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Statistics on cranial and intra-cranial lesions observed on drivers of two-wheeled vehicles which have undergone accidents are quite numerous in the medical literature. Researches into the circumstances of the accidents in which such vehicles are involved have also developed for a number of years. On the other hand, studies specifying the lesions observed as a function of the circumstances of the accident are practically inexistant and the distribution of the impacts in the skull is understood only little.

These concepts however are indispensable to specify the conditions of effectiveness of helmets. Knowledge of the frequency of the various points of impact is not usable without knowing the seriousness of the lesions provoked.

We have therefore striven to compare the lesions observed in two homogenous series of lethal accidents where the circumstances of the accident were known.

One series considers all lethal accidents in a suburban zone, whether death has ensued immediately or as a result of secondary causes.

The other concerns users whose condition justified transfer to a neuro-surgical environment, where death followed for secondary reasons.
(1) - I R O - R. Poincare Hospital, 92 - Garches.
(2) - Pathological Anatomy Service, St Anne Hospital, Paris - 1 Paris - 14.
(3) - Physiology and Biomechanics Laboratory of Association Peugeot-Renault, 92 - La Garenne Colombes.

## OVERALL STUDY OF THE TWO SERIES OBSERVED

$1^{\circ}$ _ Breakdown by type_of vehic1e
The 35 users of two-wheeled vehicles studied had suffered a cranio-encephalic lesion either isolated or in conjunction with other injuries, in which case it appeared as the main cause of death. Their breakdown by type of two-wheeled vehicle used differs slightly from those of deaths in 1974 at national level.


The difference is significant for users of motorcycles. Since the lesions responsible for death are not known on national scale, one cannot assert whether the difference observed is caused by a higher frequency of deaths of cranial origin in drivers of motorcycles of whether it can be explained by the lack of representativity of our sample.
$\underline{2}^{\circ}-=$ Configuration of accidents involving_a second vehicle other than the two-wheeled vehicle

24 accidents fall into this category. We have attempted to specify whether the lesions observed were provoked by the vehicle (13 cases), falling onto the ground (9), or against a rigid fixed obstacle and then onto the ground (2) depending on the type of collision.

In this type of accident, the ground is responsible for cranial traumas in $46 \%$ of all cases, and this proportion increases to $100 \%$ when one considers side-swipe conditions. On the other hand, it falls to $23 \%$ if the collision is frontal for the two-wheeled vehicle and the proportion is only slightly
different when one considers frontal collisions for the vehicle impacting the two-wheeled vehicle (25\%).

|  | Two-wheeled | vehicle |
| ---: | :---: | :--- |
| Frontal | Lateral |  |
| Frontal | 7 | $/ 6$ |

Other vehicles

| Lateral | 4 | $/ 2$ | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rear side swipe/0 |  |  |  |

Table 1 - The number of head impacts against the adverse vehicle is shown in the lower right hand corner of each box.
$3^{0}-=$ Study of the obstacies struck
Alongside the 13 impacts against vehicles which we have considered, the ground is responsible for an equivalent number of lethal cranial traumas ( 12 cases), and more rarely a rigid and fixed obstacle (5 cases), secondary run-over after a fall (3 cas.), or a combination impact first against a fixed obstacle and then against the ground (2 cases).
$4^{\circ}-$-ニ_Anatomical_1ocations_of the traumas_in_terms of the type of obstacle struck It is often difficult to specify the point of impact in the cranial skeleton ; in addition, one should bear in mind the incomplete nature of this information if the direction of the force exerted on the skull is not known. For these reasons, it is sometimes hazardous to compare the series which qualify the point of impact as in front of, alongside or higher
than those which use a bone reference, since an impact of the rear and lateral part of the frontal bone may be classified as lateral whereas it may lie anatomically on the frontal section.

Having said this, one should stress the frequency of temporal impacts $(40 \%$ for the pure temporal impacts, $60 \%$ should one add frontal-temporal impacts concerning the temporal facette of the frontal bone and temporal-occipital impacts) and of those concerning the face and or forehead (31.5\%), the parietal impacts are exceptional (8.5\%).

