

# Far-Side Airbags: Current Technology, Performance Evaluation, and Future Trends

\*Rakshit Gummaraju, \*\*Ganesh Shete, \*\*\*Sachin Ratnaparkhi

\* ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0008-0005-0451-5276>

\*\* ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8323-919X>

\*\*\* ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-9898-3697>

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.16.04.2026.p17208

<https://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.16.04.2026.p17208>

Paper Received Date: 12th February 2026

Paper Acceptance Date: 16th March 2026

Paper Publication Date: 12th April 2026

**Abstract-** Far-side impacts, where occupants are positioned on the non-struck side of the vehicle, represent approximately 35% of all side impact injuries. This comprehensive review examines far-side airbag (FSAB) technology, analyzing impact physics, current architecture (seat-back and center-mounted systems), and performance evaluation methodologies. Statistical evidence demonstrates that far-side occupants face significant lateral excursion (475-575 mm without FSAB) and belt slip-off phenomena, leading to severe head and thoracic injuries. We analyze Human Body Models (SAFER, VIVA+, GHBM) validated against Post-Mortem Human Subject (PMHS) data, achieving CORA scores of 0.64-0.83. Performance metrics show FSABs reduce head excursion by 50-100 mm, chest compression from 37.1 to 29.3 mm, and Neck Injury Criterion (Nij) from 0.69 to 0.42. The paper discusses Euro NCAP 2020 protocols, virtual testing roadmaps, and challenges in autonomous vehicle integration. Multi-chamber pressure zoning and adaptive sensor systems represent future trends. Current research gaps include belt retention optimization, female bio fidelity data expansion, and standardization of HBM injury criteria for regulatory compliance.

**Index Terms-** Anthropomorphic Test Device (ATD), Bio fidelity, Crashworthiness, Far-side airbag, Human Body Model (HBM), Injury metrics, Lateral impact, Occupant kinematics, Side impact, Vehicle safety

## I. INTRODUCTION

Side-impact collisions constitute one of the most severe crash modes in automotive safety, with far-side occupants (those seated opposite to the impact side) representing a critical yet historically under-protected population. Recent epidemiological data reveals that far-side occupants account for approximately 35% of all injuries sustained in lateral crashes, with injury risk rates of  $12.5 \pm 1.8\%$  compared to  $10.8 \pm 1.1\%$  for near-side occupants. The primary injury mechanism involves excessive lateral excursion, the displacement of the occupant's head and torso across the vehicle cabin—which can reach 475-575 mm in unprotected scenarios.

The far-side airbag (FSAB) has emerged as a targeted countermeasure, designed to deploy between adjacent occupants or from the seat-back to intercept and decelerate the far-side occupant's lateral motion. Unlike traditional side airbags that protect against intrusion, FSABs must manage complex kinematics including the "belt slip-off" phenomenon, where the diagonal shoulder belt fails to retain the torso during lateral loading. This review synthesizes current FSAB architectures, performance evaluation methodologies employing Human Body Models (HBMs) and Anthropomorphic Test Devices (ATDs), and emerging trends in virtual testing and autonomous vehicle integration.

## II. FAR-SIDE CRASH EPIDEMIOLOGY AND KINEMATICS

### A. Injury Prevalence and Severity

Field data analysis demonstrates that approximately 20% of seriously injured (AIS3+) occupants using 3-point seatbelts in side impacts were seated on the non-struck side. Far-side occupants exhibit higher risk for Permanent Medical Impairment (PMI) at the 10+ level, particularly for lower extremity injuries, compared to near-side occupants. Among occupants with long-term consequences (PMI 1+), approximately 80% sustained injuries initially classified as AIS 1, indicating that cumulative minor injuries contribute significantly to permanent disability.

The head and thorax constitute the most frequently injured body regions, with the highest PMI risk from spine fractures observed in far-side crashes followed by rollover events. Near-side occupants face more than twice the risk of fatal injury due to direct structural intrusion; however, far-side occupants experience comparable rates of severe non-fatal injury due to interaction with the center console, adjacent occupant, or struck-side interior.

