DEVELOPMENT OF MALAYSIAN-SIZE HYBRID III ANTHROPOMORPHIC TEST DEVICE'S MODEL FOR FRONTAL IMPACT SAFETY ASSESSMENT

MOHD SYAZWAN BIN ABDUL SAMAD

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the

Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia

DECEMBER 2022

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful, the only One who is worthy to worship. Without Your permission, it is impossible to complete this thesis.

Special thanks to my parents for always praying for my success. My thanks also to my wife for supporting me in completing my thesis. May Allah bless you and reward you with Jannah.

I thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mohd Khir bin Mohd Nor for helping to make my PhD journey such a smooth-sailing process. I hope we can continue collaborating to add more contributions to knowledge and society. I also thank Ir. Mohd Marzuki bin Abdul Majid and Dr. Noor Hisham bin Ismail for their continuous guidance on numerous subjects. May Allah reward all of you in this world and the hereafter.

I am grateful to the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) for providing the financial means during the preparation to complete this research under the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS) – FRGS/1/2020/TK02/UTHM/ 02/5, Vot K331.

Lastly, to my friends and colleagues, I will never forget your wishes and prayers. I wish the same to all of you. Thank you.



ABSTRACT

Anthropomorphic test devices (ATDs) are used to assess vehicle occupant injuries during a crash event. In general, the Hybrid III 50th percentile (H350) is used to optimise vehicle restraint systems. However, the H350 is developed based on the United States population's anthropometric sizes. Thus, it can be hypothesised that the vehicle restraint systems are not optimised for the Malaysian population. The hypothesis is supported by studies on the Chinese-size ATD. To explore this issue, it is necessary to develop a Hybrid III 50th percentile Malaysian-size (H350M) ATD. First, a donor H350 finite element was validated against standard biofidelity response corridors. Then, it was scaled using the global scale factor of 0.9437 to meet the 50th percentile Malaysian anthropometric sizes. Validations of the H350M were performed by using a new set of biofidelity response corridors. After the validation process, the H350 and H350M were integrated into a validated vehicle model and restraint systems. Simulations of Full-Width Rigid Barrier at 56 km/h (FRB 56 km/h) and Offset Deformable Barrier at 64 km/h (ODB 64 km/h) were performed to compare the injuries of the H350 and H350M. A total of 12 simulations of frontal crash load cases were conducted at various impact speeds from 30 km/h to 64 km/h. Paired *t*-test indicated that H350M 3ms chest acceleration and chest displacement were higher than those of the H350 for almost every frontal load case with *p*-values less than 0.05. This research also showed that H350M head acceleration and chest displacement can be reduced by 5.3g and 1.6 mm, respectively, with the introduction of a new set of restraint system parameters. Lastly, a Vehicle Pulse Index with new parameters was proposed. It can predict the H350M occupant's peak chest acceleration by using the vehicle acceleration profile as an input, with a root mean square error of 2.86 g. The model will help vehicle manufacturers predict occupant responses at the early stage of vehicle development.



ABSTRAK

Peranti Ujian Antropomorfik (ATD) digunakan untuk menilai kecederaan penumpang semasa kemalangan. Secara umumnya, Hybrid III 50th percentile (H350) ATD digunakan untuk mengoptimumkan sistem kekangan kenderaan. Bagaimanapun, H350 dibangunkan berdasarkan saiz antropometrik rakyat Amerika Syarikat. Oleh itu, boleh dihipotesiskan bahawa sistem kekangan kenderaan itu tidak optimum untuk penduduk Malaysia. Hipotesis ini disokong oleh kajian terdahulu yang dilakukan pada ATD bersaiz rakyat China. Untuk meneroka isu ini, model Hybrid III 50th percentile Malaysian size (H350M) perlu dibangunkan. Pertama, model elemen terhingga H350 perlu memenuhi piawaian koridor tindak balas *biofidelity*. Kemudian, ia diskalakan menggunakan faktor skala global 0.9437 untuk memenuhi saiz 50-persentil rakyat Malaysia. Pengesahan pada H350M dilakukan dengan menggunakan koridor tindak balas biofidelity yang baharu. Kedua-dua H350 dan H350M dimasukkan ke dalam model kenderaan dengan sistem kekangan yang telah disahkan. Simulasi Full-Width Rigid Barrier 56 km/j (FRB 56 km/j) dan Offset Deformable Barrier 64km/j (ODB 64 km/j) dilakukan untuk membandingkan kecederaan antara H350 dan H350M. Dua belas kes hentaman hadapan telah disimulasikan pada pelbagai kelajuan dari 30 km/j hingga 64 km/j. Paired t-test menunjukkan bahawa pecutan dada 3ms, anjakan dada H350M adalah lebih tinggi daripada H350 untuk hampir setiap kes dengan p bernilai kurang daripada 0.05. Kajian ini juga membuktikan bahawa pecutan kepala dan anjakan dada H350M boleh dikurangkan masing-masing sebanyak 5.3 g dan 1.6 mm dengan pengenalan sistem kekangan yang baharu. Akhir sekali, Vehicle Pulse Index dengan parameter baharu telah dicadangkan. Ianya boleh meramalkan puncak pecutan dada penumpang H350M dengan menggunakan profil pecutan kenderaan sebagai input, dengan ralat purata kuasa dua punca sebanyak 2.86 g. Model berangka ini akan membantu pengeluar kenderaan tempatan untuk meramalkan tindak balas penumpang pada peringkat awal pembangunan kenderaan.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TITL	Ε	i
	DECI	LARATION	ii
	ACK	NOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
	ABST	TRACT	v
	ABST	TRAK	vi
	TABI	LE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST	OF TABLES	xv
	LIST	OF FIGURES	xviii
	LIST	OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xxvi
	LIST	OF APPENDICES	xxix
CHAPTER 1	INTR	ODUCTION	1
	1.1	Introduction	1
	1.2	Problem statement	2
	1.3	Research objectives	3
	1.4	Research scope	3
	1.5	Significance of research	4
	1.6	Thesis structure	5

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEWS

2.1	Introdu	uction	7	
2.2	Anthro	opomorphic test devices	7	
2.3	Types	of ATDs	8	
	2.3.1	Frontal-impact ATDs	8	
	2.3.2	Side-impact ATDs	12	
2.4	H350 :	finite element models	15	
2.5	Predic	tion of human injuries based on output of		
	sensor	s	17	
	2.5.1	Head injuries	17	
	2.5.2	Chest injuries	18	
	2.5.3	Neck injuries	19	
	2.5.4	Femur and knee injuries	20	
	2.5.5	Tibia injuries	20	
2.6	H350	component calibration	21	
	2.6.1	Head calibration	21	
	2.6.2	Neck calibration	23	
	2.6.3	Chest calibration	28	
	2.6.4	Femur calibration	29	
2.7	Scaled	Hybrid III ATD biofidelity response		
	corrido	Drs	30	
	2.7.1	Scaled head biofidelity response corridors	31	

