

Investigation of Human Kinematics and Risk of Injury during a Vertical Impact using Dummy and Human Finite Element Models

Jacob B. Putnam¹, Costin D. Untaroiu¹

¹ Center for Injury Biomechanics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

ABSTRACT

The safety of aerospace transport for both fixed and rotary wing aircraft is evaluated primarily through testing of anthropometric test devices (ATDs), commonly known as crash test dummies. While the majority of the ATDs were certified under automotive horizontal impact conditions, their biofidelity under vertical loading is less known. The first objective of this study was to validate a finite element (FE) model of the THOR crash dummy in a vertical impact scenario. The second objective was to compare the dummy model response to the corresponding response of the THUMS human FE model in the same impact conditions.

A series of vertical drop tests were performed on a THOR-NT crash dummy. Impact conditions were replicated in FE simulation based on pre-impact velocities and crash pulse decelerations measured during testing. FE simulations were run with both dummy and human FE models using LS-Dyna software. The dummy model was evaluated relative to the test data in terms of kinematics (e.g. landmark trajectories) and kinetics (e.g. upper/lower neck and lumbar spine loading). Comparisons between injury prediction of dummy and human models were also performed. Preliminary results showed a good correlation between the response of physical THOR dummy and its FE model. A good correlation was observed in terms of neck load between both FE models. The THUMS spine showed a higher bending flexibility within the sagittal plane. In addition, differences were observed in pelvis region where a significant bouncing was observed in THOR model, but not in the THUMS model.

Promising overall results validate the use of the current THOR FE model in vertical load simulations, for evaluation of occupant safety in the aerospace field. In addition, comparison with THUMS human model may help to improve the THOR design and define better injury criteria for vertical loading.

INTRODUCTION

During a crash aircraft occupants can be exposed to a variety of complex loading conditions the primary component of which is typically a high rate vertical acceleration. These extreme loading scenarios commonly induce a variety of injuries during the initial impact acceleration phase. Recently, several studies reported that serious and fatal injuries could be potentially avoided if the protective systems within the aircraft are adequately designed. It has been estimated that 85 percent of all aircraft crashes were classified as survivable [Shanahan 2004]. A better understanding of human response and injury mechanisms under vertical loading is necessary to improve the design of novel airplane protective systems (e.g. seats, restrain systems).

The safety of aerospace transport for both fixed and rotary wing aircraft is evaluated primarily through testing of anthropometric test devices (ATDs), commonly known as crash test dummies. Historically, the Hybrid II, Aerospace Hybrid III, and FAA Hybrid III dummies have been the most commonly used ATDs in aircraft crashworthiness testing. Recently, there has been an increased interest for testing the Test Device for Human Occupant Restraint (THOR), the most advanced automotive dummy, in aerospace loading conditions. ATD testing provides an effective method for vehicular safety evaluation. However, the high cost and limited availability of THOR ATD makes performing impact tests in the multitude of possible aerospace impact configurations difficult. Numerical simulations of impact provide an important compliment to ATD testing by evaluating performance in a limitless number of scenarios.

Vehicle structural response to a crash impact can be accurately modeled in currently available finite element codes such as LS-DYNA (Jackson 2009). Yet to confidently model the safety of aircraft, a well validated test dummy model which exhibits biofidelic response in relevant impact scenarios is necessary. Further, simulation of dummy model response with a human model may help in the continuous improvement of dummy design and in the defining of better dummy injury criteria.

In the current study a drop test is simulated using a FE model of THOR-NT based on the data recorded during a series of dummy tests performed at NASA LaRC (Littell 2013, Putnam 2013). After the dummy FE model is calibrated, the same drop test is simulated using THUMS (Total Human Model for Safety) FE model. Finally, the dummy and human responses are compared and the differences are discussed.

METHODS

Simulation Modeling

In the vertical ATD impact tests, the THOR-NT dummy was arranged in an upright position prior to each test. Lap and chest restraints were used to hold the dummy to the seat; minimum tension was applied. Dummy and seat were dropped from a certain height onto a honeycomb block setup which generated a specific deceleration pulse upon impact (Littell 2013).

The latest available version of THOR NT dummy FE model was used in this study. The model was updated and calibrated for vertical loading in our previous study (Putnam 2013). A seat model was developed to the specifications of the seat used in the physical tests. The THOR-NT dummy FE model was originally positioned within the seat and the safety straps used in testing were modeled as seat belts in LS-PREPOST. The final pre-test posture of the dummy model was verified based on photogrammetric imagery of the dummy recorded prior impact (Fig. 1).




