



Title	Investigation of the force associated with the formation of lacerations and skull fractures
Authors(s)	Sharkey, E. J., Cassidy, Marie, Brady, J., et al.
Publication date	2011-08-06
Publication information	Sharkey, E. J., Marie Cassidy, J. Brady, and et al. "Investigation of the Force Associated with the Formation of Lacerations and Skull Fractures." Springer-Verlag, August 6, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00414-011-0608-z .
Publisher	Springer-Verlag
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/4828
Publisher's statement	The final publication is available at www.springerlink.com
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1007/s00414-011-0608-z

Downloaded 2026-05-02 00:29:53

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

**Investigation of the Force Associated with the Formation of Lacerations
and skull fractures**

E. J. Sharkey^{1,2}, M. Cassidy^{2,3}, J. Brady⁴, M. D. Gilchrist^{4,5} and N. Nic Daeid¹

¹Centre for Forensic Science, WestCHEM, Department of Pure and Applied Chemistry,
University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

²State Pathologist's Office, Marino, Dublin 1, Ireland

³Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, **123 St Stephens Green, Dublin 2, Ireland**

⁴School of Mechanical & Materials Engineering, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin
4, Ireland

School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 6N5

ABSTRACT

Post mortem examination is often relied upon in order to determine whether a suspicious death was natural, accidental, suicidal or homicidal. However, in many cases the mechanism by which a single injury has been inflicted cannot be determined with certainty based on pathological examination alone. Furthermore the current method of assessing applied force relating to injury is restricted to an arbitrary and subjective scale (mild, moderate, considerable, or severe). This study investigates the pathophysiological nature of head injuries caused by blunt force trauma, specifically in relation to the incidence and formation of a laceration. An experimental model was devised to assess the force required to cause damage to the scalp and underlying skull of porcine specimens following a single fronto-parietal impact. This was achieved using a drop tower equipped with adapted instrumentation for data acquisition. The applied force and implement used could be correlated with resultant injuries and as such aid pathological investigation in the differentiation between falls and blows. Experimentation revealed prevalent patterns of injury specific to the reconstructed mechanism involved. It was found that the minimum force for the occurrence of a laceration was 4000 N.

INTRODUCTION

Damage to skin

A wound has been defined as any ‘damage to any part of the body due to the application of mechanical force’ [1]. Excessive mechanical forces on bodily tissues can, in some cases, cause lacerations to the affected area and the pattern of laceration to be determined by the structural and biomechanical properties of the skin [2]. The organised structure of skin serves as the primary protective barrier from the external environment, including mechanical trauma such as friction, impact, pressure, cutting and shearing [3,4]. This protection is achieved through the skin’s non-homogenous, non-linear, anisotropic viscoelastic properties [5]. Skin can be divided into two main structured layers; the outer epidermis and the underlying dermis. Skin thickness normally ranges from 4 mm to 0.5 mm, and thus has varying mechanical properties with varying location [6]. The mechanical resistance of skin is mainly concentrated in the dermis in the form of a matrix of collagen and elastin fibres [5,38]. Collagen and elastin fibre arrangement in the papillary dermis is fine and vertically orientated while the reticular dermis beneath shows a thicker, coarser network with a longitudinal arrangement. This causes creased tension lines known as ‘Langer lines’, first described and plotted by Karl Langer [7], and are a key intrinsic factor required for consideration during the forensic interpretation of lacerations [8,9].

Skin is in a state of unequal biaxial tension over the body, varying with respect to movement of joints and volume of mass under the skin [10,11,39]. When skin is relaxed, the collagen and elastin fibres are unordered. When a load is applied to skin, it responds by dissipating the energy via its viscous component. The skin’s load response is further explained by Young’s modulus, or the stress-strain curve [3,10]. Applied strain initially causes the elastin fibres to carry the load and collagen fibres remain unordered. As the strain increases, collagen gradually aligns in the direction of the load, where at the highest level of strain the collagen carries almost all the load until it finally fails. Collagen fibres aligned in the direction of an applied force have been shown to fail at a strain of 5-6 % and strengths in the range of 147-343 MPa, varying with location on the body [6,11,12,13].

The testing of skin can estimate values such as ultimate tensile strength, elasticity and density, while animal models provide information of the skin’s response to external forces of stretch, shear, torsion, compression and indentation [3,10,39]. The kinetic energy absorbed by

the surface on impact causes the skin to deform. If the surface is curved or irregular, this deformation may increase the area of contact, spreading the force per unit area (stress) and decreasing the severity of the resultant injury [15]. If there is an oblique impact where the angle of contact is between 0° and 90°, only a fraction of the kinetic energy is transferred, hence damage will be less than in a normal (i.e., perfectly perpendicular) impact. Mechanical forces that can be exerted include compression, tension, and shear and combinations of such forces. In order to quantify the biomechanics of head injury, the laws of fundamental mechanics and physics need to be evaluated, in addition to the stress and strain limits of the bones and tissues on which they are acting.