7

			2.7.2 Scaled neck biofidelity response corridors	31
			2.7.3 Scaled chest biofidelity response corridors	32
		2.8	Study on varying anthropometric sizes and masses subjected to frontal impact	32
		2.9	Malaysian anthropometric data	33
		2.10	Study on scaled Hybrid III ATD	35
		2.11	Insights into public vehicle finite element models	36
			2.11.1 LS-DYNA keyword structure	37
			2.11.2 Structure modelling	38
			2.11.3 Material modelling used in CCSA finite element models	39 AH
			2.11.4 Correlations with physical test results	42
			2.11.5 Other applications of vehicle models	43
			2.11.6 Limitations of CCSA finite element models	45
		2.12	Prediction of occupant response using vehicle crash	
			pulse	46
		2.13	Research gap and needs	49
		2.14	Other applications of H350 ATD	50
		2.15	Summary of Chapter 2	51
	CHAPTER 3	B MET	HODOLOGY	55
		3.1	Introduction	55
		3.2	Finite element approach	57
		3.3	Selection of H350 finite element model	58

3.4	Validation of selected H350 finite element model	58
	3.4.1 Model preparation for head drop, neck extension and neck flexion simulations	59
	3.4.2 Simulation setup for head drop	60
	3.4.3 Simulation setup for neck extension and neck flexion	62
	3.4.4 Simulation setup for pendulum impact on chest	64
3.5	Method for scaling H350 to H350M	66
3.6	Vehicle model selection	70
3.7	Simulation setup for integrated occupant-vehicle finite element model	71
	3.7.1 Positioning H350 into vehicle model	71
	3.7.2 Seat squash simulation	73
	3.7.3 Restraint system modelling	75
	3.7.4 Parameterised variables	78
	3.7.5 Setting up FRB 56 km/h and ODB 64 km/h simulations	78
3.8	Objective evaluation for correlation between	
	simulation and physical test results	81
3.9	Integration of H350M into correlated model	83
3.10	Injury comparisons between H350 and H350M subjected to several crash load cases	84
3.11	Parameter identification for new analytical model	85

х

		3.11.1 Proof of concept on current H350 subjected to	
		various vehicle acceleration profiles	87
	3.12	Summary of Chapter 3	89
CHAPTER 4	VALI	DATION OF H350 FINITE ELEMENT	
MODEL			91
	4.1	Introduction	91
	4.2	Validation of H350 head drop test	92
	4.3	Validation of H350 neck extension	95
	4.4	Validation of H350 neck flexion	99
	4.5	Validation of pendulum impact on H350 chest	102
	4.6	Summary of chapter 4	104
CHAPTER 5	VALI	DATION OF INTEGRATED OCCUPANT-	
VEHICLE M	IODEL	AGAINST PHYSICAL TESTS	105
	5.1	Introduction	105
	5.2	Correlation between results of base finite element	
		model and FRB 56 km/h physical test	105
	5.3	Correlation between results of base finite element	
		model and ODB 64 km/h physical test	108
	5.4	Correlation between results of integrated occupant-	
		vehicle model and physical tests	109
	5.5	Correlation between results of base finite element	
		model and ODB 64 km/h physical test	114
	5.6	Summary of Chapter 5	116

xi

CHAPTER 6 DEVELOPMENT OF H350M FINITE ELEMENT MODEL

	6.1	Introdu	ction	117
	6.2	Referen	nce anthropometric data	117
	6.3	Global	scale factor calculation	118
	6.4	Calibra respons	tion of H350M components with biofidelity se corridors	121
		6.4.1	Calibration of head biofidelity response corridors	121
		6.4.2	Calibration of neck extension biofidelity response corridors	122
		6.4.3	Calibration of neck flexion biofidelity response corridors	124
		6.4.4	Calibration of chest biofidelity response corridors	125
	6.5	Morphi	ing extremities and mass confirmation	129
	6.6	Summa	ary of Chapter 6	131
CHAPTER 7	сом	PARAT	IVE STUDY ON OCCUPANT	
KINEMATIO	CS ANI) INJUF	RIES OF H350 AND H350M	132
	7.1	Introdu	ction	132
	7.2	Integra model	tion of H350M into correlated finite element	132
	7.3	Compa FRB 56	risons between H350 and H350M injuries in 5 km/h	133
		7.3.1	Head and neck injuries	133

117

	7.3.2 Chest Injuries	140
	7.3.3 Overall injury comparisons in FRB 56 km/h load case	142
7.4	Comparisons between H350 and H350M injuries in	
	ODB 64 km/h	144
	7.4.1 Head and neck injuries	144
	7.4.2 Chest injuries	148
	7.4.3 Overall injury comparisons in ODB 64 km/h	
	load case	151
7.5	Discussion on FRB 56 km/h and ODB 64 km/h	
	results	153
7.6	Comparison between H350 and H350M injuries at	
	various impact speeds	155
	7.6.1 Significant difference between H350 and	
	H350M injuries in combined crash load cases	156
	57.6.2 Significant difference between H350 and	
	H350M injuries in separate crash load cases	157
7.7	Discussion on improvement proposal	158
7.8	Summary of Chapter 7	159
CHAPTER 8 PRE	DICTION OF H350M RESPONSE BASED ON	
VEHICLE ACCE	LERATION PROFILE	161
8.1	Introduction	161
8.2	Proposed VPI parameters	162
8.3	Limitations of proposed VPI parameters	165

xiii

	8.4	Summary of Chapter 8	166			
CHAPTER	CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS					
	9.1	Introduction	167			
	9.2	Conclusion	167			
	9.3	Contributions	168			
	9.4	Recommendations for future works	169			
REFERENC	CES		171			
PUBLICAT	ION		186			
EXHIBITIC	NS		187			
INTELLEC	TUAL	PROPERTY	188			
APPENDIC	ES		189			

xiv

LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Filter requirements for H350 in SAE J211(SAE,	
	2007) and per LST recommendation (Guha, 2014)	16
2.2	Neck injury criteria per ASEAN NCAP and UNECE	
	R94 requirements (Carhs, 2017)	20
2.3	Femur axial force limit per UNECE R94 and ASEAN	
	NCAP requirements (Carhs, 2017)	20
2.4	Tibia injury limit per UNECE R94 and ASEAN	
	NCAP requirements	21
2.5	Head drop test specifications (CFR: TITLE 49 -	
	Transportation, 1949)	22
2.6	Neck extension test requirements	26
2.7	Neck flexion test requirements	26
2.8	Test requirements for pendulum impact on chest	29
2.9	Femur impact test requirements	30
2.1	Malaysian male anthropometric data (Abd Rahman et	
	al., 2018)	34
2.11	Comparison of recommended shell formulation	
	options against practice for CCSA finite element	
	models	39
2.12	Summary of findings and limitations of previous	
	studies related to injury predictions due to difference	
	in anthropometric size	52
3.1	Target velocity, rotational velocity for simplified	
	model, and rotation angle for free-fall simulation	63
3.2	Difference between anthropometric measurements of	
	US 50th Percentile (Jordan, 2000) and H350 finite	
	element model	68

