Final Report

EVALUATION OF CHILD RESTRAINT DEVICES

Prepared for: Consumers Union of U.S., Inc. Auto Test Division 367 Boston Post Road Orange, Connecticut 06477

April 28, 1972

by

Richard L. Stalnaker, Ph.D.

Highway Safety Research Institute The University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

EVALUATION OF CHILD RESTRAINT DEVICES

PART I. INTRODUCTION

On April 1, 1971, the United States Department of Transportation adopted a static load-bearing requirement (U.S. Government Standard No. 571.213) for child seats. It requires that a child seat be able to sustain a transverse static load of 1000 pounds applied to a dummy torso at an angle between 5° and 15° above the horizontal, with a maximum torso deflection of 12 inches.

Recent investigation indicates that a static deflection test is an inadequate measure of the safety of a restraint system (D. H. Robbins, et al. (1)). This new evidence indicates that dynamic loading patterns are substantially different from the static load specified in Standard No. 571.213.

The Highway Safety Research Institute at The University of Michigan proposed and carried out a nationwide market survey followed by rigorous dynamic testing and evaluation of 18 different child restraint devices. The devices tested were selected from the large number of devices available in such a way as to test the widest possible variety of restraint device designs, and to test those which showed promise in earlier dynamic tests.

PART II. STATE OF THE ART AND MARKET SURVEY

The most general discussion of the protection of children in an automobile crash can be found in a study by Siegel, et al. (2) in which they discuss the frequency of various types of injuries, and child anthropometry as it relates to seating design. Based on a survey of accident cases, they recommend the use of lap belts for children over three to four years of age.

The excellent presentations of Burdi, et al. (3) and King (4) on child safety restraints are more anthropologically and medically oriented than that of Siegel. D. H. Robbins, et al., Burdi, and King, place great importance on head motions, particularly the snapping which can occur because of the lack of strength in children's neck muscles. They also warn against any head contact with the interior of a vehicle. They believe using an adult lap belt is dangerous because a child's iliac crest is not sufficiently developed to act as a belt anchor location. Caution is advised in applying restraint loads to the chest due to its highly compressible nature and due to the vulnerability of the internal organs to nonpenetrating injuries. Finally, distribution of restraint loads over wide areas of the body is recommended as an important design criterion.

Other studies by Aldman (5) suggest rear-facing children's seats, while Van Kirk (6) suggests a restraint net to obtain a gentle ride. Papers by Head and Grenier (7), Feles (8), and Appoldt (9) all discuss the performance of child seats.

Robbins and his co-workers found that, in addition to the above criteria, the devices should: (1) possess structural integrity, (2) avoid dynamic interaction with the adult seat, and (3) attach securely to the vehicle.

A retail market survey was conducted to determine what restraint devices for infants and children were available. Fifteen manufacturers and distributors of child restraint devices were contacted by telephone to determine which of their devices had the largest sales, and which they would recommend as their best. The devices tested and studied were available between February 14, 1972 and February 25, 1972, and all met Government Standard No. 517.213.

With this information, 18 test devices were selected on the basis of consumer popularity. More than one model from a manufacturer was tested when one of the child seats was found to differ substantially in design from the rest of that manufacturers line. Descriptions and comments on the test devices are shown in Table I.

PART III. TEST PROGRAM

The basic objective of the test program is to obtain an experimentallydetermined estimate of the protection potential offered to the child by the 18 devices to be tested in the study.

In order to achieve this, it was necessary to:

1. Develop a performance criterion for evaluating the various devices.

2. Select an occupant for use in the test program.

3. Construct a test environment, including an adult seat capable of being oriented so that impacts from various directions could be studied.

4. Select instrumentation and data-handling procedures to determine forces and motions experienced by the occupant in the test in order to provide data for performance evaluations.

5. Select a test matrix.

6. Conduct the test program and gather data.

PERFORMANCE CRITERION

The purpose of this research is to provide an objective measure of the protection from serious injury afforded a child occupant by these restraint systems.

Accordingly, we have developed a formula to express quantitatively the likelihood of injury to an occupant and the severity of any injury. We shall refer to this factor as Total Injury Index (TII). A high TII indicates that the restraint system affords limited protection from injury; conversely, a low TII indicates a safer restraint system (i.e., one in which injury is less likely, and the injuries are less serious).

Head Excursion Factor (HEF)

Injury to the vehicle occupants in a crash can arise from three basic causes. First, and probably most critical, is the possibility of the child being thrown on impact against the dashboard, windshield, door pillars, or windows, etc.

Since the head is the region most susceptible to this kind of injury, the best measure of danger is head excursion. Head excursion is the maximum displacement of the head from its initial (pre-impact) position in the direction of the impact. This measurement was made from high-speed film records of the tests. The HEF's were computed according to the formulae:

For front impacts:

HEF =
$$(E_{max} - 19 \text{ inches})^2$$

where:

1

 E_{max} is the Maximum Head Excursion.

If E_{max} - 19 inches is greater than, or equal to, five inches, the dummy's head has left the safety zone and the restraint system has failed the test and is given an HEF of 25.

For side impacts:

HEF = $(E_{max} - 12 \text{ inches})^2$

If E_{max} - 12 inches is greater than, or equal to, two inches, the seat has failed and is given an HEF of 4. (See Figure 1)

Acceleration Factor (AF)

The second factor which can cause injury to occupants of a restraint system in a crash is excessively high acceleration. The areas of the body most susceptible to serious injury due to acceleration are the head and the chest.