Skull Fractures

Fractures to the skull occur when a force has been applied in such a way to exceed the strength or the maximum threshold of elasticity of the calvaria. The resulting fracture is determined by the degree of force, the object mass, shape and speed of collision, local anatomy as well as the physiological status of the bone itself, including skull thickness and impact area. This has been summarised in various publications as indicated in table 1.

Insert table 1

Experiments conducted on animal models provide physiological injury data, although scaling laws are necessary to allow translation onto human specimens and are currently imprecise [15]. Not all skull fractures sustained are fatal, and not all head injuries have accompanying fractures. Skull fractures are, however, a useful aid in the interpretation of the point of impact and the nature of the force and object involved. Linear or curvilinear fractures indicate contact of the head by a relatively broad object, often seen in falls or striking with a flat object. More focused impacts, such as those from a hammer, tend to push a small area of bone downward and into brain tissue (a depressed skull fracture). These fractures are comminuted if there are many widely displaced pieces of fractured bone [21].

Falls and blows

A fall involves the head coming into contact with an immovable object such as the ground, and so is similar, in biomechanical terms, to receiving a blow to the head. Similarly, a fall can involve varied forms of associated impact force, be it a fall from one's own height, an accelerated fall from a punch or shove, or a fall from a height. **Assessment of resulting**

injuries from an assault can be quite complex, as the victim can often receive multiple blows from a range of objects or from physical actions such as kicking, punching and stamping. A fall can also occur at any stage in the sequence [21]. Resulting patterns of injury depend on the location and force applied. Previous research into the investigation of applied force is highlighted in table 2.

Insert table 2

It has been suggested that blunt force injury requires greater energy to form a laceration than sharp force injury [26]. The Hat Brim Line Rule (HBL) has been suggested as a means to differentiate between falls and blows, where Ehrlich *et al* [27] and Kremer *et al* [28] reported that lacerations of greater than 6cm were indicative of blows from an object. However, a systematic evaluation of this approach [29] concluded that the use and value of the HBL rule could not be confirmed. Similarly, Kremer *et al.* noted the need for an improved and adaptable criterion through the analysis of both the location and frequency of lacerations in order to associate a force to the resulting pattern [30].

In this study we investigate certain mechanisms of blunt force trauma on the basis of the prevalent pattern of injury highlighted through a comprehensive review of autopsied cases coupled with associated literature. The objective was to reconstruct certain mechanisms of single impact injury and measure the associated force to aid pathological differentiation between falls and blows.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Review of Blunt Force Trauma cases.

A retrospective study was conducted involving 377 cases of head injury where an autopsy was undertaken by the Irish State Pathologist's Office from January 2000 to December 2009. Of these, 287 cases included blunt force trauma and were further sub categorised and correlated according to the nature of the injuries encountered. Cases where information was limited, or those involving motor vehicle accidents and gunshot wounds were excluded.

Generation of Blunt Force Injury using Porcine Models

To associate the mechanics of impact with the pathophysiological changes of the scalp, simulations of single impacts were designed to mimic a fall to the ground, stamping, and blows from **two different** blunt objects, a hammer and a wooden broom handle.

Morphological and functional data suggests that the skin of the domestic pig is most akin to human skin [31,32]. Meyer *et al.* in 1978 noted the possibility of using porcine skin as an experimental model for research into human skin [33], a suggestion supported by the comparable ratio of dermis to epidermis and epidermal turnover in porcine versus human skin. As such 5 month old, male and female Landrace pig heads were chosen as suitable models in this work.

A test rig was designed in order to facilitate a perpendicular fronto-parietal impact of the pig head by each implement of interest (hammer, broom handle, training shoe and a piece of wooden flooring). The hammer and broom handle were used to mimic trauma due to a deliberate blow, the training shoe was used to mimic trauma due to a stamping action and the wooden flooring was used to mimic trauma due to a fall.

Each implement was dropped from a fixed height (2.8 meters) using a constructed mechanical rig. The weight attached to each implement was modified by increasing the range of applied force. An accelerometer was attached to the drop carriage and provided an output of the maximum voltage on impact. The voltage was converted to acceleration and combined with measurements of the total weight and drop height to generate data on the acceleration versus time, velocity versus time, displacement versus time, force versus displacement and average force of impact using MATLAB® (Version 7.4.0.287 R2007a). The specific equations used for the calculations are presented in the appendix.

