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Abstract

Accident data shows that driver’s kinematics response in real accidents can be significantly different from that in dummy or cadaver tests because of driver’s muscle contraction. In this study, a finite element (FE) human body model consisting of an upper body of a dummy model and a lower limb-pelvis biomechanical model with 3D active muscles was developed to in-depth investigate lower limb injuries. Driver’s emergency reaction during frontal impact was simulated by modelling muscle active contraction based on a series of volunteer experimental tests. Besides, a realistic impact environment with the response of the restraint system and the invasion of the driver's compartment was established in this study. The results show that muscle contraction can cause extra loads on lower limbs during the impact, which can increase the injury risk of lower limbs. As for the femur injury, muscle contraction caused an additional 1kN axial load on the femur and the femur resultant bending moment of active models was also higher by about 10-40Nm. Besides, the tibial index of the model with muscle activation was about 0.1 higher. Additionally, the results indicate that the femur injury is strongly related to the combined action of both axial force and bending moment. And the variation of the injury tolerance along the tibia shaft should be considered when evaluating the tibia injury. Overall, the current lower limb injury criteria can be still lack of robustness.
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1. Introduction

With a wide use of restraint systems in cars, fatal injuries of head and chest have been greatly limited [1]. However, lower limb injury prevalence has not been reduced [2]. Previous biomechanical cadaver tests showed that most Knee-Thigh-Hip (KTH) injuries of lower limbs occurred in distal femur and patella [3-5]. However, Rupp et al. [6] analysed the statistics of Japan traffic accident data and concluded that the pelvis joint injury accounted for 42% of the lower extremity injury in frontal crashes followed by the femur fracture accounting for 32%. Other studies also showed similar results [7, 8]. To explain such difference, some studies indicated that previous biomechanical tests didn’t properly consider the combined effects of femur axial forces and bending moments [9-12]. Some believed that muscle active contraction during drivers’ emergency braking action plays an important role [13-16].

Ejima et al. [17] drew a conclusion from Institute for Traffic Accident Research and Data Analysis (ITARDA) that more than 60% of car drivers in Japan made evasive manoeuvres on braking with their feet when they realized an unavoidable accident. In these emergency cases, they might prepare their bodies by bracing muscles in order to face the upcoming impacts. All these actions can change their kinematic responses during the crash due to the active muscular forces as well as the muscular stiffness. Therefore, occupant behaviours in real accidents can be significantly different from the responses obtained in dummy or cadaver tests.

Since no muscle active contraction can be involved in the cadaver tests, it’s an effective method to investigate active muscle effects in frontal crashes by using biomechanical human body models with muscle contraction modelled. Silvestri [18] developed a lower limb skeletal model for the study of lower limb injury mechanism based on the work of Schauer [19]. This model used 1D spring elements and *MAT_SPRING_MUSCLE material in Ls-dyna to simulate muscles. Chang [15] estimated the activation levels of muscle groups by what is called equivalence principle based on electromyogram (EMG) signals. And the activation
levels were then loaded into a lower limb FE model containing a 35-bundle 1D active muscle unit. However, muscles in his model were modelled with only 1D elements, the material parameters were antiquated, and the equivalence method to get the muscle activation levels needed to be verified.

With the development of modelling method, muscle models with higher fidelity gradually emerged. Chang et al. [14, 15] developed a FE model of a midsize male’s pelvis and his lower extremities with 35 Hill-type muscles in each extremity. He found that muscle activation increases the bending moment in the femoral shaft, thereby increasing the risk of femoral shaft fractures by 20%-40%. Both Behr [20] and Iwamoto [21] conducted volunteer emergency braking experiments and measured the surface EMG signal to obtain muscle activation levels, which were then used to simulate the lower limb muscle activity in frontal collisions. Generally, all of these models mentioned above used simplified loading conditions. The effect of the restraint system and the invasion of the driver's compartment were not taken into account. The specific injury criteria such as the femur axial force, the femur bending moment, or the tibial index were not given. And different frontal crash conditions were not considered.