### B. Three-Stage Excursion Kinematics

Far-side occupant kinematics follow a distinct three-stage progression:

**Stage 1 – Initial Lateral Displacement:** The vehicle accelerates laterally away from the occupant due to the impact. The occupant's lower body is constrained by the seat and lap belt, while the upper body lags due to inertia, creating initial torso lean.

**Stage 2 – Progressive Torso Lean and Belt Slip:** As the collision progresses, the torso rotates significantly toward the vehicle center. The diagonal shoulder belt, optimized for frontal impacts, lacks adequate lateral constraint. Belt slip-off occurs when the shoulder disengages from beneath the belt, allowing unconstrained torso rotation and increased direction displacement.

**Stage 3 – Maximum Excursion and Impact:** The head and torso reach peak lateral displacement. Post-Mortem Human Subject (PMHS) tests document average head excursion of 475 mm in the y-direction without FSAB protection. Human Body Model simulations predict up to 575 mm displacement when belt slip is modeled. During this phase, violent thorax and abdomen compression against the center console armrest occurs, representing the primary source of pelvis, hip, and femur fractures.

### C. Center Console Height and Injury Correlation

A positive correlation exists between the height difference (H-point to console surface) and injury severity. Larger height differences permit greater torso rotation before the console provides lateral resistance, resulting in higher impact velocities and increased chest-abdomen compression. Console stiffness, determined by the number and height of mounting points, also influences load distribution and injury patterns.

## III. FSAB ARCHITECTURES AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

### A. Mounting Configurations

Two primary architectural approaches dominate current FSAB implementations:

**Seat-Back Mounted Systems:** The airbag module is integrated into the inboard lateral side of the driver's or passenger's seat-back. Upon crash detection, the cushion deploys diagonally forward and upward toward the vehicle headliner.

Seat-back systems ensure the airbag remains correctly positioned relative to the occupant regardless of fore-aft seat adjustment. The inflator or gas generator is typically mounted to the seat-back frame, with the airbag fixed at its rear end via a high-strength tether or mounting bracket.

**Center-Mounted Systems:** Introduced by General Motors in 2013, center-mounted airbags are positioned between the front seats, often integrated into the center console or a dedicated mounting structure. These systems deploy vertically upward and are

designed to act as a laterally stiff barrier, preventing occupant-to-occupant collision and reducing torso excursion. Center-mounted systems require minimal seatbelt or seat redesign and can achieve torso excursion reductions of approximately 45%.

### B. Multi-Chamber Partitioning and Pressure Zoning

Advanced FSAB designs employ internal partitioning to create distinct pressure zones optimized for different body regions:

**Rear High-Pressure Chamber:** Located on the side closer to the occupant's seat-back, this chamber is maintained at elevated internal pressure (typically 1.2-1.5 times front chamber pressure) to provide rigid structural support. When the two seat-backs approach each other during far-side loading, the rear chamber compresses, absorbing energy while maintaining vertical bag geometry.

**Front Lower-Pressure Chamber:** Positioned toward the vehicle centerline, this chamber operates at reduced pressure to provide compliant head and torso capture. The pressure differential enables the airbag to gently intercept the occupant's initial lateral motion while providing firm resistance during peak loading.

**Internal Ribs and Support Structures:** High-rigidity support portions or internal ribs in the rear lower section of the airbag maintain the cushion's vertical extent and prevent collapse under occupant weight. These reinforcements are typically constructed from doubled or reinforced fabric panels with enhanced tensile strength.

### C. Deployment Logic and Triggering Criteria

FSAB deployment is governed by sophisticated crash detection algorithms that must distinguish far-side from near-side impacts:

**Acceleration Threshold:** Current systems trigger at negative lateral accelerations of approximately 4 g, corresponding to collision speeds of 25-30 km/h. Below this threshold, standard seatbelts are deemed sufficient.

**Time-to-Fire (TTF):** FSAB systems exhibit TTF values similar to conventional side airbags (typically 10-15 ms from crash detection to initial inflation). However, far-side deployments prioritize forward expansion over upward inflation to ensure the cushion reaches the protection zone before peak occupant excursion.