The Acceleration Factors (AF) are computed by application of the following formulae:

For front impacts:

$$AF = \frac{A_{h}}{21 \text{ G's}} + \frac{A_{c}}{21 \text{ G's}}$$

For side impacts:

$$AF = \frac{A_{h}}{15 \,\text{G's}} + \frac{A_{c}}{15 \,\text{G's}}$$

where:

A_h is the resultant head acceleration

 $\boldsymbol{A}_{\boldsymbol{C}}$ is the resultant chest acceleration

Twenty-one G's and 15 G's are the nominal sled pulse peaks for front and side or rear impacts, respectively. If the head accelerations (A_h) exceed the maximum survivable accelerations according to the Maximum Strain Criterion for triangular pulses (Stalnaker, et al., 10, 11), the restraint system has failed the test, and is given the cut-off score of 7.2 for forward and 6.4 for side impact.

The maximum survivable accelerations for adult humans according to the MSC are:

 $(A_h)_{max} = 92 \text{ G's}$ (for anterior-posterior (A-P) head acceleration) $(A_h)_{max} = 54 \text{ G's}$ (for left-right (L-R) head acceleration)

The maximum allowable chest acceleration (A_c) used by the U.S. Government in Standard No. 208 is 60 G's (for both A-P and L-R accelerations).

Load Distribution Factor (LDF)

The third cause of injury to a child in a restraint system is stress to vital organs during impact due to improper load distribution. The location of the restraining (load bearing) surfaces is especially critical in children because some skeletal regions are not fully developed, and ossification is not complete. In particular, the iliac crest has not developed and therefore doesn't provide as good a load bearing structure for a child as for an adult. Therefore, the lap belt has a strong tendency to ride-up off the pelvis and into the abdominal region, which is very dangerous.

In order to compute the Load Distribution Factor (LDF), we first divide the seats into two groups, according to whether or not the adult lap belt bears upon the child.

Group 1

If the adult lap belt bears upon the child's midsection, then the total transverse dynamic load must be borne at the child's midsection. (See Figure 2) Therefore, the load on the child is the sum of the loads on the adult seat belts.

$$LDF = \left(\frac{F_{r} + F_{l}}{A_{e}}\right) \times LF$$

where:

LF = Load Factor (See Group 2)

 F_r = Maximum force on right adult lap belt

 F_1 = Maximum force on left adult lap belt

 A_{e} = Effective load bearing area (See Group 2)

Group 2

In those seats where the adult lap belt does not bear upon the child's midsection (See Figure 3) the LDF is computed by application of the formula:

$$DF = \left(\frac{D_w \times A_s}{A_e}\right) \times LF$$

where:

- D_{W} = Weight of the dummy (31 pounds for all except the GM Infant Carrier, for which the weight of the dummy is 15 pounds)
- A_e = Effective area of the restraint system, i.e., the load bearing area



FIGURE 2. LAP BELT LOADS UPON CHILD.



FIGURE 3. LAP BELT DOES NOT LOAD UPON CHILD.



FIGURE 4. LOAD FACTOR.

TABLE I. DEVICES SELECTED FOR CONSUMER UNION STUDY

formante	VUININGINAS	Has three uses: car seat, high chait, many	<u> </u>	2011 as 11 1011 15/2 0. 0. 1 clines 3 case 35			Manufacturer's choice for consumers, best seller,	. and most expensive. Available in some Penney's	stores as 1971 stock no. 6193.		Easy to use, and can be used to carry the bany out		The quantity and type of material used in the body	shield padding has been changed in the last two	years. Very easy to use.	Sold at Montgomery Wards Stores, Item No. 0104.			come or Coone cothelow item no 1D85285C, manufac-	turer's choice for consumers.			Same as Sears catalog Item no. Irooz/IL UI Irooz/LL			Manufacturer's best seller.				Most expensive and manufacturer's choice for con-	p Sumers.		
		Molded plastic shell with clip on double diagonal chest harness, also a belly strap. Gives side sup		ubular steel pedestal Told-up seat with Novk- dor cost monsting Ecom moddod sholl with head	Under seat mountring. Froam paudeu sneit with neur	rest and arm rests. Suspender-type shoulder surap Seat and child restrained by adult lab belt.	Tubular frame fold-up nedectal with padded head	restraint and arm rests. hook-under seat mounting.	Chest strap. Seat and child restrained by lap	belt.	Molded plastic shell. Occupant rests in a semi-	reclining position rearward facing. Shoulder strans	Molded plastic shell encapsulating child. Padded	face guard.		Molded seat with padded sides, and a padded face	and body shield supported by a tubular frame in	front of child. The child and seat restrained by		Molded plastic shell, padded seat and nead rest, with hook-under seat mounting. Suspender-type	shoulder harness. Adult lap belt restrains child	and seat.	Tubular pedestal with molded plastic shell.	Padded seat with arm rests and head rest. Hook-	under seat mounting. Suspender-type shoulder har	Tubulay wolontal with madded and worte and head	I unutar peuestar with paudeu atmitests and meda breet Suspender-type shoulder strans Child and	cost restrained by adult lan helt.		Molded plastic pedestal-type; padded seat, back,	and head rest. Suspender-type shoulder belts, la	belt, and crotch belt.	
	Seat Name	Bobby-Mac 3 in 1 Baby Chair		Model 61 E-Z-F1t			Continui Can Soat	central y car sear			Infant Carrier		Tot Guard			Protecta Tot				Teddy Tot 6200			Teddy Tot 6600			N-1-1 EAGE	MODEL 24U3			Model 5500			
	Manufacturer	Thayer Inc. 205 School St.	Garner, Mass.	Bunny Bear Inc.	Nursery Lane	Everest, Mass.	Cartinit Duaduate Tac	UCHICUTY FLOUDELS INC.	Cleveland, Ohio		General Motors Corp.	GM Building	Ford Motor Company	c/o American Road	Dearborn. Mi	Hamill Mfg. Co.	(Division of Firestone)	6116 Van Dyke	Washington, Mi	International Mfg.	Roxeurv. Mass.		International Mfg.	2500 Washington	Roxeury, Mass.		Jamy Inc.		BUX 1433	Alligscolls ra	1 .lamv lane	Box 1499	Viscoton Da