Figure 1. Pre-test conditions of THOR ATD a), THOR-NT FE model (b), and THUMS FE model (c).

Initial velocity in was set to all dummy and seat model parts based on the test pre-impact velocity. The acceleration time history of the seat, recorded in testing and filtered in accordance with guidelines set forth by SAE J211 (Society of Automotive Engineers 2007), was assigned to the seat model (Fig. 2). In addition, gravitational acceleration (9.81 m/s^2) was applied to all parts in the FE simulation. LS-Dyna FE software (LSTC, Livermore, CA, USA) was used to run all simulations. Simulations were performed on a desktop PC with an Intel® Core™ i7-2600 CPU @ 3.4 GHz processor. Simulation time step of the THOR-NT was $0.63 \mu\text{s}$ and an average computation time for a 150 ms impact condition was approximately 30 hours.




Figure 2. Impact deceleration pulse used in simulation.

The THUMMS human model (Fig. 1c) was positioned in the same seat and arranged to match the postural setup of the THOR-NT model (Fig. 1b). THUMS positioning was performed in LS-PREPOST (LSTC, Livermore, CA, USA) and it was limited to limb adjustments. The neck and spine were fixed in the upright position. THUMS simulation setup matched that of the THOR simulation. Simulation time step of the THUMS model was $.4 \mu\text{s}$ and the time required to complete the simulation was approximately 70 hours.

THOR FE model Validation

The THOR FE model was validated under three different vertical loading conditions by comparing kinematic and kinetic time history responses to those measured in physical testing (Putnam et al. 2013). The acceleration response of THOR dummy FE model was verified against the test data at the representative head CG (Center of Gravity), T1 vertebrae, and T12 vertebrae locations in all three conditions. The loading in terms of vertical force and sagittal moment were verified at the upper neck, lower neck, and lumbar spine load cells. The CORA rating system (Gehre et al. 2009) was used to provide a cumulative evaluation of the THOR FE model.

Kinematic and kinetics analysis between models

Dummy head and spine kinematics were calculated at the locations of head CG, T1, and T12 accelerometers (Fig. 3a). Three nodes were defined at corresponding locations in THUMS FE model (Fig. 3b). The trajectories of the head CG and T1 were calculated based on displacement data recorded in both models relative to the chair.




Figure 3. The cross-sections through the head-neck-spine complex a) THOR-NT dummy FE model b) THUMS human FE model

Loading data in the FE model of THOR-NT dummy during drop simulation was calculated at its upper neck, lower neck, and lumbar spine load cells (Fig. 3a). Similar load cells were defined in THUMS FE model using cross-section planes at locations of C1, T1 and T12/L1 with their respective local coordinate systems aligned with the loading orientation up the spine (Fig. 3b). To calculate the compressive force between the lumbar spine and pelvis, an additional load cell was defined at L5 in THUMS FE model (Fig. 3b).

Injury metric correlation between models

The Head: The Head Injury Criterion (HIC) was calculated for the head of **THOR dummy** during the impact. The HIC is current standard metric outlined in FMVSS 208 (occupant crash protection) for head injury and is computed from the following expression (GESAC 2005).

$$HIC_M = \max_{t_2 - t_1 \leq M} \left\{ \frac{1}{(t_2 - t_1)^{3/2}} \left[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} a(t) dt \right]^{5/2} \right\} \quad (1)$$

Linear acceleration magnitude, $a(t)$, is calculated at the head center of mass (COM). HIC is typically calculated at time intervals, Δt , of 15 ms and 36 ms. Currently, the established injury thresholds for HIC_{15} and HIC_{36} are 700 and 1000 respectively for a mid-size male. The maximum first principle strain (FPS) and Cumulative Strain Damage Measure (CSDM) were calculated for the head of **THUMS model** during the impact. CSDM measures the volume percentage of elements within the cerebrum model which experience FPS over a specified value. The FPS threshold used in this study was .15, written as CSDM 15%. This threshold has been shown to best correlate with diffused axonal brain injury DAI (Zhang et al 2006). Maximum FPS is used as a comparison to evaluate the results of CSDM with respect to the FPS threshold used.

