Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table 1: Collection criteria for RAIDS on-scene and retrospective data

Supplementary Table 2: Mayo TBI Classification System Search Terms

The terms shown in Supplementary Table 2 were used in the free-text search algorithm to extract TBI information from the RAIDS database. The terms were selected and categorised by Mayo TBI severity by the authors before being reviewed by an independent histopathologist and TBI clinician. The terms were refined using RAIDS Phase 1 and 2 data and validated manually for 507 subjects involved in 200 collisions from Phase 2 Extension data (2019-2020) obtaining ≥99.4% agreement. Our method also captured all AIS injury-coded pathologies it was possible to directly compare (subdural haematoma, subarachnoid haemorrhage and skull fracture). Sentences containing the terms were extracted for further analysis. Where terms related to false positives were found, for example 'no' preceding a TBI search term, these were flagged for manual review. Note that skull fracture-related search terms were put in the mild category, but the sentences they appeared in were assessed for severity. The vast majority of skull fractures which were classified as moderate-severe also presented with other moderatesevere TBI terms. Following false positive assessment, we reclassified our casualties to ensure that the maximum TBI severity was correct.

haemorrhage, subarachnoid hemorrhage, occipital lobe, parietal lobe, penetrating brain injury, arachnoid membrane, temporal lobe, traumatic brain injury, grey matter, white matter, grey-white matter, white-grey matter, brain tissue, decompressive craniectomy, cerebral, extra axial hematoma, extra-axial hematoma, extra axial haematoma, extra-axial haematoma, extra axial bleed, extra-axial bleed, extra-axial haemorrhage, extra axial haemorrhage, extra-axial hemorrhage, extra axial hemorrhage, corpus callosum, microhaemorrage, microhaemorrhage, microhemorrage, microhemorrhage, posterior fossa, dura mater, pia mater, cortical contusion, cerebral cortex, midline shift, sub-frontal contusion, occipital contusion, occipital haematoma, occipital hematoma, occipital haemorrhage, occipital hemorrhage, cortical infarction, Cerebral infarction, cerebral laceration, intraparenchymal haemorrhage, intraparenchymal hemorrhage, intraparenchymal haematoma, intraparenchymal hematoma, interparenchymal haemorrhage, interparenchymal hemorrhage, interparenchymal haematoma, interparenchymal hematoma, midbrain, mid-brain, gyrus, gyri, sulcus, sulci, third ventricle, 3rd ventricle, fourth ventricle, 4th ventricle, cerebral aqueduct, hippocampus, lateral ventricle, thalamus, cerebral hemisphere, amygdala, limbic system, pituitary fossa, sella turcica, cranial nerve, Wernicke, Broca, bihemispheric, bi-hemispheric, TBI, \(TBI\), brain substance, brain laceration, brain showed contusion, cerebral hemisphere, intraventricular haemorrhage, intraventricular hemorrhage, intraventricular haematoma, intraventricular hematoma, intraventricular bleed, interventricular haemorrhage, interventricular hemorrhage, interventricular haematoma, interventricular hematoma, interventricular bleed, exposing the brain, exposed the brain, brain was exposed, fragmentation of the brain, thalamic parenchymal haematoma, evulsion of the brain, temporal pole contusion, pole contusion, bilateral brain, brain parenchyma, brain parnchyma, parenchymal contusion, parnchymal contusions, parenchymal contusions of the brain, parnchymal contusions of the brain, parenchymal brain contusions, parnchymal brain contusions, head injury - post traumatic punctate h, head injury - post-traumatic punctate h, temporal horn, quadrigeminal plate, brain bruis, bruises to the brain, bruise to the brain, bruising to the brain, bruises of the brain, bruise of the brain, bruising of the brain, Brain had been effectively eviscerated, Brain: small severely torn fragments, contusion to the inferior aspect of the brain, Haemosiderin deposition in the brain, pneumocephalus, brain was oedematous, displaced skull fracture, brain is swollen, brain was swollen, brain is diffusely swollen, brain was diffusely swollen, swollen brain, brain swelling, brain oedema, Oedema on the right side of brain, Oedema on the left side of brain, Oedema on the right side of the brain, Oedema on the left side of the brain, occipital condyle fracture, hemorrhagic contusion, haemorrhagic contusion, basilar skull fracture, intracranial abnormalit, intercranial, abnormal head CT, hydrocephaly, GCS3, GCS 3, GCS of 3, Glasgow Coma Score 3, GCS4, GCS 4, GCS of 4, Glasgow Coma Score 4, GCS5, GCS 5, GCS of 5, Glasgow Coma Score 5, GCS6, GCS 6, GCS of 6, Glasgow Coma Score 6, GCS7, GCS 7, GCs of 7, Glasgow Coma Score 7, GCS8, GCS 8, GCS of 8, Glasgow Coma Score 8, GCS9, GCS 9, GCS of 9, Glasgow Coma Score 9, GCS10, GCS 10,

Supplementary material is continued on the next page.