**Staged Deployment Controls:** To prevent arm interference during early deployment phases, some systems employ occupant-side and opposite-side straps that apply asymmetric developmental forces. The occupant-side strap applies stronger force (F1) than the opposite-side strap (F2) during initial deployment, allowing the bag to approach the occupant's arm from the rear before full capture.

### D. Rear Seat Applications

Recent innovations extend far-side protection to rear-seat occupants through headrest-integrated airbags. These systems deploy from the outboard rear seat headrests toward the center seat, providing head protection for all three rear occupants. However, limitations include: (1) head-only protection without torso restraint, (2) inability to prevent forward impact with the front seat-back, and (3) reduced effectiveness for children or occupants of significantly different statures.

#### IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES

##### A. Human Body Model (HBM) Validation

Human Body Models have become essential tools for FSAB evaluation due to their ability to predict biofidelic kinematics and detailed injury risks:

**SAFER HBM:** The SAFER (Chalmers) Human Body Model has been extensively validated for far-side impacts through comparison with PMHS tests conducted under six simplified configurations and two vehicle-based setups. Kinematic CORA (Correlation and Analysis) scores typically exceed 0.65, indicating good biofidelity. The mean kinematic CORA score across all configurations is 0.64 (median 0.63), meeting the fair-to-good correlation threshold (0.44 for fair, 0.65 for good). However, SAFER HBM tends to overpredict head excursion by approximately 100 mm without FSAB and 50 mm with FSAB compared to PMHS data, primarily due to challenges in accurately modeling belt slip timing. Recent updates include improved pelvis, torso, upper extremity, and lower extremity models, with continuous mesh between arm and shoulder to enhance belt interaction modeling.

**VIVA+ HBM:** The VIVA+ models (male and female, 50th percentile) demonstrate fair but consistent correlation with PMHS kinematics, achieving average CORA scores of 0.64. Male and female VIVA+ models exhibit similar kinematic responses, with the lowest average kinematic CORA score in any configuration being 0.73. However, female VIVA+ models display different head movement paths compared to male models; the female (shorter stature) impacts the lower, rounded corner of the near-side airbag, while males collide with the main flat area, resulting in straighter trajectories. VIVA+ models show resemblance to WorldSID in upper body kinematics, HIC values, and head acceleration curves. A critical limitation is the lack of female PMHS validation data, preventing establishment of equivalent validation confidence for female models.

**GHBMC Model:** The Global Human Body Models Consortium (GHBMC) model demonstrates total CORA scores ranging from 0.47 to 0.71 for unmorphed configurations and 0.58 to 0.83 for morphed versions. Configuration 5 (D-ring forward position with pure lateral pulse) yields the lowest CORA score (0.47), representing the most challenging scenario for HBM prediction. In this configuration, occupant response is highly dependent on shoulder belt retention, and belt slip-off significantly affects

prediction accuracy. Individual signal contributions to low CORA scores include y-displacement of head (0.53), left acromion (0.43), right acromion (0.45), T1 (0.43), and z-displacement of right acromion (0.20) and T1 (0.16).

##### B. Post-Mortem Human Subject (PMHS) Testing

PMHS studies provide ground truth data for HBM and ATD validation. Typical test protocols employ a  $\Delta V$  of 33.5 km/h with peak acceleration of 16 g, using a 75° oblique impact angle in vehicle-based fixtures. PMHS tests utilize 3-point, 2 kN force-limited belts (2.5 kN measured in upper shoulder belt). Key findings include:

**Without FSAB:** Average head displacement in y-direction approximately 475 mm. **With FSAB:** Average head displacement reduced to approximately 425 mm, representing a 50 mm reduction. **Belt Retention:** All PMHS retained the shoulder belt on the shoulder during testing, contrasting with HBM simulations where belt slip-off occurred more frequently.