The Neck: The Lower Neck Beam Criterion (BC) and Neck Injury Criteria (upper neck), specific dummy criterion, were used as the neck injury metric for the **THOR model**. BC value is computed from the following equation.

$$BC = \frac{F_z}{F_{zc}} + \frac{M_y}{M_{yc}} \quad (2)$$

The maximum vertical load (F_z) and anterior/posterior flexion moment of the lower neck (M_y) are used in this calculation. F_{zc} and M_{yc} are critical values specific to the 50th percentile ATD male: 5,430 N (compression) and 141 Nm (flexion). BC can be used to calculate the probability of moderate neck injuries ($AIS \geq 2$) (Manoogian et al. 2006).

$$Risk\ of\ AIS \geq 2 = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\left(\frac{1-BC}{0.19}\right)}} \quad (3)$$

The injury risk in the **THUMS model** was assessed by calculating the percentage of maximum in principle stress of the C1 and T1 vertebrae to failure stress defined in the cortical vertebrae material model used in THUMS. Yield stress defined for all vertebrae in the THUMS model is 120 MPA.

The Lumbar region: In the **THOR model**, the Lumbar Load Criterion (LLC) is a measure of peak vertical load between the pelvis and lumbar spine with respect to a maximum injury threshold value. The injury threshold value is defined for 50th percentile ATD male as 6,672 N. In the **THUMS model**, the load through the lumbar spine was calculated at T12/L1 (the level which corresponds to the lumbar spine load cell in THOR and at the L5 location. The L5 location was additionally evaluated as it is closer to the impact region and may exhibit a superior indication of lower spine injury than L1. Percentages of maximum principle stress to defined failure stress value were developed. Percentage of total vertical load distributed from the seat impact to each location was additionally compared between THUMS and THOR-NT models.

RESULTS

THOR FE model Validation

The CORA rating system evaluated the similarity between the THOR FE model Gehre 2009, Untaroiu 2013) and the physical THOR dummy to be .886/1 in the conditions simulated in

this study. Overall the THOR FE model showed similar peak accelerations and vertical forces to the dummy (Fig. 4). Main differences occurred in the unloading portion, in which the FE model was demonstrated to be stiffer.




Figure 4. Comparison of the THOR-NT dummy and model response at a) the local vertical T12 acceleration b) the vertical lumbar spine load

THOR vs. THUMS Response

Overall, the THOR-NT FE dummy model (Fig. 5a) shows a stiffer kinematic response than the THUMS FE model during the drop simulation (Fig. 5b). The THUMS FE model exhibits a relatively large flexibility of its vertebral column in the sagittal plane and significant pelvis flesh compression during vertical loading. The THOR FE model shows a less spinal flexibility and less deformation of the pelvis flesh.




Figure 5. Comparison of the a) THOR FE model and b) THUMS FE model kinematics during drop simulation (sagittal cross-sections).

The Head: The two models begin with a similar trajectory (Fig. 6). However, as the simulation progresses the head CG in the THUMS model demonstrates a larger vertical displacement. This difference in vertical displacement is primarily developed early in simulation. Overall, both FE models predict a similar horizontal displacement (head excursion).




Figure 6. The trajectory of the Head CG in the THOR and THUMS FE Models.

Both THOR and THUMS FE models predict no risk of head injury in the simulation performed (Tab. 1). Both HIC criteria calculated the THOR FE data are below 1% of the maximum threshold for injury. In addition, the first principal strain of the THUMS cerebrum model was lower than .15 during the simulation which indicates a very low probability of injury.

Table 1: Head injury metrics calculated in THOR and THUMS FE models

Kinematic Injury Metrics	
<u>Dummy Criteria</u>	<u>THOR Value</u>
% Threshold HIC15	0.56%
% Threshold HIC36	0.37%
<u>Human Criteria</u>	<u>THUMS Value</u>
CSDM 15%	0
Max FPS	.0628514

The Neck: The trajectory of T1 is seen to oscillate in the THOR model while continually decreasing in THUMS (Fig. 7). Similar to the head CG trajectory a significant increase in vertical displacement is observed in the THUMS model. The maximum difference in T1 vertical displacement (85 mm) is close to the corresponding distance of at the head CG (103 mm). The difference in total T1 horizontal displacement is approximately 18 mm compared to only 4 mm in the head CG.




Figure 7. . The trajectory of T1 in the THOR and THUMS FE Models.