TABLE I. DEVICES SELECTED FOR CONSUMER UNION STUDY (Continued)

suprante - - the

1

13

For those seats which used the adult lap belt around the child, A_e is the area of the lap belt that bears on the child. For those devices which did not collapse, and in which the adult lap belt did not bear upon the child, A_e is simply the area of the restraining surfaces bearing on the child. For those devices in which the seat back collapsed, and in which the adult lap belt did not bear upon the child, A_e was determined to be one-half the total area of all the restraining straps.

 A_s = Maximum height of sled acceleration pulse.

LF = Load Factor (See Figure 4). The LF is a weighting function to account for the different load bearing capabilities of different areas of the body. A restraint system bearing upon the whole torso is good, and its LF is 1. A system bearing upon the thorax and/or pelvis receives an LF of 2. A system bearing upon the abdomen is poor and its LF is 3.

If the restraining belts bear upon areas where there is no suitable skeletal structure to bear the load, penetration occurs and damage to internal organs may result. Consequently, those regions best able to bear loads without injury have low load factors.

For both groups, if the LDF exceeds that of the case below, then it is considered to have failed the test.

Failure (for forward impacts):

Minimum restraining belt area = 15 in^2

Restraining belt bears on the most susceptible region (abdomen), LF=3

Maximum LDF =
$$\left[\frac{31 \text{ lbs x } 21 \text{ G's}}{15 \text{ in}^2}\right] \times 3 = 130$$

Failure (for side impacts):

Minimum restraining belt area = 12 in^2

Restraining belt bears on the most susceptible region (side of abdomen), LF=3

Maximum LDF = $\left[\frac{31 \ 1bs \ x \ 15 \ G's}{12 \ in^2}\right] \times 3 = 116.3$

The Total Injury Index is made up of these three parts, weighted in order to make their magnitudes comparable. It is very important, however, to note that a seat must perform reasonably well according to all three indices in order to be considered safe. For example, a seat with good load distribution factors and acceleration factors (i.e., low values), but which allows the child's head to go through the windshield, is clearly not safe.

Each of the three performance factors (LDF, HEF, AF) is weighted so that their respective cut-off cases each contributed 33 1/3 points. Therefore, a seat which fails all three measures of safety receives a score of 100. SELECTION OF OCCUPANT

The 3-year-size Sierra Engineering anthropometric dummy was used for all tests, except the G.M. Infant Carrier test. The Sierra 3-year is 38 inches high and weighs 37.5 pounds. The weights of the various body components are distributed nearly correctly, thus giving a fair duplication of body kinematics. (See Figure 5)

In order to test the G.M. Infant Carrier, a doll with the approximate dimensions of an average three-month-old baby was disassembled. The two legs, torso, two arms, and head were weighted with lead shot to simulate the body segment weights for a baby of this size. The doll was then reassembled. The length of the doll was 16 inches and it weighed 15 pounds. This technique has been used by General Motors in developing their Infant Carrier (See Figure 6).





FIGURE 6. WEIGHTED DOLL

SELECTION OF TEST ENVIRONMENT

The test configurations consisted of a Ford bench seat mounted on a test rig which exactly duplicated the seat mounting, lap belt attachment points, and floor and toe board locations in a full-size 1971 Ford vehicle. The entire assembly was capable of being rotated as a unit and thus the geometry of the simulated vehicle remains constant for front, side, and rear impacts. SELECTION OF INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA-HANDLING PROCEDURES

The 3-year dummy was instrumented with triaxial accelerometer packs in the head and in the chest. The individual accelerometers were Setra Model Number 111. A Statham strain-gage accelerometer was used to sense sled deceleration. Belt loads were recorded using Lebow seat-belt force transducers if an adult lap belt was used with the child seat. Timing signals and impact velocity were also recorded using a Honeywell 1612 light-beam oscillograph.

High-speed motion pictures were also taken for each test. A Photosonics 16-mm camera was located directly to the side of the impact area, and another directly overhead. The filming rate used was 1000 frames per second. These motion pictures were supplemented by slides taken before and after each test. Also, a Graph-chek sequence camera was used in the test program to provide an instantaneous evaluation of the test as a sequence of eight frames on a 3×5 -in. Polaroid sheet.