Therefore, the present study aims to investigate the role of active muscles in the injury of occupant lower extremities during realistic frontal crashes. A lower limb-pelvis FE model with detailed 3D muscles was used in this study. Muscles’ active levels during the emergency braking were obtained by volunteer emergency braking tests. Its biofidelity of both passive and active properties has been validated against recent experimental tests [16]. A realistic frontal crash model for simulating real accidents was then established. Both the response of a detailed restraint system and the invasion of the driver's compartment were taken into account in this paper. Different kinds of frontal impacts with different overlap rates were simulated to investigate the effects of muscle active contraction during the emergency braking on lower limb injury occurrences.
2. Methods

2.1 Lower limb-pelvis FE model with active 3D muscles

A lower limb-pelvis model with active 3D muscles was used in this study to investigate the effect of muscle active contraction on lower limb injuries during emergency braking. The model geometry was extracted by software Geomagic and Mimics from the computed tomography (CT) scans of bones and Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans of soft tissue. The FE model was developed in LS-DYNA codes by HyperMesh. Considering the influence of element size on computational accuracy and efficiency, most of element sizes were controlled between 4 and 8 mm. As shown in Fig. 1, each muscle of the lower limb-pelvis model consists of three parts: tendon units modelled by non-linear spring elements, muscle passive property modelled by hexagonal elements and muscle active contraction modelled by 1D elements. Muscle passive property was modelled by the Ogden constitutive model in LS-dyna.

![Figure 1. A lower limb-pelvis FE model with 3D active muscles](image)

Muscle active contraction was modelled by the Hill constitutive model in LS-dyna. The muscle active contraction force is defined as follows.

\[ F_{ce} = A(t)F_l(l)F_y(V)F_{max} \]  

(1)
Where $F_{ce}$ is the muscle active contraction force, $A(t)$ is the muscle activation level, $F_l(l)$ is the force–length curve, $F_v(v)$ is the force–velocity curve and $F_{max}$ is the maximum isometric force. $F_l(l)$, $F_v(v)$ and $F_{max}$ were given by empirical formulas summarized by relevant scholars. The specific definition of each parameter can be found in the previous research [16]. To obtain driver's muscle activation level $A(t)$ during the emergency braking, volunteer emergency braking experiments were conducted in Laboratory of Applied Biomechanics of IFSTTAR. The volunteers were asked to sit on the simulator seat according to the driver's sitting posture, and keep a constant 4N force on the acceleration pedal, simulating an average driving speed of 120km/h. In order to simulate the emergency braking situation, after receiving the braking order, the volunteers slammed on the brakes for at least 3 seconds. Braking force, braking time and muscle EMG activities were recorded during the experiments. Details regarding the experimental procedure and experimental data processing have been reported in the previous studies [16, 22]. The average muscle active levels obtained after EMG signal data processing are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Muscle active levels $A(t)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of braking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak of braking force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, bone tissues were modelled with shell and solid elements. According to the anatomy of bone structure, different shell thicknesses and solid densities were used to simulate the epiphysis regions of long bones. The previous study found that such modelling method provides better prediction of strain distribution and bone fracture in the epiphysis regions than the uniform thickness approach [11]. The whole model consists of 22 muscle groups. Both passive property and active property of this model have been validated against recent relevant experiments. Model validation summary for occupant safety has been shown in the Appendix Table 1. More details supporting the present model have been reported in the previous study [16].

2.2 Establishment of realistic impact environment

![Diagram of frontal impact FE model with driver's emergency reaction](image)

Figure 2. The frontal impact FE model with driver’s emergency reaction for realistic impact environment simulation

In order to validate the validity of the lower limb-pelvis FE model, a realistic simulation of the emergency braking was conducted according to the volunteer experiments mentioned above. As shown in Fig. 2, the hybrid dummy model is made up of the validated lower limb-pelvis model and the upper part of the 50th percentile Hybrid III dummy model. The lower
limb-pelvis part of the dummy was removed. And then the new-developed pelvis FE model was constrained with the lumbar vertebrae part of the original dummy model. The driver's compartment is from a validated vehicle FE model produced by a Chinese Company. Since the emergency braking verification is a static experimental simulation, the restraint system was not considered. During the simulation, driver’s lower limb muscles were activated to simulate driver’s emergency braking action. The braking force was recorded in the simulation and then compared with that of the volunteer tests. As shown in Fig. 2, the braking force of the simulation is basically consistent with the data corridor of the volunteer tests.