Overall, the time histories of vertical load in the neck show highly correlated values between the THOR FE load cell and vertebrae of the THUMS model (Fig. 8a). The C1 vertebra demonstrates the greatest correlation, with both initial and second peaks closely matching (Fig. 8a). The initial peak is also synonymous in the T1 and lower neck load cell (Fig. 8b), though the second peak is significantly higher in the THOR model. In both instrumented measurements the loads calculated in the THOR model demonstrate more dramatic unloading and secondary loading rates.




Figure 8. The time histories of vertical force at a) Upper neck b) Lower Neck in the THOR and THUMS FE models.

No risk of injury is predicted at the neck in either the THOR or THUMS FE models. Both dummy neck injury criteria predict very low risk of moderate injury with values. In the THUMS FE model, the peak stress in the T1/C1 vertebrae were also well below failure (Tab. 2).

Table 2: Neck injury metrics calculated in THOR and THUMS FE models

Kinetic Injury Metrics	
<u>Dummy Criteria</u>	<u>THOR Value</u>
Nij (Upper Neck)	.2111 (No Predicted Injury)
BC (Lower Neck)	.3746 (No Predicted Injury)
<u>Human Criteria</u>	<u>THUMS Value</u>
C1 % failure stress	43.02%
T1 % failure	36.94%

The Lower Spine: The trajectory of T12 in the THOR and THUMS models differ fairly radically (Fig. 9). As the THOR FE model bounces in the seat, the vertical displacement of T12 returns to zero.




Figure 9. . The trajectory of T12 in the THOR and THUMS FE Models.

The THUMS demonstrates a much more prolonged vertical drop. In addition very little horizontal T12 displacement is observed in the THOR dummy model, while the THUMS T12 vertebra demonstrates significant horizontal movement.

The vertical load in the L5 vertebra of the THUMS shows a closer load history to the lumbar load cell of the THOR FE model, than the L1 vertebra (Fig. 10). The THOR model exhibits a dramatic initial load spike not seen in the THUMS model. The initial peak load is significantly larger in the THOR model, though secondary loading matches closely to L5. Initial load rise time is longer in the THUMS model and increases from L5 to L1.




Figure 10. The time histories of vertical force at Lumbar spine

No risk of injury is predicted in the lumbar spine in both the THOR and THUMS models (Tab. 3). The lower lumbar peak force in the THOR model is almost 2,000 N below the injury threshold. Stress in both L1 and L5 are the less than defined yield stress, thus low probability of spinal damage due to column fracture is predicted.

Table 3: Lumbar spine injury metrics calculated in THOR and THUMS FE models

Kinetic Injury Metrics	
Dummy Criteria	THOR Value
LL	3547.01 (No Predicted Injury)
Human Criteria	THUMS Value
max. stress vs. L1 failure stress	59.76%
max. stress vs. L5 failure stress	43.02%

Model Force Distribution: The distribution of peak seat force into the vertebral column of the THUMS and THOR model shows a similar decrease from the lumbar region into the neck though a significant difference in spinal loading (Fig. 11). The THOR lumbar load cell is shown to absorb over 50% of the vertical impact force in comparison to the L1 vertebra which is over 40% less at approximately 10%. The absorption rate of the THOR lumbar load cell is shown to be more representative of the L5 vertebra which absorbs approximately 30% of impact force. The THOR and THUMS neck models demonstrate similar absorption with approximately 10% of the distributed impact load in the upper and lower neck, though the absorption in THUMS neck is slightly higher.




Figure 11. The Percentage of vertical impact force transmitted through the lumbar spine (L5 & L1), lower neck and upper neck. Comparison between the THOR and THUMS FE models.

DISCUSSION

The THOR-NT dummy was mostly evaluated against test data recorded on PMHS tested under automotive horizontal impact conditions. Overall, it was concluded that THOR dummy closely mimics the head-neck and thorax responses (Forman et al. 2006, Yoganandan et al. 2012). This has led to increased interest to evaluate THOR in aerospace loading conditions as well.

A previously developed FE model of THOR by NHTSA and their collaborators (Untaroiu et al. 2009) was improved and validated in our previous study to facilitate vertical impact simulations (Putnam et al. 2013). The OC joint model was simplified relative to the previous model, but its response was preserved and the current model exhibits better stability during

severe impacts. In addition, the model positioning tree was updated to allow an easier and faster setup of the dummy posture corresponding aerospace pre-impact configurations. Since the initial NHTSA model showed a stiffer response compared to the physical dummy under vertical loading, several parametric studies were performed to discern the cause of these differences. It was concluded that the material properties of pelvic foam had the most significant influence on dummy response, so the stress-strain curves of its LS-Dyna material model (Mat 83, LS-Dyna) were scaled down. While a good correlation was obtained between the updated dummy FE model and the physical dummy, demonstrated by the 0.89 Cora score, parameter identification of THOR-NT FE material models based material test data is strongly recommended in the future for its further improvement.