TEST MATRIX

The test matrix for this program was designed to include forward impact, side impact, and rear impact. Each of the restraint devices was mounted on the bench seat in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions (Table II), securing the dummy in the device with the appropriate emergency restraints. All of the test devices were tested in the frontal impact direction at 30 mph and 21 G's. The devices which performed satisfactorily were then retested,

Manufacturer's Name and Model No.	Ford Tot Guard	Peterson Model 63	Peterson Model 61	Klippan Safety Seat	Trimble Model 875	Kantwet Model 872	Jamy Model 5500	Teddy Tot Model 6200	Teddy Tot Model 6600	Firestone Protecta-loc	Century Model 4845	Bunnv Bear Model 61	Sears Harness (Small)	This This	General Motors Infant Carrier		Thayer Bobby Mac	
Test Number	ភ្លួនភ្លួន ភ្លួនភ្លួន ភ្លួន	519	520	521	523	524	270	527	548		530	53]	532	533	539 538 538 538 538 538 538 538 538 538 538	544	546	
Age of Child (years)							+		T					+				
Standing Height of Child (inches)	<48*	26-40.5	26-40.5	<42 29.5-48	<40	25-43	<42	^35	<40	į	<43	24-40					<40	
Weight of Child (pounds)		17-37	17-37	14-44	15-50	15-45	15-50	15-35	15-42		15-45	15-40	>50 0r 40-70	<20	\$	35 6	/-35	
For Use in Forward Facing Seats Only		, V	V	V	V	k		V			.v	×						
Used With Adult Lap Belt Across Child's Lap			 					/			<	~						•
Does Not Use Adult Seat Belt												\uparrow		+				
Use Only With Non- Folding Seats or Seats With a Latch		× ×	V			~						×		-				
Not For Use in Trucks or Buses									~					+				
Use on Both Front and Rear Facing Seats				V														
Only For Children Capable of Sitting Upright						V.		1	~			-						•
Use in Light Trucks		-				~		1			-			-		+		
Restrictions on Use				In front ceat use in center of seat only,	in rear seat, can be used anywhere. Belt must attach 4 inches aft of child seat back		For costs with head vestraint height >22 inches.	Belt must attach 4 inches aft of child seat back	Child's head must be below top of the seat	back and Protecta-Tot. Balt must attach 4 inches aft of child seat back	Cannot be used in cars with shoulder belt per-			Infant faces rearward.		Auto seat belt must have belt loop length above	the auto seat cusnion of at least to see the auto seat cusnion of at least to see the least to see the around and secure Bobby Mac.	When used for youngsters soo in incomposition where seat back height or be used on auto seat where seat back height or combined seat back and head restraint is at

,

TABLE II. SUMMARY OF MANUFACTURER SPECIFICATIONS

ł,

with new restraints where necessary, in the rear direction at 20 mph and 15 G's. Those devices which performed satisfactorily in the rear impact were then retested for side impact performance, at 20 mph and 15 G's. Any device which performed satisfactorily in all three modes was then retested in the front, rear, and side impact modes for repeatability.

DATA GATHERED IN TEST PROGRAM

 $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{C}}$

The data from all tests are summarized in Table III. All acceleration and force data are given as peak values. The head and chest accelerations are given as "A-P" referring to the anterior-posterior direction, "S-I" to the superior-inferior direction, and "L-R" to the left-right direction.

The complete set of data gathered in this study is included as Appendix A to this report.

			SLE				HEAU				CHES	F		BELT 1	OAD	Maximum Head
Manufacturer and Model	Test No.	Direction	Velocity MPH	ACCN 6's	AP G's	SI G's	5. S'S	RES G's	SEVERITY INDEX	G's	51 6' 5	6.K	G's	Rt. Lbs.	بة الأ	Excursion Inches
Ford Tot Guard	518 535 536 541	Front Front Back Side	30.00 30.10 20.40 20.00	21.0 20.5 13.6 14.5	75 80 34 7*	64 65 15 46	8.7 10 2.5 20*	85 93 48*	1140 1200 - 350*	5 19 110011	19 25 27 16	15 15 2.5 25	53 54 27 27	NA NA NA	NANNA	23.75 23.33 1.21 27.43
Peterson: Model 63 Model 61	519 520	Front Front	29.70 29.15	20.5	152 91	105 93	38	166	>2000 >2000	40 400	33	11	50 42	500 520	880 1200	30.37 28.25
Klippan Safety Seat	521	Front	30.05	22.0	35	64	39	68	780	46	21	10	48	NA	NA	21.55
Strolee Model 590	522	Front	29.50	21.0	. 19	70	26	85	1160	42	19	10	43	NA	Ą	31.02
Trimble Model 875	. 523	Front	29.70	21.0	43	67	5	71	960	25	35	Ξ	39	NA	NA	34.78
Kantwet Model 872	524	Front	29.72	20.8	44	63	45	7	1155	28	21	15	32	560	770	27.38
Jamy: Model 5500 Model 5405	525 526	Front Front	29.50 29.25	20.5	97 108	77 82	80%	120 134	1500 >2000	27 38	16 23	14	39 39	NA 525	NA 775	31.81 25.23
Teddy Tot: Model 6200 Model 6600	527 548	Front Front	30.20 20.40	22.5	198 72	85 105	148 35	250 112	>2000 >2000	33 40	17	20	39 43	525 225	810 1000	26.53 30.20
Firestone Protecta-Tot	529	Front	29.50	22.0	45	120	18.0	124	>2000	23	18	80	54	575	930	30.08
Century Model 4845	530	Front	29.90	21.5	210	125	100	270	>2000	52	29	=	53	500	800	32.17
Bunny Bear Model 61	531	Front	29.20	20.5	175	188	32	245	>2000	52	34	14	55	550	1050	31.97
Sears Harness (small)	532 537 540	Front Back Side	29.50 20.05 19.80	20.5 13.5 14.5	20 *	75 10* 40	25 5* 13	82 25* 42	1400 120* 230	46 145 13	20 24 16	0 e e c L	46 21 21	NAN	AAA	22.52 4.61 25.74
General Motors: Infant Carrier	533 534 543 543	Front Front Back Side Side	30.10 30.10 19.80 19.40	20.5 21.0 14.0 14.0 13.5	1 1 F 1 4 40	1,1,1,1,1,1,1			11111	11111				NA NA NA NA NA	NANANAN	RARARA
Thayer Bobby Mac	546	Front	30.20	21.0	56	69	6.3	72	1000	37	Ξ	9	37	A	NA	26.36
Seat Belt only	549	Front	30.00	20.0	118	116	38	144	>2000	25	28	0[35	440	380	23.01
			*Data has b	een adji	isted to	o remove	e experi	mental a	irtifact.].						

