷ 14



Figure 3.18 (continued)

At 6 G's, the matching is a reasonable fit, though not as close as the 15 G results. The simulation curve for angular acceleration shows a positive peak slightly larger and about 20 msec earlier than the experimental curve, but there is excellent agreement on the negative acceleration portion of the curve. The angular velocity curves match less well with the simulation having a larger peak and, as with the 15 G test, decreasing to zero at a greater rate. The simulation curve also does not show the plateau at about 150 msec although there is a slight change in the slope at this point. The angular position curves match well in magnitudes, but again the simulation curve peaks about 40 msec sooner than the experimental curve. Head resultant and T, resultant acceleration simulation curves show the bimodal characteristics and are of similar magnitude to the experimental curves but the second spikes occur earlier (i.e., the frequency is higher) for the simulation curves.

On the angular position curves, the symbols indicate the times at which the subject has reached the joint stops as determined by the procedures in Section B.2. In both cases the subject initially contacts the joint stop at the condyler with the head/neck joint in extension (i.e., angle # in Figure 3.2 initially increases). At 15 G's the subject reaches the condyle joint stop in flexion at about 123 msec and then reaches the lower neck joint stop in flexion at about 132 msec. At 6 G's the subject reaches the condyle joint stop in flexion at about 156 msec and does not reach the lower neck joint stop.

b. Neck Forces and Torques. Figures 3.19 and 3.20 s. we the magnitudes of the neck joint torgues contrilated by viscous, muscular, and joint stop mechanisms in the simulations at 6 and 15 G's respectively. It will be noted that the contributions due to joint stops are relative-



Figure 3.19 Neck Joint Torques in 6 G Simulation. Muscle Tension = 33% Maximum, Viscous Coefficients = .01 N-m-sec/ deg for Upper Neck and .03 N-m-sec/deg for Lower Neck. Joint Stop Coefficients = .0261 N-m/deg for Upper Neck in Flexion, 1.0 N-m/deg for Upper Neck in Extension, and nNMY N-m/deg for Lower Neck in Extension, and nNMY N-m/deg for Lower Neck in Floxian and Extension.





ly small (except for the condyles in extension) due to the small values of quadratic deflection coefficients sed. It is also seen that the muscle provides the major restraining torque at both joints and at both G levels, the proportion to viscous torques being greater for the 6 G simulation.

Figure 3.21 illustrates the neck forces in telsion (negative) and the compression (positive) contributed by muscle, viscous, and elastic components at 6 and 15 G's. It is seen that the proportional contribution of the force due to muscle is greater at 6 G's than at 15 G's.

c. Belt Forces. Figure 3.22 illustrates the belt forces developed versus time for each run. Since the deflection of the upper torso belt does not exceed 5 cm (it reaches about 3.5 cm at 15 G's) the forces in whis belt (belt 2) and belt 3 (see Figure 3.6) do not exceed 70 N. As one might expect, the force time-curve for the fake chest belt shows the same multi-peak characteristics as the  $T_1$  resultant acceleration curves.

d. Effect of Increasing Neck Joint Stop Stiffness. Figure 3.23 illustrates the effect on the 15 G results of Increasing the joint stop quadratic deflection coefficients to what would seem to be more realistic values of 2.0 N-m/deg<sup>2</sup> at the condyles and 1.0 N-m/d<sup>2</sup> at  $C_7-T_1$ . The primary effect (compare with Figure 3.18) is the large negative spikes on the head angular acceleration curve which result from the head suddenly contacting the more rigid stops. It will be noticed, however, that the peak head angle position is not reduced significantly from that which resulted from the softened stops used in all other simulations.

e. Effect of Chest Compliance. Figures 3.24 and 3.25 illustrate the effects of changing the chest compliance factor to 3500 N/cm and 875 N/cm respectively. As expected, the primary change is in the frequency or



Figure 3.21 Longitudinal Neck Forces in 6 G (upper) and 15 G (lower) Simulations.

ŧ

4

5

- 10 - 70 0



i e o

ື ສະ .... ເ

> . K

> > $\widetilde{\delta}$

.

Ø

.....

. Seri

> 唐. """

. 4

. .

.

Ś

10 10 10

Figure 3.22 Belt Forces from 6 G (upper) and 15 G (lower) Simulations.



na NU





X

**#** 

Figure 3.23 (continued)

times of occurrence of the peaks and valleys. With a stiffer chest the curves are sharper and peaks occur earlier. If one considers the  $T_1$  resultant acceleration to be the best measure of chest compliance, then it would appear that 1751 N/cm (Figure 3.17) is the best value. The results for 875 N/cm (Figure 3.25) are complicated, however, by the fact that this lower chest compliance allowed greater than 5 cm deflection of the upper torso belt and the real belt properties came into play at about 96 ms/c. (see Figure 3.7) This resulted in a sudden additional acceleration to the chest and head causing the curves to change shape more than would have been produced by changing chest compliance alone. It is clear that further work is needed to improve this part of the restraint system modeling.

W294

é

à.

f. Effect of Reducing Condyle Joint Stop Stiffness in Extension. As indicated in Section B.3, the condyle joint stop stiffness coefficient in extension was maintained reasonably close to the MVMA-2D baseline values at 1.0 N-m/deg<sup>2</sup> while other joint stop coefficients were reduced substantially. The reasoning behind this was that in the initial position the subject's head/neck angle is very close to the maximum head/neck angle in extension determined by the procedures outlined in Section B.2. Since considerable effort is exerted by the subjects to achieve this position during range-of-motion testing, the MVMA-2D coefficients seemed a more reasonable approximation to model the initial joint torque situation. In an effort to determine the appropriateness of this assumption, a simulation run was made with this joint stop coefficient reduced to .0261 N-m/deg as is used for the condyles in flexion. Figure 3.26 shows the results of this run. In comparing these curves with those of Figure 3.18, it is seen that the only significant change is that the initial peak of the angular acceleration curve is reduced slightly but more important, it is delayed in time so that it is









ð. 8 s!

ħ.

8

à.

. - 1944

്

je G**u**een

6.. ő.

. تذاك

ь ..

85 1 8

8

ß

.





読める

í ń

ينتن تعتقر

đ

Figure 3.25 (continued)

95


₿ Ľ

ĝi.

۲

ŝ

ן גר

\*\* \*\*

> ر مندر منتخب بیگ

88 11

Figure 3.25 (continued)



Ŵ

. 1 1

Ď.

8

. . . . .

) **b** 

. ج ي

Şį.

1









È.C.

10.1

Line

Figure 3.26 (continued)

 $H^{(n)}_{i}({\mathbb R}^{d})$ 

ŝ

9**9** 

more in phase with the experimental curve. Figure 3.27 illustrates the head/neck angle curves for the two cases. The difference is small but significant in terms of the time shift in the peak of the angular acceleration curve. For the smaller joint stop stiffness coefficient, the head is allowed to extend backward relative to the neck an additional 2-3 degrees, resulting in a time delay of about 8 msec before the head begins to rotate forward. The effect that this change would have on improving the 6 G simulations has not yet been determined, but it is evident that further work is needed in modeling the joint stop characteristics.

gr a

્યુ

 $^{\circ}b^{\circ}$ 

Ĭ

.

 $^{3}l$ 

6 6 6

d.

, n<sup>' ()</sup>

What

Ņ

**\$** 

s<sup>a d</sup>

e N

ð

 . ... ............

5. 18

i de 👂 de Miste



TIME (msec)



g. Effect of Adding Upper Torso Flexion. As described in section B.1, the torso segment lengths were changed from the proportions of the MVMA-2D baseline data set so that the upper torso joint (joint 3 of Figure 3.1) is above the chest restraint belt. In this way, some amount of torso flexion which is observed in the high speed movies may be added by adjusting the stiffness of this joint. In the runs presented so far, this stiffness was maintained sufficiently high (500 N-m/deg) so that almost no torso flexion occurred. This was done primarily because the maximum head angle of the simulations was already greater than the experi intal results and adding torso flexion would increase this angle further. In addition, the parameters established by using T<sub>1</sub> accelerations as the input were based upon no rotation of T1. It is considered important, however, that this feature be eventually included in the model. Figure 3.28 shows the results obtained at 15 G's by reducing the linear stiffness coefficient of joint 3 from 500 to 75 N-m/deg while maintaining the reduced joint stop coefficient of the condyles in extension (Figure 3.26). Again, the changes are not dramatic but are informative. The angular acceleration curve is seen to be further improved in that the initial peak is increased in magnitude slightly and is a better fit to the experimental curve in the time following this peak. The angular velocity curve no longer has the plateau at 150 msec and crosses zero slightly later in time. While the angular position curve reaches a greater maximum angle by about 6 degrees (the upper torso angle now flexes by about 6 degrees) it does not show the tendency to curve up again at 275 msec. While these changes represent improvement in the simulations, it is curious that the T, and head resultant acceleration curves match less well to the experimental results when this torso flexion is allowed.

and the

18

 $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ 

∵Ĉ

ë P

(interfe

\_48.) .pr:1

 $\mathcal{A}^{d'}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 



a the second second second

19

ц. 6

tinn Jar ti

ų,

Y pro hi

# #

į

din.

豪心的

• • •

5

10.0

ું છે. તુકાર્ય છે. જે

115





ġ

. **19** 

, **(** 

28<sup>6</sup>

(Barta

بر المدني 24 ج

## Chapter 4

## SIMULATIONS FOR 18-24 YEAR FEMALES

### A. 18-24 Year Female Data Set.

While there are several aspects of the NAMRL data set and simulation which can be improved by further work and investigations, an attempt was made at this time to predict the sled test results that might be expected if young females were tested at 6 and 15 G's. The data set for these subjects was obtained by scaling the NAMRL data set parameter values using similar procedures to those discussed in Chapter 3, Section B and the measurement data obtained for these subjects and presented in references 22 and 23.

## 1. Segment Specifications

a. Torso and Extremities. Torso length was computed in the same manner as for the NANRL subjects and the segment lengths taken in the same percentages of total torso length. Exercisely lengths were taken from the same anthropometrie measurements and again the arms were removed and does hald of the upper arm mass was added to the upper taken. Values of mass, moment of inertia, and distances to centers of mass from joints were computed by scaling to the NAMRL data set values in a manner similar to that used for scaling NAMRL data to the MVMC baseline data. The result of the calculations gave the parameter values shown in Table 4.1.

#### Table 4.1

Torso and Extremity Segment Specifications For 18-24 Year Female Data Set

Segment	Length (c-)	End of Link to Center of Mass (Cm)	<u>Mass(kg</u> )	<u>IYY (Kg-m<sup>2</sup>)</u>
Upper Torso	17.78	8.89	11.4	.087
Middle Torso	22.95	8.5	7.9	.095
Hip	9.95	3.84	6.55	.133
Upper Leg	41.88	19.03	13.7	. 222
Lower Leg	40.5	25.47	7.4	. 208

b. Head and Neck Mass and Moment of Inertia. Head mass for the females was estimated by assuming that head mass is proportional to [Head Length x Head Breadth] and scaling to the Navy data based on the ratio of these values for both data sets. By these calculations, the female head mass is .885 times the NAMRL head mass giving an instrumented head mass of 4.164 kg for the females. As with the NAMRL subjects, female head moment of inertia was calculated from the male cadaver data of Chandler, et al. (3) using the relationship that head moment of inertia is proportional to [(Menton to vertex)<sup>2</sup> + (head length)<sup>2</sup>] x [Head circumference]. This gives an instrumented head moment of inertia for young females of .0211 Kg-m<sup>2</sup>.

