

GOVERNMENT INDUSTRY MEETING April 3-5, 2019 | Washington, DC

Restraint Optimization for Obese Occupants

Hamed Joodaki¹, Vivek Maripudi² ¹University of Virginia Center for Applied Biomechanics ²Joyson Safety Systems

*This meeting is co-located with





Motivation





2011-2012: 78.6 million U.S. adults obese (Ogden et al. 2014)

Rear-seat frontal impact sled tests





Restraint system optimization for obese occupants

SAE INTERNATIONAL

FOOTER CHANGED UNDER INSERT>HEADER & FOOTER



Overview



FURTHER UNDERSTANDING THE ISSUE

University of Virginia Center for Applied Biomechanics



Restrained occupants in frontal crashes

Data

- NASS-CDS
- Frontal crashes (PDOF -30° to 30°)
- Belted occupants only
- Air bag deployed

Restrained occupants in frontal crashes



- BMI vs Risk of AIS2+ injury to different body regions
- Most common injuries of obese vs non-obese
- Injury mechanism speculation

BMI vs Risk of Injury to Different Body Regions



Most common injuries of obese

Rank	risk for obese > risk for non-obese	
1 st frequent	Talus fracture	
2 nd	Tibia NFS; medial malleolus; open/ displaced/ comminuted	
3 rd	Metatarsal or tarsal fracture	
4 th	Carpus or Metacarpus fracture	
5 th	Patella fracture	
6 th	Radius Fracture NFS with or without styloid process including Colles	
7 th	Knee NFS sprain	
8 th	Fibula fracture; any type but NFS as to site; head, neck, shaft	
9 th	Rib Cage NFS; 2-3 multiple rib fractures; any location or multiple fractures of single rib; with stable chest or NFS (OIS Grade I, II, III)	
10 th frequent	Rib Cage NFS; multiple rib fractures NFS; >3 ribs on one side and no more than 3 ribs on other side, stable chest or NFS	

Injury mechanism speculation

- Large forward motion
 - Higher risk of LX and UX injury
 - Foot/ankle/tibia injuries
- Limited by knee bolsters
 - knee injuries commonly observed
 - no difference in abdominal injuries

MORPHED GHBMC OBESE HBM EVALUATION

University of Virginia Center for Applied Biomechanics



Obese HBM

- Baseline GHBMC morphed
 - External body contour
 - Rib cage and lower extremity skeletons geometry
- 3 BMIs, 2 heights, 2 ages



29 km/h Tests



Experimental test video

48 km/h Tests



Reasons contributing to decreased protection of obese



Conclusion

- HBM and PMHS behaviors comparable in test
 with no submarining
- Pelvis motion restrained for driver
- → HBM useful

RESTRAINT MODELS SIMULATION SET-UP

University of Virginia Center for Applied Biomechanics



Restraint models

Sled

Seat belt

Standard and inflatable Buckle and anchor pre-tensioner Adaptive vent driver air bag

Knee air bag

Low-mount

Mid-mount

Under-the-seat air bag

Curtain air bag

OPTIMIZATION

University of Virginia Center for Applied Biomechanics



Optimization method

Choosing parameters

Seat belt

- Buckle vs anchor pre-tensioner
- Load limiter and pre-tensioner levels
- Air-belt vs no air-belt
- Air-belt pressure
- Pressure of different air bags
- Force level of collapsible steering column

Optimization method



Optimization method







GOVERNMENT INDUSTRY MEETING April 3-5, 2019 | Washington, DC

Restraint Optimization for Obese Occupants

Hamed Joodaki¹, Vivek Maripudi² ¹University of Virginia Center for Applied Biomechanics ²Joyson Safety Systems

*This meeting is co-located with