21

TABLE III. CHILD RESTRAINT TEST SUMMARIES

÷,

NA = Not applicable.

				.
Total Injury Index	20.7 65.8 68.3 84.2 93.5	84.0 91.7 89.9 84.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	23.4	20.4 65.8 74.2
Weighted Head Excursion Factor (WHEF)	0 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 35.5 35.5 35.5 35.		Ο	0 33.3 33.3
Head Excursion Factor (HEF)	0 23.7 6.5 144.0	250.0 164.0 340.0 16.2 16.2 86.0 39.0 39.0 174.0 174.0 174.0 171.0	Down Down	0 238.0 189.0
Weighted Acceleration Factor (WAF)	19.000 31.900 29.000 26.200 24.800 29.000	25.200 33.3000 33.3000 30.3000 33.30000 33.30000 33.30000 33.300000 33.300000000	17.800 ery Gentle Ride ery Gentle Ride	17.800 22.321 18.800
Acceleration Factor (AF)	4.00 6.70 5.50 6.10 6.10	5.30 7.20 7.20 7.20 7.20 7.20 7.20 7.20 7.2	4.00 Ve Ve	4.00 5.00 4.20
Weighted Load Distribution Factor (WLDF)	3.44 1.66 6.14 33.30 26.10 31.20	26.10 25.10 33.30 3.300	5.56	2.53 8.16 22.20
Load Distribution Factor (LDF)	6.70 6.50 24.00 139.00 122.00	102.00 98.00 266.00 112.00 229.00 173.00 301.00 296.00 296.00 213.00	11.25	5.11 28.50 77.50
Manufacturer and Model	Front Impact (50 mpn) G.M. Infant Carrier Ford Tot Guard Sears Harness (Small) Klippan Safety Seat Thayer Bobby-Mac Strolee Model 590	Trimble Model 875 Jamy Model 5500 Kantwet Model 872 Seat Belt Only Peterson Model 63 Jamy Model 5405 Teddy Tot Model 6200 Firestone Protecta Tot Century Model 4845 Teddy Tot Model 6600 Bunny Bear Model 61	Rear Impact (20 mph) G.M. Infant Carrier Ford Tot Guard Sears Harness (Small)	olde Impact (20 mpn) G.M. Infant Carrier Ford Tot Guard Sears Harness (Small)

22

TABLE IV. RANKING OF CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEM FOR FORWARD 30 MPH IMPACTS

ľ

*Low score is safe, high score is unsafe. A seat must have all of its scores below 33.3 to pass.

PART IV. QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

A qualitative evaluation of the restraint systems was made on the basis of all available data (quantitative data, film record, lab notes, etc.). The results are given below (Table IV).

EXCELLENT

<u>General Motors Infant Carrier</u> - The Infant Carrier's performance was the best overall. It's biggest drawback is that it can be used only for infants of less than 20 pounds. This is the only seat which passed all the safety criteria for front, side, and rear impacts.

GOOD

<u>Ford Tot Guard</u> - The Tot Guard's performance was excellent in front and rear collisions, but poor in side collisions. This seat was the easiest to use by far, with no straps to tighten and no buckles to buckle. For a child heavier than 20 pounds, this is the best seat.

<u>Sears Harness (Small)</u> - Sold by Sears as the freedom harness, this device lets the child sit, stand and lie down. Its dynamic performance was excellent. Its biggest handicap is that it may take up to one hour to install and could require five minutes to put the harness on every time it's used. This device failed the side impact test because of excessive head excursion. BORDERLINE

<u>Klippan</u> - The quantitative data indicates that this is a superior seat; however, the anthropometric dummy suffered severe distortion of the lumbar vertebrae. This device would be greatly improved by adding a crotch strap to inhibit the harness from sliding up into the abdominal region, which would, in turn, reduce distortion of the occupant.

Thayer Bobby-Mac - Failed only head excursion.

NOT ACCEPTABLE

The seats below have all definitely failed the test.

Strolee Model 590 - Dummy's head hit the dash hard.

<u>Trimble Model 875</u> - The seat collapsed, crushing the dummy. Dummy's head impacted the dash very hard.

<u>Jamy 5500</u> - Seat base broke. Dummy's head struck dash hard. This seat would be greatly improved with use of the adult shoulder harness to support the seat back.

<u>Kantwet Model 872</u> - Shoulder belt slipped down around upper abdomen. Dummy bent badly at mid-thoracic.