Female neck mass was scaled to the NAMRL neck mass by assuming that mass is proportional to volume and that the neck is a cylinder whose circumference is equal to the average of superior and inferior neck circumference and whose length is proportional to erect sitting height. This gives a female neck mass of 1.194 Kg. of which 33% was placed at the condyles and 67% at  $C_7-T_1$ .

c. Neck Length and Location of Head Center of Gravity. The location of the head center of gravity relative to the condyles was determined by measuring distances from tragion to the condyles on x-rays from young females in the IIHS sagittal study. This gave average distances for tragion of .987 cm forward and 1.966 cm above the condyles. The distances given by Ewing, et al. (8) for the location of the c.g. relative to tragion and the shift in the c.g. due to the instrument package (9) on young males were assumed for the females also, and were added to the distances of tragion to condyles to give the location of the head center of gravity relative to the cordyles. This gave:

x distance condyles to head c.g. = 2.3 cm.

sautre av

4 1

y distance condyles to head c.g. = -4.07 cm.

Neck lengths for young females were obtained by direct measurement on x-rays of the linear distance from the condyle to  $C_7-T_1$  disk. After appropriate scaling this give an average neck length of 10.6 cm. This is in good agreement with the value of 10.4 cm which would be obtained if neck length were scaled to the NAMRL neck length by the proportions of erect sitting height [i.e., (female sit. ht./NAMRL sit. ht.) x NAMRL neck length = (86.24/92.88) x 11.2 = 10.4 cm].

2. Head and Neck Range of Motion. Values of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ , were determined for the NAMRL data set from x-rays of young males in the IIHS sagittal study (see Section B.2). The mean ranges of motion in flexion and extension for this group were 62.5 and 79.6 degrees respectively. For the young females the mean values for flexion and extension were 60.9 and 77.1 degrees respectively. Since these values do not differ significantly from the values for the males, the same values for  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\delta$  were used for the female data set.

3. <u>Passive Joint Torques and Joint Stops</u>. Since the joint stop quadratic deflection coefficients used for the

NAMEL subjects have little physiological basis, the same values ware used for the young females. Viscous coefficients, however, were scaled to the NAMEL data set values of .01 N-m-sec/deg and .03 N-m-sec/deg for the upper and lower neck joints respectively by the proportion of neck cross-sectional areas. The average of superior and inferior neck circumferences was used to determine neck radius which was computed to be 5.99 cm for the NAMEL subjects and 5.49 cm for the females. This gave a scaling factor of .84 which gives values of .0084 and .0252 N-msec/deg for the female upper and lower neck viscous coefficients.

¢2 ir

4. Neck Muscle Parameters. Neck muscle parameters  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ ,  $a_3$ , and  $a_1^{\ell}$ ,  $a_2^{\ell}$ ,  $a_3^{\ell}$  were scaled to the NAMRL parameters using the relations given in equations 1 through 4 of section B.4 of Chapter 3. Distances  $\ell_1$ ,  $\ell_2$ ,  $\ell_3$ , and  $\ell_4$  (see Figure 3.4) were assumed to be the same for the young females as were estimated for the NAMRL subjects. The neck length of 10.6 cm was used for  $\ell_n$ . In extension, the average pull force for young females was 27.04 lbf compared to 48.3 lbf for the NAMRL subjects. In flexion the average pull force for young females was 19.4 lbf compared to 36 lbf for NAMRL subjects. Using these values and the procedures outlined in section B.4. of Chapter 3 and in greater detail in reference 1, the muscle parameter values shown in Table 4.2 for the young female data set were calculated.

	Parameter				
Location	a <sub>1</sub> (N-m/deg)	a2(deg <sup>-1</sup> )	a <sub>3</sub> (sec/deg)	100% Muscle Torque (N-m)	
Occ. Condyle	es .03	.086	.007	6.51	
с <sub>7</sub> -т <sub>1</sub>	.093	.086	.007	19.99	
	a <sup>l</sup> (N/cm)	$a_2^{l}(cm^{-1})$	$a_3^{\ell}(sec/cm)$	100% Muscle Tension (N)	
Neck Stretc	h 73.7	1.29	.15	938.5	

Muscle Parameter Values Used in 18-24 Year Female Data Set

Table 4.2

ţ,

¢,

As with the NAMRL subjects the muscle torques and tensions were maintained constant at 33% of maximum throughout the simulation.

5. Neck Stretch and Compression Parameters. The elastic and viscous coefficients which describe the viscoelastic properties of the neck in stretch and compression were maintained at  $C_s = 10.55$  N-sec/cm and  $K_s = 1636$  N/cm for the young female subjects. Variations of these values in simulations of NAMRE subjects showed the model to be relatively insensitive to changes in these parameters.

6. <u>Head and Neck Initial Angles</u>. The initial **position of the head and neck were maintained the same as** for the NAMRL subjects.

7. <u>Restraint System and Chest Compliance</u>. The restraint system configuration was maintained the same as for NAMRL subjects except for repositioning the anchor points and attachment points due to the change in body segment sizes. Chest compliance was maintained at 1751 N/cm or 1000 lb/in.

#### B. Simulations for 18-24 Year Females.

8 (\*\*\*

93 .

i Jarri

R

5

агу, Д

Ħ

. *\**6,

÷.,

ي الغري

<u></u>

- 3% - 1 5

**\*** (

1

n gin /

jE:

Figures 4.1 and 4.2 show the simulation results (dashed lines) in comparison to the NAMRL experimental results solid line) and NAMRL simulation results (dotted line) for 6 and 15 G sled tests. In general, the results are not markedly different from the NAMRL results. The primary difference is in the angular position curves where the maximum head rotation is approximately 40 and 25 percent greater in the 6 and 15 G runs respectively. This increase in peak head angle is probably largely due to the weaker neck muscles and consequent changes in neck muscle model parameters. A second probable consequence of the weaker muscles is seen in the angular velocity curve at 6 G's where the curve is seen to return to zero more slowly (and interestingly in closer approximation with the NAMRL experimental curve). At 15 G's this portion of the angular velocity curve is not changed as much and this is perhaps another indication that the role of neck muscles is less important at higher G levels.

At 6 G's the initial peak in the angular acceleration curve is nearly identical in magnitude and time to the NAMRL simulation, but both occur sooner in time than the experimental results. At 15 G's the initial peak for the females is slightly larger and occurs slightly earlier than the NAMRL simulation. This earlier peaking may be a consequence of the smaller head mass and moment of inertia for the females. At both 6 and 15 G's the initial negative peak is reduced from the NAMRL simulations and this may also be a consequence of the reduced muscle strength. The reduction in these negative peaks is seen to be greater at 6 G's than at 15 G's.

Concerning the resultant acceleration, it is seen that at 6 G's the frequency of the bimodal portion of the curves is increased from the NAMRL simulations although the

initial spike occurs at about the same time. At 15 G's the initial spike occurs sconer but the frequency is not significantly different.

.

÷.

a

 $(\cdot, t)$ 

ä,

ġ,

2 1990 1990

р. . . . . д. . . . . . .

الين مريدين بريدين

ан н ал У

۹.) ه

8.

<sup>1</sup>. A<sup>rana</sup> A<sup>lu</sup>

, k

.

.







1947 - St. 1 1947 - St. 19

к.

いっしゅう 振動 しゅうだいがい 日本 身体の かかい かたい しゅうぶい しゅうかい しゅうかい しゅうかい しょうかい しょうしょう かい かいしょう ひょうしょう

້, **/** ທີ່ສະ

ະ • **7** ູ •

. .



113



A.

Figure 4.1 (continued)







 $\{ \{ i,j\}, i \in \mathcal{I} \}$ 



ųν.

 $\gamma_{1}\gamma_{2}$ 

5

¢.

÷

\*

antes.

#### Chapter 5

 $i\pi$ 

. A

-

5

J.

ĩå\_,

9997

**9**22

应常的为

444000

38

#### DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Ideally, the fulfillment of the objectives of this research effort will ultimately result in 1) a better understanding of the r lationships and importance of various physical characteristics to the dynamic response (and therefore injury susceptibility) of the head and neck, and 2) a mathematical model which utilizes these parameters and which will enable accurate and reliable predictions of head and neck responses over a large range of conditions and variations in subject physical characteristics. The results and accomplishments of the initial 12 months of this study have been satisfying and encouraging toward achieving these goals.

The simulation results of Chapter 3 illustrate excellent reproductions of NAMRL sled test results for head angular acceleration, head angular velocity, head angular position, and head and  $T_1$  resultant acceleration curves. Indeed, it might be concluded that these results are sufficient and that the model can now be used to obtain reasonable predictions for tasks 6 through 8 (see section C, Chapter 1). It is believed, however, that there are significant improvements which can still be made in the model validation which will both add to our understanding of the mechanisms involved in a dynamic situation and improve the capability and credibility of the model.

One area of particular concern in the simulations presented to date is in the modeling of joint stops and passive tissue resistance, and the manner in which measured voluntary range-of-motion limits relate to these phenomena. While the simulations presented in Chapter 3 are reasonable fits to experimental results, there is considerable question as to the values of joint stop parameters used.

Proceeding page blank 119

This question must be resolved if the model is to be a reliable predictor for persons with smaller ranges of motion (e.g., elderly persons) or for higher G levels where the stop plays a more significant role in restraining the head. A more complete resolution of the problem will require experimental measurements on humans and animals, but it is also likely that further attempts at simulating these characteristics will lead to more suitable and realistic simulation results and a better understanding of this area.

14-1943

The importance of muscle forces in the dynamic response of the human neck has been investigated to some degree in this study, but there is more to be done. Results so far suggest that muscle effects are more significant at 6 G's than at 15 G's on the NAMRL sled tests but that subjects may not be using their muscles to the maximum extent possible even during the 15 G sled runs. While an increase in muscle tension above the 33% of maximum used would improve the simulation head angular position curve by reducing the peak, it would also result in a more rapid decline of head angular velocity which is already too steep. Further work with this aspect of the model should prove useful in understanding the role of muscle and improving the model performance. The use of EMG signals during dynamic testing and experiments with animals would provide useful information for understanding the action of muscle under dynamic conditions.

For the NAMRL sled test simulations and predictions, further work with the restraint system is needed, especially with regard to the apparent slipping of the shoulders relative to the shoulder belts and the consequent torso bending. Measurements of belt forces during sled tests would be extremely useful to improving this aspect of the model which is essential if sled test results are to be accurately extended to the general adult population.