3.3	Static measurements for ATD positioning	72
3.4	Classification of correlation rating	82
3.5	Load case type and impact speed	85
3.6	Optimised VPI Parameters	88
4.1	Properties of H350 Head Skin Material (Wood et al.,	
	2010)	94
4.2	Summary of H350 head impact simulation against	
	ATD specifications	94
4.3	Summary of H350 neck extension simulation result	
	against specifications	97
4.4	Summary of H350 neck flexion simulation result	
	against specifications	101
4.5	Summary of simulation result of pendulum impact on	
	chest against specifications	104
5.1	Comparison between hardware and software	
	configurations	107
5.2	Airbag and seatbelt parameters for FRB 56 km/h and	
	ODB 64 km/h load cases	110
5.3	CORA rating of FRB 56 km/h crash with identified	
	parameters	110
5.4	CORA rating of ODB 64 km/h crash with identified	
	parameters	114
6.1	Comparison between measurements of US and	
	Malaysian 50th percentile anthropometric sizes	120
6.2	H350 and H350M head biofidelity response corridors	122
6.3	Summary of H350M head drop result	122
6.4	Calculated H350M neck extension biofidelity	
	response corridors	122
6.5	Summary of H350M neck extension result	123
6.6	Calculated H350M neck flexion biofidelity response	
	corridors	124
6.7	Summary of H350M neck flexion result	124



6.8	Comparison between H350 and H350M upper torso	
	masses	126
6.9	Calculated H350M chest biofidelity response	
	corridors	128
6.1	Summary of result of pendulum impact on H350M	
	chest	129
7.1	Head and neck injury measurements in FRB 56 km/h	
	simulations	139
7.2	Chest injury measurements in FRB 56 km/h	
	simulation	142
7.3	Head and neck injury measurements in ODB 64 km/h	
	simulations	148
7.4	Chest injury measurements in ODB 64 km/h	
	simulations	150
7.5	Summary of comparison between H350 and H350M	
	injuries for different frontal load cases and impact	
	speeds	155
7.6	Paired t-test result for overall simulations	156
7.7	Paired t-test result for FRB and ODB load cases	157
8.1	Proposed VPI constants to predict H350M 3ms chest	
	acceleration	162
8.2	Comparison of 3ms chest acceleration predictions	
	using different VPI parameters	165

xvii

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Adult ATDs and impact applications (Xu et al., 2018)	8
2.2	Location of accelerometers and loadcells in H350	
	ATD	9
2.3	Design on chest displacement transducer in H350	
	ATD	9
2.4	Kinematics of PHMS, THOR, WorldSID and H350	
	(Umale et al., 2018)	10
2.5	Comparison of kinematics for head, T1 spine, T12	
	spine and sacrum in 90-degree lateral impact (Umale	
	et al., 2018)	11
2.6	NHTSA frontal oblique impact (Barbat & Li, 2017)	11
2.7	Major sensors equipped in ES-2	12
2.8	ES-2 ATD design to cater for lateral impact	13
2.9	ES-2 without rib extension stuck at seat frame (Van	
	Ratingen et al., 2005)	13
2.1	New IR-TRACC system (Scherer et al., 2001)	14
2.11	Comparison between ES-2's and WorldSID's ribs	
	(Stahlschmidt & Gromer, 2010)	15
2.12	H350 finite element model developed by LST	16
2.13	Head accelerometers' location inside H350 ATD	18
2.14	Neck flexion, extension and bending motions (Haug,	
	Choi, Robin, & Beaugonin, 2004)	19
2.15	Head drop test standards based on U.S. CFR Title 49	
	§ Part 572.32 (CFR: TITLE 49 - Transportation,	
	1949)	22
2.16	Main construction of H350 head	23

2.17	Pendulum specifications for neck flexion and neck	
	extension tests (CFR: TITLE 49 - Transportation,	
	1949)	24
2.18	Test setup for neck extension prior to pendulum	
	impact (CFR: TITLE 49 - Transportation, 1949)	24
2.19	Test setup for neck flexion prior to pendulum impact	
	(CFR: TITLE 49 - Transportation, 1949)	25
2.2	Comparison between neck extension test data (Lai et	
	al., 2011) and neck extension biofidelity response	
	corridors (Mertz, Irwin, Melvin, Stanaker, & Beebe,	
	1989)	27
2.21	Comparison between neck flexion test data (Lai et al.,	
	2011) and neck flexion biofidelity response corridors	
	(Mertz et al., 1989)	27
2.22	Test setup for pendulum impact on chest (CFR:	
	TITLE 49 - Transportation, 1949)	28
2.23	Comparison between data of pendulum impact on	
	chest (Lai et al., 2011) and chest biofidelity response	
	corridors (Mertz et al., 1989)	29
2.24	Test setup for femur impact (CFR: TITLE 49 -	
	Transportation, 1949)	30
2.25	Deviation of 3ms-clip of chest acceleration with	
	respect to ATD mass in ODB 56 km/h crash test	
	(Happee et al., 1998).	33
2.26	Deviation of 3ms-clip of chest acceleration with	
	respect to ATD mass in ODB 56 km/h crash test	
	(Happee et al., 1998)	33
2.27	List of vehicle models developed by CCSA (CCSA,	
	n.d.)	37
2.28	Example of parameters in CCSA 2010 CAMRY finite	
	element model	38
2.29	2010 Yaris BIW material distribution	40
2.3	Common input curves for MAT24	41

Correlation between 2010 Varia model developed by	
CCSA against EDD 56 km/h physical test (Dhafer	
Managanist FRB 56 km/n physical test (Dhaler	40
Marzougui et al., 2013)	42
Correlation between 2010 Yaris model developed by	
CCSA against ODB 64 km/h physical test (Dhafer	
Marzougui et al., 2013)	43
Comparison between head accelerations in simulation	
and physical test in model developed by Singh et al.	
(2018)	44
Comparison between chest accelerations in	
simulation and physical test in model developed by	
Singh et al. (2018)	44
Comparison between pelvis accelerations in	
simulation and physical test in model developed by	
Singh et al. (2018)	45 H
Influence of carpet in predicting lower leg injuries	
(Thomas, 2008)	45
Location of accelerometer of interest	46
OLC calculated based on vehicle velocity profile	47
VPI mass-spring system	48
VPI calculated based on vehicle acceleration profile	
(filtered using CFC60)	49
Research framework	55
Steps in finite element analysis	57
Process flow for validation of H350	59
Parts of interest for head drop, neck extension and	
neck flexion simulations	60
Transformation of H350 include file for head drop	
simulation	61
Initial configuration for H350 head drop	62
Difference between simplified neck pendulum	
simulation and free-fall simulation	63
Dummy positioning tool in LS-PrePost	65
	Correlation between 2010 Yaris model developed by CCSA against FRB 56 km/h physical test (Dhafer Marzougui et al., 2013) Correlation between 2010 Yaris model developed by CCSA against ODB 64 km/h physical test (Dhafer Marzougui et al., 2013) Comparison between head accelerations in simulation and physical test in model developed by Singh et al. (2018) Comparison between chest accelerations in simulation and physical test in model developed by Singh et al. (2018) Comparison between pelvis accelerations in simulation and physical test in model developed by Singh et al. (2018) Influence of carpet in predicting lower leg injuries (Thomas, 2008) Location of accelerometer of interest OLC calculated based on vehicle velocity profile VPI mass-spring system VPI calculated based on vehicle acceleration profile (filtered using CFC60) Research framework Steps in finite element analysis Process flow for validation of H350 Parts of interest for head drop, neck extension and neck flexion simulations Transformation of H350 include file for head drop simulation Initial configuration for H350 head drop Difference between simplified neck pendulum simulation and free-fall simulation Dummy positioning tool in LS-PrePost