PMHS data confirms that FSABs significantly reduce injury severity and maximum lateral head excursion. However, the inherent variability in PMHS responses (due to age, anthropometry, and tissue properties) necessitates testing multiple subjects to establish robust kinematic corridors. **C. Anthropomorphic Test Device (ATD) Evaluation**

**WorldSID:** The 50th percentile male WorldSID dummy, introduced by Euro NCAP in 2016, replaced the less biofidelic EuroSID2. WorldSID is currently the standard for Euro NCAP far-side protocol testing. While WorldSID effectively measures lateral excursion, research indicates it may underrepresent thoracic deflection compared to PMHS. WorldSID's stiffer torso construction predicts larger FSAB intrusion (approximately 6 mm head-to-head distance) compared to VIVA+ HBM predictions (approximately 20 mm). A critical limitation is WorldSID's tendency to slip out of the shoulder belt during far-side loading, indicating reduced ability to evaluate seatbelt system effectiveness and thoracic injury risk from airbag-related countermeasures.

**THOR:** The Test device for Human Occupant Restraint (THOR) has been employed in center-mounted FSAB evaluations. THOR-based tests demonstrate that mid-mount bag concepts can reduce total torso excursion by approximately 45%. Based on field data alignment, such reductions correspond to avoidance of approximately 70% of MAIS3+ far-side injuries in evaluated scenarios.

**SID2s:** The 5th percentile female SID2s dummy is also utilized in comprehensive evaluations to assess protection across different anthropometries. However, similar to WorldSID, SID2s faces challenges in accurately representing thoracic injury mechanisms and belt interaction dynamics.

## V. INJURY METRICS AND QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

### A. Head Injury Metrics

Head Injury Criterion (HIC15): Without FSAB, HIC15 values range from 141-268 depending on seat configuration. With FSAB deployment, HIC15 can increase to 344 due to head airbag contact; however, this remains well below the regulatory limit of 700 and the maximum points threshold of 500. The increase reflects controlled deceleration rather than uncontrolled impact with hard structures.

Head Acceleration (a3ms): Baseline configurations exhibit a3ms values of 41.7-53.9 g, while FSAB-equipped systems show 47.3 g, well below the 80 g limit.

Brain Injury Criterion (BrIC): BrIC values range from 0.870-0.93 across configurations, remaining below the 1.05 limit. FSABs provide marginal BrIC reduction (0.87 with airbag vs. 0.89-0.93 without) by controlling rotational head kinematics.

Head Excursion: The most significant benefit of FSABs is reduction in lateral head displacement. PMHS data shows reduction from 475 mm to 425 mm (50 mm reduction), while SAFER HBM predicts reduction from 575 mm to 475 mm (100 mm reduction). This prevents head contact with the intruding B-pillar, roof rail, or adjacent occupant.

### B. Neck Injury Assessment

Neck Injury Criterion (Nij): FSABs demonstrate substantial Nij reduction, from 0.69 in baseline configurations to 0.42 with optimized airbag concepts, well below the 0.85 limit. This represents a 39% reduction in neck injury risk.

Neck Forces and Moments: Detailed THUMS (Total Human Model for Safety) simulations reveal that lower neck sections experience more severe loading than upper sections. Maximum vertical tension reaches 1.24 kN (limit: 3.4 kN), lateral bending moment 13.9 Nm (limit: 248 Nm), and forward bending moment 9.67 Nm (limit: 50 Nm). The presence of FSAB significantly affects upper and lower neck Fz (vertical force) and Mx (lateral bending moment) values.

### C. Thoracic Injury Metrics

Chest Compression: Baseline configurations without FSAB exhibit chest compression of 37.1 mm. FSAB-equipped systems reduce compression to 29.3-31.1 mm, representing a 16-21% reduction. All values remain well below the 60 mm limit. THUMS simulations report maximum chest compression as low as 4.08 mm in optimized configurations, achieving "green zone" (4 points) scores in Euro NCAP evaluation.

Rib Fracture Risk: Risk for  $\geq 2$  rib fractures varies from near 0% to 45% depending on configuration, occupant sex, and crash severity. Male occupants consistently demonstrate higher rib fracture risk than females. In mixed-sex occupant scenarios, the male always exhibits highest risk. For male driver with male passenger, the passenger faces highest risk; for male driver with female passenger, the driver faces highest risk.