In Chapter 1, section C, eight tasks were listed which would lead to achievement of the project goals. Of these, the first three have been completed and a substantial and promising start has been made on task four. In view of these achievements and the results to date, it is recommended that efforts toward completing task four (as outlined in the above discussion) be continued, and where appropriate and feasible that experiments be conducted to assist with the model validation. As an additional part of this validation, it is also recommended that efforts be included to:

- extend simulations to include 3, 10, and greater than 15 G (if available) sled tests.
- include simulations of sled tests with acceleration profiles of different rates of onset and different durations.
- 3) include simulations of sled tests with different head/neck initial positions.

At the same time work on task five can be started. This will involve:

- studying experimental results of NAMRL subjects whose physical characteristics differ from the group used for simulations of this report.
- extending simulations to these other NAMRL subjects.
- performing statistical correlations of physical measurement results with peak parameter values of sled tests for the 18 NAMRL subjects measured.

Upon completion of these tasks, work on tasks six through eight can be undertaken with the expectation that the predictions will be reliable extrapolations. The results will therefore be useful toward defining the envelopes of impact acceleration which result in injury. In addition, by these procedures which combine physical measurements, experimental data, and mathematical modeling, an increased understanding of the factors influencing dynamic responses during impact can be achieved. This will provide important information for design of improved dummies for impact investigations.

**新闻** 

Arritan Arritan

أتطنعنى

## References

A SA

. ∦<sup>M</sup>

1 #\*\*\*\* #\*

yretti 🗯

- 1. Bowman, B. M. <u>Analytical Model of a Vehicle Occupant</u> For Use in Crash Simulations. Ph.D. Thesis. The University of Michigan 1971.
- Bowman, B. M., Bennett, R. O. and Robbins, D. H. <u>MVMA Two-Dimensional Crash Victim Simulation, Version 3</u> Volume 1 and Volume 2. Final Report No. UM-HSRI-BI-74-1, June 1974.
- 3. Chandler, R. F., Clauser, C. E., McConville, J. T., Reynolds, H. M. and Young, J. W. <u>Investigation of</u> <u>Inertia Properties of the Human Body</u>. Final Report DOT-HS-801 430, March 1975.
- Clarke, T. D., et al., "Human Head Linear and Angular Accelerations During Impact," 15th Stapp Car Crash and Field Demonstration Conference Proceedings, SAE #710857, November 1971.
- 5. Ewing, C. L, Thomas, D. J., Beeler, G. W., Patrick, L. M., and Gillis, D. B. "Dynamic Response of the Head and Neck of the Living Human to Gx Impact Acceleration." <u>Proceedings, Twelfth Stapp Car Crash Con-</u> ference. Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc. New York. SAE #680792, October 1968.
- 6. Ewing, C. L., Thomas, D. J., Patrick, L. M., Beeler, G. W., and Smith, M. J. "Living Human Dynamic Response to -Gx Impact Acceleration. II. Accelerations Measured on the Head and Neck." <u>Proceedings, Thirteanth Stapp Car Crash Conference</u>. Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc. New York. SAE #690817, December 1969.
- 7. Ewing, C. L., and Thomas, D. J. "Human Dynamic Response to -Gx Impact Acceleration." AGARD Conference Proceedings, AGARD-Cp-88-71, June 1972.
- 8. Ewing, C. L. and Thomas, D. J. <u>Human Head and Neck</u> <u>Response to Impact Acceleration</u>. NAMRL Monograph 21 USAMRL 73-1, August 1972.
- 9. Ewing, C. L. and Thomas, D. J. "Torque Versus Angular Displacement Response of Human Head to -G Impact Acceleration." <u>Proceedings, Seventeenth Stapp Car</u> Crash Conference, SAE \$730976, November 1973.

123

10. Ewing, C. L., Thomas, D. J., Lustick, L., Becker, F. Williams, G. and Muzzy, W. H. III, "The Effect of the Initial Position of the Head and Neck on the Dynamic Response of the Human Head and Neck to -G Impact Acceleration." <u>Proceedings of Ninteenth</u> Stapp Car Crash Conference, SAE \$751157, November 1975.

£ .\*!

8

2. 8

a Alfan

ыż.

ка Сей

1100 11

. 165...) йс. 1994 г.

atar .

- 11. Foust, D.R., Chaffin, D.B., Snyder, R.G. and Baum, J.K., "Cervical Range of Motion and Dynamic Response and Strength of Cervical Muscles." <u>Proceedings, 17th Stapp</u> Car Crash Conference, SAE #730975, November 1973.
- 12. Gurdjian, E.S., "Discussion of Tolerance of Subhuman Brain to Cerebral Concussion," in <u>Impact</u> Injury and Crash Protection, pp. 370-371, 1970.
- 13. Hodgson, V.R., "Physical Factors Related to Experimental Concussion," in Impact Injury and Crash Protection, pp. 275-302, 1970.
- 14. Holbourn, A.H.S., "The Mechanics of Brain Injuries," British Medical Bulletin, 3:147-149, 1945.
- 15. Mahone, R., Carrao, P., Ommaya, A., Hendler, E., and Schulman, M., "A Theory on the Mechanics of Whiplash produced Concussion in Primates," Preprint, 40th Scientific Meeting, <u>Aerospace Medical Association</u>, pp. 44-45, May 1969.
- 16. Martinez, J.L., and Garcia, D., "A Model for Whiplash,' Journal of Biomechanics, 1:23, 1968.
- 17. Moffatt, C.A., Harris, E.H., and Haslam, E.T., "An Experimental and Analytic Study of the Dynamic Properties of the Human Leg." <u>Journal of Biomechanics</u>, Volume 2, No. 4, 373-387, October 1969.
- Ommaya, A.K. and Hirsch, A.E. "Tolerances for Cerebral Concussion from Head Impact and Whiplash in Primates," Journal of Biomechanics, 4:13-21, 1971.
- 19. Pudenz, R.H. and Sheldon, C.H. "The Lucite Calvarium --A Method for Direct Observation of the Brain. II Cranial Trauma and Brain Movement," Journal of Neurosurgery, 3:487-505, 1946.
- 20. Robbins, D.H., Bowman, B.M. and Bennett, R.O.: "The MVMA Two-Dimensional Crash Victim Simulation." Proceedings of 18th Stapp Car Crash Conference. SAE #741195, 1974.

21. Schneider, L. W., Foust, D. R., Bowman, B. M., Snyder, G., Chaffin, D. B., Abdelnour, T. A., and Baum, J. K. "Biomechanical Properties of the Human Neck in Lateral Flexion." <u>Proceedings of Nineteenth Stapp Car Crash Conference</u>, SAE #751156, November 1975.

- 22. Snyder, R. G., Chaffin, E. B., Schneider, L. W., Foust, D. R., Abdelnour, T. A., Bowman, B. M. and Baum, J. K., <u>Basic Biomechanical Properties of the</u> <u>Human Neck Related to Lateral Hyperflexion Injury</u>. Prepared for Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Washington, D.C., Final Technical Report (UM-HSRI-BI-75-4) NTIS PB 241246, March 31, 1975.
- 23. Snyder, R. G., Chaffin, D. B., and Foust, D. R. <u>Bioengineering Study of Basic Physical Measurement</u> <u>Related to Susceptibility to Cervical Hyper-</u> <u>extension - Hyperflexion Injury.</u> Prepared for Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Washington, D.C., Final Technical Report, (UM-HSRI-BI-75-4) NTIS PB 241246, September 1975.
- 24. Von Gierke, H. E., "Biodynamic Response of the Human Body." <u>Applied Mechanics Reviews</u>, Vol. 17, No. 12, December 1964.
- 25. Walker, L. B., Jr., et al., <u>Mass Volume, Center of</u> <u>Mass Moment of Inertia of Head and Neck of the</u> <u>Human Body.</u> Final Rept. to Dept. of Navy, AD-762 581, 1973.
- 26. Young, J. W., Fisher, R. G., Price, G. T., and Chandler, R. F. "Experimental Trauma of Occipital Impacts," <u>Proceedings, International Conference</u> of Biokinetics and Kinematics, 1973.

## APPENDIX A

శ్రా

1

. Enter

9

> ⊂**2**2€ −

Â

## CROSS REFERENCE TABLES FOR MEASUREMENT CODE NAMES

Tables A.1 through A.4 provide a cross reference for the abbreviated measurement names used in the tables of statistical results in Chapter 2 and in the tables of measurement results by subject in Appendix B.

## TABLE A.1 ANTHROPOMETRY CODE NAME CROSS REFERENCE

CODE NAME MEASUREMENT WT(KG) Weight in ka WT(LB) Weight in 1b STAT(CM) Stature PONDINDX Ponderal Index ERSITHT Erect Sitting Height Head Circumference HEADCIR Bennett Ellipse Circumference **HEADELPS** Bitragion Diameter BITRGDI HEADBR Head Breadth HEADLG **Head Length** SAGARC Sagittal Arc Length Coronal Arc Length CORARC Bitragion-Glabella Arc Length BITRGCLB BITRGMEN Bitragion-Menton Arc Length Bitragion-Inion Arc Length BITRGINA Facial Height FACEHT Lateral Neck Breadth LATNKBR Anterior-Posterior Neck Breadth APNKBR SUPNKCIR Superior Neck Circumference INFNKCIR Inferior Neck Circumference POSTNKLG **Posterior Neck Length** Biacromial Breadth BIACRBR Shoulder Breadth (Bideltoid) BIDELTBR Chest Height CHESTHT Chest Breadth CHESTBR Chest Circumference CHESTCIR WAISTHT Waist Height Waist Breadth WAISTBR Waist Circumference WAISTCIR HIPHT Hip Height HIPBRSTD Hip Breadth (Standing Erect) HIPCIR Hip Circumference Acromion-Radiale Length ACCRRADLG Upper Arm Circ. (at Axilla) Upper Arm Circ. (above Elbow) ARMCIRAX ARMCIREL BICFLCIR **Biceps Flexed Circumference** RADSTYLG Radiale-Stylion Length Forearm Circumference FRARMCIR WRISTCIR Wrist Circumference Hand Length HANDLG TRCFEMLG Trochanter-Femoral Condyle Length UPTHICIR Upper Thigh Circumference LYTHICIR Lower Thigh Circumference FIBULALG Fibula Length FIBULAHT Fibula Height

TABLE A.1 (continued)