3.9	Model setup for pendulum impact on chest	65
3.1	Proposed process flow to scale H350 to H350M	67
3.11	Anthropometric measurement taken on H350 finite	
	element model	68
3.12	Donor finite element model developed by CCSA	70
3.13	Total measurement points taken from physical test	
	(NHTSA, 2006)	71
3.14	Modification of seat position	73
3.15	Seat squash simulation	74
3.16	Seat deformation after seat squash simulation	75
3.17	Modifications to steering system	76
3.18	Gas fraction for mass flow rate (NHTSA, 2016)	76
3.19	Input for airbag mass flow rate (NHTSA, 2016)	77
3.2	Seatbelt modelling method	78
3.21	Two types of frontal crash load cases (Carhs, 2017)	79
3.22	Comparison between include files of FRB 56 km/h	
	and ODB 64 km/h crash load cases	80
3.23	Comparison between parameters of FRB 56 km/h and	
	ODB 64 km/h crash load cases	81
3.24	Examples of outputs from physical test (NHTSA,	
	2006)	82
3.25	Process flow to identify restraint system parameters	83
3.26	Standard definitions measured by H-Point manikin	
	(Bakar et al., 2019)	84
3.27	Flowchart to find optimised parameters for VPI	87
3.28	Occupant response prediction for H350 by using	
	default and scaled VPI Parameters	88
3.29	Occupant response prediction for H350 by using	
	optimised H350 VPI parameters	89
4.1	Process flow to validate H350	92
4.2	Head drop simulation of H350 (a) Initial condition at	
	0 ms and (b) Peak acceleration at 22.5 ms	93
4.3	H350 head acceleration result using default properties	93



4.4	H350 head acceleration result using revised material	
	properties	95
4.5	Pendulum model in finite element pre-processor	96
4.6	Head extension of H350 (a) before impact and (b) at	
	peak deformation	96
4.7	Comparison between neck extension simulation	
	result and LST simulation result (Guha, 2014)	97
4.8	Kinematics of neck extension simulation and physical	
	test (Lai et al., 2011) against standard biofidelity	
	response corridors (Mertz et al., 1989)	99
4.9	Head flexion of H350 (a) before impact and (b) at	
	peak deformation	100
4.1	Comparison between neck flexion simulation result	
	and LST simulation result (Guha, 2014)	101
4.11	Kinematics of neck flexion simulation and physical	
	test (Lai et al., 2011) against standard biofidelity	
	response corridors (Mertz et al., 1989)	102
4.12	Pendulum impact on H350 chest (a) at 0 ms and (b) at	
	50 ms	103
4.13	Pendulum reaction force versus H350 chest	
	displacement against test data (Lai et al., 2011) and	
	biofidelity response corridors (Mertz et al., 1989)	103
5.1	Comparison of rigid wall force across different CPUs	
	(Roh, 2000)	106
5.2	Structural correlations between results of physical test	
	(NHTSA, 2006) and finite element model in FRB 56	
	km/h load case	107
5.3	FRB 56 km/h simulation results at 0 ms, 40 ms, 80 ms	
	and 120 ms	108
5.4	Structural correlation between results of physical test	
	(IIHS, 2006) and finite element model in ODB 64	
	km/h load case	108

	٠	٠	٠
vv	1	1	1
ΛΛ	1	1	L

5.5	ODB 64 km/h simulation results at 0 ms, 40 ms, 80	
	ms and 120 ms	109
5.6	Comparisons between FRB 56 km/h physical test	
	(NHTSA, 2006) and simulation results	111
5.7	Deformation of right knee bolster in FRB 56 km/h	
	simulation	112
5.8	Head acceleration result with different head skin	
	materials	113
5.9	Comparisons between ODB 64 km/h physical test	
	(IIHS, 2006) and simulation results	115
6.1	Comparison between H350 (US 50th percentile) and	
	H350M (Malaysian 50th percentile)	119
6.2	H350M head drop simulation result	121
6.3	Comparison between H350 and H350M neck	
	extension results against biofidelity response	
	corridors	123
6.4	Comparison between H350 and H350M neck flexion	
	results against biofidelity response corridors	125
6.5	Parts included in upper torso mass calculation	126
6.6	Initial H350M chest biofidelity response	126
6.7	Thickness change to meet H350M biofidelity	
	response corridors	127
6.8	Improved H350M chest biofidelity response	128
6.9	Example of H350M arm morphing	130
6.1	Overall morphed parts for H350M	130
6.11	Mass calculated by LS-DYNA in d3hsp	130
7.1	ATD positioning of H350M and H350 in vehicle	
	model	133
7.2	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in FRB 56	
	km/h at 0 ms	134
7.3	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in FRB 56	
	km/h at 37.5 ms	135

6.5 6.6 6.7 6.1 6.1

7.4	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in FRB 56	
	km/h at 47.5 ms	135
7.5	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in FRB 56	
	km/h at 62.5 ms	136
7.6	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in FRB 56	
	km/h at 75 ms	137
7.7	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in FRB 56	
	km/h at 90 ms	137
7.8	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in FRB 56	
	km/h at 105 ms	138
7.9	Steering column collapse's time history plot in FRB	
	56 km/h load case	140
7.1	Distance between chest to steering wheel and chest	
	deflection curve in FRB 56 km/h load case	141
7.11	Minimum distance between chest to steering wheel in	
	FRB 56 km/h load case	141
7.12	Comparisons between H350 and H350M injuries in	
	FRB 56 km/h	143
7.13	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in ODB 64	
	km/h at 60 ms	144
7.14	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in ODB 64	
	km/h at 70 ms	145
7.15	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in ODB 64	
	km/h at 90 ms	146
7.16	Steering column collapse's time history plot in ODB	
	64 km/h load case	146
7.17	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in ODB 64	
	km/h at 102.5 ms	147
7.18	Comparisons between H350 and H350M in ODB 64	
	km/h at 127.5 ms	147
7.19	Distance between chest to steering wheel and chest	
	deflection curve in ODB 64 km/h load case at 95 ms	149



7.2	Minimum distance between chest to steering wheel in	
	ODB 64 km/h load case	150
7.21	Comparisons between H350 and H350M injuries in	
	ODB 64 km/h	152
7.22	Difference in head kinematics between FRB and	
	ODB load cases	154
7.23	Improvement in H350M injuries by changing seatbelt	
	and airbag parameters	158
7.24	H350M neck injury and chest acceleration results	
	with new seatbelt and airbag parameters	159
8.1	Occupant response prediction for H350M by using	
	default and scaled VPI Parameters	162
8.2	Occupant response prediction for H350 by using	
	optimised VPI parameters	163
8.3	Predictions of 3ms chest acceleration in FRB 56 km/h	
	load case by using different VPI parameters	164
8.4	Predictions of 3ms chest acceleration in ODB 64	
	km/h load case by using different VPI parameters	164

