5<sup>th</sup> Annual RCCADS Workshop

## Al-Guided Integrative Vehicle Safety through Pre-crash and Crash Simulations

### **Jingwen Hu, PhD** Associate Director & Research Professor

### Wenbo Sun, PhD Assistant Research Scientist

May 21, 2025 | East Liberty, OH



# Background



# **Motivation – Why Integrated Safety?**

- **Problem #1:** About 90% of crashes involve human error, yet most crash tests and models ignore pre-crash behavior.
- **Problem #2:** Current pre-crash safety algorithms focus on crash avoidance, but do not consider potential injury outcomes if a crash is inevitable.

 Research Gap: Traditional approaches treat pre-crash and crash as separate silos

• **Research Need:** Holistic decision making considering both pre-crash and crash conditions and outcomes simultaneously.





## **Pre-Crash Simulation Examples**







## **Parametric Human Body Models**







## **Active Human Body Model**









#### Occupant Factors

# What Affects Crash Outcomes?

#### Vehicle Factors

### **Occupant Characteristics**

Sex, BMI, body shape, bone strength, ...

### **Restraint Parameters**

Pre-tensioning, load limit, inflation pressure...

#### Posture

Torso recline & flexion, LX position, rotation, ...

Seat Position Fore-aft/vertical/cushion angle

> Belt Fit Shoulder & lap



**Pre-Crash Maneuver** AEB, FCW, lane change, ...

### **Restraint Geometry**

Belt anchorage & knee bolster locations, airbag size & shape...

### **Vehicle Interior Geometry**

Steering wheel & dash locations, pillars, header, ...

#### **Crash Pulse** Direction, magnitude, phases

Crash Factors

# **Early Work: Field Capability**



**Computational Modeling** 





**Integration of Active and Passive Safety** 





**Naturalistic Driving Data Analysis** 



Head location	Injury Risk Reduction	
	ATD Model	Human Model
Head forward	43%	58%
Head neutral	14%	47%
Head rearward	13%	44%
Weighted average	17%	48%

### Hu et al. 2015 Stapp



### **Pre-Crash Posture and Occupant Size Effects**



Head to IP contact

LX concerns Boyle et al. 2020 TIP

# **Design Optimizations Addressing Different Needs**

$$a^{*} = \underset{a \in \mathcal{A}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \mathbb{E}_{s} \left[ f\left(s, a(s)\right) \right]$$
$$= \underset{a \in \mathcal{A}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \int_{s \in \mathcal{S}} f\left(s, a(s)\right) p\left(s\right) ds,$$



d = a(s) Design policy

*s*: Occupant and crash covariates *p* (*s*): Occupant weighting function





Sun et al. 2023 Frontiers

# **Gaussian Process (GP) Model & Inducing Points**

*Inducing points:* representative subjects that accounts for population variation



**Gaussian Process Surrogate Model** 





Sun et al. 2024 AAAM

# **Adaptive Design Optimization Results**



The adaptive designs are associated with lower means and standard deviations of injury risks compared to the baseline design.



Sun et al. 2024 AAAM

## **Pedestrian Pre-Crash Simulation Example #1**

Test Setting: Walking Pedestrian

**AEB Setting:** TTC threshold: 1000 ms; AEB braking g-force: 0.5; Pedestrian Speed: 5km/h.

Vehicle stats: SUV, initial speed: 50 km/h; hitting speed: 39.97 km/h.

Subject info: Female, 1.65m, Age 30, BMI 22.

Injury Risks [head, chest, femur, tibia] (%): [11.01, 38.50, 79.77, 27.45]

**Pjoint:** 91.97%



Frame: 163 collision: 1245 current\_simulat\_time: 164 e\_veloc: 49.999768 TTC: 1180.0 TTC\_threshold: 1000.0 pedestrian\_velocity: 5.0 delay\_count: 0 / 0 delay\_threshold TTC less than 200: False SAW\_WALKER\_cam1: 0 SAW\_WALKER\_cam4: 0 GLOBAL\_BRAKE: 0 apply\_brake: 0



## **Pedestrian Pre-Crash Simulation Example #2**

Test Setting: Walking Pedestrian

**AEB Setting:** TTC threshold: 1000 ms; AEB braking g-force: 0.3; Pedestrian Speed: 5km/h.

Vehicle stats: SUV, initial speed: 40 km/h; hitting speed: 26.17 km/h.

Subject info: Female, 1.65m, Age 30, BMI 22.

Injury Risks [head, chest, femur, tibia] (%): [0.01, 17.54, 1.05, 11.96]

**Pjoint:** 27.78%



Frame: 124 collision: -999 current\_simulat\_time: 1.25000000000000 e\_veloc: 4.110509 TTC: 18699.97 TTC\_threshold: 1000.0 pedestrian\_velocity: 5.0 delay\_count: 0 / 0 delay\_threshold TTC less than 200: False SAW\_WALKER\_cam1: 0.0 SAW\_WALKER\_cam4: 0 GLOBAL\_BRAKE: False apply\_brake: False



## Integrative Pedestrian Safety Device Triggering Algorithm



Trigger the airbag for minor crashes

Fail to trigger the airbag for severe crashes

0.8

0.6

0.4

0.2

0.8

0.6

0.4

0.2

### **TeraSim Architecture**



<sup>(</sup>AV collisions/mile, etc.)

#### TeraSim is a traffic environment simulator that provides:

- NDE: Interactive naturalistic traffic environment learned from real world
- Adversities: Diverse stochastic challenging events
- NADE: Adversity orchestrator to intelligently challenge the AV
- Integration: API for seamless integration with existing simulators



# Challenges

- Improve realism of AI-generated behavior
- Validation against real crash data
- Consider sensing accuracy and robustness

Ultimately, integrated safety is not about a single simulation or a single algorithm, It's about creating a continuous feedback loop that connects how we avoid crashes, how we survive them, and how we learn from every outcome. By combining AI, computational models, and design optimizations, we pave the way for smarter and more adaptive safety designs.



# Acknowledgements



Contact: Jingwen Hu, PhD, jwhu@umich.edu