B HANNA

ŝ

¢₿. • :: •

ម ូម ូម

CODE NAME	MEASUREMENT	
CALFCIR	Calf Circumference	
ANKLECIR	Ankle Circumference	
FOOTLG	Foot Length	
FOOTBR	Ball-of-Foot Breadth	
HIMDIA	Humeral Biepicondylar Dia.	
FEMOLA	Femoral Biepicondylar Dia.	
TRICPSE	Triceps Skinfold (mm)	
SUBSCPSE	Subscapular Skinfold (mm)	
SUPTISE	Suprailiac Skinfold (mm)	
ITTI-SYM	Left Asis to Symphysion	
RTTL-SYM	Right Asis to Symphysion	
ASTSBR	Anterior Superior Iliac Spine (Asis) Breadth	
NRMSITHT	Normal Sitting Height (re SRP)	
TRAGHTS	Tragion Height (re SRP)	
TRAGOPS	Tragion Depth (re SRP)	
GI ARHTS	Glabella Height (re SRP)	
BLABOPS	Glabella Depth (re SRP)	
EYELPHTS	Eve Ellipse Point Height (re SRP)	
EYELPDPS	Eve Ellipse Point Deuth (re SRP)	
EYELPWDG	Eve Ellipse Point Width (re Glabella)	
C7HTS	Cervicale Height (re SRP)	
C7DPS	Cervicale Depth (re SRP)	
SSTRNHTS	Suprasternale Height (re SRP)	
SSTRNDPS	Suprasternale Depth (re SRP)	
SHLDRHTS	Shoulder Height (re SRP)	
SHLDRDPS	Shoulder Depth (re SRP)	
SHLDRBR	Shoulder Breadth	
ILCSPHTS	Anterior Superior Iliac Spine Ht (re SRP)	
ILCSPDPS	Anterior Superior Iliac Spine Depth (re SRP)	
BISPNBR	Bispinous Breadth	
TRCHHTS	Trochanter Height (re SRP)	
TRCHDPS	Trochanter Depth (re SRP)	
BITRCHDI	Bitrochanter Diameter	
HIPBRSIT	Hip Breadth (Seated Erect)	
ORBHTT	Infraorbitrale Height (re Tragion)	
ORBDPT	Infraorbitrale Depth (re Tragion)	
TRAGHTC7	Tragion Height (re Cervicale)	
TRAGDPC7	Tragion Depth (re Cervicale)	
GLABHTT	Glabella Height (re Tragion)	
GLABDPT	Glabella Depth (re Tragion)	
EYELPHTT	Eye Ellipse Point Ht (re Tragion)	
EYELPDPT	Eye Ellipse Point Depth (re Tragion)	
ECTCNATT	Ectocanthus Height (re Tragion)	
ECTCNDPT	Ectocanthus Depth (re Tragion)	

# TABLE A.2 UPPER TORSO AND HEAD LANDMARK CODE NAME CROSS REFERENCE

i, sile

1 State

х () ДШ

•

. 8<u>-</u> 8

a A

s 🚛

<u>)</u> (

۴.

CODE NAME MEASUREMENT Shoulder Point -X Direction SHLDRSX SHLDRSY Shoulder Point -Y Direction SHLDRSZ Shoulder Point -Z Direction -Y Direction **C7** SX Cervicale -Y Direction C7 SY Cervicale Cervicale -Z Direction **C7** SZ Suprasternale -X Direction SSTRNSX Suprasternale -Y Direction SSTRNSY -Z Direction SSTRNSZ Suprasternale -X Direction TRAG SX Tragion TRAG SY Tragion -Y Direction Trag SZ Tragion -Z Direction -X Direction ORBITSX Infraorbitale -Y Direction ORBITSY Infraorbitale Infraorbitale -Z Direction ORBITSZ GLAB SX Glabella -X Direction Glabella -Y Direction GLAD SY -Z Direction Glabella GLAB SZ Eye Ellipse Point -X Direction **EYELPSX EYELPSY** Eye Ellipse Point -Y Direction Eye Ellipse Point -Z Direction **EYELPSZ** ECCANSX Ectocanthus -X Direction -Y Direction ECCANSY Ectocanthus Ectocanthus -Z Direction ECCANSZ

## TABLE A.3 RANGE-OF-MOTION CODE NAME CROSS REFERENCE

ádhai.

-fa

**M**RC 2

,arN

÷.

A BANK

#### MEASUREMENT CODE NAME **P2NEUTY** PNoto 2--Neutral Head Position--Yaw Photo 2--Neutral Head Position--Pitch P2NEUTP **P2NEUTR** Photo 2--Neutral Head Position--Roll **P3EXTY** Photo 3--Extension--Yaw Photo 3--Extension--Pitch **P3EXTP** Photo 3--Extension--Roll P3EXTR Photo 4--Flexion--Yaw P4FLEXY **P4FLEXP** Photo 4--Flexion--Pitch **P4FLEXR** Photo 4--Flexion-Rol7 Photo 5--Right Rotation--Yaw **P5RTROTY** Photo 5--Right Rotation--Pitch **P5RTROTP P5RTROTR** Photo 5--Right Rotation--Roll PELTROTY Photo 6--Left Rotation--Yaw PELTROTP Photo 6--Left Rotation--Pitch Photo 6--Left Rotation--Roll **P6LTROTR** Photo 7--Right Lateral Bend--Yaw P7RLBNDY Photo 7--Right Lateral Bend--Pitch P7RL8NDP Photo 7--Right Lateral Bend--Roll P7RLBNDR PELLENDY Photo 8--Left Lateral Bend-Yaw PSLLBNDP Photo 8--Left Lateral Bend--Pitch Photo 8--Left Lateral Bend--Roll PBLLBNDR P91\_ROFLY Photo 9--Left Rotation + Flexion--Yaw Photo 9--Left Rotation + Flexion--Pitch P9LROFLP **P9LROFLR** Photo 9--Left Rotation + Flexion--Roll Photo 10--Left Rotation + Left Lateral Bend--Yaw PIOLROBY Photo 10--Left Rotation + Left Lateral Bend--Pitch PIOLROBP Photo 10--Left Rotation + Left Lateral Bend--Roll PIOLROBR PIIRROXY Photo 11--Right Rotation + Extension--Yaw PIIRROXP Photo 11--Right Rotation + Extension--Pitch **P11RROXR** Photo 11--Right Rotation + Extension--Roll Sagittal Range of Motion from Photogrammetry PSAGROM (P3EXTP + P4FLEXP)Rotational Range of Motion from Photogrammetry PROTROM (P5RTROTY + P6LTROTY)Lateral Bend Range of Motion from Photogrammetry PLATROM (P7RLBNDR + P8LLBNOR)

# TABLE A.4 REFLEX TIMES AND STRENGTH CODE NAME CROSS REFERENCE

See Star Ag

- W.

1.0

**\*** 

187 (<sup>1</sup>)

L. mar

 $- r_{\rm c}$ 

CODE NAME	MEASUREMENT			
RFL LAT	Reflex Time In Lateral Flexion			
RFL PLXR	Reflex Time of Flexor Muscles			
RFL EXTR	Reflex Time of Extensor Muscles			
RFL AV	Average of All Reflex Times			
STR RTL	Pull Force From Right Lateral Flexors			
STR LTL	Pull Force From Left Lateral Flexors			
STRLATAV	Average Pull Force From Left and Right Lateral Flexors			
STR EXTR	Pull Force From Extensor Muscles			
STR FLXR	Pull Force From Flexor Muscles			
STRSAGAV	Average Pull Force From Extensors and Flexors			
SAGLATAV	Average Pull Force From Lateral and Sagittal Tests			

## APPENDIX B

## MEASUREMENT RESULTS BY SUBJECT

Tables B.1 through B.4 give the measurement results by individual subject for anthropometry, head and torso landmarks, range of motion, and strength and reflex time results respectively. The abbreviated measurement names may be cross referenced in the Tables of Appendix A.

4

- 75
TABLE B.1 ANTHROPOMETRY BY SUBJECT

A PARTICIPATION AND A PART

C. **F**. E. C. H.

is ra

i.syjel

N.

> 9 ... a

., 📩

1999 - A. B. B.

. . . . . . . .

		TARIAD	LES							
20905	ICT NO	WI (KG)	ET (TB)	STAT (CH)	IGHIGHOA	181912 	HEADCIR	HEACELPS	BITAGDI	HEAC <b>B</b> 8
NA 601	H-39	74.09	163.00	174.20	31.90	93.50	55.50	64.40	13.20	14.90
NABO2	H-46	105.23	231.50	176.30	28.72	93.40	66.20	70.50	14.59	14.80
E ÕT Å H	5 <b>4</b> - H	83.64	184.00	182.50	32.09	95.40	57.40	69, 30	14.20	15.10
na RC 4	Hot 2	75.45	166.00	176.80	32.18	91.90	59.10	70.60	13.90	15.20
MAR05	8 <b>-</b> 48	66.15	145.50	177.60	33°77	93.70	54.60	64.20	14.30	14.80
<b>KA</b> 806	H - H H	65.68	144.50	175°80	33.51	92.30	54.70	62.40	13.20	14.60
KASO 7	K- 38	61.14	134.50	165.50	32, 31	96.50	56.60	65.30	13.40	15.70
nan09	H-32	75.45	166.00	176.00	32.03	91.80	57.13	64.40	13.00	14.60
83809	8=52	70.45	155,00	172.69	32.14	69 - 40	56.80	64.20	13.40	15.10
NAN 10	H-47	77.27	170.02	173,20	31.09	65.00	54.70	66.10	13.80	14.90
NAT 11	8-51	66.36	146.07	183.50	34, 85	93.50	57.89	65. 19	14.40	15.90
<b>#A</b> 812	H-50	60°69	152.00	175.60	32.91	90.40	55.60	63.50	12.40	14.90
818 <b>1</b> 3	¥-53	67.79	215.00	176.00	29.38	66.39	56.20	64.00	14.10	15.10
NAT 14		50*89	141.00	179.00	34.40	94.50	56.10	62.20	14.00	14.70
8215	8 <b>-</b> 35	89.55	197.00	184.40	31, 73	69*66	57.60	65° \$0	13.50	14.70
<b>NAN1</b> 6	H-33	95.00	209.00	177.30	29.88	<b>36 * 36</b>	57.40	67.00	14.60	14.00
HAT 17	0 ii - H	72.95	160.50	179.00	32, 94	93.60	56.40	65.70	13.60	13.10
KAT18	8-37	74.09	163.00	181.70	33.27	C6 * 16	61.60	68.00	14.80	15.00

**...** 

Arat g

ąζ

~ <del>31606</del>.