All of the seats below use the adult lap belt around the child's abdomen. <u>Adult Lap Belt Only</u> - For comparison purposes.

<u>Peterson Model 63</u> - Lap belt bears on child resulting in severe distortion of sacral spine region. This seat collapsed completely on impact.

<u>Peterson Model 61</u> - Lap belt bears on child resulting in considerable distortion of sacral spine region. This seat collapsed on impact.

<u>Jamy 5405</u> - Lap belt goes around the child. Severe spinal distortion and abdominal penetration. The seat collapsed and folded up, wedging the dummy out of the seat.

<u>Teddy Tot 6200</u> - Lap belt goes around the child. Severe distortion of spine in lumbar sacral region. Abdominal penetration evident. The seat shattered, with the upper part of the seat breaking completely off.

<u>Firestone Protecta Tot</u> - Adult lap belt bears on the child. This seat holds the lap belt <u>up off the pelvis</u>, resulting in severe penetration of abdomen and severe lumbar-sacral distortion. <u>Century Car Seat</u> - Lap belt bears on child. This seat is very flimsy, it totally collapsed on impact. Back of child seat hit dummy's head, speeding it up as it went into the dash.

<u>Teddy Tot 6600</u> - Lap belt bears on child. Very poor restraint location, resulted in spinal distortion. Severe penetration by lap belt. <u>Bunny Bear Model 61</u> - Lap belt bears on child. The seat belt pulled the dummy's sacrum through the rear of the seat. Folded the dummy over and jammed his back. This seat has good structural strength, but needs to have a different belt arrangement, one without the adult belt around the child.

Table V is a recommended ordering of the child restraint systems according to their overall safety.

TABLE V. THE QUANTITATIVE RESULTS OF THE CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS TESTED

.

EXCELLENT	General Motors Infant Carrier
GOOD	Ford Tot Guard Sears Child Harness
BORDERLINE	Klippan Safety Seat Thayer Bobby-Mac
NOT ACCEPTABLE	Strolee Model 590 Trimble Model 875 Jamy 5500 Kantwet Model 872 Adult Lap Belt Only Peterson Model 63 Peterson Model 61 Jamy 5405 Teddy Tot 6200 Eirestone Protecta Tot
	Firestone Protecta Tot Century Car Seat Teddy Tot 6600 Bunny Bear Model 61

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Robbins, D. H., Henke, A. W. and Roberts, V. L., "A Study of Concepts in Child Seating and Restraint Systems," SAE Paper No. 70041, 1970.
- Siegel, A. W., Nahum, A. M. and Appleby, M. R., "Injuries to Children in Automobile Collisions," <u>Proc. Twelfth Stapp Car Crash Conference</u>, 1-46, 1968.
- Burdi, A. R., Huelke, D. F., Snyder, R. G. and Lowrey, G. H., "Infants and Children in the Adult World of Automobile Safety Design: Pediatric and Anatomical Considerations for Design of Child Restraints," <u>J. Bio-</u> <u>mechanics</u>, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 267-280, 1969.
- King, B. G., Paul, E. C. and Spitznagel, C. R., "Children's Automobile Safety Restraints, Characteristics and Body Measurements," SAE Paper No. 690467, 1969.
- Aldman, B., "A Protection Seat for Children Experiments with a Safety Seat for Children Between One and Six," <u>Proc. Eighth Stapp Car</u> <u>Crash Conference</u>, 1964.
- Van Kirk, D. J. and King, A. I., "A Preliminary Study of an Effective Restraint System for Pregnant Women and Children," <u>Proc. Thirteenth</u> Stapp Car Crash Conference, 1969.
- Head, S. A. and Grenier, E. P., "The Design and Development of a More Effective Child Restraint Concept," SAE Paper No. 680002, 1968.
- Feles, N., "Design and Development of the General Motors Infant Safety Carrier," SAE Paper No. 700042, 1970.
- Appoldt, F. A., "Dynamic Tests of Restraints for Children," <u>Proc. Eighth</u> <u>Stapp Car Crash Conference</u>, 1964.

LIST OF REFERENCES (Continued)

- Stalnaker, R. L., et al., "Door Crashworthiness Criteria," Final Report, NTIS Release No. PB-203-721, 1971.
 - 11. Stalnaker, R. L., McElhaney, J. H. and Roberts, V. L., "MSC Tolerance Curves for Human Head Impacts," ASME Paper No. 71-WA/BHF-10, 1971.

APPENDIX A

HSRI SUMMARY DATA SHEET

Test Number:	A-533
Test Date:	February 23, 1972
Restraint Description:	General Motors Infant Carrier
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the rear of the vehicle.

Test Observation:

The doll received a very gentle ride. The rebound caused the Carrier to rotate around the adult seat belt forming a protective shield over the doll. The Carrier cracked on each side where the belt crossed through the Carrier.

simulated





HSRI SUMMARY DATA SHEET

Test Number:	A-534
Test Date:	February 23, 1972
Restraint Description:	General Motors Infant Carrier
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the rear of the simulated vehicle.

Test Obšervation:

The doll received a very gentle ride. The rebound was as in Run A-533. The Carrier did not break because a simulated dash was put on the sled to limit the forward motion of the Carrier.



