

An Improvement to the THOR-50M Upper Leg Qualification Test Methodology

William Millis, Research Engineer, Applied Biomechanics



Overview

- THOR-50M upper leg qualification test overview
- Previous test procedures and R&R analysis (2016)
- Focus areas for test improvement
- Improved test procedures and R&R analysis (2020)
- Differences between the 2016 and 2020 test procedures and results





About the THOR-50M Upper Leg Test

- Test examines the response of the femur to axial impacts
- Data collected
 - Peak probe force
 - Peak femur force
 - Peak resultant acetabulum force





What is R&R?

- Repeatability is the measure of how well a single dummy produces the same response with successive tests
 - Five repeat tests on a single dummy
- **Reproducibility** is the measure of how well a dummy type/model produces the same response with successive tests
 - Three different dummies at same lab (dummy reproducibility)
 - A single dummy at three labs (test reproducibility)
- R&R results are evaluated by calculating the coefficient of variation $\left(CV = \frac{std.dev.}{mean}\right)$
- CV is evaluated as follows:
 - Below 5%: No further investigation
 - Between 5% 10%: Sources of variation investigated
 - Greater than 10%: Test procedure thoroughly reviewed and dummies inspected





2016 Upper Leg Test Requirements



2016 Requirements				
Parameter	Units	Specification		
		Min.	Max.	
Impact Velocity	m/s	2.55	2.65	
Peak Impactor Force	Ν	4221	5158	
Peak Femur Force, Fz	Ν	-3314	-2712	
Peak Resultant Acetabulum Force	Ν	1478	1806	

Note: Upper leg test procedure and requirements, originally published in 2016, remained unchanged in <u>2018 THOR-50M</u> Qualification Procedures Manual

Test Reproducibility

Response Requirement	Peak Probe Force (N)	Peak Femur Force, F _z (N)	Peak Resultant Acetabulum Force (N)
Mean	4887	-3282	1760
Standard Deviation	184	204	259
CV	3.8%	6.2%	14.7%



Test data derived from DO9799 upper left leg

Test Reproducibility

Response Requirement	Peak Probe Force (N)	Peak Femur Force, F _z (N)	Peak Resultant Acetabulum Force (N)
Mean	4514	-2723	1487
Standard Deviation	91	300	64
CV	2.0%	11.0%	4.3%





- Test Reproducibility CV > 10% in the peak Zaxis femur forces and peak resultant acetabulum forces
- Inconsistent shape of peak resultant acetabulum forces
- Resultant acetabulum force: qualification test vs. crash tests
 - ~1,700 N average in frontal rigid barrier tests (Summers et al, 2020)
 - ~3,000 N average in oblique moving deformable barrier tests (Saunders et al, 2015)
 - p(hip fracture) ~ 0.003 (Craig et al, 2020)



Methods for Test Improvement

- Increase response to real-world targets
- Implement use of backer plate brace
- Critical attention to positioning
- Monitor loosening of pelvic fasteners







2020 Upper Leg Test Requirements



Test Reproducibility

Response Requirement	Peak Probe Force (N)	Peak Femur Force, F _z (N)	Peak Resultant Acetabulum Force (N)
Mean	8323	-5144	2723
Standard Deviation	322	355	146
CV	3.9%	6.9%	5.4%



Test Reproducibility

Response Requirement	Peak Probe Force (N)	Peak Femur Force, F _z (N)	Peak Resultant Acetabulum Force (N)
Mean	8653	-5162	2710
Standard Deviation	297	231	131
CV	3.4%	4.5%	4.8%



Resultant Acetabulum Force Comparison





2020 Upper Leg Dummy Reproducibility

Dummy Reproducibility

Response Requirement	Peak Probe Force (N)	Peak Femur Force, F _z (N)	Peak Resultant Acetabulum Force (N)
Mean	8310	-4824	2690
Standard Deviation	391	229	115
CV	4.7%	4.7%	4.3%



Summary of Upper Leg Test Improvements

Test Setup Parameter	2016	2020
Velocity (m/s)	2.55 - 2.65	3.25 - 3.35
Probe Mass	5.00 kg	12.00 kg
Backer Plate Brace	No	Yes
Lower Thoracic Spine (LTS) Pitch Change Setting	Slouched	Slouched
Neck Pitch Change Setting	Neutral	Neutral
Tilt Sensor Reading: Pelvis	X = 0 ± 0.5°; Y = 15 ± 1°	X = 0 ± 0.5°; Y = 15 ± 1°
Wait Time Between Tests	At Least 30 Minutes	At Least 30 Minutes

Response Requirement	Units	2016 Nominal	2020 Nominal
		Response	Response
		Value	Value
Peak Impactor Force	Ν	4689.5	8352.5
Peak Femur Force, Fz	Ν	-3013	-4980
Peak Resultant Acetabulum Force	Ν	1642	2719

15

Review

- 2016 R&R analysis identified areas for test improvement
- Improvements implemented
- 2020 R&R analysis demonstrates that test improvements address previous findings
- Minimal test changes
 - Increased velocity
 - Increased mass (same probe used during knee impact test)
 - Addition of backer plate



AN AN ANTIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Thank you

William Millis William.millis@dot.gov