Detailed Description of Method for Scaling Findings to GB Level

The national level STATS19 data is collated by the police. STATS19 includes information about the type of road user involved in the collision, their overall injury severity, details about the road a collision occurs on, environmental factors such as lighting and collision causation. Collisions must be attended by the police or be reported to the police within 30 days. Not all collisions are reported to the police, with those causing minor injuries more likely to be missed. STATS19 data does not report injury pathology. Collisions involving cyclists are particularly known to be underrepresented (*47*). RAIDS is a subset of STATS19 that focusses on severe injuries and fatalities, whereas STATS19 covers injuries of all severities. A mapping is therefore required to scale RAIDS results to STATS19. We use fields available both in RAIDS and STATS19 to create a mapping, following similar methodology to other in-depth database scaling, refined by TRL statisticians to best encompass the GB scenario³⁰.

Seven collision characteristics present in both datasets were considered for relating the RAIDS and STATS19 populations. The shortlisted collision variables were road user type, casualty age, lighting level, speed limit, road class and vehicle age and overall injury severity (as an output). These were chosen because they are the most important to the GB scenario and relate to the selection criteria for RAIDS cases. For each group in RAIDS and STATS19, we counted the number of casualties who met a given combination of the six input collision characteristics. The counts for a given combination of collision characteristics were compared in corresponding RAIDS and STATS19 populations. We applied chi-squared tests to ensure the casualty counts for our chosen scaling variables in RAIDS and STATS19 were significantly different. We used R to fit decision tree models with injury severity as the outcome variable to determine which input variables were most important in classifying RAIDS by injury severity. This analysis was performed with a minimum cluster size of 49 and a maximum depth of 2 variables. We applied chi-squared tests to ensure the casualty counts for our chosen scaling variables differed significantly in RAIDS and STATS19.

As the collection criteria for RAIDS was slightly different in each phase, we first split the data into a Phase 1 group and a Phase 2 subset. Each phase of RAIDS data is then further split into two subsets depending on whether investigators attended the scene. As each of these subsets have different selection criteria, we applied the same selection criteria to split the STATS19 data into four subsets: Phase 1 On-Scene, Phase 1 Retrospective, Phase 2 On-Scene and Phase 2 Retrospective. For each of these four subsets, a decision tree analysis was performed to select the scaling variables. A weighting is then calculated for casualties who are grouped by the chosen combination of collision factors. Overall injury severity and road user type were selected to determine the weighting for casualties involved in all on-scene cases. In addition to road user type and overall injury severity, vehicle age was also included to calculate weightings for casualties involved in Phase 1 Retrospective cases. Overall injury severity, road class and vehicle age were used to calculate weightings for casualties involved in Phase 2 Retrospective cases. The weighting value, W , is calculated from the normalised ratio of S19 casualties divided by the normalised ratio of RAIDS casualties $R_{N, S19}/R_{N, RAIDS}$ where the normalised ratio for each group is given by the casualty numbers of a given factor combination divided by all casualties in the subset where $R_N = \frac{cauality\,count\,for\,given\,factor\,combination}{causuality\,count\,for\,all\,factor\,combination\,in\,subset}$. These weights are then applied in subsequent analysis to calculate casualty numbers at GB level when the information of interest, such as TBI severity, is only available at RAIDS level.

Weights for RAIDS Phase 1 and Phase 2 casualties are shown below. Generally, slightly injured casualties have higher weights (>1) as they are underrepresented in RAIDS, while seriously or fatally injured casualties have lower weights (≤ 1) as they are overrepresented.

Supplementary Table 3: Phase 1 On-Scene Investigation Weights

Supplementary Table 4: Phase 1 Retrospective Investigation Weights

Supplementary Table 5: Phase 2 On-Scene Investigation Weights

Supplementary Table 6: Phase 2 Retrospective Investigation Weights

Supplementary material is continued on the next page.

Detailed Description of Delta-V Calculation

Vehicle delta-V is determined from crush profiles and initial trajectories where these are available (Fig. 2A). Vehicle crush measures are taken at the scene by expert collision investigators for all vehicles. Vehicle trajectories are estimated from physical evidence (e.g. skid marks or CCTV footage). The AiDamage program is used to reconstruct the collision from this information³⁴. The CRASH3 algorithm is used to determine energy-related parameters including delta-V³³. Longitudinal (front-to-back), lateral (side-to-side) and total delta-V are calculated for each vehicle. Vehicles generally have different delta-V value (ΔV_{V1}) and ΔV_{V2} in Fig. 2Aii). Total delta-V comprises the Pythagorean sum of the longitudinal and lateral components, $\Delta V_{total} = \sqrt{\Delta V_{longitudinal}^2 + \Delta V_{lateral}^2}$, capturing the directional transfer of force during the collision. If two vehicles are involved, crush measurements were required from both vehicles to calculate valid delta-V values. All car occupants with valid delta-V estimates from single impact phases were included. Where multiple impacts were present, delta-V was included only if one of the impact phases was clearly the injury-causing phase.