FIGURE A-2. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA



Severity Index 20 sec/div.
Test Number:	A-538
Test Date:	February 25, 1972
Restraint Description:	General Motors Infant Carrier
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	20 mph
Sled G-Level:	15
Impact Direction:	Back
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the rear of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The doll received a fairly gentle ride. There was a tendency for the doll to submarine under the adult seat belt.

A-7



FIGURE A-3. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA



Resultant Head Acceleration 10 g's/division Filtered Class 1000

Severity Index 50 g^{2.5} sec/div.

A-539
February 25, 1972
General Motors Infant Carrier
3-Year
20 mph
15
Back
Sitting, facing toward the rear of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

ł.

The doll received a fairly gentle ride. There was a tendency for the doll to submarine under the adult seat belt.



FIGURE A-4. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA



Severity Index 100 g^{2.5} sec/div.

Test Number:	A-543
Test Date:	February 28, 1972
Restraint Description:	General Motors Infant Carrier
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	20 mph
Sled G-Level:	15
Impâct Direction:	Side
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the rear of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The doll received a fairly gentle ride. No damage was observed to the doll or Carrier.



FIGURE A-5. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA



Infant Carrier was not instrumented with accelerometers, therefore no acceleration

Test Number:	A-544
Test Date:	February 29, 1972
Restraint Description:	General Motors Infant Carrier
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	20 mph
Sled G-Level:	15
Impact Direction:	Side
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the rear of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The doll received a fairly gentle ride. No damage was observed to the doll or Carrier.



FIGURE A-6. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA



Test Number:	A-518
Test Date:	February 18, 1972
Restraint Description:	Ford Tot Guard
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The motions experienced by the dummy were minimal. The seat cracked on the sides due to the loading of the face and chest shield. Head and chest G loadings were high.







L ?;

Test Number:	A-535
Test Date:	February 23, 1972
Restraint Description:	Ford Tot Guard
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

1

The motions experienced by the dummy were minimal. The padding on the face and chest shield was pushed off by the impact. Approximately 90° of whiplash was experienced by the dummy on rebound due to the removal of the head rest. The head and chest G loadings were high.



FIGURE A-8. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA





11

A-26

Test Number:	A-536
Test Date:	February 24, 1972
Restraint Description:	Ford Tot Guard
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	20 mph
Sled G-Level:	15
Impact Direction:	Back
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

Neither the G loadings nor the excursion of the dummy were severe. However the face and chest shield pivoted upward and slapped the dummy's face. i



FIGURE A-9. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA



SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS

E I

.





A-30

Test Number:	A-541
Test Date:	February 28, 1972
Restraint Description:	Ford Tot Guard
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	20 mph
Sled G-Level:	15
Impact Direction:	Side
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

્રિ

The dummy torso and head bent sideways over the low support structure at the side of the Tot Guard. Contact with the vehicle interior side structure is likely. The dummy's arm hit the side of his head giving a right-left acceleration spike.





Ľ

Ŧ



A-34

Test Number:	A-532
Test Date:	February 23, 1972
Restraint Description:	Sears Harness (Small)
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The dummy motion was minimal. No damage was observed to the restraint system. Head accelerations were high. The rebound due to the elastic energy, was observed to be very large.







A-38

Test Number:	A-537
Test Date:	February 24, 1972
Restraint Description:	Sears Harness (Small)
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	20 mph
Sled G-Level:	15
Impact Direction:	Back
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

Dummy's head struck a support used to reinforce the adult seat belt. Aside from this, no gross loadings of motions were observed.



FIGURE A-12. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA



l



A-42
Test Number:	A-540
Test Date:	February 28, 1972
Restraint Description:	Sears Harness (Small)

Dummy:	3-Year	
Sled Velocity:	20 mph	-
Sled G-Level:	15	
Impact Direction:	Side	
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulate vehicle.	ed

Test Observation:

1

The dummy received a very gentle ride. The excursion was such that the likelihood of contact with the car side structure is great. Head and chest accelerations were low.





L. I



A-46

Test Number:	A-521
Test Date:	February 21, 1972
Restraint Description:	Klippan Safety Seat
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

8.

The dummy motion was minimal. The fiberglass shell was fractured on each side where the adult seat belt crosses the child seat. The dummy appeared to submarine under the child harness and contacted the adult seat belt causing the back of the dummy to be jammed. Head and chest acceleration were low.





-



02-A

Test Number:	A-546
Test Date:	29 February 1972
Restraint Description:	Thayer Bobby-Mac
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

1

The motions experienced by the dummy were minimal. The seat failed where the adult lap belt is secured allowing the dummy to go into the adult belt very hard. Head accelerations were high.







- 14

 $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle$



 \mathcal{T}

A-54

Test Number:	A-522
Test Date:	February 21, 1972
Restraint Description:	Strolee Model 590
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The seat structure collapsed allowing the dummy to move forward and contact the simulated dash board. The seat bent and then held the dummy in a bent over position so that the harness buckle was buried in the abdomen, and could not be unbuckled. The head and chest G loads were high.



SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS





A

A-58

Test Number:	A-523
Test Date:	February 21, 1972
Restraint Description:	Trimble Model 875
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Semi-reclining, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

1

The seat structure collapsed allowing the dummy to move forward and contact the simulated dash board. The collapse of the seat back wedged the dummy forward out of the seat causing the lap and torso belt on the dummy to be pulled very tight. The head and chest accelerations were low.