XXV

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ан	-	peak head acceleration of H350
a_s	-	peak head acceleration of scaled model
С	-	head circumference
D_H	-	chest displacement of H350 dummy
D_s	-	chest displacement of scaled dummy
F_H	-	reaction force of H350 dummy
F_s	-	reaction force of scaled dummy
L	-	head length
M_H	-	neck moment of H350 dummy
m_P	-	mass of pendulum
M_s		neck moment of scaled dummy
m_t	-	mass of thorax assembly
R _a	-	ratio between peak head accelerations of scaled dummy and H350 dummy
R _D	1ST	ratio between chest displacements of scaled dummy and H350 dummy
RFPERM	-	ratio between reaction forces of scaled dummy and H350 dummy
R_K	-	ratio between thorax stiffness of scaled dummy and H350 dummy
R_M	-	ratio between neck moments of scaled dummy and H350 dummy
R_P	-	ratio between pendulum masses for scaled dummy and H350 dummy
$R_{ heta}$	-	ratio between rotation angles of scaled dummy and H350 dummy
W	-	head width
$ heta_H$	-	rotational displacement of H350 dummy
θ_S	-	rotational displacement of scaled dummy
λ	-	ratio of size between scaled model and H350 dummy

REFERENCES

- Abd Rahman, N. I., Md Dawal, S. Z., Yusoff, N., & Mohd Kamil, N. S. (2018). Anthropometric measurements among four Asian countries in designing sitting and standing workstations. *Sādhanā*, 43(1), 10.
- Allsop, D. L., Warner, C. Y., Wille, M. G., Schneider, D. C., & Nahum, A. M. (1988).
 Facial impact response—A comparison of the Hybrid III dummy and human cadaver. *Proceedings of the 32nd Stapp Car Crash Conference*. Society of Automotive Engineers, Warrendale, PA.
- Andrade, F., Borrvall, T., DuBois, P., & Feucht, M. (2019). A Hosford-based orthotropic plasticity model in LS-DYNA. *Proceedings of the 12th European LS-DYNA Conference*. Koblenz.
- Andrade, F., & Erhart, T. (2020). A review of LS-DYNA's most popular material model. Stuggart, Germany. Retrieved from https://www.dynamore.de/en/downloads/presentations/2020/copy_of_dynam ore-express-good-old-mat_024-a-review-of-ls-dyna2019s-most-popularmaterial-model/view
- Andrade, F., Feucht, M., & Haufe, A. (2014). On the prediction of material failure in LS-DYNA®: A comparison between GISSMO and DIEM. 13th International LS-DYNA Users Conference. Detroit U.S.A.

- Bakar, N. A., Dolah, R., & Ghazilla, R. A. R. (2019). Comparison study of Malaysian driver seating position in SAE J1517 accommodation model. SAE International Journal of Passenger Cars-Mechanical Systems, 12(2), pp. 73–81.
- Balasubramanian, S. (2006). Posterior cruciate ligament (PCL) injury and repair: A biomechanical evaluation of the human knee joint under dynamic posterior loading; *kinematics and contact pressure measurements in normal, PCL deficient and PCL reconstructed knees. Wayne State University, United States: PhD Thesis.
- Balasubramanian, S., Beillas, P., Belwadi, A., Hardy, W. N., Yang, K. H., King, A. I.,
 & Masuda, M. (2004). Below knee impact responses using cadaveric specimens. *Stapp Car Crash Journal*, 48, pp. 71–88.
- Barbat, S., & Li, X. (2017). NHTSA's proposed frontal oblique impact test protocol:
 Analyses and evaluation. SAE International Journal of Transportation Safety, 5(2), pp. 217–226. https://doi.org/10.4271/2017-01-1475
- Bari, M. (2015). A finite element study of shell and solid element performance in crashbox simulations. University West, Sweden: Thesis.
- Beach, D., White Jr, R., Shams, T., Rangarajan, N., & Haffner, M. (1998). THOR advanced test dummy–biofidelity and injury assessment. *International Fire* and Cabin Safety Research Conference. Atlantic City, New Jersey.
- Begonia, M., Rooks, T., Pintar, F. A., & Yoganandan, N. (2019). Development of a methodology for simulating complex head impacts with the advanced combat helmet. *Military Medicine*, 184(Supplement_1), pp. 237–244. https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/usy282



- Bliven, E., Rouhier, A., Tsai, S., Willinger, R., Bourdet, N., Deck, C., Madey, S., Bottlang, M. (2019). Evaluation of a novel bicycle helmet concept in oblique impact testing. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 124, pp. 58-65.
- Borrvall, T., Johansson, T., Schill, M., Jergéus, J., Mattiasson, K., & DuBois, P. (2013). A general damage initiation and evolution model (DIEM) in LS-Dyna. 9th European LS-DYNA Conference. Manchester, United Kingdom.
- Böttcher, C., Frik, S., & Adam Opel, A. G. (2003). Consideration of manufacturing effects to improve crash simulation accuracy. 4th European LS-Dyna Users Conference. Ulm, Germany.
- Cao, L., Huang, X., Dai, H., & Yan, L. (2014). Development strategy of frontal crash JN AMINA dummy based on Chinese human body. Chinese Mechanical Engineering, 25(10), pp. 1412–1414.

Carhs. (2017). Safety Companion 2017. Carhs Training GmbH.

- Carhs. (2019). Euro NCAP / ANCAP: MPDB (2020) Compatibility assessment. In Safety Companion 2019 (p. 40).
- CCSA. (n.d.). Center for Collision Safety and Analysis Finite Element Models. Retrieved July 4, 2021, from https://www.ccsa.gmu.edu/models/
- United States of America (1949) CFR: TITLE 49—Transportation: Anthropomorphic Test Device U.S. Code of Federal Regulations § Part 572 - Anthropomorphic Test Device 1949.
- Chao, Y., Wang, F., Wang, B., Li, G., & Li, F. (2020). A Computational Biomechanics Human Body Model Coupling Finite Element and Multibody Segments for Assessment of Head/Brain Injuries in Car-To-Pedestrian Collisions. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17, 492.



- Chu, R., & Li, G. (2000). Scalability of LS-Dyna on SGI Systems. *Proceedings of the* 6th International LS-DYNA User's Conference. Dearborn, Michigan.
- Damm, R., Schnottale, B., & Lorenz, B. (2006). Evaluation of the biofidelity of the WorldSID and the ES-2 on the basis of PMHS data. *Proceedings of the International Research Council on Biomechanics Of Injury Conference*. Spain.
- Dan, P. O. P. (2019). Finite element analysis of occupant safety in the case of far side impact with a rigid pole. *Journal of Automotive Engineering*, 25(1), pp. 12-17.
- Du Bois, P. (2000). *Crashworthiness engineering with LS-Dyna* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from DYNAmore Gmbh.
- DYNAmore. (n.d.). Recommendations for structural impact. Retrieved June 4, 2021, from Welcome to the LS-DYNA support site website: https://www.dynasupport.com/howtos/general/recommendations-forstructural-impact
- Faerber, E. (2001). EEVC research in the field of improvement of crash compatibility between passenger cars. *Proceedings of the 17th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*. Amsterdam, United Kingdom.
 Fagerström, J. (2020). *Rear end crash simulation using Human Body Models : An investigation of the design of seat structure using a 50th percentile female*

Human Body Model. Lulea University of Technology, Sweden: Master Thesis.