For VRUs, a hybrid approach is adopted. Pedestrian delta-V is approximated as the impact speed of the vehicle because most pedestrians in RAIDS had no velocity component in the direction the impacting vehicle was travelling as they are most commonly injured while crossing. Cyclists travel at higher speeds, sharing the carriageway with vehicles. Therefore, their initial speed can be influential on the delta-V and must be taken into account by combining the velocity of the cyclist with the impact speed of the vehicle involved in the collision (Fig. 2B). Vehicle impact speed at the start of the impact is determined using a combination of physical evidence such as CCTV or dashcam footage and physical evidence such as skid marks. In each collision configuration, the relative velocity is taken to account for the pre-crash directions of the VRU relative to the vehicle. For head-on collisions, the initial VRU speed is added to the impact speed of the other vehicle involved. In collisions where both the VRU and other vehicle involved have the same direction of travel, VRU speed was subtracted from the other vehicle's speed. Only the velocity component parallel to the direction of travel of the vehicle was considered ($\Delta V_{VRU} = V_{car\ initial} + V_{VRU\ initial}$). VRUs who were runover without being accelerated to the speed of the vehicle, for example those already lying in the road prior to impact, as the assumption that the VRU is accelerated to the speed of the impacting vehicle is not upheld and therefore cannot be used to calculate delta-V.

It is important to note that the delta-V we define refer to the change in velocity of the overall vehicle or VRU system during the injury causing impact phase and does not capture the specific delta-V of individual local regions. For car occupants, even while belted, the occupant's head is not perfectly coupled to the vehicle. The delta-V of local body regions may vary based on the kinematics of the VRU impact (i.e. the head may be accelerated towards the windscreen in certain collisions scenarios).

Supplementary material is continued on the next page.

Supplementary Figure 1: Logistic regression curves for distinct TBI pathologies

Supplementary Figure 1. Logistic regression models predicting the risk of sustaining TBI pathology from total delta-V (km/h). There are 651 car occupants without TBI in the baseline group (a-d), compared to 14 with skull fracture (A), 14 with subdural haematoma (B), 24 with subarachnoid haemorrhage (C) and 19 casualties with focal injury. For VRUs, there were 82 baseline casualties without TBI compared to 25 with skull fracture (E), 9 with subdural haematoma (F), 19 with subarachnoid haemorrhage (G) and 21 with focal injury (H). p-values indicate that delta-V is a significant predictive parameter for all instances except subdural haematoma in the pedestrian-cyclist group (possibly due to small sample size).

Supplementary Figure 2: Comparison of TBI pathology risk for different road users

Supplementary Figure 2. Injury risk for different pathologies and road users. For 60km/h and below, the risks are significantly different for the car occupant and the VRU group

Supplementary Figure 3: Multivariate logistic regression for car occupant TBI risk

Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curves for Biomechanical Multivariate Logistic Regression

Supplementary Figure 3. ROC curves for car occupant risk of moderate severe TBI with baselines of (A) all other outcomes and (B) the uninjured cohort, constructed using multivariate logistic regression. Including the additional flag of dominant lateral delta-V increased the prediction capability of the models fitted in all instances (including pathologies).

Statistical Summary for Logistic Key Regression Models

To create the logistic regression models, the data was randomly split into k approximately equal-sized subsets. Stratification was used to ensure that in each subset the proportion of baseline and injury groups were representative of the overall dataset. Binary logistic regression models were trained on all data except kth subset, which was withheld for testing. k-fold crossvalidation was repeated 200 times with prespecified data seeds used to ensure repeatability when randomly shuffling the data prior to partitioning at the start of each iteration. Results from all 1000 iterations were recorded. The average injury risk curve was given by the $50th$ percentile of the ranked risk value at each point. 95% confidence intervals are again determined by taking the 2.5th and 97.5th ranked values at each point. To determine the predictive capability of our injury risk curves, we use the Receiver Operator Characteristic (ROC) curve and associated Area Under Curve (AUC) averaged over all 1000 iterations. We provide the precision (the number of correctly labelled positives divided by all labelled positives) and recall (the number of labelled positives divided by actual positives, also known as sensitivity) in the table below as these may be of particular interest for the application of these results to an Advanced ACN-type algorithm. Further work is required to ensure these results are generalisable and implementable to advanced ACN algorithms. For example, small differences (mean absolute error -4km/h) exist between CRASH3 and EDR delta-V in European vehicles (Lenard, et al., 2000), further research could usefully determine the current difference. Similarly, additional analysis and consideration of cut-off thresholds to ensure appropriate under- and over-triage rates are necessary prior to any real-world application.

Supplementary Table 7: Moderate-severe TBI logistic regression risk curve parameters