## TABLE II

|  | $\text { Vehicle/Ground/ Fixed } \text { Obstacle }_{\text {Frushing/Combined }}^{\text {Impact }} / \mathrm{Tt1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frontal | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 4 |
| Fronto-facial | 3 |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |
| Facial | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Frontal and temporal |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Frontotemporal | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 |
| Temporal | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| Temporaloccipital | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 3 |
| Parietal posterior |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| TOTAL (Tt1) | 13 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 35 |

$5^{0}$ - = Anatomical_1ocation_of the trauma_in terms_of the_con= figration of the accident

Cranial lesions are "lateralized" in all cases of collision between the front of a private car and the side of a twowheeled vehicle.

By contrast, facial and frontal lesions are more frequent (7/10) when the two-wheeled vehicle collides against the
adverse vehicle with its front wheel and the head strikes this vehicle.

The lesions provoked by the ground are more unevenly distributed, with a slight predominance of temporal and temporooccipital impacts (7/12).

## COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE TWO SERIES OF ACCIDENTS OBSERVED

Despite the restricted number of accidents studied in these two series, they differ significantly in several respects. In the series of immediate deaths, in 6 cases out of 8 , the trauma resulted in fracture either directly at the point of impact without any extension in distance (2 cases) or with an extension ( 2 cases), or again an indirect fracture at a distance from the point of application of the forces (2 cases of circular fractures of the base of the skull).

Meningo-encephalic lesions varied in victims killed immediate1y. Hematoma never gathered, but rather a diffused bleeding of the soft meningus accompanied by often considerable cerebral lesions (one fracture of the cerebral pedonculae, one fracture of the callous body). The impacts were either frontal or facial 6 times out of 8 .

In the series of neuro-surgical origin (death ensuing laler), a fracture occurred 21 times out of 25,11 situated at the point of application of the forces and 10 extending to some distance from this point. No indirect fracture occurred in this series. The relatively high frequency of extra and subdural hematoma (7/25) can easily be explained by the neurosurgical origin of this series.

The impact zones were lateral in 19 cases and fronto-facial in the remaining 6.

It would therefore appear that the lesions observed in the victims originating in a geographically limited zone are characterized by the high frequency of injuries which are immediately lethal with frontal impacts, while on the contrary
the injured persons treated in a neuro-surgical service have more frequently suffered lateral impacts (temporal, frontotemporal, temperal-occipital). These distributions of the impact zone both differ from what is observed in drivers of two-wheeled vehicles who do not die as a result of their accident ; in these cases, facial impacts occur most often. The proportion of vehicles of over 125 cc . also differs in the two series : 6/10 in the Garches series and $3 / 25$ in that of the St Anne Neuro-surgical centre.

It should also be remarked that the victims killed immediately had struck a vehicle or fixed obstacle head-on 5 times out of 8 , whereas the proportion is 14 out of 27 for subsequent deaths.

A helmet was worn 5 times out of 8 by victims killed immediately and twice the helmet had been lost before the cranial impact responsible for death, while another time it was lost after the main impact. It should be noted that in the three cases where the helmet was not capable of ensuring survival, the impact occurred at the level of the chin-piece of an integral helmet in the case of circular fracture of the base of the skull and in another case the quality of the helmet could well be called into question (breakage of straps, which had been weakened by aging), while the third helmeted victim was killed at a very high speed by impact against a vertical obstacle.

In cases of secondary death, the helmet was worn only 5 times out of 27 , and was lost only once.

## CONCLUSION

One can schematically confront the motor cyclist whose forehead strikes the adverse vehicle or the fixed obstacle with death often occurring immediately, with the moped rider, when struck laterally, who almost invariably suffers temporal impact with death usually being delayed.

We consider the most important facts to be the variable frequency of impacts between the head and an adverse vehicle, depending on the configuration of the accident, the mean being $37 \%$ for the whole studied sample, and the high rate of temporal impacts which justify the development of helmets providing an effective protection for this zone.

## TABLE LEGEND

| CL | - | cycle |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MP | - | moped |  |
| mc | - | motorcycle | 125 cc |
| MC | - | motorcycle | $>125 \mathrm{cc}$ |
| F | - | fracture |  |
| H | - | Hematoma |  |
| 0 | - | Oedema |  |
| C | - | complex les | ions |