1.11

SUF		VAELERI Beadle 	LES SAGARC	CORARC	BI TRGGLB	 R2 293118	81233183 *******	PACENT	LATIK52	APKEBR 
NAEO 1	56 -3	19.10	34,33	34.30	29.40	<b>31.2</b> 0	29°2)	13.30	12.50	11.16
KAR02	B-46	20.30	35.03	36.70	31.33	34.50	0E • JE	14,60	13.60	12.80
KATC3	5 t - A	20.20	35,50	35.75	30.70	34.20	27.60	13.90	13.10	11.30
KA BC4	8-42	29.60	H.D.	35.73	31.00	33.20	27.20	14.10	11.60	11.70
NAECS	8 <b># -</b> 8	18.60	37.60	35.60	26. 40	30.96	25.73	13.00	11.40	11.20
KABÜ6	**-1	19.20	32.10	35.19	28, 53	23.93	24,60	13.80	11.30	10.40
NASC 7	E+3€	18.60	34.23	36.50	28.67	29 . <b>k</b> û	26.7C	12.50	11.50	16.60
KA 278	H=32	23.26	35. 10	35.00	29.70	30.60	28.56	11.90	12.93	11.10
EONAN	H-52	19.30	35.60	34.40	27.73	29.40	32.30	12.30	12.10	10.50
MA H 1 °	H-47	19.10	35.10	35.50	28, 93	31.20	29.40	fe, 20	12.40	11.70
KAT11	H-51	19.90	34.23	35.30	30. 40	31.30	35.30	12.60	13.70	11.60
88312	3 <b>-</b> -20	19.60	34.33	34.30	29.00	39.50	29, 36	13.20	11.70	10.50
KAE13	H=5.3	18.10	33.59	00.66	29.63	32 . 40	29.40	11:60	12.70	12.10
FATI	6 <b>4</b> - H	19.93	35.60	34.23	29.30	0 <b>4</b> 0E	27.30	13.60	11.60	30.90
<b>KAT 15</b>	H-35	20.20	36.4C	35.93	30.50	32.90	29.60	13.40	13.80	12.70
KAM16	K-33	19.80	32. 7.	35-20	22 <b>.8</b> .	31.30	30.20	12.30	12.60	12.50
<b>NAT17</b>	H-8C	19.20	35, 10	35.20	28.40	JQ. 7U	31.20	13.50	11.90	11.60
MAT 18	H-37	23.30	37. 13	36.60	30.30	31.40	31,10	13.50	12.10	10.80

and the second ц.

н<sup>0</sup> 5 (95)

-

ece S . Thurse 

HORNEL PT

ł

		YARTAB.	125							
				POSTRE C						
MA 80 1	8E -H	37.90	38.40	19.50	39.73	<b>68.8</b> ₽	127.90	32. 30	91.50	102.60
NA Bộ2	9 <b>4-</b> H	44.30	43.20	18.50	39. 7.)	54.20	09'181	34.70	G# * 66	104.40
E OT AN	5 <b>4</b> - H	40.30	<b>39. 2</b> 0	17.13	40.23	46.90	136.56	30.60	97.40	168.70
PCBAT	H=42	36.70	39.30	16.30	35.03	49.20	131.79	32.60	101.50	105.10
KAR <sup>n</sup> 5	8 # 1 H	36.10	37.50	17.60	40.53	46.90	111.70	30.20	93.60	107.50
4 <b>880</b> 5		35.40	36.30	16.50	40.33	46. 3A	132.10	25.70	91.30	196.20
102AN	<b>1</b> -36	36.00	36.30	15.70	39.00	46.30	122.10	29. 30	91.30	99.80
HAKP6		36.92	31.30	14.20	41.20	47.10	134,50	29.60	94.40	109.10
RAE03	H-52	34.90	35. 60	16.80	38.20	45.60	131.10	28.80	69.50	107.00
of 2.4	N-47	36.70	38.60	14.90	41.13	47.70	131.27	26.60	93.60	104.20
RAT11	H- 5 1	37.60	39.60	16.93	42.43	47.00	135.30	29.00	91.40	111.00
<b>84812</b>	6-50	35.60	39.20	15.10	41.20	47.10	111.20	24.65	91.90	107.90
KAR13	i-53	49.60	42.20	15.20	44,94	52.70	131,40	33.70	104.50	105.50
KAT 14	K-4 3	34.90	36.30	16.20	40.60	45.30	132.70	34.26	88.20	107.90
NT15	H-35	\$2.30	43.50	17.60	43.29	51.60	136.80	34.20	101.50	103.70
<b>NAN 16</b>	22 - H	40.90	42.29	17.60	39.10	51.50	129.10	33.00	111.60	105.10
KAT 17	8-4C	36.60	37.60	16.20	41.10	49.30	112.10	30.56	91.64	167.40
RAT16	H- 37	37.30	34.70	14.90	42. 13	48.60	137.20	21.Ou	94.60	111.50

h in

 $\sim 10^{10}$ 

1. . . . .

dian.

Ú,

		VAC TAD								
308.	ECT RC	1122281 112281	KAISTCIS	KEPHT 	02 5 <b>3 64</b> 7H	MIPCI.	ACEPALLG	Liåcirat 	AARCIAZL	DICFLCI
NAKC 1	9 <b>C -</b> H	30.66	98.80	88.40	32.90	95.7)	37.50	33.65	26.70	33.6
KARO2	8-#C	37.60	98,52	32.90	LA.1E	112.3J	15.20	39.50	32.46	39.6
E CTAN	H= 4 9	3.3.10	63.50	94.50	35. 43	93°84	J5.6û	31.60	26.20	33.6
RA BUS	2 <b>4</b> - H	31.39	85.80	61.53	31.50	93.5	1. 4 <sup>7</sup>	31.60	26.40	32.0
NA 405	0 <b>4</b> - 3	26.73	74.63	92.90	32,90	\$4.2.	336	29.70	14.80	29.8
4ARC o	2 4 - H	26.50	74.93	92.51	32.50	51.5	31.8.1	30.90	23.80	90 <b>°</b> 0
XAS 37	H= 38	28.10	76. 60	8ú.63	31.70	51.20	1 . 2 v	30. 10	24.20	31.9
FORVE	h=32	28.30	82.30	93.6)	32.40	94 . 4	32, 10	3 <b>3</b> , CJ	25 - Bú	33,2(
f. 474	h= 32	27.90	CD.25	ê3.6û	34.03	96.83	<b>j2.</b> ci	31, 36	27.24	32.21
5177 N	4-27	23.40	83. SU	Jۥ#5	32.51	94.20	32, P.J	32490	20.9C	34.4
84211	le - 3 l	27,90	75.60	93.53	31, 33	34.05	12.45	31. 10	24.61	38
RA 912	H-5¢	27.60	78.50	l),40	32.1,	52.53	32.22	33 <b>.</b> 1C	25.90	34.11
KA813	: <b>: :</b> - F	35.23	109.00	10.12	36. J	1.4.20	J1. Ju	37.60	<b>∠9</b> • 5 ∪	35.81
8AT14	C # - H	26.83	73.60	93.4Û	11.20	69.27	33.02	23° RJ	24.35	27.8(
KAT15	H•35	32.90	94.20	(9.22	35.96	153.20	]2,5	38.13	27.75	35,3(
M1216	li-33	15.Cu	64+20	83.87	37.54	(6.82	31.31	33.65	31.40	39.BL
KA 1 1 7	) t - H	29.53	82.95	54-63	32.93	94 . 1.	34,67	£.0.●£	26.41	33.8
811A	H= 37	27.50	82.20	56 ° 1 J	34.23	33 * 16	.1.46	29. 30	24.10	29.11

est:

", Maria

*i* ,

į.

14.\* \*\*

17825	10	VARIAS. PADSTILG	TABACTR		K4 #D16 	TICPESIC	<b>BPERCIA</b>	1121121	81881456	71881481
1024	K-39	25.20	26.20	17.50	18, 30	39.60	56.70	35.20	39.50	44.50
N 832		25.70	32.29	19.30	19.40	43.20	66.50	46.90	35.50	46.30
14203		25.50	39.10	18.30	19.30	£1.20	60.90	82.73	41.10	46 . 10
E	1-45 1-45	26.16	27.60	17.40	18.40	40.60	55.10	36.10	38-36	41.40
<b>83 80</b> 5	84-1	25.10	27.20	16.90	13.90	96 · 6E	51.00	35.00	38.19	44.40
3CEAS		24.98	26.70	17.20	16.79	40.00	51.90	15.70	40 ° <del>6</del> 0	44.56
EA EO 7	8 - 1 8	26.10	27.20	16.70	13.10	38.43	51.20	34.18	39-66	41.60
NA R08	5-32	26.10	27.70	16°60	19.10	3.1	55.30	39.30	69 ° 69	45.90
2 0 1 0 1	8-52	25,30	27.10	16.70	10. 00	41.70	\$7.10	19, 20	40.26	69.24
84210	1-47	26.78	23.10	17.49	19.20	43.46	62.20	42.80	13.30	94.39
82211		28.20	27.40	17.20	19.09	43.40	48.30	31.30	42,58	47.00
KAE12	1-50	27.70	27.10	17.70	18.99	61.50	55°20	38.40	£3.20	46.30
E? S.A.B	2-5-8	25.98	29.90	17.20	19.36	39.60	69.20	11.20	35.46	44.50
<b>11218</b>	E 4-3	25.78	26.20	16.39	19.66	60 <b>8</b> 0	50.50	36.49	40.36	46.60
<b>HAT15</b>	<b>1</b> -35	26.50	29.90	16.20	18.90	42 c 60	59.70	40.90	42.26	48.20
<b>HAB16</b>		25.40	32.49	10.70	16. 10	\$2.00	<b>66.20</b>	45.20	33,20	45.00
EA217	01-1	26. 59	28. ng	17.50	18. 50	46.70	58.94	37.60	40,70	15.60
8778		26.70	26.90	16.20	19.96	42.00	<b>\$</b> 5.40	37.10	43.20	49.50

. •

.....

来自己的

 $G_{ir}$ 

**W**5.0

.

		¥28283	LES							
548.1	ICT EC	CALFCIE	ABSLICIE	700116	1001 88	KUSDIÅ verseere	₹ 480 52 • = • • • • • •	TELCES F wasses	1913808 1918	2071205 2071205
<b>88371</b>	6£ =H	35.20	22.19	26.03	9.43	7.12	3 <b>*</b> * 5	10.40	33.61	16.20
¥2 502	¥=46	89°0	24.00	26.90	10.53	7.13	11.26	29.70	39.30	38.30
KATO 3	5 <b>4</b> a ji	39.90	24.70	27.73	11.00	7.50	14.80	24.30	10.00	14.20
ra so4	「中国	36.60	21.70	26.73	10.30	6.63	9.63	12.60	12.70	15.35
N2.505	9 7 - X	36.36	21.60	27.43	9.13	6.80	9.70	14. 50	15.20	12.50
1 BRE		30.60	23.90	25.73	0**6	é.51	\$.5J	17.60	7.00	9.30
NAS07	¥- 38	35.75	19.61	25.23	9.50	6.93	9,30	15.70	11.10	9.80
KA 208	26.3	34,90	20.70	26.20	10.49	7.00	9°53	18.50	13.30	14.30
NAE09	2-52	37.40	22.30	27.13	10.63	7.19	10.00	15.30	13.00	16.00
61 E Y I	H-47	36,30	21.50	26.31	10.70	7.00	10.10	6.30	15.60	22.30
KAT11	8-51	33, 30	21.60	27.20	9.70	7.50	10,01	5.70	9.00	6.06
<b>XA312</b>	8-50	36.40	21.80	26.23	10.60	7.53	10,10	6.70	13.76	10.30
84843		40,50	24.70	28.2J	11.10	7.55	9.40	11.70	27.35	27.70
BATT4	64-H	32.04	22.60	26.60	16.40	۴ <b>،</b> 8	9.70	6.80	60.8	0.00
NAT15	<b>b=</b> 35	37.50	23 60	27.13	10.40	7.20	9.45	9,00	18.50	19,06
KAB 16	H- 33	42.40	25.10	26.30	10.80	7.50	10.63	20.70	29.30	29.00
KAT17	H-4C	35.70	22.50	26.40	10.10	7 - 42	9.30	30.50	17.80	16.00
SAT 18	H-37	36.20	22.50	25.00	10.60	7.20	9.50	6.20	9.80	11.70