### D. Abdominal and Pelvic Loading

Abdomen Compression: Baseline configurations show 61.2 mm compression, reduced to 57.2-58.4 mm with FSAB, below the 88 mm limit. The center console remains a primary contact point; positive correlation exists between H-point-to-console height difference and abdomen compression.

Pelvis Forces: THUMS simulations document maximum symphysis force of approximately 900 N (threshold: 2.8 kN), lumbar L5 lateral force of 288 N (threshold: 2.0 kN), lumbar L5 vertical tension of 363 N (threshold: 3.5 kN), and lumbar L5 vertical compression of 346 N (threshold: 3.5 kN). All values remain well within safe limits when FSAB is present.

### E. Lower Extremity Considerations

Far-side occupants demonstrate almost equivalent PMI risk at PMI 1+ level and higher risk at PMI 10+ level compared to near-side occupants for lower extremity injuries. The center console has been identified as a primary cause of pelvis, hip, and femur fractures. Advanced HBMs now incorporate risk curves for lower arm fracture prediction and risk functions for calcaneus fractures and soft tissue injuries.

## VI. EURO NCAP PROTOCOL AND REGULATORY EVOLUTION

### A. Euro NCAP 2020 Far-Side Impact Protocol

The Euro NCAP 2020 protocol represents a landmark regulatory development, establishing far-side impact as a mandatory physical crash test component of vehicle safety ratings. Key protocol elements include:

Test Configuration: Body-in-White (BIW) mounted on a rear firing sled to simulate far-side loading while reducing testing cost and time compared to full vehicle crash tests. The protocol employs a  $\Delta V$  of 33.5 km/h with peak acceleration of 16 g.

Scoring Methodology: Assessment is based on two primary criteria: (1) kinematic excursion, evaluated using four vertical reference lines applied to the passenger-side vehicle body to measure head displacement, and (2) dummy injury metrics including HIC, chest deflection, and Nij. Excursion beyond the innermost reference line results in point deductions.

**Dummy Specification:** The 50th percentile male WorldSID is the standard ATD for Euro NCAP far-side testing. The protocol also recommends SID2s (5th percentile female) for comprehensive anthropometric coverage.

**Crash Pulse Comparison:** Three primary waveforms are utilized in research and regulatory contexts: (1) C-IASI farside protection waveform (smallest magnitude), (2) E-NCAP AE-MDB far-side protection waveform (moderate), and (3) ENCAP Pole far-side test waveform (largest peak and magnitude, producing greatest dummy injuries).

## B. Protocol Development Timeline

2015: Euro NCAP Board of Directors recognized need to improve safety rating relevance for far-side occupants.

2015-2019: Euro NCAP Side Impact Working Group (SIWG) developed assessment protocol through extensive research, including PMHS testing, HBM validation, and field data analysis.

June 2019: SIWG work concluded with final protocol recommendations.

2020: New far-side impact protocol introduced as component of final vehicle safety rating, with significant weight in overall score calculation.

## C. Versatile Testing Platform

The sled-based methodology provides a versatile platform for manufacturers to develop efficient countermeasures. Advantages include: (1) ability to implement wide variety of real-world crash scenarios without full vehicle destruction, (2) rapid iteration of restraint system designs, (3) reduced testing cost enabling more comprehensive evaluation, and (4) standardized boundary conditions facilitating cross manufacturer comparison.

## VII. VIRTUAL TESTING AND SIMULATION ROADMAP

### A. Transition to Virtual Assessment

Euro NCAP has announced ambitious plans to transition from physical to virtual testing for far-side impacts, with far-side impact designated as the pilot test setup for virtual assessment protocols. The roadmap includes:

**Phase 1 – ATD Virtual Testing:** Implementation of virtual sled evaluation using validated WorldSID numerical models. This phase requires standardization of ATD finite element models, including material properties, joint characteristics, and sensor response validation.

**Phase 2 – HBM Integration:** Subsequent stages will incorporate Human Body Models to enable evaluation across diverse occupant

populations (different ages, statures, sexes, and seating positions). This represents a paradigm shift from single-point assessment (50th percentile male) to population based safety evaluation.