18 impact experiments were conducted (each on a different porcine head) for each implement with varying weight in order to generate a range of forces per injury mechanism. Porcine specimens were impacted within 2 to 24 hours of slaughter.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION:

Review of Blunt Force Trauma Cases.

287 autopsied cases of cranial blunt force trauma were reviewed. These were classified into two distinct groups; those where the cause of the head injury was known or could be established with some certainty (n=189) and those where the cause was unknown (n=97).

The known group was sub-divided into categories of similar **trauma** mechanisms. These were falls (from a height, down stairs, or accelerated), blows (blunt objects, stamping, kicking, punching, or axe) and multiple mechanisms, where more than one mechanism was suspected. This approach also facilitated the investigation of the injury pattern associated with each mechanism; results are presented in table 3 and figure 1 (a and b).

Insert table 3

Insert figures 1 a-b

A laceration was present in 44% of cases relating to simple falls, 71% of which were cranial. In cases involving blows from blunt objects a laceration was present in 93% of cases, 89% of which were cranial. Fractures were present in 68% of cases involving simple falls and 75% of cases involving blows from blunt objects. In both mechanisms over 90% of the fractures were cranial.

The pattern of injury obtained from examination of cases where the mechanism was known, was applied to the remaining unknown cases, with the aim of identifying the mechanism of injury. However it became apparent that these unknown cases were difficult to discriminate on the basis of injury pattern alone. The use of a database alone was insufficient to determine the mechanism associated with a single impact injury, specifically in the differentiation between falls and blows.

Generation of Blunt Force Injury using Porcine Models

The blunt force trauma **simulations were inflicted on the porcine specimens** using a specially designed test rig constructed to deliver a blow of measureable force using the various implements of interest. Under theoretical conditions as outlined in the Appendix, a mass of approximately 3.5 kg dropped from a height of 2.8 m will have an impact velocity of 7.4 m/s and a kinetic energy of 96 Joules. If this energy is fully absorbed so that the impacting implement penetrates to a depth of 0.03 m (3 cm), the deceleration during penetration is approximately 900 m/s^2 (= 93g) and the work-energy principle allows us to infer that the impacting force is 3200 N.

The weight used was altered in order to vary the range of force applied, for each implement and the forces generated are presented in tables 4 and 5 and figure 2.

Insert table 4

Insert table 5a, b, c and d

Insert figure 2

Lacerations

Both the hammer and the broom handle caused the greatest incidence of lacerations within the test set. The greater amount of pressure per impact was observed with the focal impact of the hammer compared to all other implements. The pattern of injury observed with impacts from both the hammer and wooden handle were indicative of the implement involved and produced crescent and linear shaped lacerations, respectively. Only one laceration was observed from stamping by the training shoe **at a force of 5259 N**. The average stamping force has been recorded by Farrugia *et al* as 3500 N [34, 35]. The results also suggest that only falls where forces greater than 4300 N are experienced resulted in lacerations, though this did not occur in all cases. Observed laceration patterns are presented in figure 3.

Insert figure 3

Overall the results **indicate** that the minimum force associated with the formation of a laceration **is at least** 4000 N. This correlates with the findings of Whittle *et al.*, where the force required to tear human skin was found to range between 2-10 kN [36].

Fractures

The test sets demonstrate a steady increase in the incidence of suture separation with increasing force for the hammer, wooden handle and piece of wooden flooring. Slight skull depression was the second most common skull damage observed between test sets, which would be expected in cases involving more focal impacts over the suture cross section of the fronto-parietal region. The incidence of suture separation occurred slightly less frequently with impacts of the wooden handle, though still increased with increasing force. The hammer, wooden handle and wooden flooring test sets displayed only one linear fracture each. However, it should be noted that in these cases the skull may have be congenitally or previously weakened prior to experimentation. Impact with the training shoe produced the most suture separations, even at low impact forces.

Combined Injury Pattern

23% of cases involving simple falls and 70% of cases involving blows from blunt objects presented both laceration and fracture. This suggests that the presence of both injuries increases confidence in differentiating between the mechanism of the injury (fall or blow). This is strongly supported by the experimental findings, where the occurrence of a laceration was more frequently observed in cases where the injury was focused (hammer and wooden handle) and the shape of the laceration indicated the implement used (crescent shaped lacerations and linear lacerations were indicators of impacts involving the hammer and wooden handle respectively). The sole pattern was also observed on the skin in impacts from the training shoe. Suture separation was the most commonly observed skull damage in all four test sets, particularly with the training shoe and so was not a suitable differential aid. Table 6 illustrates these results.