ġ

t we

SUBJE	CT 1C	VARIAE) Mrastrht	LES Teaght S	TRAGDP S	GLABLHTS	GLAPLDPS	<b>STRALSIS</b>	ETELPDPS	Donatela	CTAT S
1 6 1 1		* * * * * * *							8	885
LOHEN	H• 39	91.40	77.80	-4.73	82.43	6.53	19.73	4.80	3.00	64.10
6 A 8 0 2	8-46	90.80	76.03	2.70	80.70	13.70	78.50	11.50	3.10	66.20
NAT53	54-8	53.70	79°60	-2.3ù	64.50	C# * 8	81.60	6.60	3.00	68.40
HA RO 4	5 <b>b</b> -8	87,70	73.90	0#*[-	78.30	10.30	75.93	8.30	3.50	63.10
NA ROS	8 <b>4-</b> 48	90.60	77.60	-2.50	80.20	7.50	18.30	5.30	3.30	65.50
KAM06	\$ 11 - H	89.10	76.10	-4.93	79.60	5.33	77.00	3.40	2.80	63.50
<b>KA</b> 507	H-36	E4.2C	70.50	ũ.30	73.90	9.40	72.10	8.00	3.80	60.90
ha ec 8	E-32	88.80	75.60	1.40	CL.97	11.50	77.10	10.60	3.10	06
КАМС Э	B~52	85.70	74.20	-6.30	78.40	9.20	75.60	7. 60	3.10	62.80
CLEAN	H-47	62.50	05-27	- 3. 70	74.33	8.60	72.00	7.30	3.40	60.20
NA 2 1 1	H-51	89.90	77.50	3.60	80.40	14.20	78.40	12.00	3.50	56 <b>.</b> 8U
<b>NAN12</b>	€ <b>5</b> -8	85.23	73.40	9 <b>.</b> 40	77.23	10.10	74.83	8.60	3.20	63.40
61 H A N	8-5-H	91.70	80°30	0.73	83, 80	10.00	62.10	8.50	3.60	69.40
MAT14	€ <b>4</b> - 8	92°96	76.40	~2 <b>.</b> 40	83.50	7.60	8ú.90	6.10	2.80	6 <b>7.6</b> 0
KAT15	H= 35	97.00	e2.30	-1.30	66.10	11.40	83.50	9.70	3.10	70.30
84X16	H-33	92.60	78.90	-2.23	83.20	7.#0	80.90	2• 90	3.40	66.70
¥ÅT17	9 <b># -</b> # 0	91.00	17.40	-2.40	84.90	7.10	78.33	5.50	3 <b>• 8</b> 0	64.70
KAT 18	H- 37	92.70	75.70	2.50	76. 60	12.10	C6.91	10.50	3.50	65.00

j¥.

, « , « , «

SUBJE	CT NC	VABIAB	LES SSTBMHTS 	557 # 1025		SHLDADP3	SHLURBE	ILCSPHTS	ILCSPDPS	40X3510
na h¢ 1	H-39	- 11.40	5 <b>6</b> .20	1.00	55. 83	-6.30	41.10	19.40	12.30	24.40
NA EO 2	8-46	-8.10	58.50	5.10	CE '09	-2.40	40.70	22.40	10.40	23.70
RATUS	5 # -8	-10.20	23.60	<b>1.3</b> 0	59.02	19 <b>4 - 1</b> 91	40.73	18.20	9.30	-28.20
KAR04	H=42	-7.40	55.10	4.90	56. 40	-5.73	39.40	19.90	10.40	27.00
NA BOS	8 <b>- 4</b> 8	-16,70	57.40	1.93	57.00	-5.40	<b># 0 .</b> 70	20.00	11.30	25.60
NABA6	4 4 4 4	- 12.60	56.70	-1.70	55.20	-8.60	42.50	19.10	10.30	27.30
NAS07	H-38	-7.90	53.00	2.60	52.20	-3.33	40,30	18.30	U9.6	26.30
NA 208	8-32	-7.60	57.80	3.20	58.33	-4.75	40* 30	19.50	9.50	23-20
808AS	R-52	0 # °3 -	56.40	3,50	56. 80	-9.10	1.D.	14.30	11.20	24.00
<b>NA 1</b> 0	H-47	-8.83	52.30	2.70	53.30	-4.50	42.43	13.6)	9.80	24.10
82211	H=51	-7.40	57.60	3.13	57.10		36.63	19.60	3.70	24 . 90
NA612	H-50	05°L-	55.00	2.50	52.63	-1.20	41.70	18.60	09-6	24.40
<b>1351</b> 3	H= 5.1	-8-30	66.70	5.20	61.00	-4.63	47.00	19.60	12.90	23.50
NA 714	H-43	-9.20	56.70	3.43	58. 60	-4.50	40*0*	13.20	06*6	26.70
<b>HA 115</b>	H <b>-</b> 35	-9.56	60.20	3.10	61.30	-1.63	04.84	2:1.80	12.20	25.00
NA:16	H-33	-11.10	55.50	2,60	58.50	<del>-</del> 5,50	4 4, 20	24.50	11.60	25,80
NAT17	H=4 C	- 11. 10	57.40	04-0-	55.30	-é, éĵ	42,00	19.40	11.20	25.70
NA 218	8-37	-7.10	54.40	2.40	55.29	-3.63	41.90	21.20	11.10	26.50

.

.

50831	ICT IIC	TARIABI TROCERTS	LES TROCEDPS	BIT BCHDI	11 <b>51 8</b> 4 19	OEBHT T	1 40 <b>81</b> 0	TEAGETC7	TRAGDPC7	
KARO 1	8c~39	10.00	1.1. 50	30°20	33.70	0.60	9.50	13.70	6.70	4 • 60
NA NO 2	8-46	9.93	7.80	33.20	42.40	0.70	8.70	9.70	10.60	4.60
KATC3	5 <b>#</b> - #	7.40	9.20	33.50	33.20	1.00	6.70	11.20	7.50	6.90
RLB34		96*8	11.40	31.00	36.60	0.70	05°a	10.60	7.00	4.40
NA505		8.90	10.70	32.50	34.60	-0.70	7.90	12.00	7.90	2.60
NA 606		9**6	10.00	31.60	35.90	-0.20	6.0¢	12.60	7.70	3.50
NA307	H= 38	7.10	10.00	30.00	34, 30	0.70	7.40	9.60	8.20	3.40
<b>FA KO8</b>	<b>H-</b> 32	9.10	9.40	31.60	36.50	-0.20	8.10	6.30	9.00	4.10
44 HO 9	H=52	7.70	10.30	29.30	38.50	0.20	7.50	11.40	8.10	4.20
<b>NAB 1</b> 0	H-#7	9.40	10.60	32.80	35. 83	-0.20	1.90	10. 30	8.10	3.60
EATI	H-51	00.9	69.60	32.30	38.10	1.00	8.00	10.70	11.10	2.90
<b>FA812</b>	H-50	8.50	8.70	31.90	35.10	0.20	1.90	9 ° 30	8.30	3.60
61813	8-2°	7.40	11.60	34.20	46.00	-0.10	7.40	10.80	9.00	3.50
1214	8-#3	9.70	10.30	31.30	35.20	0.60	<b>6.</b> ≜0	10.80	6.60	5.10
RAT 15	B-35	11.70	12.50	33.70	39° 90	-0.10	10.70	12.10	8.20	3.60
NA. 16	8 <b>-</b> 33	11.30	12.60	32.50	42.50	0.83	7.90	12.20	8.60	4.20
NA217	B=# C	9.20	12.00	32.40	40.20	0.00	7.60	12.60	8.70	3.50
MAT 18	B-37	10.60	13.10	32.40	35.00	0.20	7.70	10.70	9.60	2.90

÷.

. .....

.

	CT NO	GLABLDPT		14047 <b>518</b>		BCTCH DPT	L111-578	2711-57K	ASIS5
KANC 1	8-39	11.20	1.90	9°20	1.90	6.8	12.80	12.00	21.00
NA NO 2	H-46	11.00	2.50	8.60	2, 50	7.80	11.50	12.70	20.50
NAT03	6 <b>4</b> - 8	10.70	2.00	6.60	2.60	7.60	13.60	13.70	23.70
EA 80 4	2 <b>4 -</b> 8	10.70	2.00	8.60	1.60	7.30	13.00	13.40	21.10
NA 805	H-#8	10.40	0.40	6.20	0.93	7.30	12.90	13.60	21.10
NA 806		9.90	0* 30	8.30	1. 10	7.20	13.70	14.70	23.00
HAS07	<b>E-3</b> 8	9.10	1.60	7.70	1.63	6.70	14.70	14.60	23.10
<b>HABO8</b>	8-32	10° 1C	1.50	6.60	1.40	7.40	12.20	12.40	19.90
HA 809	8-52	9.60	1.40	8.10	1.40	7.02	13.90	12.60	21.70
MAR10	8-47	05.9	1.50	8.00	1.50	7.10	12.20	12.60	18.00
N111	<b>H-51</b>	10.50	0.90	8.40	1.03	7.50	14.00	14.90	22.50
KAN12	H-50	9.70	1.40	8.20	1.40	7.43	12.30	13.10	16.80
<b>KAB13</b>	H+53	9.20	1.80	7.70	1.70	6.80	11.40	11.70	15.20
<b>NAT 14</b>	8-43	16.20	2.50	8.50	2.50	7.30	13.90	1., 30	22.60
<b>11115</b>	8-35	12.70	1.10	11.60	1.03	13.00	12.90	14.10	21.20
<b>BAB16</b>	E=33	9.60	1.80	8.10	1.63	7.10	14.20	14 ° 60	23.90
<b>1124</b>	04-8	9.50	0.90	7.90	0.60	6.62	13.20	13.30	21.50
<b>XAT18</b>	<b>II-37</b>	9.76	1.20	8.10	1.30	6.90	13.70	14.60	23.60

9. <sub>10</sub>.

. .