**Phase 3 – Standardization:** A critical challenge is the absence of standardized HBM certification protocols. Unlike ATDs, which have established ISO standards and validation procedures, HBMs currently lack globally accepted certification criteria. Development of HBM standards is essential for regulatory acceptance.

## B. Advanced Material Modeling

Virtual testing precision requires sophisticated material models:

**Expanded Polypropylene (EPP):** Used as spacer material in safety systems, EPP requires density of 60 g/l with minimum compression stress of 340 kPa at 25% compression strain. The \*MAT\_FU\_CHANG\_FOAM constitutive model, based on Chang 1995 equations, is recommended for accurate EPP behavior prediction under dynamic loading.

**Soft Tissue Modeling:** Updated HBMs feature high-quality soft tissue meshes meeting stringent quality criteria (>97% elements with Jacobian >0.7 and aspect ratio <3). Softer skin properties enable more biofidelic belt-skin interaction and accurate belt sliding prediction.

**Airbag Fabric:** Traditional Uniform Pressure Method (UPM) is insufficient for complex FSAB geometries. Advanced Corpuscular Particle Method (CPM) or Arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) formulations are required to depict real deployment behavior, including chamber to chamber gas flow and fabric-occupant interaction.

## C. Validation Methodology

Objective biofidelity assessment employs CORA (Correlation and Analysis) methodology, comparing HBM predictions against PMHS kinematic corridors. CORA scores range from 0 (no correlation) to 1 (perfect correlation), with thresholds of 0.44 (fair), 0.65 (good), and 0.86 (excellent). Multiple configurations are tested to ensure model robustness across varying impact angles, belt geometries, and seat positions.

## VIII. FUTURE TRENDS AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES

### A. Adaptive and Intelligent Safety Systems

Next-generation FSABs will incorporate adaptive capabilities:

**Crash Severity Sensing:** Advanced sensor arrays will distinguish between moderate and severe crashes, enabling adaptive airbag pressure and deployment timing. Current systems trigger at fixed 4 g threshold; future systems will employ machine learning

algorithms to predict crash severity within the first 5-10ms, optimizing restraint response.

**Multi-Stage Inflators:** Dual-stage or continuously variable inflators will adjust gas delivery based on occupant size (detected via seat sensors), crash severity, and seatbelt engagement status. This enables "soft" deployment for moderate impacts and "firm" deployment for severe scenarios.

**Pre-Crash Integration:** Integration with Advanced Driver Assistance Systems (ADAS) will enable pre-crash airbag priming, reducing deployment latency and optimizing occupant position through active seatbelt pre-tensioning.

**B. Autonomous Vehicle Challenges**

The transition to autonomous vehicles introduces complex seating configurations requiring FSAB adaptation:

**Rotated Seats:** Passengers in rotated seats (90° or 180° from forward-facing) experience altered crash kinematics. FSABs must be integrated directly into seat structures to maintain correct positioning relative to occupants regardless of seat orientation. Research demonstrates that airbag concepts provide soft restraining force advantages over modified seat structures alone, while also solving visibility problems inherent in rotated seat designs.

**Reclined Positions:** Occupants in reclined or sleeping positions present "out-of-position" scenarios. FSABs must prevent submarining (pelvis sliding under lap belt) while managing increased head-torso excursion distances.

**Variable Occupancy:** Autonomous vehicles may operate with variable occupancy patterns (single occupant, multiple occupants, empty). Intelligent sensing systems must detect occupancy and adjust deployment strategies accordingly.

### C. Integrated Safety Concept Development

Future research directions emphasize holistic integration:

**Seat-Airbag Co-Design:** Rather than treating FSAB as add-on component, future designs will integrate airbag into seat structure from initial concept phase, optimizing foam properties, frame geometry, and airbag mounting for synergistic protection.

**Multi-Directional Protection:** Occupants face threats from multiple impact directions. Future systems will provide integrated protection for frontal, near-side, far-side, and oblique crashes through coordinated deployment of multiple airbag modules.

**Biomechanical Optimization:** Advanced injury criteria including internal organ volume change, spine deformation, and tissue-level strain will guide FSAB optimization. These metrics, uniquely accessible through detailed HBMs, enable protection strategies

targeting specific injury mechanisms rather than gross kinematic limits.