The human finite element (FE) models are currently the most sophisticated human numerical models, due to their ability to calculate detailed stress/strain distributions inside the model which consequently can be correlated with the risk of injury. THUMS is a human FE model developed to study various injury mechanisms by Toyota Central R&D Labs. The model was initially developed and validated using PMHS data for use in automobile impact scenarios (Iwamoto et al. 2002). Recently the model was also used successfully for aerospace applications (Danelson et al. 2011). To better develop an understanding of the biofidelity of THOR dummy under vertical loading, THUMS human FE model was simulated in the same loading conditions as the THOR dummy in this study.

Model Response: In observing the kinematic responses of both human and dummy models a difference in spinal response is immediately apparent. The human model exhibits much greater flexibility in the spine, showing greater horizontal displacement in the lower back leading to increased vertical displacement in the head and neck. However, the THOR model shows good vertical load biofidelity in the neck. The peak initial load is very similar in both the lower and upper neck load cells in comparison to the corresponding locations in the human model. The drop in force observed in the THOR model is likely due to the bounce observed in kinematics and not a direct function of the neck response. This seat bouncing observed in THOR may be caused by the higher stiffness and lower damping of the THOR pelvis region than similar region of THUMS. While the deformation of pelvis has no a significant influence during the frontal crashes, its role in load transmission seem to be significant during vertical loading. Therefore, improving the biofidelity of THOR pelvis under compressive loading is suggested to be performed in the future.

As in the case of spinal kinematics, differences in lumbar load response between THUMS human model and THOR dummy model are observed as well. While the level of neck load cells (T1 and C1) correlated relatively well, higher peak loads are observed in THOR lower spine relative to THUMS (L1 and L5). These differences could be caused by the higher flexibility of THUMS spine which may cause a significant portion of the seat load to appear as a tangential force along the THUMS spine, in comparison to the primarily compressive load in the THOR spine. Therefore, in addition to pelvis improvement suggested previously, an increase of the flexibility of THOR spine is recommended as well.

Injury Criteria Correlation: HIC values of less than 1% of maximum in dummy head were shown to correlate well with the low strain values observed within the human model cerebrum. While this is a positive indication in correlation between the two models further studies are necessary to validate this correlation in more violent impact scenarios.

The LL dummy injury criteria predicts no injury, as it is predicted by the low maximum stresses recorded within the THUMS L5 and L1 vertebrae. While some significant variations

were observed in the normal force along the THUMS spine (e.g. L1, and L5), future studies are suggested to specifically evaluate differences in loading pathways up through the pelvis and thorax.

Limitations: This study presents the vertical load response similarities and differences between the THUMS human and THOR dummy FE models. The results of this study are limited by a few factors which should be taken into account in future studies. Firstly, the THUMS model has been primarily validated in vertical impact conditions (Iwamoto 2002). Future volunteer/PMHS studies are necessary to further validate its biofidelity in vertical impacts conditions. Secondly, the test simulated was a low injury risk impact, limiting the power of injury metric analysis. Lastly, material property differences have been speculated between the THOR FE model and dummy (Putnam 2013). These differences may limit the ability to relate the results of this study to the physical dummy.

CONCLUSION

- Similar load characteristics were observed in the neck region of both THOR dummy and THUMS human FE models.
- Significant difference in load distribution through the lumbar spine is shown between models, suggesting an alternate load pathway in the THUMS human model likely caused by its spinal flexibility.
- Dummy injury criteria developed using the THOR FE model is supported by stress and strain values in the THUMS model in a low injury risk impact scenario.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This THOR-NT FE work was funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) –Langley Research Center. This paper does not represent official policy or practice of the NASA. The authors are also thankful for the THUMS FE model provided by the Toyota Motor Company.