- Foster, J. K., Kortge, J. O., & Wolanin, M. J. (1977). Hybrid III a biomechanicallybased crash test dummy. *21st Stapp Car Crash Conference*. Warrendale, PA.
- Funk, J. R., Rudd, R. W., Kerrigan, J. R., & Crandall, J. R. (2003). Analysis of tibial curvature, fibular loading, and the tibia index. *Proceedings of the International Research Council On Biomechanics Of Injury Conference*. Lisbon, Portugal.

- Galán, J., Samek, L., Verleysen, P., Verbeken, K., & Houbaert, Y. (2012). Advanced high strength steels for automotive industry. *Revista de Metalurgia*, 48(2), 118.
- Gehre, C., Gades, H., & Wernicke, P. (2009). Objective rating of signals using test and simulation responses. *Proceedings of the International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*. Stuggart, Germany.
- Gehre, C., & Stahlschmidt, S. (2011). Assessment of dummy models by using objective rating methods. 22nd International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles Conference (ESV). Washington, DC.
- Gökler, M. İ., Doğan, U. Ç., & Darendeliler, H., (2016). Effects of forming history on crash simulation of a vehicle. 10th International Conference and Workshop on Numerical Simulation of 3D Sheet Metal Forming Processes. Bristol, United Kingdom.
- Guha, S. (2014). LSTC NCAC Hybrid III 50th dummy positioning & post-processing.Michigan: Livermore Software Technology Corporation.
- Happee, R., Van Haaster, R., Michaelsen, L., & Hoffman, R. (1998). Optimisation of vehicle passive safety for occupants with varying anthropometry. *Proceedings of the 16th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*. Windsor, Canada.
- Haufe, A., Du Bois, P., Neukamm, F., & Feucht, M. (2011). GISSMO–Material modeling with a sophisticated failure criteria. *LS-Dyna Developer Forum*. DYNAmore, Stuggart.
- Haufe, A., Schweizerhof, K., & Dubois, P. (2013). Properties & limits: Review of shell element formulations. *LS-Dyna Developer Forum*. DYNAmore, Stuggart.

- Haug, E., Choi, H.-Y., Robin, S., & Beaugonin, M. (2004). Human Models for Crash and Impact Simulation. In *Computational Models for the Human Body* (Vol. 12, pp. 231-452). Elsevier.
- Hering, A. M., & Derler, S. (2000). Motorcycle helmet drop tests using a Hybrid III dummy. International Research Council On Biomechanics Of Injury Conference, Conference on the Biomechanics of Impact. Montpellier, France.
- Holmen, J. K., Johnsen, J., Morin, D., Børvik, T., & Langseth, M. (2020). Application of *MAT_258 for bending and crushing of extruded aluminum profiles using shell elements. *16th International LS-DYNA Users Conference*. Detroit, U.S.A.
- Hubbard, R. P., & McLeod, D. G. (1974). Definition and development of a crash dummy head. 18th Stapp Car Crash Conference, Society of Automotive Engineers, Warrendale, PA. pp. 3836–3851.
 HUS (2000) T
- IIHS. (2006). Crash test report 2007 Toyota Yaris (CEF0610). Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. Retrieved from Insurance Institute for Highway Safety website: https://techdata.iihs.org/secure/filegroup.aspx?790
- Isa, M. H., Deros, B., Jawi, Z. M., & Kassim, K. A. A. (2016). An anthropometric comparison of current anthropometric test devices (ATDs) with Malaysian adults. *Malaysian Journal of Public Health Medicine, Special Volume 1*, pp. 15–21.
- Jackson, K. E., Fasanella, E. L., Boitnott, R., McEntire, J., & Lewis, A. (2004). Occupant responses in a full-scale crash test of the Sikorsky ACAP helicopter. *Journal of the American Helicopter Society*, 49(2), pp. 127–139. https://doi.org/10.4050/JAHS.49.127

- Jinhuan, Z., Jie, Y., Xin, J. I. N., Ming, S., Xiao, L. U. O., & Chunsheng, M. A. (2016). Differences of anthropometric dimensions between Chinese and American and the effects on drivers' injury risks in vehicle frontal crash. *Journal of Automotive Safety and Energy*, 7(02), p. 175.
- Jordan, P. W. (2000). *Designing pleasurable products: An introduction to the new human factors*. CRC press.
- Jost, T., Heubrandtner, T., Ruff, C., & Fellner, B. (2008). A new method to model aluminium honeycomb based crash barriers in lateral and frontal crash load cases. *LS-DYNA Anwenderforum*. Bamberg, Germany.
- Kamarulzaman, M. F., Nor, M. K. M., & Samad, M. S. A. (2021). Microstructural Analysis of Strain Rate Dependence for Commercial Dual Phase Steel DP590 Undergoing Finite Strain Deformation. *International Journal of Integrated Engineering*, 13(7), pp. 226–234.
- Kan, C.-D., Marzougui, D., & Bedewi, N. E. (2003). Development of a 50th percentileHybrid III dummy model. *Proceedings of the Fourth European LS-DYNAUsers Conference*. Ulm, Germany.
- Kang, S., Chen, C., Guha, S., Paladuga, M., Ramasamy, M. S., Gade, L., & Zhu, F. (2018). LS-DYNA® belted occupant model. 15th International LS-Dyna Users Conference. Detroit U.S.A.
- Karmegam, K., Sapuan, S., Ismail, M. Y., Ismail, N., Bahri, M. T., Mohana, G. K., ... Thiyagu, P. (2011). Anthropometry of Malaysian young adults. *Journal of Human Ergology*, 40(1_2), pp. 37–46.

- Kassim, K. A. A., Jawi, Z. M., Isa, M. H. M., Ahmad, Y., Hamzah, A., Paiman, N. F., Aqbal, H. A., Rahman., MK., Solah, M. S. (2013). Scanning the achievement of MyVAP versus ASEAN NCAP and the similarity. *Southeast Asian Safer Mobility Symposium*.
- Kassim, K. A. A., Jawi, Z. M., & Isa, M. M. (2017). ASEAN NCAP's contribution to Malaysia's automotive ecosystem. *Journal of the Society of Automotive Engineers Malaysia*, 1(1), pp. 20–32.
- Kellas, S., Jackson, K. E., & Littell, J. D. (2010). Full-scale crash test of an md-500 helicopter with deployable energy absorbers. *Proceedings of the 66th AHS Annual Forum*. Phoenix, Arizona.
- Kim, T.-W., & Jeong, H.-Y. (2010). Stochastic analysis of the variation in injury numbers of automobile frontal crash tests. *International Journal of Automotive Technology*, 11(4), pp. 481–488.
- Kübler, L., Gargallo, S., & Elsäßer, K. (2009). Frontal crash pulse assessment with application to occupant safety. *ATZ Worldwide*, *111*(6), pp. 12–17.
- Lai, X., Wang, Y., Zhou, Q., Lin, Z., & Culiere, P. (2011). Development of a finite element PAM-CRASH model of Hybrid III anthropomorphic test device with high fidelity. *The 22nd International Conference on the Enhanced Safety Vehicles (ESV)*. Washington, DC.
- Lau, I. V., & Viano, D. C. (1986). The Viscous Criterion Bases and Applications of an Injury Severity Index for Soft Tissues. SAE Transactions, 95, 672–691.
- Lef, C., & Dolange, G. (2015). Understanding lower leg injury in offset frontal crash: A multivariate analysis. KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden: Master Thesis.