Table 2 Simulation matrix of different frontal impact types and muscle status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100% full impact</th>
<th>40% offset impact</th>
<th>25% offset impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inactive muscle</td>
<td>A0</td>
<td>B0</td>
<td>C0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active muscle</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, a realistic frontal impact model including a detailed restraint system was eventually established based on the aforementioned driver’s emergency reaction as shown in Fig. 2. Three typical frontal crash situations with different overlap rates were simulated including 100% full impact, 40% offset impact and 25% offset impact. As shown in Table 2, in order to investigate the effect of active muscles on lower limb injury, the simulations were classified into two groups with or without muscle activation. Each simulation consumed 24 CPUs and 8 hours. If the hybrid dummy and a full vehicle were both included to complete the whole collision process, the calculation process would be very long. Therefore, in this study, the acceleration curve of the B pillar and the invasion curve of the driver’s compartment under different collision conditions were used as the input conditions of the simulations.

100% frontal rigid wall collision (50km/h) and 40% offset collision (64km/h) based on China-New Car Assessment Program (C-NCAP) and 25% small offset collision (64km/h) based on The US Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) were simulated with a full
vehicle model. Under different frontal collisions, the acceleration curves of B pillar (Fig. 3) and the invasion curves of the driver's compartment (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5) were recorded as input conditions of simulations in Table 2.

![Acceleration curves of B pillar](image1)

**Figure 3. Acceleration curves of B pillar**

![Invasion of left and right knee bolsters](image2)

**Figure 4. Invasion of left and right knee bolsters**

![Invasion of footrest pedals and brake pedals](image3)

**Figure 5. Invasion of footrest pedals and brake pedals**
Taking the 100% full impact simulation as an example, muscle active process and the input condition were set as shown in Fig. 6. When drivers are aware of the danger, most of them begin to slam on the brake after a brief reaction delay. Muscles are then activated, and the driver's lower extremity response will be affected by the muscle active contraction. According to Behr’s experiments [20], after the driver starts braking, the vehicle will start decelerating at an average acceleration of 0.7 G. Each simulation began while the vehicle hit the barrier and lasted for 120ms. In this paper, we assume that muscle active contraction will be released after the femur force reaches its peak value.

Figure 6. Frontal impact loading condition
The evaluation indexes for lower limbs are tibia index, femoral axial force and resultant bending moment. Tibia Index (TI) is now widely used to evaluate occupant tibia injuries during the vehicle frontal impact. According to Nyquist et al. [23], a revised TI index with the thresholds of bending moment $M_c$ at 240 Nm and axial force $F_c$ at 12 kN was used to evaluate tibia injury risk. The formula is as follows.

$$\text{TI} = \frac{M}{M_c} + \frac{F}{F_c}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

3. Results

3.1 KTH injury analysis

![Figure 7. Typical injury occurrences of KTH in 25% overlap impact](image)

There was no KTH injury found in 100% full impacts, and slight acetabulum failure were noted in 40% offset impacts. However, serious KTH injuries were found in 25% offset impacts both with and without muscle activation. As shown in Fig. 7, the femur fracture (modelled by element deletion) occurred around the lesser trochanter of the left thigh. Evident acetabulum fractures were also noted in the hip region. Besides, some element failures occurred in the contact area between the patella and the femoral condyles.

