INTRODUCTION

- Pediatric cervical spine injuries account for roughly 10% of all cervical spine injuries across all age groups.1-3
- Anatomical differences in children may account for this increased vulnerability of the cervical spine (c-spine).1,4
- The broad objective of this research is to quantify biomechanical responses of the c-spine in children 5–7 years old to aid and improve the biofidelity of pediatric human body models (HBMs) and anthropomorphic test devices (ATDs).
- However, this task is not possible without the development of a custom fixture that allows the quantification of c-spine biomechanics.
- This study is focused on the validation of a custom head fixture to quantify volunteer c-spine biomechanics.

MATERIALS & METHODS

A custom head fixture was designed and machined as an attachment to a Biodex Isokinetic Dynamometer to quantify c-spine strength and stiffness of pediatric volunteers in the anterior-posterior (AP) and lateral directions (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Custom head fixture mounted on the Biodex Isokinetic Dynamometer arm. Left: Subject seated in the AP direction of motion. Right: Subject seated in the lateral direction of motion.

• Validation of the fixture was performed in 2 phases to better understand the usability of the custom head fixture.

Phase I: Mechanical Validation

- Evaluated in “worst-case” scenarios with increased speed and increased range of motion.
- Artifact interference
- Load distribution
- Repeatability

If the head fixture showed repeatable and consistent behavior, the head fixture was deemed safe for next step of validation.

Phase II: Fixture Validation with an Adult Cohort

- Evaluation of self-selected snug and loose helmet fits. Subject efforts were assessed with surface electromyography (sEMG) on the sternocleidomastoid and upper trapezius muscles. Direction order was randomized.
- Isometric strength measurements with maximum subject efforts
- Stiffness measurements

Measurement accuracy was determined by comparing measurement outputs within the adult subjects to available literature.5,6
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Figure 2: Torque output comparison between the custom head fixture and the manufacturer provided ankle attachment. Top: 5°/s velocity. Bottom: 60°/s velocity.

Table 1. Peak Torques Per Helmet Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and Helmet Fit</th>
<th>Peak Torque Flex. (Nm)</th>
<th>Peak Torque Ext. (Nm)</th>
<th>∆ Peak Torque (Nm)</th>
<th>Helmet Fit</th>
<th>∆ Helmet Fit (Nm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01_L</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>A01_L</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01_S</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>A01_S</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A02_L</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>A02_L</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A02_S</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>A02_S</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A03_L</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>A03_L</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A03_S</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>A03_S</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04_L</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>A04_L</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04_S</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>A04_S</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A05_L</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>A05_L</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A05_S</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>A05_S</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Torque comparisons between all subjects with both helmet fits. Left: AP direction. Right: Lateral direction. Solid lines: Loose fit; Dashed lines: Snug fit. Blue: A00; Red: A01; Green: A02; Magenta: A03; Black: A04.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

- There were no patterns between peak torque generation and helmet fit.
  - AP direction: all maximum peak torques occurred in extension.
  - Lateral direction: maximum peak torques occurred more frequently towards the subjects’ right.
- Comparing measured peak torques to the literature, we found that our protocol results in comparable torque calculations of the atlantooccipital joint.6
- Helmet fit does not affect subjects’ ability to engage with the equipment nor to produce maximum torque during the 30°′s portion of the protocol in both directions.
- The custom head fixture produces consistent and repeatable data outputs.
- Next steps include testing pediatric volunteers 5–7 years old, to better understand the unique characteristics of the pediatric c-spine.
- With these new data, we will help bridge the gap of knowledge in the pediatric biomechanics field and begin to improve the biofidelity of the current pediatric HBMs and ATDs.
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