REFERENCES

- DANIELSON, K.A., BOLTE J.H., STITZEL JH, Assessing astronaut injury potential from suit connectors using a human body finite element model, *Aviat Space Environ Med* 82:79-86.
- EELHOOT, M., Cardboard in architecture, IOS Press, 2008, pp. 139
- FORMAN J, LESSLEY D, SHAW CG, EVANS J, KENT R, ROUHANA SW, PRASAD P. (2006) Thoracic response of belted PMHS, the Hybrid III, and the THOR-NT mid-sized male surrogates in low speed, frontal crashes, *Stapp Car Crash J.* 2006 Nov;50:191-215.
- GEHRE C, GADES H, WERNICKE P (2009), Objective Rating of Signals using Test and Simulation Responses, In ESV Conference, Stuttgart, Germany, June 2009.

- IWAMOTO M, KISANUKI Y, WANTANABE, I, FURUSU K, MIKI K, HASEGAWA J. (2002) Development of a finite element model of the Total Human Model for Safety (THUMS) and application to injury reconstruction. Munich, Germany, IRCOBI.
- JACKSON, K.E., FUCHS, Y. T., KELLAS, S., (2009) Overview of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Subsonic Rotary Wing Aeronautics Research Program in Rotorcraft Crashworthiness, *Journal of Aerospace Engineering*, Vol. 22, (3), 2009, pp. 229-239.
- LAWRENCE, C., LITTELL, J. D., FASANELLA, E. L., TABIEI, A., (2009) Orion Crew Member Injury Predictions during Land and Water Landings,” *J. of Aerospace Engineering*, Vol. 22, (3), 2009, pp. 214-221.
- LITTELL, J. and ANNETT, M. (2013), The Evaluation of a Test Device for Human Occupant Restraint (THOR) Under Vertical Loading Conditions: Experimental Setup and Results, American Helicopter Society 69th Annual Forum, Phoenix, AZ, May 21-23, 2013
- MANOOGIAN, S., KENNEDY, E., WILSON, K., DUMA, S., ALEM, N., (2006) Predicting neck injuries due to head-supported mass, *Aviat Space Environ Med* , 77:509-514.
- POLANCO, M. A. and LITTELL, J. D., (2011) Vertical Drop Testing and Simulation of Anthropomorphic Test Devices, 67th AHS Forum, Virginia Beach, VA, May 3-5, 2011
- PUTNAM, J.B., UNTAROIU, C.D., LITTELL, J., ANNETT, M. (2013), Validation and Sensitivity Analysis of a Finite Element Model of THOR-NT ATD for Injury Prediction under Vertical Impact Loading, American Helicopter Society 69th Annual Forum, Phoenix, AZ, May 21-23, 2013.
- SALZAR, R., BOLTON, J., CRANDAL, J., PASKOFF, G., SHENDER, B., (2009) Ejection Injury to the Spine in Small Aviators: Sled Tests of Manikins vs. Post Mortem Specimens, *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine*, Vol. 80, 2009, pp. 621-628.
- SOCIETY OF AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEERS Surface Vehicle Recommended Practice: Instrumentation for Impact Test-Part 1-Electronic Instrumentation, SAE J211-1, 2007.
- SHANAHAN, D.F.2004. Human tolerances and crash survivability. Paper presented at RTO HFM Lecture Series on “Pathological Aspects and Associated Biodynamics in Aircraft Accident Investigation”, Madrid, Spain. RTO-EN-HFM-113.
- UNTAROIU, C.D., SHIN, J., LU, Y., (2013) Assessment of a Dummy Model in Crash Simulations using Rating Methods, *Int. Journal of Automotive Technology*, (in press)
- UNTAROIU, C., LIM J. Y., SHIN J., CRANDALL J., MALONE D. P., TANNOUS, R. E., (2009) Evaluation of a finite element of the THOR-NT dummy in frontal crash environment, Paper 2009-0272, 21st ESV Conference, Stuttgart, Germany.

UNTAROIU, C. and LU, Y., (2013) A Simulation-Based Calibration and Sensitivity Analysis of a Finite Element Model of THOR Head-Neck Complex, *SAE Technical Paper*, 2011, doi:10.4271/2011-01-1123.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION. “Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Part 571. Standard 208 – Occupant Crash Protection.” www.fmcsa.dot.gov

YOGANANDAN, N., PINTAR F., MOORE J., SCHLICK M., HUMM J., RINALDI J., MAIMAN, J (2012) Sled tests using the THOR-NT device and post mortem human surrogates in frontal impacts, *IRCOBI Conference*, Dublin, Ireland, Paper nr. IRC-12-20.

ZHANG, J., YOGANANDAN, N., PINTAR, F., GENARELLI, T., (2006) Brain Strains In Vehicle Impact Tests, Annual Proceedings AAAM.