 $(n, b) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ 

THREE SPACE LOCATIONS OF UPPER TORSO AND HEAD LANDMARKS BY SUBJECT TABLE B.2

3

SUBJE	CT NG	VAELABI Shldrsk	LES Seldest	2540THS	C7 SI	c7 sr	C1	52	SSTRNSI	351 hk st
KARC 1	H- 39	-é.3G	19.20	55.60	-11.40	-1.93	17 0	.1.	1.00	-1.80
<b>KAE02</b>	8-46	-2.40	17.90	60 <b>.</b> 30	-8.13	-2.40	65	.20	5.10	-2.30
RATC3	54-H	94.4-	19.70	59.00	-16.20	C8 * 7 =	68	. #C	1.30	- 3.70
おき用つけ	<b>H-4</b> 2	-5.70	16.30	56.40	-7.40	-1.30	63	.13	66.4	-1.20
KAE95	87-8	=5.40	16.30	57.40	-10.70	-2.30	63	. 53	1.90	-2.20
nan-6	7 <b>7</b> -3	-8.60	13.30	55.26	-12.63	-2,20	63	.50	-1.70	-2.10
NASU7	H-38	-3.30	16.50	52.20	-7.90	-1.30	63	06°	2.80	-1.80
NA NO 8	H-32	-4.70	20.70	56.30	-7.63	0.70	67	• 30	3.20	0.70
NASO9	8-52	-4.10	19.20	56.60	-8.40	06°C-	62	. 80	3.50	-9.90
XAB10	H-47	-4.50	20.63	53.30	-8,60	-3.63	6)	• 20	2.70	-0,43
117 AN	H-51	-7.00	23.83	57.10	-7.40	-0.10	66	. 80	2.10	-0.10
KAN12	8-50	-1.20	20.63	52.60	-7.90	-1.30	63	.40	2.53	-0.30
KA 913	6-53	-4.80	24.34	61.63	-8.33	~2.93	69	. 60	5. 20	-2.80
BAIT4	8-43	.1.3	17.30	58.60	-9.20	- 3, 30	61	. 60	ů. 40	-3.20
NAT15	E= 35	-1.63	21.20	61.30	-9.53	-1.63	70	.30	3.10	-1.50
KAM16	B~33	-5.50	14.50	58.50	-11.10	-3.13	¢ 6	. 70	2.60	-3-2-
NLT17	94-H	-é.6û	20 <b>.</b> 3f	55.90	-11.13	-0-60	64	. 7.9	- J. 40	-C. • 6 U
NAT18	H- 37	<b>-3.</b> 6ù	20.70	55.20	-7.10	-c. 8J	65	• • •	2.40	-3.60

зŵ

asana ay

8 8 5

ire de	ICF EC	728148 5572852	LIS The Si	116 57 	73.46 55	1511610	ORBIEST	0131155	6143151
84 NO 1	9E-I	58.20	-4.70	5.20	77.60	4.90	1.80	78.60	6.50
NAE02	34-3	58.50	2.70	5.20	76.00	11.30	1.30	76.70	13.70
11103	5 ti - 11	59.60	-2.30	5.80	79.60	6.40	2.10	80.60	8.40
NA ROS	<b>8-42</b>	55.10	-0.40	5.30	73.50	<b>a</b> .50	2.30	74.60	10.30
<b>F</b> AE05	-46	57.40	-2.90	5.10	77.60	5.00	2.00	76.90	7.50
KAK06		56.70	- 4.90	4.30	76.10	3.10	1.30	75.90	5.00
NA 507	ii-36	53.00	6.30	5.60	70.50	7.70	1.60	71.20	9.40
NA NO S	2E-8	57.80	1.40	<b>6.30</b>	75.60	9° €0	3. 36	35.40	11.50
r <b>à a</b> 09	E-52	56.40	-C. 30	5.90	74.20	7.50	2.80	74.40	9.20
<b>14810</b>	1-4-X	52.30	-0,70	6.00	70.50	7.20	2.90	76.30	9.40
84511	<b>H-51</b>	57.60	3.65	5.30	17.50	11.60	3.46	78.50	14.20
NAN12	<b>H-50</b>	55 <b>.0</b> 0	0.40	7.20	73.40	8.30	3.90	73.60	10.16
86813	8-53	60.70	0.70	2.70	80.30	8.20	-1.00	80.20	10.00
8274	E ++ 3	58.70	-2.40	1.30	78.40	5.70	0.50	79.30	7.60
<b>XAT15</b>	R-35	60.20	-1.30	11.70	82.38	0**6	1.80	82.30	11.40
<b>NAB16</b>	H-33	59.50	-2.20	4.40	78. 90	5.70	0.90	19. 80	7.40
NAT17	0 <b>4</b> - H	57.40	-2.40	6.70	77.40	5.30	3.80	77.40	7.10
91 <b>7</b> 18	<b>II-</b> 37	54.40	2.56	6.00	75.70	10.10	2.60	15.90	12.10

a

81

janeko Valen

		VARIABI	513						
10605	ICF BC	1518151		ETELPSI ********	ET 21. PS T	<b>RTRLFSS</b>	ECCABSI	RCCANST	BCCAK58
NAKO 1	8-39	-1.40	62.45		1.60	19.70	3.70	2.60	79.70
KA HO 2	94-1	-2.00	£0.70	11.50	1.10	78.50	10.50	2. 40	78.50
RAT03	64-8	-0.90	84.50	6.60	2.20	81.65	5.53	3.40	61.60
HAE04	29-8	-1.40	78.30	6.30	2.60	75.90	£.30	3.50	75.50
NABOS	8+-8	-1.40	80.20	5.30	2.00	78.30	4.40	3.10	78.50
NAR06	44-8	-1.70	75.60	3.40	1.10	77.00	2.30	2.40	77.20
KAS07	8 <b>-</b> -9	-2.26	13.90	8.00	1.60	72.10	7.00	2.80	72.10
EA HOS	<b>I</b> -32	-0.10	01.91	10.00	3.00	77.10	8.90	0 <b>4</b> • <b>4</b> 0	77.00
KAE09	8-52	-0.50	78.40	7.60	2.60	75.60	6.70	4.10	75.60
<b>BAR10</b>	8-47	-0.90	74.30	7.30	2.50	72.06	6.40	3.90	72.00
NAT11	8~51	-0.40	80.40	12.00	3. 10	78.40	11.20		78.50
NAB12	E-50	0.60	77.20	8.60	3.70	74.80	7.60	4.90	74.60
84813	6 <b>3 -</b> 8	-4.80	83, 80	8.50	-1.20	82.10	7.60	0.20	<b>e</b> 1.90
RAT 14	第-43	-2.60	8 <b>3.5</b> 0	6.10	0.20	80.90	¢. 90	1.50	90°08
XX 15	8-35	-1.50	66.10	9.70	1.70	63.59	8.70	3.19	83.40
84816	<b>8-</b> 33	-2.50	63.20	5.90	0.90	69 . 60	4.90	2.30	08.68
<b>BAT17</b>	E-40	0.00	90.50	5.50	3.50	78.30	4.20	4.90	78.20
¥1718	<b>B-</b> 37	-1.60	78.60	10.50	1.90	76 ° 90	9.40	э. 10	76.90

TABLE B.3 RANGE-OF-NOTION ANGLES BY SUBJECT

> ÷ °

jin. N

÷,

، بر تا بر

1

508J	ICT NO	YARIAB P2NEUTY	LES P2XEUTP	P2X5UT8	P3111	₽3££₽₽ ₽3££₽₽	P31211		 111144	<b>P</b> 4717X 
NAE01	H- 39	- 1.60	C.80	0.20	E. D.	83.00	<b>8.</b> D.	-3.50	-66.00	2.20
NA 802	8-46	-2.80	4.50	-1.80	H.D.	79.00	H.D.	2.10	-63.20	-4.70
NAT03	5 t - H	-0,10	-5, 40	1.20	<b>B.</b> D.	79.50	<b>E.</b> D.	1.90	-62.60	-6.89
KAR04	H-42	2.70	-3.10	1.30	H.D.	87.50	<b>K.D.</b>	3, 30	-68.20	0.20
<b>BABO</b> 5	8 <b>t</b> - H	0.00	0.50	-0.70	ñ. D.	62.00	M.D.	-0.80	-66.70	-3.60
NAMO6	**	1.10	3.70	-1.90	щ. D.	85.80	H.D.	2.50	-50.60	-10.30
NAS07	8-38	1.40	-5.50	-0.50	E. D.	63.03	K.D.	3.50	-55.30	-3.40
NA NO 8	B=32	3.50	1.60	1.10	<b>E.</b> D.	76.59	5.D.	2.50	-57.60	-3.30
NA.809	H-52	-1.10	-3.30	1.90	B.D.	76.00	<b>H</b> •D•	-16.90	-55.90	<b>*</b> 00
KAN19	8-47	-1.20	-1.50	-1.30	Б. D.	79.00	8.0.	1.50	-54.50	-2.30
KAT11	H-51	-0-80	- 3. 60	1.00	H.D.	84.03	8°D.	4.00	-54.30	1.70
91812	H-50	-7.10	-5.40	0.10	<b>K.</b> D.	80.5J	H.D.	11.70	-62.60	-4.80
ELUI3	E-53	0.60	-4.60	-1.10	N.D.	82.00	<b>K</b> .D.	-1.70	-55.70	B.D.
M. Z. 14	H=4 3	1.70	- 6. 00	0.10	E, D.	76.53	<b>H.</b> D.	5.10	- 54.20	-6.90
EAT15	8 <b>-3</b> 5	-3.90	-0.30	-0.90	<b>K.</b> D.	77.10	M.D.	-1.40	-65.70	H.D.
81216	H=33	-1.70	-3.20	0.4.0	E. D.	64.03	8.D.	3.60	-68.50	-3.50
XAT 17	07 - H	-2.20	-6.00	2.40	<b>II.</b> D.	85.50	8. D.	7. 10	-58.20	-5.90
8118 8718	8-37	-3.50	1.00	0.60	<b>6</b> . D.	82 . ÙÛ	8.D.	-9.20	-65.10	13.50

1780S	SCT NO	VAETABI P5272071 	LES PSETROTF	P5873072	P6118077	P6LT 80TP	101194	P71LBUD	achelero	P7ELBUDE
F 0 8 4 9 1	8-39	83.50	-8.60	14.60	-83.10	-0.10	- 19.20	2.20	5.50	46.30
AABO 2	H-46	70.20	- 3. 70	3.60	-68.90	-7.00	-10.00	-7.90	1.30	43.00
<b>FAT03</b>	6 <b>4</b> -H	71.10	-6.20	7.70	-66.70	-11.40	-7.60	-5.50	-2.50	34.90
BARGS	K-42	77.10	0.20	9.60	-81.90	-0.90	-9.90	-1.00	-1.90	51.30
<b>BAROS</b>	8 <b>t</b> - R	73.80	6.00	6.70	-79.70	-2.00	-3.10	10.60	00.0	84.20
HA ROS	\$ <b>7</b> - 8	87.50	£. 60	6.60	-81.60	3.30	-5.50	3.90	2.40	47.60
NAS07	fi= 38	65.30	-5.40	7.60	-72.60	-5.70	~15.60	6.90	3.10	37.40
e os en	H-32	72.90	06 * L	7.80	-79.00	3.30	-0.60	14.80	3.40	35 <b>°2</b> (
NANC 9	8-52	78.16	- 2, 16	<b>b</b> . bJ	- 6'3. ) J	<b>1.</b> D.	9-2-	1. 43	J•46	45.00
NA 8 10	8-47	75.50	4.50	7°20	-81.40	5.30	-11,60	5.40	-2.60	43.00
84211	1 H	88.40	-1.20	7.60	-63.20	0.10	-9.10	20.70	10.90	67.00
<b>BAE12</b>	8-50	80.10	-1.70	-4.90	- 19.70	-6.20	-6.00	1.40	-9.60	45.10
¥4813	H=53	73.20	2.40	7.20	- 60. 10	-0.60	-13.60	2.50	-3.80	37.80
8274	8-43	70.40	-9.90	5.00	-66.20	-11.10	-6,30	10.70	-2.20	<b>8</b> 6.20
NAT15	H-35	76.20	- 3. 80	-3.30	-61.40	-3.30	-8.50	4.10	- 10. 70	47.30
MAR16	H-33	75.30	-4.80	6.00	-51.13	-5.60	-12.60	-6.10	2.90	53.80
KAT17	8-40	73.60	-5.40	<b>N.</b> D.	-81.20	-1.00	-15.30	7.40	-0.60	43.40
<b>HAT18</b>	<b>k-37</b>	76.10	-9.10	3.50	-70.00	-2.50	-0.20	з.70	6.20	41.30

.