- Lin, Y.-Y., & Wang, J. (2009). Performance of the hybrid LS-DYNA on crash simulation with the multicore architecture. 7th European LS-DYNA Conference. Salzburg, Austria.
- Longhitano, D., & Turley, J. E. (2003). The upper-body response of THOR in frontal barrier tests. *Proceedings of the International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*. Nagoya, Japan.
- Ly, A. H., & Hoang, T. D. (2017). Scaling the 50th percentile Hybrid III dummy model to the height and the weight of a typical Vietnamese. *Science & Technology Development Journal - Engineering and Technology*, 2(SI2), pp. SI105–SI113.
- Marzougui, D., Samaha, R., Cui, C., & Kan, C. D. (2011). Development & validation of a finite element model for the 2010 Toyota Yaris passenger sedan. Prepared for FHWA. *National Crash Analysis Center*. Washington, DC.
- Marzougui, Dhafer, Samaha, R. R., Cui, C., & Kan, C. D. (2012). Extended validation of the finite element model for the 2007 Chevrolet Silverado pick-up truck. *National Crash Analysis Center*. Washington, DC.
- Marzougui, Dhafer, Samaha, R. R., Nix, L., & Kan, C.-D. S. (2013). Extended validation of the finite element model for the 2010 Toyota Yaris passenger sedan (MASH 1100kg vehicle).
- McElhaney, J. H., Nightingale, R. W., Winkelstein, B. A., Chancey, V. C., & Myers,
 B. S. (2002). Biomechanical aspects of cervical trauma. *Accidental Injury* (pp. 324–373). Springer, New York.
- Melvin, J. W. (1979). *Human neck injury tolerance*. (Report No. 790136). SAE Technical Paper.

- Mertz, H. J., Irwin, A. L., Melvin, J. W., Stanaker, R. L., & Beebe, Ms. (1989). Size, weight and biomechanical impact response requirements for adult size small female and large male dummies. *SAE International Congress and Exposition*. Detroit, Michigan.
- Mohamed, M. S., & Mustafa, S. (2014). Kansei engineering implementation on car center stack designs. *Int. J. Educ. Res*, 2(4), pp. 355–366.
- Mohan, P., Park, C.-K., Marzougui, D., Kan, C.-D., Guha, S., Maurath, C., & Bhalsod,
 D. (2010). LSTC/NCAC dummy model development. *11th International LS-Dyna Users Conference*. Detroit U.S.A.
- Montfort, S. van, Versmissen, T., & Uittenbogaard, J. (2014). FIMCAR XV: Fleet studies. Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin.
- Moss, S., Wang, Z., Salloum, M., Reed, M., Van Ratingen, M., Cesari, D., ... Beusenberg, M. (2000). Anthropometry for WorldSID a world-harmonized midsize male side impact crash dummy. *SAE Transactions*, pp. 2297–2307.
- Neukamm, F., Feucht, M., Haufe, A., & Roll, K. (2008). On closing the constitutive gap between forming and crash simulation. *10th International LS-Dyna Users Conference*. Detroit, U.S.A.
- Neukamm, Frieder, Feucht, M., & Haufe, A. (2009). Considering damage history in crashworthiness simulations. *Ls-Dyna Anwenderforum*. Salzburg, Austria.
- NHTSA. (2006). New Car Assessment Program Frontal Barrier Impact Test—Toyota Motor Corporation 2007 Toyota Yaris (Report No. Test 5677). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Retrieved from National Highway Traffic Safety Administration website: https://www.nhtsa.gov/researchdata/research-testing-databases#/vehicle/5677

- NHTSA. (2016, November 21). Crash Simulation Vehicle Models [Text]. Retrieved August 31, 2020, from NHTSA website: https://www.nhtsa.gov/crashsimulation-vehicle-models
- Noureddine, A., Eskandarian, A., & Digges, K. (2002). Computer modeling and validation of a hybrid III dummy for crashworthiness simulation. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 35(7–8), pp. 885–893.
- Ozturk, F., Toros, S., & Kilic, S. (2014). Effects of anisotropic yield functions on prediction of forming limit diagrams of DP600 advanced high strength steel. *Procedia Engineering*, 81. Nagoya, Japan.
- Park, C.-K., & Kan, C. (2010). Objective evaluation method of vehicle crash pulse severity in frontal new car assessment program (NCAP) tests. *Center for Collision Safety and Analysis, George Mason University*, pp. 15–0055.
- Prasad, A., & Weston, D. (2011). NHTSA's rear seat safety research. International Conference on Enhanced Safety of Vehicles (ESV). Washington, DC.
- Prasad, P. (1999). Biomechanical basis for injury criteria used in crashworthiness regulations. International Research Council On Biomechanics Of Injury Conference. Washington, DC.
- Praxl, N., Schonpflug, M., & Adamec, J. (2003). Simulation of occupant kinematics in vehicle rollover-dummy model versus human model. *Proceedings of the International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*. Nagoya, Japan.
- Rashid, Z., Bakar, N., & Raja Ghazilla, R. A. (2013). Comparison of Malaysian and SAE J833 anthropometric proportions for vehicle package design. *Advanced Engineering Forum*, 10, pp. 336–344.

- Reichert, R., Park, C. K., & Morgan, R. M. (2014). Development of integrated vehicle-occupant model for crashworthiness safety analysis (Report No. DOT HS 812 087). *National Highway Traffic Safety Administration*. Washington, DC.
- Reichert, Rudolf, & Kan, S. (2017). Development of a 2015 mid-size sedan vehicle model. 11th European LS-DYNA Conference. Salzburg, Austria.
- Reichert, Rudolf, Mohan, P., Marzougui, D., Kan, C.-D., & Brown, D. (2016).Validation of a Toyota Camry finite element model for multiple impact configurations. SAE 2016 World Congress and Exhibition. United States.
- Rhule, H., Moorhouse, K., Donnelly, B., & Stricklin, J. (2009). Comparison of WorldSID and ES-2re biofidelity using an updated biofidelity ranking system. *Proceeding of the International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*, 2009. Stuttgart, Germany.
 Proh. V. G. (2000).
- Roh, Y.-S. (2000). Scaling study of LS-Dyna MPP on high performance servers. 6th International LS-DYNA Users Conference. Detroit, U.S.A.
- SAE, S. (2007). J211-1 Instrumentation for impact test. Part 1: Electronic instrumentation". *In Surface Vehicle Recommended Practice*. Warrendale, PA:
 SAE International.
- Scherer, R., Bortenschlager, K., Akiyama, A., Tylko, S., Hartlieb, M., & Harigae, T. (2009). WorldSID production dummy biomechanical responses. *Experimental Safety of Vehicles*. Stuttgart, Germany.
- Scherer, R., Cesari, D., Uchimura, T., Kostyniuk, G., Page, M., Asakawa, K., Hautmann, E., Bortenschlager, K., Sakurai, M., Harigae, T. (2001). Design and evaluation of the WorldSID prototype dummy. *Proceedings of the 17th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles*. Amsterdam.