Insert table 6

CONCLUSIONS

The occurrence of scalp lacerations and skull fractures are influenced by a range of exogenous and endogenous influences, and as such the majority of cranial blunt force trauma cases require individual assessment. These parameters include the shape of the bony support, the local thickness of the overlying soft tissues, the impact geometry of the causative implement (striking surface, edge, angle), the velocity of impact etc. Notwithstanding this, the pattern of injury associated with the impact experiments, indicate that the occurrence of lacerations and fractures caused by blunt objects are variable and somewhat unpredictable.

Some trends in the data were evident. While there was no distinct correlation between the occurrences of a laceration and increasing force, presumably due to factors associated with the viscoelastic properties of skin, the more focal objects (hammer and wooden handle) produced a greater number of lacerations and where these were produced they provided an indication of the object used. Both the database and experimental findings show that the scalp reacts better to a dispersed force than a localised one, correlating with the anatomical purpose of the scalp to dampen the effect of force via its inherent mechanical properties. Underlying

skull damage appears to be more directly linked to the magnitude of the force on impact where all impacts, apart from those involving the training shoe, required a force exceeding 4000N for damage to occur. The training shoe, which was delivered in all cases with a force at least equivalent to an average stamping action, produced skull fractures most consistently across the four objects studied. Discrimination between the mechanism of blunt force trauma increased when the occurrence of both a laceration and underlying skull damage was considered. The damage resulting from simulations involving focal impact surfaces (hammer and wooden handle) could be differentiated from those of greater impact surface area (the wooden floor and the training shoe), thus aiding the differentiation between falls and blows.

It should be noted that the review findings are biased towards autopsied cases, and so for a more complete representation of the pattern of head injury associated with specific mechanisms, one might also consider the addition of hospital admittance records. The fact remains that each suspicious death should be investigated individually, combining all possible contributing factors, be it intelligence gathered from scene examinations, additional injuries, or simulated experimentation.

REFERENCES

1. C.Z. Cory, M.D. Jones, D.S. James, S. Leadbeatter, and L.D.M. Nokes. The potential and limitations of utilising head impact injury models to assess the likelihood of significant head injury in infants after a fall. *Forensic Science International*, **123**, (2001), 89-106.
2. R.H. Lee, W.B. Gamble, M.H. Mayer, and P.N. Manson. Patterns of Facial Lacerations from Blunt Trauma. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.*, **99**, (1997), 1544-1554.
3. C. Edwards and R. Marks. Evaluation of Biomechanical Properties of Human Skin. Elsevier Science Inc. *Clinics in Dermatology*, **13**, (1995), 375-380.
4. M.G. Dunn and F. H. Silver. Viscoelastic Behaviour of Human Connective Tissues: Relative Contribution of Viscous and Elastic Components. *Connect. Tiss. Res.*, **12**, (1983), 59-70.
5. T. Cook. The Mechanical Characterization of Human Skin in Vivo. Ph. D. Dissertation. Stevens Institute of Technology, 1975.
6. J. E. Sanders, B.S. Goldstein, and D. F. Leotta. Skin Response to Mechanical Stress: Adaptation rather than breakdown – A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Rehabilitation, Research and Development*, **32**, No. 3, (1995), 214-226.