A Sec

 $\gamma \in \mathcal{V}$ 

AL PROPERTY

30842		Idialited	Pallard?	101911284	11208164	47408764	11201762	7011087	P10LEOB?	P10520B8
NA 80 1	i- 39	-5.60	5.10	-51.60	-64.90	-38.10	-31.69	-75.10	4.20	-55.60
KA EO 2	3 <b>4</b> -8	-6.20	-1.10	-53.40	-65.40	-24.50	-15.80	-63.60	6.30	-42.00
EOTAN 1	5 # 3	1.60	-1.50	-41.10	-58.40	-29,90	-16.70	-66.20	7.20	-40.40
NA EO 4	K-42	-6.03	3.60	-50.30	-75.40	- 36. 19	-11.90	-74.40	13.00	-54.50
KAN05	84-3	-7.80	-2.76	-43.60	-73.20	-34.03	-10.30	-68.70	4.20	-\$2.50
NARO6		-0.60	- 3. 50	- 49.90	-69.33	-26,80	-7.70	-88.60	10.50	-54.80
<b>NAS07</b>	<b>H-</b> 36	-11.10	-5.70	-51.80	-72.40	-32.03	-25.30	-53.20	- 3.60	-41.80
6 8 6 6	H-32	-10.30	12.50	-35.80	-72.60	-23.50	- 15.50	-80.20	6.30	-31.50
NAR09	H~52	-8.20	-6.70	-33.40	-73.10	-19.40	-8.60	-78.70	4.70	-26.80
N.R.H.10	B-47	-8.50	-1.40	-47.79	-70.30	-28.70	-17.70	-81.30	11.70	-46.80
KRT11	H-51	-12.70	7.20	-54.40	-65, 10	-26.70	-17.60	-60.60	9.80	-45.80
KAR12	H-50	-4.10	-10.60	-51.40	-81.90	-37.03	5.90	-74.10	-8.00	-35.40
88.83 8	E3-8	3.30	-11.90	-43.20	-82.90	-80.43	-11.70	-68.50	6.60	-36.80
HAT14	E #-8	06.1	6.2N	-43.53	-65.30	-31.90	- 3.90	-64.90	-4.20	-24.40
<b>HAT15</b>	H-35	-9,00	- 7. 60	<b>E</b> .D.	-72.60	-24.60	-15.60	-74.60	5.00	-31.50
VAN10	<b>6-3</b> 3	0° 80	00.0	-55.90	-71.60	-44.10	- 18, 00	- 63. 30	-10.70	-53.00
RAT17	11 - 4 C	-7.60	3.00	-43.80	-67.70	-22.50	- 16.00	-80.30	04.6	-38.30
NAT 16	H-37	-5.20	-2.90	-36,50	-85.50	-33.80	12.60	-69.00	-5.70	-26.30

a sealandation of the

Ŕ

yalverta.

ana ang Star

gaver Atta

*.* 

308.71	ECT NO	VARIA5	LES F14F0XP	A I CEA I LA	#SAG#0#	Rottora	PLAFECH
1 CB TH	8 - 10						
			70°37	A	149.40	100.64	53,90
HARC 2	8-4E	78.10	24.00	12.63	142.29	(1.961	56.4.
EUTAN	5 <b>4-</b> H	65.90	19.30	15.30	142.13	137.00	76.00
115 AN	<b>H-#</b> 2	75.30	19.50	14.90	155.73	159.63	1.1.64
ARU5	5 <b>4</b> E	80.70	24.10	96.71	142.70	153.5J	92.83
NA 806	# # = H	69°CC	26.00	11.60	136.43	169.13	67.73
ASC7	K- 36	64.10	33.20	13.30	118.30	132.90	69.20
BARCE	<b>h=</b> 32	76.90	27.73	22.50	134,37	151.50	71.30
NA.309	H~52	76.66	25.30	14.43	131.93	147.13	64.43
KA319	8-47	72.50	<b># 0. 0</b> 0	11.60	133.55	156.90	90.70
84211	8-51	67.9C	39.90	25.10	138.37	171.63	121.40
KA512	H-5C	8e.10	2 <b>0.</b> Eu	11.53	143.13	154.63	96.50
<b>KAB13</b>	E 3 - H	73.90	16.30	6.20	137.73	153.30	79.00
KAT14	£ ₩-₩	73.50	13. 50	17.40	142.7J	136.60	93.73
<b>#AT15</b>	95 -H	JÚ*28	6 • 9 3	19.10	142.53	157.63	<b>*</b> • <b>C</b> •
KAN16	H+33	75.00	12.70	e. 30	132.53	156.80	11.77
<b>KAT17</b>	H-4C	73.40	33.40	13.79	143.77	154.60	84.23
#AT 18	K- 37	73.50	13.50	5.53	1€7. 1.)	154.13	79.80

# TABLE B.4 REFLEX TIME AND VOLUMTARY STRENOTH RESULTS BY BUBJECT

A DESCRIPTION OF

ers diag

्भ भ and the second

3rgns	CI 10	763485 RFL LAT 	RPL FLER	**************************************	kPL AVG	TJN WIS	111 115
N 2 20 1	9C -H	51. 30	([']5	+ 3, 30	50.33	1.2	\$3.50
# 4 B C Z	99-X	50.70	30.52	66.30	56.20	32°30	31.33
E O L V V	5 3 4 2	49,30	54.70	55.50	53,23	34.30	12.79
HAN JU	2 <b>#</b> =H	54.00	66.80	66.30	62.91	49.70	53.7J
88.805	8 <b>*</b> - H	42.70	64.70	50.81	52.59	25. J1	J1.70
KAROG	モノー語	£1.3Ú	e. D.	54 <b>.</b> 20	63.30	24.76	37.63
NASP7	H- 38	42.75	69.84	55.03	47.50	22.70	19.37
****	н-32	53.70	54.53	56.00	54.73	33.00	36.00
80888	1=52	57.60	56.33	57,30	56.50	29.30	28.30
( L 2 7 )	5 <b>4</b> - 8	53 <b>. 1</b> 0	£C, 70	61.30	59.23	42.03	39, 30
24-11	H-51	70.06	61.70	63.00	63.33	£1.70	44,30
NA 512	H-51	50° u 3	5 <b>0.</b> 03	¥9.00	52.3J	31.6	31.70
6173A	h=5.3	51.70	63.73	54.70	56. 70	56.30	46.7)
442.44	1 <b>a</b> a	37.40	60°10	37.63	+5.12	25 . Jú	26.00
#1-15	H-35	55.72	43.30	42.70	47.2J	28.33	16.46
21 H V V	H-33	45.76	46.03	42.70	44.8]	52.70	45.30
4217	H-41	48.37	46.50	45.70	46.73	42.03	17.76
KA 7 1 5	H- 37	51.36	57.70	66.44	51.10	#C • 70	42.33

ł,

. .

8 1993 199

		VARTAP1				
50 B.J.	ICT NC	SIRLATA V	51% EX19	372 FLKk ********	576 54GA V ********	SAGLATAV
EANC 1	96 - H	32.30	44.73	39.30	42.0)	37.20
KAMO 2	9+-H	31.80	54.70	39.30	47.03	G# . EE
KAT03	57-8	31.50	32,30	41.70	37.03	34.20
4 6 H C H	H=# 2	51.70	55.63	36 • ( )	45.57	4 B • 6C
KA HC 5	7 <b>4</b> - H	28.50	32.70	30.00	31.90	30.20
44.40v	ササーゼ	32.80	37.00	33.30	35. 2.)	£9 • 8£
NASU7	H- 36	21.00	55 <b>-</b> 30	16.70	24.80	22.53
KA MC B	H=32	33.50	53.60	36.70	43.3)	38.43
RANGS	H-52	28.80	CE •SE	21.01	31.20	90.06
NA 3 10	1 - 4 7	40.70	47.33	32.00	39.70	40.23
KA71	t s e H	43.00	57. 30	34.00	47.7J	45.30
KAN12	H= 5 C	37.64	#E.CJ	35, 33	41.73	36.20
KA 7 1 3		51.30	55.30	- +2.00	48.70	5C . UG
84 <u>5</u> 14	6 3-H	23.20	39, 33	22.30	30.67	26.00
81715	H- 35	31.30	46.05	30.06	30.6)	34.70
66.5 1o	H= ] :	3 <b>0°6</b> t	56.70	\$3.90	48.30	64.70
64757	11-40	13.63	54.00	37.70	45.80	42.83
8128X	<del>1</del> 37	#1.50	54.70	34.73	44.77	43.19

김 아파 집 집 같이 같이?

1. S. A. S.

### APPENDIX C

,84∰ ₹\*\*

ALC: NO

### EXPERIMENTAL SLED TEST RESULTS

Figures C.1 through C.5 show the 6 G experimental time traces for head angular acceleration, head angular velocity, head angular position, head resultant acceleration, and  $T_1$  resultant acceleration for the five NAMRL subjects used in the simulations of Chapter 3. The dashed line in each figure is the average of the five curves and corresponds to the solid line shown in the simulation comparisons of Chapters 4 and 5. Figures C.6 through C.10 show similar experimental curves for 15 G sled tests.



, pr

Figure C.1 6 G Experimental Head Angular Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.



َيَّة. 5.

> 19 19 19

> > . 8

. ?

4

197 H. 5

ź

Figure C.2 6 G Experimental Head Angular Velocity Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.





A STATE OF A



A LAN THE AREA

42 14 10 n 1

Figure C.4 6 G Experimental Head Resultant Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.

ор. И. С. # الا



Figure C.5 6 G Experimental  $T_1$  Resultant Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.

ale al the second s



star Ali

**بنغر** کارش

31

y da t

Ĕa:

Figure C.6 15 G Experimental Head Angular Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.



an chir Mir na

.

\$

in the second se

set

**باللغ**ان الم

1

Æ

Figure C.7 15 G Experimental Head Angular Velocity Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.



ngi). N

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

.

k

۰.,

ð

gi.

Figure C.8 15 G Experimental Head Angular Position Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.



¢

¥. 1

.

1475) 14

**9**66

41

38

Figure C.9 15 G Experimental Head Resultant Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.

and an in the second second



£.

-

3

Figure C.10 15 G Experimental  $T_1$  Resultant Acceleration Curves for Five NAMRL Subjects. Dashed Line is Average Curve.