| 17 | mc | :Rigid fixe | : obstacle | :fixed obst: <br> : | no |  | 19 | :fronto- <br> :facial | : | $+:$ | 0 |  |  | :Lower limbs : |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | CL | : Pte car | :Head-on (car)-side | : ground | no | : | 1 | :temporal | : | + : | + | + | + | : |
|  |  | : |  |  |  | : |  | : | : | : |  | : |  | : |
| 17 | MP | : Pte car | : Side (car) head-on | : vehicle | no | : | 5 | : fronto- | : | + | + | + | + |  |
|  |  | : | : | : |  | : |  | :temporal | : | : |  | : |  | : |
| 17 | MP | : Pte car | : Side (car) head-on | : ground | no | : | 12 | : temporal | : | + : | + | : + | 0 | : |
|  |  | : | - | : |  | : |  | : | : | : |  | : |  | : |
| 13 | CE | : Pte car | :Head-on (car)-side | : vehicle | no | : | 3 | :temporo- | : | + : | 0 | + | 0 | :Chest |
|  |  | : | : | : | : | : |  | :occipital | : | : |  | : : |  | : |
| 26 | MC | : Pte car | :Side-swipe | ;guard-rail: | : yes | : | 60 | :frontal and | : | + : | 0 | 0 : | + | :Lower limbs |
|  |  | : | : | : + ground : |  | : |  | : temporal | : | : |  | : |  | : |
| 26 | mc | : Pte car | : Head-on (2wheel)rear | : vehicle | no | : | 1 | : temporal | : | + : | 0 | + | 0 | : |
|  |  | : | : | : |  | : |  | : | : | : |  | : $\quad$ |  | : |
| 29 | MP | : Pte car | :Head-on | : vehicle | no | : | 2 | : fronto- | : | + : | 0 | 0 | + | : |
|  |  | : | : | : |  | : |  | : facial | : | : |  | : |  | : |
|  |  | = | = | $=$ |  | = |  | = |  | = |  | = |  | = |
| 43 | MC | : Pte car | :Side-swipe | : ground : | :yes + | : | $\leqslant 1 \mathrm{~h}$ | : parietal | : | 0 : | 0 | 0 : | + | :Chest + lux |
|  |  | : | : | : | loss | : |  | :posterior | : | : |  | : |  | : D1 D2 |
| 17 | MP | : Pte car | : Head-on | vehicle | no |  | く1 h | :fronto- | : | + : | 0 | 0 : | + | : Chest + Abdo |
|  |  | : | - | - |  | : |  | :facial | : | : |  | : |  | :lower limbs |
| 17 | MC | : Pte car | : Head-on | : vehicle | yes |  | $<1 \mathrm{~h}$ | facial | : | + : | 0 | 0 : | + | :Chest |
|  |  | : | : | : |  | : |  | - | : | : |  | : |  | : |
| 23 | MC | : Pte car | : Head-on | : ground : | yes + | : | <1 h | : parietal | : | + : | 0 | 0 | + | :Chest + lower |
|  |  | - | : | : | loss | : |  | : posterior | : | : |  | : |  | : 1 imbs |
| 20 | MC | : : Rigid fix | xed obstacle | : Fixed obst: | yes | : | 13 | : frontal | : | + : | 0 | + | + | : |
|  |  | : | : | - |  | : |  | : | : | : |  | : |  | : |
| 21 | MC | : Rigid fix | ed obstacle | :Fixed obst: | : yes | : < | $<1 \mathrm{~h}$ | : fronto- | : | + : | 0 | 0 : | + | : |
|  |  | : | : | : |  | . |  | :facial | : | - |  | : |  | : |
| 23 | MC | : Run over | by Private car | :Run over : | yes + | : < | $<1 \mathrm{~h}$ | : temporal | : | 0 : | 0 | 0 : | + | :Chest + Abdo |
|  |  | : | : | : | loss | : |  | : | : | : |  | : |  | : lower limbs |
| 53 | MP | : Rigid fix | ed obstacle | :Fixed obst: | no |  | $<1 \mathrm{~h}$ | : fronto- | : | + | 0 | 0 | + | :Chest and |
|  |  | : | : | : |  | - |  | :facial | : |  |  | : |  | : abdomen |
| 15 | MP | : Pte car | :Side(car) head-on | : vehicle | no | 2 | 27 | : frontal | : | + : | 0 | + : | 0 | : Chest+Limbs |
|  |  | : |  | : |  | : |  |  | : | : |  | : |  | - |
| 63 | MP | : truck | :Side-swipe | : ground : | no |  | <1 h | : temporal | : | + : | 0 | 0 : | + | :Chest + abdo |
|  |  | : |  | : kerbstone |  | : |  |  | : | : |  | : |  |  |