7. K. Langer. On the Anatomy and Physiology of the Skin. *British Journal of Plastic Surgery*, **17**, No. 31, (1978), 93-106.
8. K. Langer. On the Anatomy and Physiology of the Skin I. Cleavability of the cutis. *British Journal of Plastic Surgery*, **31**, (1978), 3-8.
9. K. Langer. On the Anatomy and Physiology of the Skin: 2- Skin tension. *British Journal Of Plastic Surgery*, **31**, (1978) 93-106.
10. A.J. Bailey, C. M. Peach, L. N. Fowler. E.A. Balazs ed. *The Chemists Molecular Biology of Intercellular Matrix*. New York Academic Press, **1**, (1970), 385-404.
11. H. Alexander and T. H. Cook. Accounting for Natural Tension in the Mechanical Testing of Human Skin. *Journal of Investigative Dermatology*, **63**, (1977), 310-314.
12. G. Wilkes, I. Brown and R. Wildnauer. *The Biomechanical Properties of Skin*. *CRC Crit. Rev. Bioeng.*, (1973), 453-495.
13. F. H. Silver, J.W. Freeman, and D. DeVore. Viscoelastic Properties of Human Skin and Processed Dermis. *Skin. Res. Tech.*, **7**, (2001), 18-23.
14. C.Z. Cory, M.D. Jones, D.S. James, S. Leadbeatter, and L.D.M. Nokes. The potential and limitations of utilising head impact injury models to assess the likelihood of sP. Saukko and B. Knight. *Knight's Forensic Pathology*. Third Edition. 2004, Arnold Publishers.
15. N. Yoganadan and F.A. Pintar. Review: Biomechanics of Temporo-Parietal Skull Fracture. *Clinical Biomechanics*, **19**, (2004), 225–239.
16. O. Messerer. *Uber Elasticitat und Festigkeit der Menschlichen Knochen*. (1880), Stuttgart, Germany.
17. A. Nahum, J.D. Gatts, C.W. Gadd, and J.Danforth. Impact tolerance of the skull and face. In: *Proceedings of the 12th Stapp Car Crash Conference*, Detroit, MI, (1968), 302.
18. D. Schneider and A Nahum. Impact studies of facial bones and skull. In: *Proceedings of the 16th Stapp Car Crash Conference*, Detroit, MI, (1972), 186–203.
19. R. Stalnaker, J Melvin, G Nuscholtz, N. Alem, J. Benson. Head impact response. In: *Proceedings of the 21st Stapp Car Crash Conference*, New Orleans, LA, (1977), 305–335.
20. N. Yoganandan, F.A. Pintar, Jr. A. Sances, P.R. Walsh, C.L. Ewing, D.J. Thomas, and R.G. Snyder. Biomechanics of Skull Fractures. *J. Neurotrauma* **12**, (1995), 659–668.
21. D. Dolinak, E. Matshes, and E. Lew. *Forensic Pathology, Principles and Practice*. Elsevier Academic Press, 2005.
22. D.L. Allsop, T.R. Perl, and C.Y. Warner. Force/deflection and fracture characteristics of the temporo-parietal region of the human head. In: *Proc. 35th Stapp Car Crash Conf.*, (1991) 269–278.
23. V. Henn, E. Lignitz. Kicking and Trampling to Death. *Forensic Pathology Reviews*, **1**, (2004), 31-50.

24. E. Böhm and B.U. Schmidt. Kriminelle und kinetische Energie bei Tötungshandlungen durch stumpfe Gewalt. *Beitr Gerichtl Med*, **45**, (1987), 331-338.
25. K.J Farrugia, N. NicDaeid, K. A. Savage, and H. Bandey. Chemical enhancement of footwear impressions in blood deposited on fabric — Evaluating the use of alginate casting materials followed by chemical enhancement, *Science and Justice*, 2010, 50, 4, 200-204.
26. O.A. Shergold and N.A. Fleck. Mechanisms of Deep Penetration of Soft Solids, with Application to the Injection and Wounding of skin. *Proc Roy Soc A Math Phys Eng Sci*, **460**, (2004), 3037-3058.
27. E. Ehrlich and H. Maxeiner. External Injury marks (wound) on the Head in Different types of Blunt Trauma in an Autopsy Series. *Med Law*, **21**, (2002), 4, 773-82.
28. C. Kremer, S. Racette, C.A. Dionne, and A. Sauvageau. Discrimination of Falls and Blows in Blunt Head Trauma: Systematic Study of the Hat Brim Line Rule in Relation to Skull Fractures. *J Forensic Sci*, **53**, No. 3 (2008), 716-719.
29. H. Maxeiner, E Ehrlich., Site, number and depth of wounds of the scalp in falls and blows--a contribution to the validity of the so-called hat brim rule. *Arch Kriminol*. 2000 Mar-Apr;205(3-4):82-91.
30. C. Kremer and A. Sauvageau. Discrimination of Falls and Blows in Blunt Head trauma: Assessment of Predictability through Combined Criteria. *J Forensic Sci*, **54**, No. 4 (2009), 923-926.
31. A.M. Barbero and H. K. Frasch. Pig and guinea pig skin as surrogates for human *in vitro* penetration studies: A quantitative review. *Toxicology in Vitro*, **23**, (2009), 1-13.
32. W. Meyer, K. Neukand, B. Radke. Collagen Fibre Arrangement in the Skin of the Pig. *J. Anat.* **134**, 1, (1982), 139-148.
33. W. Meyer R. Schwarz and K. Neurand. The Skin of Domestic Mammals as a Model for Human Skin, with special reference to the Domestic Pig. *Curr Probl Dermatol*, **7**, (1978) 39–52
34. K.J Farrugia, K. A. Savage, H. Bandey and N. NicDaeid, Chemical enhancement of footwear impressions in blood on fabric — Part 1: Protein stains, 2011, *Science and Justice*, doi:10.1016/j.scijus.2010.11.001, [in press](#).
35. K.J Farrugia, K. A. Savage, H. Bandey, T. Ciuksza and N. NicDaeid, Chemical enhancement of footwear impressions in blood on fabric — Part 2: Peroxidase reagents, 2011, *Science and Justice*, doi:10.1016/j.scijus.2010.11.002, [in press](#).
36. K. Whittle, J. Kieser, I. Ichim, M. Swain, N. Waddell, V. Livingstone, and M. Taylor. The biomechanical modelling of non-ballistic skin wounding: blunt-force injury. *Forensic Sci med Pathol*, **4**, (2008), 33-39.
37. R. G. Snyder. Human Tolerances to Extreme Impacts in Free-Fall. *Aerospace Med*. **34**, (1963), 695-709.