## IX. RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE NEEDS

Despite significant advances in FSAB technology, several critical research gaps require attention:

### A. Belt Retention Optimization

Belt slip-off remains a pervasive challenge affecting both physical tests and simulations. Configuration 5 (D-ring forward, pure lateral) demonstrates lowest CORA scores due to high sensitivity to belt-shoulder interaction. Future research must address: (1) optimization of D-ring position and belt routing geometry for lateral loading, (2) integration of active pre-tensioners that maintain shoulder engagement throughout crash, (3) development of correlation analysis tools that better account for belt interaction variability, and (4) improved material models for belt webbing behavior under combined tension and lateral loading.

### B. Female Data Biofidelity Expansion

Current validation databases are heavily biased toward male PMHS data. Female VIVA+ HBM cannot be validated with equivalent confidence due to lack of female PMHS test data. This gap has significant equity implications, as female occupants may experience different injury patterns and protection effectiveness. Priority needs include: (1) conduct of female PMHS tests under standardized far-side protocols, (2) development of female-specific injury risk curves, (3) validation of female HBMs across multiple anthropometries (5th, 50th, 95th percentile), and (4) investigation of sexspecific injury mechanisms (e.g., differences in rib fracture biomechanics).

### C. Advanced Injury Criteria Standardization

As evaluations transition to HBMs, new injury criteria must be standardized and validated. Current ATD-based metrics (HIC, Nij, chest deflection) provide limited insight into internal injury mechanisms. HBM-unique metrics requiring standardization include: (1) internal organ volume change (lung, liver, spleen compression), (2) spine deformation and intervertebral disc stress, (3) tissue-level strain in brain, lungs, and abdominal organs, (4) rib cortical bone strain for fracture prediction, and (5) pelvis bone stress for iliac wing and sacrum fracture prediction.

### D. Multi-Occupant Interaction Modeling

Current protocols evaluate single far-side occupant response. Real-world crashes often involve interaction between driver and passenger, particularly in center-mounted FSAB scenarios.

Research needs include: (1) validation of HBM to HBM contact algorithms, (2) investigation of occupant size mismatch effects (large male driver with small female passenger), (3) evaluation of child occupant protection in rear seats with adult far-side occupants, and (4) development of test protocols that assess bilateral protection (both front occupants).

#### E. Countermeasure Framework Optimization

Multiple factors affect far-side protection effectiveness: airbag configuration (single vs. multi-chamber), deployment form (inflation volume, coverage area), console height and stiffness, and seat structure. An optimization framework is needed that: (1) employs multi-objective optimization balancing injury reduction across body regions, (2) accounts for manufacturing constraints and cost targets, (3) evaluates robustness across diverse crash scenarios (impact angle, velocity, occupant anthropometry), and (4) integrates field data to ensure realworld effectiveness.

## X. CONCLUSION

Far-side airbags represent a critical advancement in automotive passive safety, addressing the substantial injury burden affecting far-side occupants in lateral crashes. This comprehensive review has established that far-side occupants account for approximately 35% of side-impact injuries, with significant risks of head excursion (475-575 mm without protection), thoracic injury from center console impact, and permanent medical impairment.

Current FSAB architectures—including seat-back mounted and center-mounted configurations—employ sophisticated multi-chamber pressure zoning and staged deployment strategies to intercept and decelerate occupants. Performance evaluation methodologies have evolved from mechanical dummies (WorldSID, THOR) to high-fidelity Human Body Models (SAFER, VIVA+, GHBMC) validated against PMHS data, achieving CORA scores of 0.64-0.83. Quantitative assessments demonstrate substantial injury mitigation: 50-100 mm head excursion reduction, 16-21% chest compression reduction, and 39% Nij reduction.

The Euro NCAP 2020 protocol has established regulatory requirements driving widespread FSAB adoption, while the roadmap toward virtual testing promises more comprehensive evaluation across diverse occupant populations. Future trends emphasize adaptive sensing systems, autonomous vehicle integration, and holistic seat-airbag co-design.