FIGURE A-17. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA







Test Number:	A-525
Test Date:	February 22, 1972
Restraint Description:	Jamy Model 5500
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated

Test Observation:

The seat back bent forward allowing the dummy to move forward and contact the simulated dash board. The dummy's back was bent so much that the back links jammed. The base of the seat broke. The lap belt was pulled very tight around the dummy's mid-section. Head accelerations were high.

vehicle.



A-65 SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS



Class 1000

Acceleration 20 g's/division Filtered Class 1000



1

τ.

A-66

Test Number:	A-524
Test Date:	February 23, 1972
Restraint Description:	Kantwet Model 872
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Reclining, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The child seat rotated forward and down until the child seat bottomed on the car seat. The dummy moved forward far enough to contact the simulated dash board. The torso belt slipped down and off the dummy's chest allowing the dummy to bend over the adult lap belt. The adult belt loads were very high, as was the head acceleration.

NOTE: The tape record of this test was lost. The data used in evaluation and computation was obtained from the oscillograph record.



Test Number:	A-549
Test Date:	March 2, 1972
Restraint Description:	Seat Belt Only
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The motions experienced by the dummy were minimal. Head and chest G loadings were very high. The dummy's head hit the sled floor.



FIGURE A-20. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA

SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS

A-/ I



ł

٦

٠.



Test Number:	A-519
Test Date:	February 18, 1972
Restraint Description:	Peterson Model 63
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The seat structure collapsed allowing the dummy to move forward and contact the simulated dash board. The dummy then carried through the dash and struck the floor pan. The adult belt loads on the dummy were very high. Head and chest accelerations were very high.









A-76

81

Test Number:	A-520
Test Date:	February 18, 1972
Restraint Description:	Peterson Model 61
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The seat structure collapsed allowing the dummy to move forward and contact the simulated dash board. The dummy then carried through the dash and struck the floor pan. The adult belt loads on the dummy were very high. Head and chest acceleration were very high.






 \cdot



Test Number:	A-526
Test Date:	February 22, 1972
Restraint Description:	Jamy Model 5405
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The seat back collapsed allowing the dummy to move forward and contact the simulated dash board. The adult belt loads were very high. Head accelerations were very high.



FIGURE A-23. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA

SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS

New Z Maran	lest lype JAMY MODEL 5405
JUMMY 3 YEARS OLD	FRONT - 30 MPH
Sled Velocity42.94ft/sec	
Sled Pulse 5 g's/division Filtered	
Class 60	
Anterior-Posterior Head Acceleration 25.0 g's/division Filtered	
Class 1000	
Superior-Inferior Head Acceleration 25.0 g's/division Filtered Class 1000	
eft-Right lead Acceleration 25.0 g's/division iltered class 1000	
Resultant Head	
CU g's/division iltered lass 1000	
everity Index 00 g ^{2.5} sec/div.	

. .



Test Number:	A-527
Test Date:	February 22, 1972
Restraint Description:	Teddy Tot Model 6200
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The dummy motion was not great enough to contact the simulated dash board. The plastic seat back broke due to the loading of the upper torso restraint system. The adult belt loads were very high as well as the head acceleration. The head struck the front edge of the adult seat.



SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS

M-01



ł



•

A-88

HSRI SUMMARY DATA SHEET

Test Number:	A-529
Test Date:	February 22, 1972
Restraint Description:	Firestone Protecta Tot
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The body shield collapsed allowing the dummy to move forward enough to make contact with the simulated dash board. The adult belt loads were very high, as well as the head and chest acceleration.



FIGURE A-25. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA

A-91 SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS





Test Number:	A-530
Test Date:	February 22, 1972
Restraint Description:	Century Model 4845
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The seat structure collapsed allowing the dummy to move forward and contact the simulated dash board. The adult belt loads were very high as well as the head and chest acceleration. The head struck the base of the adult seat.



FIGURE A-26. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA

4

A-95 SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS

ľ

Test Number A-530	Test Type CENTURY 4845
Dummy 3 YEARS OLD Sled Velocity43.92ft/sec	FRONT - 30 MPH
Sled Pulse 5 g's/division Filtered Class 60	
Anterior-Posterior Head Acceleration 50 g's/division Filtered Class 1000	
Superior-Inferior Head Acceleration 50 g's/division Filtered Class 1000	
•Left-Right Head Acceleration 50 g's/division Filtered Class 1000	
Resultant Head Acceleration 50 g's/division Filtered Class 1000	
Severity Index 200 g ^{2.5} sec/div.	



. [

Test Number:	A-548
Test Date:	March 2, 1972
Restraint Description:	Teddy Tot Model 6600
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

 \mathcal{T}

The seat back collapsed allowing the dummy to move forward and contact the simulated dash board. The adult belt loads were very high, as were the head accelerations.



A-99 SUMMARY DATA HEAD ACCELERATIONS

i i

ł





48

Test Number:	A-531
Test Date:	February 23, 1972
Restraint Description:	Bunny Bear Model 61
Dummy:	3-Year
Sled Velocity:	30 mph
Sled G-Level:	21
Impact Direction:	Front
Dummy Attitude:	Sitting, facing toward the front of the simulated vehicle.

Test Observation:

The seat moved forward and then rotated over the front edge of the adult seat. The dummy was then allowed to contact the simulated dash board. Because of the angle at which the adult seat belt goes over the dummy's hips, the belt loads were very large. The head and chest loads were very large also.



FIGURE A-28. GRAPHCHEK SEQUENCE CAMERA





÷.M

1:

1

31