38. Ní Annaidh, A. Bruyère, K., Destrade, M., **Gilchrist, M.D.** & Otténio, M., Anisotropic mechanical properties of excised human skin. Submitted to *Journal of Biomechanics and Modeling in Mechanobiology*.
39. Gilchrist, M.D., Keenan, S., Curtis, M., Cassidy, M., Byrne, G. & Destrade, M., Measuring knife stab penetration into skin simulant using a novel biaxial tension device. *Forensic Science International*, 177 (1) pp. 52-65 (2008).

Appendix

The acceleration calculations used took various contributing factors into account, including energy and free fall acceleration due to gravity. Studies have shown that air resistance has a negligible effect on impact velocity during free-falls from less than 50ft [37], although in guided drop weight experiments where the impactor travels along guide rail tracks, friction effects will reduce the actual impact speed below that predicted by theory. Assuming constant acceleration due to gravity and ignoring friction, the velocity at impact is directly related to the fall height by Newton's equation of motion, where the initial velocity (m/s) equals zero.

Newton's Equations of Motion:

$$V = U + A.T$$

$$V^2 = 2.A.H$$

$$S = U.T + \frac{1}{2} A.T^2$$

where V = velocity at impact (m/s)

U = initial velocity (= 0 m/s when falling from rest)

A = acceleration (= 9.81 m/s² when in free fall due to gravity)

T = time (s)

S = distance travelled (m)

The principle of conservation of energy allows us to calculate the impact energy transmitted by an impacting implement to a target.

Conservation of Energy:

$$E = PE + KE$$

$$PE = M.A.H$$

$$KE = \frac{1}{2} M.V^2$$

where E = total energy (Joules)

PE = potential energy (Joules) (= 0 at the point of impact since H = 0 m)

KE = kinetic energy (Joules)

M = mass of impacting implement and drop carriage (kg)

The work-energy principle can be used in cases where an object in motion has been brought to rest, e.g., when an impactor penetrates an object and stops after a certain depth of penetration. Work done by a force is calculated by multiplying the force acting on the body by the distance it has been moved (assuming that the force and displacement are parallel, as in this case). In order to obtain an average estimate of the impact force, the distance travelled after impact is used with the work-energy principle. The total work done by the force during the impact event is equal to the initial kinetic energy immediately prior to impact.

Work-energy principle:

$$W_{\text{net}} = F_{\text{avg}}.D = \frac{1}{2} M.V^2$$

where W_{net} = net work energy (Joules)

D = displacement during impact (m)

F_{avg} = average impact force (N)

The accelerometer used in the drop weight experiments allowed us to calculate actual acceleration values during impact; these were used instead of theoretical values which ensured that friction losses were properly considered in our data. The acceleration values allowed us to calculate velocity, energy, and force using the equations outlined above.

Tables

Author	Failure of Cranial Bone	Models Used
Messerer 1880 ^[16]	400-600 kg (M);300-600 kg(F)	Compression tests- cadaver heads
Nahum 1968 ^[17]	2450 N (M); 2000 N (F)	Impact mass - cadaver heads
Schneidner & Nahum 1972 ^[18]	~4000 N	Impact drop tests- cadaver heads
Stalnaker 1977 ^[19]	5000 N	Pneumatic piston - cadaver heads
Yoganandan 1995 ^[20]	8.8 – 14.1 kN	Impact - cadaver bodies

Table 1 - Summary of previous studies relating to failure of cranial bone

Author	Associated Force	Associated Mechanism
Allsop 1991 ^[22]	2.3-10 kN Small circular plate 5.8-17 kN rectangular plate	Impact concentrated surface area Impact broad surface area
Henn 2004 ^[23]	350 – 1200 N	Kicking and Punching
Bohm & Schmidt 1987 ^[24]	500-850 N (M); 350-550 N (F) 750-1200 N (M); 500-750 N (F)	Punch Kicking
Farrugia 2010 ^[25]	634 -5263 N; 2560 N (average)	Stamp

Table 2: Forces associated with mechanism of blunt force trauma from the literature.