- Schiavone, A., & Zhao, L. G. (2015). A study of balloon type, system constraint and artery constitutive model used in finite element simulation of stent deployment.
 Mechanics of Advanced Materials and Modern Processes, 1(1), pp. 1–15.
- Shah, C., Khambati, S., Watson, S., Balwan, N., Zhou, Z., Zhu, F., & Shetty, S. (2014).
 Newly developed LS-Dyna® models for the THOR-M and harmonized HIII
 50th crash test dummies. *Proceedings of the 13th International LS-DYNA Users Conference*. Dearborn, Michigan.
- Singh, H., Ganesan, V., James, D., Paramasuwom, M., & Gradischnig, L. (2018).
 Vehicle interior and restraints modeling development of full vehicle finite element model including vehicle interior and occupant restraints systems for occupant safety analysis using THOR dummies (Report No. DOT HS 812 545).
 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Sommera, D., Schauweckera, F., & Middendorfa, P. (2020). A study on the transfer of GISSMO material card parameters from 2D-to 3D-discretization. *16th International LS-DYNA Users Conference*. Detroit, U.S.A.
- Stahlschmidt, S., Gromer, A., & Walz, M. (2010). WorldSID 50th vs. ES-2. A comparison based on simulations. *11th International LS-Dyna Users Conference*. Detroit, U.S.A.
- Stelzmann, S. (2010). Die große elementbibliothek in. LS-Dyna. Proceedings of the ANSYS Conference & 28th CADFEM Users' Meeting. Aachen, Germany.
- Sun, D. Z., Andrieux, F., Ockewitz, A., Klamser, H., & Hogenmüller, J. (2005). Modelling of the failure behaviour of windscreens and component tests. 5th European LS-DYNA Users Conference. Birmingham, United Kingdom.

- Sutar, V., Dharankar, C. S., & Thirupathi Raju, B. (2016). High strength steel for automotive applications. *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 3(5), pp. 966–968.
- Tam, L. (2015). The Development of Finite Element Model for Malaysian Female Anthropometric Dummy. Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia: Master Thesis.
- Thomas, D. (2008). Modelling carpet for use in occupant crash simulations. *Honda R&D Technical Review*, 20(1), p. 147.
- Tsoi, A. H., & Gabler, H. C. (2015). Evaluation of vehicle-based crash severity metrics. *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 16(sup2), pp. S132–S139. https://doi.org/10.1080/15389588.2015.1067693
- Tylko, S., German, A., Dalmotas, D., & Bussières, A. (2006). Improving side impact protection: Response of the ES-2re and WorldSID in a proposed harmonized pole test. *Proceedings of the International Conference of the Biomechanics of Impact*. Madrid, Spain.
- Umale, S., Arun, M., Hauschild, H., Humm, J., Pintar, F., & Yoganandan, N. (2018).
 Quantitative evaluation of THOR, World SID and Hybrid III under far-side impacts: A finite element study. *Proceedings of International Research Council On Biomechanics Of Injury Conference*. Athens, Greece.
- Van Ratingen, M. (2001). Development and evaluation of the ES-2 side impact dummy. 7th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles. Amsterdam.
- Van Ratingen, M., Bermond, F., Hynd, D., Pastor, C., Davidsson, J., Gertosio, G., Martinez, L., Bortenschlager, K., Ohrn, H., Petit, P. (2005). *Technical Note on EuroSID-2 with rib extensions (ES-2re)*. WG12 Biomechanics.

- Vedantam, K., Bajaj, D., Brar, N. S., & Hill, S. (2006). Johnson-Cook strength models for mild and DP 590 Steels. AIP Conference Proceedings, 845(1), pp. 775– 778.
- WapCar. (2022). Malaysia vehicle sales down 4% in 2021, which car was the bestselling model? | WapCar. Retrieved March 6, 2022, from https://www.wapcar.my/news/malaysia-vehicle-sales-down-4-in-2021-whichcar-was-the-bestselling-model-40677
- Wood, G. W., Panzer, M. B., Bass, C. R., & Myers, B. S. (2010). Viscoelastic properties of Hybrid III head skin. SAE International Journal of Materials and Manufacturing, 3(1), 186–193. https://doi.org/10.4271/2010-01-0383
- Wusk, G., & Gabler, H. (2017). Evaluation of vehicle-based crash severity metrics using event data recorders. 25th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles (ESV). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Detroit, Michigan.
- Xu, T., Sheng, X., Zhang, T., Liu, H., Liang, X., & Ding, A. (2018). Development and validation of dummies and human models used in crash test. *Applied Bionics and Biomechanics*, 2018, pp. 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/3832850
- Yamada, H., & Evans, F. G. (1970). *Strength of biological materials*. Baltimore:Williams and Wilkins Co.
- Yu, H., Guo, Y., & Lai, X. (2009). Rate-dependent behavior and constitutive model of DP600 steel at strain rate from 10- 4 to 103 s- 1. *Materials & Design*, 30(7), pp. 2501–2505.

PUBLICATION

There are three articles in press that resulted from this research:

- a) Samad, M. S. A., Mohd Nor, M. K., Abdul Majid, M. M., & Abu Kassim, K.
 A. (2021). Investigation on the effect of Malaysian anthropometric size in vehicle crash safety by using finite element method. *Journal of the Society of Automotive Engineers Malaysia*, 5, 176–184.
- b) Abdul Samad, M. S., Mohd Nor, M. K., Abdul Majid, M. M., & Abu Kassim,
 A. K. (2022). Optimization of vehicle pulse index parameters based on validated vehicle-occupant finite element model. *International Journal of Crashworthiness*, 1–7.
- c) Abdul Samad, M. S., & Mohd Nor, M. K. (2022). A comparative analysis between a newly Malaysian size ATD and the current Hybrid III ATD in frontal impact. *Cogent Engineering*, 9(1), 2105558.

EXHIBITIONS

There are two exhibitions and awards as resulted from this research:

- a) International Research and Innovation (RISE 2021) Silver Medal Award
- b) Malaysia Technology Expo (MTE) 2022 Silver Medal Award



INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

There is one intellectual property registered as resulted from this research:

a) Method to Scale a Crash-Test Dummy Finite Element Model or Human Body Finite Element Model to Anthropometrically Fit to a Populace (PI2021007183)



VITA

The author was born on January 17, 1985, in Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia. He went to Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan Sri Serdang for his secondary school. He pursued his degree at the Universiti Putra Malaysia and graduated with a B.Eng. in Mechanical Engineering and M.Sc. in Automotive Engineering in 2008 and 2011, respectively. After graduation, he worked as a Mechanical Engineer at Sharp Electronics (M) Sdn. Bhd for about a year and a half. Later, he worked at EDAG Holdings Sdn Bhd. as Computer-Aided Engineering (CAE) engineer. In 2013, he joined PROTON Holdings and worked as CAE Senior Engineer. Later, he is promoted to CAE Lead Engineer. His expertise is in the automotive crashworthiness and occupant safety field. He also has a lot of experience in automotive steel material testing and material characterization for CAE applications. One of his contributions is the SYAZWAN ductile failure surface model, which has been implemented in the open-source explicit finite element solver, OpenRadioss as well as in the commercial solver, Radioss. Another notable contribution is the method to estimate the linear damage calculation based on the strain histories that he has developed. Currently, he has two patents under his name. To date, he has co-authored a total of eleven papers in the field of automotive crashworthiness, occupant safety, and material characterization. In 2022, he joined Western Digital as a Principal Engineer to expand his knowledge in the area of thermal-mechanical simulation.