Axial forces of the femur are shown in Fig. 8. Compared with the other two kinds of impacts, the largest femoral axial forces occurred in 25% offset impacts. The corresponding peak forces of the left femur are 6.8 kN in the inactive model and 5.97 kN in the active model,
respectively. The smallest axial femoral forces with values lower than 2.0kN occurred in 40% offset impacts. There was an evident axial femur force addition of about 1kN at the beginning of the simulation in cases with muscle activation. This phenomenon is obviously caused by the muscle active contraction which was modelled to simulate the emergency braking action.

Figure 8. Femur axial forces in three impacts

In order to compare the femur resultant bending moment in different cases, sixteen cross sections were selected along the femur, referring to the previous study [24]. The bending moments of each section at the moment of the peak axial femur force were recorded in Fig. 9. Most femoral bending moments in active cases are larger than that in inactive cases at the same time and in the same position. The peak bending moments of active models are higher than that of inactive models by about 10-40Nm. As for the 25% offset impacts where the femur fracture
occurred, the bending moment of the left femur reached 175.3 Nm in the active case, while in the inactive case the maximum value reached 163.6 Nm.

![Figure 9](image.png)

**Figure 9.** The max bending moments of cross section along the femur

### 3.2 Tibia injury analysis

As shown in Fig. 10, tibia stress distributions of 6 simulation groups were recorded when tibia maximum stress occurred during the impact. Obvious fractures were noted in the lower tibia of both legs in 25% overlap impact, which might be primarily caused by the great invasion of the brake pedal. The fibula fracture at its distal region was also found in C0 case, and both proximal and distal regions of the fibula were injured in C1 case. Besides, the upper right fibula fracture occurred in A1 case. Generally, groups with active muscles show higher stress compared with inactive groups as well as bone injury severity.
TI index values of the left and right tibia in all cases are shown in Fig. 11. Generally, the tibia index of active models is higher than that of inactive models. The TI peak value of 100% full impact occurred first, followed by 25% offset impact. The greatest TI was found in 25% offset impacts with obvious fractures of tibias and fibula. And the corresponding TI values are 0.55 (C0 left), 0.54 (C0 right), 0.82 (C1 left) and 0.59 (C1 right). Other TI values without bone fracture are all lower than 0.5.
Figure 11. Tibia index in three impacts
4. Discussion

Effect of active muscles on lower limb injuries was discussed in previous studies with simplified models and loading conditions. A model of the realistic impact environment was established with driver's muscle active contraction, the invasion of the driver's compartment and the response of the restraint system taken into consideration in this study. Driver’s muscle active levels during the emergency braking were obtained by volunteer emergency braking experiments.

Considering the drivers’ actual response and the repeatability of the driving simulation, there is an assumption in this study defined as follows: when the femur force reaches its peak value, the muscle contraction will be released. The influence of this assumption on the biomechanical responses of lower limbs is non-predicted. The present study used normalized EMG data from experiments for muscle activation level $A(t)$. EMG signals were related to muscle activation but still limited. And in the experiments, we can only measure part of muscles conveniently by surface EMG instrument. The present study only implements muscle activations for four dominant muscles related to braking behaviour. In the future, other methods for defining muscle activations can be studied. Our recent study indicates that combining musculoskeletal model method for pre-defined muscle activation can be a good choice for defining muscle activation in FE human body model [25]. In this case, more complicated human movement during driving can be simulated and studied. Additionally, the present study adopts one specific car model and three typical impact conditions. Different kinds of car models and more real impact conditions can be considered for further investigating the robustness of the present findings.

The simulation results show that the reactions of muscles when drivers realize the accident can significantly affect the kinematics and dynamics of lower limbs in the crash. As for KTH injuries, muscle contraction can lead to an obviously additional 1kN axial load on the femur at
the moment of the impact. The femur resultant bending moment of active models is also higher than that of inactive models by about 10-40Nm. Similar phenomenon can be found in the previous study [26]. It can be concluded that muscle activity may increase KTH injury risk by increasing both femur axial force and femur bending moment. Such mechanism was also discussed in the research of Chang et al. [14, 15].