Associated Mechanism		Cranial	Facial	Both
	<i>Laceration</i>			
Fall (N=94)	41 (44%)	29 (71%)	14 (34%)	2 (5%)
Fall From Height (N=17)	12 (71%)	12 (100%)	2 (17%)	2 (17%)
Fall Down Stairs (N=13)	5 (38%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Accelerated Fall (N=5)	3 (60%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
Blunt Object (N=40)	37 (93%)	33 (89%)	18 (49%)	14 (38%)
Axe (N=6)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)
Punch (N=3)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Kick (N=2)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Stamp (N=2)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Multiple (N=7)	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	6 (86%)	3 (43%)
	<i>Fracture</i>			
Fall (N=94)	64 (68%)	58 (91%)	8 (13%)	2 (3%)
Fall From Height (N=17)	16 (94%)	16 (100%)	5 (31%)	5 (31%)
Fall Down Stairs (N=13)	10 (77%)	10 (100%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
Accelerated Fall (N=5)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)
Blunt Object (N=40)	30 (75%)	29 (97%)	17 (57%)	16 (53%)
Axe (N=6)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)
Punch (N=3)	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)	1 (33%)
Kick (N=2)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Stamp (N=2)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Multiple (N=7)	5 (72%)	4 (80%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)

Table 3 - Summary of findings from sub-categories of known head injury cases in relation to orientation and the presence or absence of laceration and/or fracture.

Implement	Dimensions	Impact area	Net Weight
Hammer	2 cm Diameter	3.14 cm ²	2.67 kg; 3.30 kg; 4.44 kg
Wooden Handle	30.5 x 24 cm	~190 cm ²	2.84 kg; 3.44 kg; 4.61 kg
Wooden Flooring	30 cm length x 2.2 cm diameter	~ 39.721 cm ²	3.20 kg; 3.99 kg; 5.13 kg
Training shoe	Women's UK size 5 26 cm length x 10.5 cm width @ ball; 8 cm width @ heel	~ 140 cm ²	3.22 kg; 3.97 kg; 5.15 kg

Table 4 – Summary of the implements used, the impact area for the trauma observed and the net weights used to generate the variable forces of impact, at 6 repeats of each to generate a total of 18 impacts per implement.

Impact	Force (N)	Pressure (kPa)	% Loss in Velocity	Laceration Observed	Fracture Observed
1.	4010	1.28	6.01	-	-
2.	4149	1.32	9.79	Crescent SL	SS & Dp
3.	4569	1.46	10.91	Double Crescent SL	SS
4.	4851	1.54	11.74	Crescent SL	L
5.	4852	1.55	10.68	Crescent SL	-
6.	5015	1.6	6.91	-	-
7.	5335	1.7	11.02	Crescent PTL	SS
8.	5493	1.75	5.48	-	-
9.	5689	1.82	3.84	Crescent SL	-
10.	5710	1.82	7.88	-	Dp & SS
11.	6020	1.92	6.14	-	-
12.	6350	2.02	6.98	-	Dp & SS
13.	6712	2.14	9.71	-	-
14.	7212	2.3	2.82	Crescent SL	-
15.	7342	2.34	4.75	Crescent SL	-
16.	7797	2.48	4.96	-	SS
17.	8632	2.75	5.22	Crescent SL	SS
18.	8137	2.6	2.96	Crescent SL	Bone loss

Table 5a: Hammer Impact repeats. Lacerations classified by increasing severity of superficial (SL), partial (PL), or full thickness (FL). Underlying skull damage classified as suture separation (SS), linear (L) or depressed (Dp). Note: The “% loss in velocity” is the difference between the theoretical and actual velocity in m/s.