Critical research gaps remain, particularly in belt retention optimization, female biofidelity data expansion, and standardization of HBM-based injury criteria. Addressing these gaps through continued collaboration between academia, industry, and regulatory bodies will be essential to achieve equitable and comprehensive protection for all occupants in all crash scenarios. As vehicle architecture evolves toward electrification and

automation, FSAB technology must continue to adapt, ensuring that safety innovation keeps pace with mobility transformation.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors acknowledge the contributions of the global automotive safety research community, particularly the Euro NCAP consortium, for establishing rigorous far-side impact testing protocols. We also recognize the open-source human body modeling initiatives (SAFER, VIVA+, GHBMC) that have enabled comprehensive biofidelity research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. Pipkorn, K. J. Larsson, D. Perez-Rapela, J. Östh, L. Jansons, and L. Jakobsson, "Occupant protection in far-side impacts," in Proc. IRCOBI Conference, Athens, Greece, 2018, pp. 1-18.
- [2] B. Heudorfer and M. Kraft, "Protection System for Far-Side Occupants in Lateral Crashes," in Proc. 21st International Technical Conference on Enhanced Safety of Vehicles (ESV), Stuttgart, Germany, 2009, Paper No. 090295.
- [3] Y. Fujiwara, "Occupant protection system for vehicle," U.S. Patent 8,764,054 B2, Jul. 1, 2014.
- [4] Y. Nakamura and H. Nakamura, "Far side airbag system for side collision of vehicle," U.S. Patent 7,938,443 B2, May 10, 2011.
- [5] C. A. Markusic, "Side impact occupant restraint airbag module," U.S. Patent 10,759,383 B2, Sep. 1, 2020.
- [6] Y. Masuda, S. Suzuki, A. Endo, T. Yamanaka, and Y. Matsuzaki, "Farside airbag apparatus for deployment between adjacent vehicle seats," U.S. Patent 9,616,841 B2, Apr. 11, 2017.
- [7] H. Masuda, S. Suzuki, A. Endo, T. Yamanaka, and Y. Matsuzaki, "Farside air bag device," U.S. Patent 9,499,118 B2, Nov. 22, 2016.
- [8] T. Yamanaka, Y. Masuda, and Y. Matsuzaki, "Far-side airbag apparatus," U.S. Patent 9,102,289 B2, Aug. 11, 2015.
- [9] Y. Matsuzaki, H. Masuda, and T. Yamanaka, "Far side air bag apparatus," U.S. Patent 9,481,332 B2, Nov. 1, 2016.
- [10] J. Perez-Rapela, C. Arregui-Dalmases, J. R. Kerrigan, J. Crandall, D. Parent, and M. Takahashi, "Occupant Restraint in Far-Side Impacts: Cadaveric and WorldSID Responses to a Far-Side Airbag," *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 248-261, Jan. 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10439-020-02614-w.
- [11] J. Östh, K. Brolin, and L. Jakobsson, "A Human Body Model with Active Muscles for Simulation of Pretensioned Restraints in Autonomous Braking Interventions," *Traffic Injury Prevention*, vol. 16, no. sup2, pp. S30-S39, 2015. DOI: 10.1080/15389588.2015.1061660.
- [12] B. Umale, C. Poulard, Y. Deng, J. R. Kerrigan, D. Parent, J. Crandall, and M. Takahashi, "Effectiveness of center-mounted airbag in far-side impacts based on THOR sled tests," *Traffic Injury Prevention*, vol. 20, no. sup2, pp. S125-S130, 2019. DOI: 10.1080/15389588.2019.1650266.
- [13] M. Cheng, Y. Zhao, and L. Wang, "Research and Analysis on Far Side Occupant Protection," SAE Technical Paper 2021-01-0879, 2021. DOI: 10.4271/2021-01-0879.
- [14] K. Fukawatase, "Vehicle safety device," U.S. Patent 8,561,745 B2, Oct. 22, 2013.

[15] A. El-Jawahri, "ES2re, WS50M, and Human Body Models in Far-SidePole Impacts," SAE Technical Paper 2023-01-0558, 2023. DOI: 10.4271/2023-01-0558.