Significantly, fracture of the driver’s left femur occurred in both models in 25% offset impacts. The peaks of the femur axial force in models with and without active muscles are 6.8 kN and 5.97 kN, respectively. The values are both lower than 10 kN, which was defined by FMVSS 208 as a femur injury threshold and is now widely used. However, relatively high bending moment of the driver’s left femur occurred in 25% offset impact, especially in the active case (175.3 Nm) (Fig. 10). This indicates that the combined action of axial force and bending moment of femur can be a main reason inducing femoral fracture. Thus, the bending moment should be involved in evaluating the femur injury during frontal crashes.

As for tibia injuries, at the initial stage of the impact, the tibial index of the model with muscle activation was about 0.1 higher than that of the model with non-activated muscles (Fig. 11). The active muscle force is considered as a main reason, which may increase both the axial force and the bending moment of tibia [26]. The TI values of the fractured tibias in all cases are far smaller than 1.0, which is widely used as a threshold to evaluate the tibia injury. The fracture occurs even when the TI value is around 0.6. And the tibia fractures primarily occurred around distal end of the tibia in this study. However, the currently widely used TI threshold values were generally based on the experimental results of the tibia mid-shaft. As the previous studies have noted that the tibia tolerance is significantly dependent on the injury area [27-29]. This phenomenon indicates that the TI index can evaluate combined loading but does not take into account the variation of the injury tolerance along the tibia shaft.
**Conclusion**

This study aims to investigate the influence of active muscles on lower limb injuries with a new-developed lower limb FE model. The frontal impact loading sequence was set with an assumption defined in this paper, which aims to simulate a realistic impact environment. Besides, driver’s emergency braking action, car body structure invasion and response of the restraint system were both taken into consideration. Three types of frontal impacts with different overlap rates were simulated and currently widely used lower limb injury indexes were implemented to evaluate the lower limb injury.

According to the simulation results, the non-ignorable effect of active muscles has been confirmed. The muscle contraction during the impact can significantly affect the kinematics and dynamics of lower limbs by inducing extra loads, which can explain the difference of the injury results between the real accidents and the cadaveric experiments in a way. Additionally, currently widely used lower limb injury criteria can be still lack of robustness. The injury indexes of femur and tibia were both lower than their corresponding thresholds when the injury occurred. Therefore, further research should focus on proposing comprehensive quantified indexes of lower limb injuries considering the active muscle effect, the combined action of different loads and the injury area.
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### Table 1 The tolerance of the lower limb model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component level validation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Femur 3-point bending</td>
<td>Quasistatic</td>
<td>A-P*: Mid</td>
<td>3.82 kN</td>
<td>3.3±0.9kN</td>
<td>Yamada, et al. 1970 [30]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tibia 3-point bending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.338 kN</td>
<td>2.91±0.97kN</td>
<td>Ehler, et al. 1970 [31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fibula 3-point bending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.449 kN</td>
<td>0.442kN</td>
<td>Asang. 1976 [32]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Femoral head</td>
<td>Quasistatic</td>
<td>Standing  posture</td>
<td>7.3 kN</td>
<td>8.4±3.0kN</td>
<td>Keyak, et al. 1997 [33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.945 kN</td>
<td>4.046±0.136kN</td>
<td>Kerrigan, et al. 2003 [27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>398.4 N·m</td>
<td>409.84N·m</td>
<td>Nyquist, et al. 1985 [23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tibia 3-point bending</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>L-M*: Mid</td>
<td>2.33 kN</td>
<td>2.25±0.7kN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15 N·m</td>
<td>3.7±1.2N·m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fibula 3-point bending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44 kN</td>
<td>0.43kN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.64 N·m</td>
<td>21.7N·m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foot axial impact</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Axial</td>
<td>4.96 kN</td>
<td>5.25kN</td>
<td>Kitagawa, et al. 1998 [34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knee bolster impact</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Axial</td>
<td>9.63 kN</td>
<td>10.1±0.3kN</td>
<td>Hayashi, et al. 1996 [36]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AP: Anterior-Posterior, L-M: Lateral