Impact	Force (N)	Pressure (kPa)	% Loss in Velocity	Laceration Observed	Fracture Observed
1.	4025	0.1	4.51	-	-
2.	5333	0.13	4.28	Linear 2 SL	-
3.	5937	0.15	6.29	-	-
4.	6176	0.16	3.16	Linear SL	-
5.	6524	0.16	3.63	Linear SL	SS; L
6.	6569	0.17	3.63	-	-
7.	6643	0.17	3.77	Linear SL	SS
8.	7335	0.18	6.93	-	-
9.	7442	0.19	2.27	2 Irregular SL	SS
10.	7505	0.19	2.78	Linear SL	-
11.	7597	0.19	8.01	-	-
12.	7885	0.2	3.39	-	-
13.	7984	0.2	-0.26	-	-
14.	8261	0.21	9.55	-	SS
15.	8263	0.21	6.11	Linear SL	SS
16.	8317	0.21	3.21	-	-
17.	9460	0.24	1.99	Linear+Irregular SL	-
18.	8676	0.22	4.89	-	SS

Table 5b: Wooden Handle Impact Repeats. Lacerations classified by increasing severity of superficial (SL), partial (PL), or full thickness (FL). Underlying skull damage classified as suture separation (SS), linear (L) or depressed (Dp). Note: The “% loss in velocity” is the difference between the theoretical and actual velocity in m/s.

Impact	Force (N)	Pressure (kPa)	% Loss in Velocity	Laceration Observed	Fracture Observed
1.	4374	0.02	10.67	Irregular SL	-
2.	5667	0.03	10.14	Irregular SL	-
3.	5757	0.03	11.24	Irregular SL	SS
4.	6032	0.03	10.34	-	-
5.	6041	0.03	8.66	-	-
6.	6246	0.03	38.22	-	SS
7.	6255	0.03	10.61	-	SS
8.	6256	0.03	9.38	-	-
9.	6797	0.04	9.04	-	-
10.	6983	0.04	3.31	-	-
11.	7061	0.04	9.13	-	SS
12.	7533	0.04	11.41	-	L
13.	7595	0.04	8.71	-	SS
14.	8336	0.04	12.70	-	-
15.	8552	0.05	6.33	Irregular SL	-
16.	9327	0.05	5.77	Irregular SL	-
17.	9778	0.05	8.63	-	-
18.	10140	0.05	8.08	-	SS

Table 5c: Wooden Flooring impact repeats. Lacerations classified by increasing severity of superficial (SL), partial (PL), or full thickness (FL). Underlying skull damage classified as suture separation (SS), linear (L) or depressed (Dp). Note: The “% loss in velocity” is the difference between the theoretical and actual velocity in m/s.

Impact	Force (N)	Pressure (kPa)	% Loss in Velocity	Laceration Observed	Fracture Observed
1.	3340	0.02	7.40	-	SS
2.	3981	0.03	8.19	-	SS
3.	4060	0.03	6.47	-	SS
4.	4078	0.03	10.86	-	SS
5.	4265	0.03	14.97	-	SS
6.	4450	0.03	4.32	-	Dp
7.	4584	0.03	7.00	-	SS
8.	4680	0.03	6.44	-	-
9.	4709	0.03	6.61	-	-
10.	4753	0.03	6.28	-	Dp
11.	4946	0.04	4.85	-	SS
12.	5031	0.04	5.00	-	SS
13.	5049	0.04	5.88	-	SS
14.	5511	0.04	5.45	-	-
15.	5259	0.04	6.95	Irregular SL	-
16.	5524	0.04	5.96	-	Dp
17.	5658	0.04	5.82	-	-
18.	6342	0.05	9.17	-	-

Table 5d: Training Shoe impact repeats. Lacerations classified by increasing severity of superficial (SL), partial (PL), or full thickness (FL). Underlying skull damage classified as suture separation (SS), linear (L) or depressed (Dp). Note: The “% loss in velocity” is the difference between the theoretical and actual velocity in m/s.

Implement	Observed Most Common External Markers of Mechanism for Impact Experiments	
	<i>Laceration</i>	<i>Skull Damage</i>
Hammer	Crescent Shaped	Suture separation.
Wooden Handle	Linear. Bruising indicating implement shape.	Suture separation.
Wooden Flooring	Irregular shaped Superficial over thinner subcutaneous tissue. Broad bruising.	Suture separation.
Training shoe	Transfer of sole pattern.	Suture separation.

Table 6 - Observations of the laceration/ skull damage obtained.

Figures




Figure 1 (a) - Bar chart representation of the number of known cases for which the mechanism could be associated with a degree of certainty. The pattern of injury shown involves cases of laceration only, fracture only, both laceration and fracture, and neither laceration nor fracture.




Figure 1 (b) - Pie chart representations of the pattern of injury associated with known cases involving (i) Falls and (ii) Blows. NOTE THERE SHOULD BE NO APOSTROPHE IN "FALL'S" OR IN "BLOW'S" AS CURRENTLY SHOWN!




Figure 2 - Comparison of the ranges of force generated by each implement.



Figure 3 - Presenting Lacerations from impact experiments. A) Crescent shaped partial laceration, B) linear superficial laceration, C) irregular superficial laceration and D) bruising indicative of trained sole pattern.