

EEVC WG12-20 Hybrid III Biofidelity Review

Presented by David Hynd, TRL Limited Chairman, EEVC WG20 GTR Meeting : 8th November, 2007



Review of

- EEVC research
- EC project results
- Published literature
- Biofidelity of
 - Head-neck kinematics
 - Seat back interaction



Literature Review

- 1 paper found that Hybrid III head motion *relative to T1* simulated volunteer results (Viano and Davidsson, 2002)
- 1 paper found that Hybrid III *head rotation* biofidelic relative to original Mertz and Patrick design target for the neck (Prasad *et al.*, 1997)
 - Dynamic tests with 1 volunteer and 2 PMHS, plus quasi-static volunteer tests



Literature Review

- All other references (approx 20) concluded that the Hybrid III was *not* biofidelic in low-speed rear impact
 - Some head-neck motion and force parameters OK for some seat designs but dependent on interaction with seat back
 - Affected by thoracic spine and shoulders
 - All studies that examined seat back interaction found that Hybrid III not at all biofidelic due to rigid thoracic spine
- More flexible spine recommended to ensure good seat interaction



EC Project Review

- Comparison with volunteer and PMHS data
 - Interaction with seat back not satisfactory
- Tests in real car seats
 - Better but no T1 rotation, retraction (S-shaped neck response) or ramping-up



EEVC Biofidelity Testing

- Not yet published, but biofidelity review is complete
- Results clearly support literature review
- Link to biofidelity presentation



Conclusion

- Hybrid III not biofidelic in low-speed rear impact seat testing
 - Thoracic spine too stiff
 - Seat back interaction poor (dependent on seat)
 - No T1 rotation
 - No retraction



- Why is good biofidelity important in low-speed rear impact seat testing?
- Primary benefit of dynamic test option is to allow reactive head restraints
 - Head restraint movement actuated by interaction between occupant spine/thorax and seat back
 - If seat interaction not biofidelic, actuation with dummy not likely to be same as actuation with human occupant
 - Hybrid III (stiff spine box) expected to actuate some reactive head
 restraints much more effectively than human occupant
 - I.e. some seats will pass test, but not work in the real-world
 - Expected benefit will not be delivered

European Enhanced Vehicle-safety Committee

Hybrid III Biofidelity Review

Also, report collates other info presented at previous GTR and GRSP meetings

- HR-5-12
 - Volvo WHIPS seat fails Hybrid III test (head angle 19.6°)
 - BUT
 - 'Good' SRA rating (by a large margin)
 - 'Good' IIWPG rating (by a large margin)
 - [NB: Volvo WHIPS also has good insurance claims performance]
 - Questions using claims rates for 2 seats to construct risk function
 - Mean delta-v for claims 10 km.hr⁻¹
 - Conclusion: proposed GTR Hybrid III test design restrictive



Also, report collates other info presented at previous GTR and GRSP meetings

• HR-7-13

- WHIPS seats have 49% claims reduction compared to previous generation Volvo seat (IIHS)
- Volvo study showed 36% reduction in long-term injury
- S80 seat fails proposed GTR (average head-torso angle 16.3°)
- Proposed requirement design restrictive



Also, report collates other info presented at previous GTR and GRSP meetings

- HR-5-11
 - Hybrid III seat back interaction poor affects results for some seats
 - Hybrid III results not well correlated to IIWPG rating



Also, report collates other info presented at previous GTR and GRSP meetings

• HR-6-7

- Shows one seat where
- Hybrid III deploys head restraint by 90 mm
- BioRID II deploys head restraint by 35 mm
- For two other seats, actuation similar



End of Presentation

Presented by David Hynd, TRL Limited Chairman, EEVC WG20 Tel: +44 1344 770310 Email: wg20chair@eevc.org