

MEASUREMENT EFFICIENCY OF AN INSTRUMENTED MOUTHGUARD UNDER A LARGE RANGE OF HEAD ACCELERATIONS AND THE EFFECTS OF FILTERING

Christopher M. Jones^{1*}, Kieran Austin¹, Simon Augustus², Kieran Jai Nicholas¹, Xiancheng Yu³, Claire Baker³, Mike Loosemore^{4,5}, Mazdak Ghajari³

1 Sports and Wellbeing Analytics, UK

2 Department of Applied and Human Sciences, Kingston University London, London, UK

3 HEAD lab, Dyson School of Design Engineering, Imperial College London, South Kensington Campus, SW7 2AZ, UK

4 English Institute of Sport, UK

5 Institute of Sport and Exercise Health (ISEH), University College London, London, UK

ABSTRACT

Instrumented mouthguards (iMG) measure head kinematics in sport, but their measurements have not been validated at high levels of accelerations observed in those sports like rugby. In addition, the effects of filter cut-off frequency on the measured kinematics are still unknown. To address these questions, a drop testing helmeted head-form of an anthropometric testing device (ATD) was used to produce a range of accelerations and accurately control them. Peak linear acceleration (PLA), rotational velocity (PRV), rotational acceleration (PRA) and maximum principal strain (MPS) values were computed. The influence of filter cut-off frequency on peak kinematics was also calculated. Comparison of the peak values across ATD and iMG indicated high levels of agreement, with a total concordance correlation coefficient of 0.97 and intraclass correlation coefficients of 0.990 for PLA, 0.970 for PRV, 0.945 for PRA, and 0.970 for MPS. Cut-off frequencies of 100-300Hz did not significantly attenuate peak kinematics, but frequencies lower than 100Hz did. This is the first study to test an iMG under impact conditions seen in sport. The method presented can be used for in-lab validation of iMGs under head accelerations seen in sport. Furthermore, these results can contribute towards defining standards for filtering iMG data.

Keywords: Mouthguard, head impact, head kinematics, traumatic brain injury, sporting

INTRODUCTION

Contact and collision sports such as boxing and rugby union expose athletes to mild traumatic brain injuries as a result of head impacts¹⁹. Recent evidence has started to relate head impact exposure (HIE) with negative long-term effects such as the neurodegenerative disease chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE)^{21,37,41,43,49}. However, there is still a lack of real-world traumatic brain injury (TBI) data paired with head impact kinematics during contact sports. Such data will allow for exploring the links between HIE and TBI.

The growth and advancement of instrumented mouthguards (iMG) has enabled the measurement of head impact kinematics of contact sport athletes in training and competition^{10,28,30,50}. There are a number of iMGs that have been used to further understand the HIE in sport^{6,10,50,51}. Most mouthguards reported in the literature achieve values that are in close agreement to the anthropometric testing device (ATD) reference systems^{10,30,31,35,48}. However, a recent comparison study found that on-field kinematics for different iMGs were materially different, in addition to a number of iMGs reportedly exceeding the laboratory testing ranges³⁰. Though it was beyond the scope of the study to outline why there were differences, a number of contributing factors were suggested such as the trigger thresholds, mandible action upon impact, adherence to teeth, vocalisation and data processing techniques. Stitt et al.⁴⁸ completed a laboratory validation which tested an iMG system over a 20 - 80 g magnitude with impact durations ranging from 15-60 ms. While authors found high levels of agreement with a Lin's concordance correlation coefficient (CCC) of 0.997, on field head impact events last for <10 ms^{40,50} and can exceed 100 g^{30,40}. All individual validation testing to date has not exceeded 100 g^{6,10,24,35,48} while impacts with higher linear accelerations occur in sporting and are often related to an increased risk of injury^{9,25,27,39}. For instance, dynamic changes in blood brain barrier regulation have been reported in professional mixed martial arts fighters who sustained impacts over 100 g³⁹, and impacts of up to 146 g have been reported within concussed American Football players⁹. Whilst debate still continues on the efficacy or accuracy of biomechanical 'thresholds' for mild TBI, it is clear that impacts of high magnitude do occur. If these impacts are to be utilised as inputs into brain injury criteria and models, it is crucial that iMG measurements are valid and reliable within this range.

Previous work has shown that large differences can occur to the peak linear acceleration (PLA) and peak rotational acceleration data (PRA) when different filters and filter cut off

frequencies are utilised⁴⁵. Specifically, shorter duration and high magnitude head accelerations are most affected by these varying cut off frequencies⁴⁵, while these accelerations typically exceed lab testing ranges^{24,30,48}. These accelerations carry a greater likelihood of inducing traumatic brain injury. Hence, if data processing procedures cause an underestimation of their magnitudes, the confidence with which injurious impacts can be identified is reduced, and less confidence can be placed on brain computational models that utilise these accelerations as inputs. While most commercial iMG systems utilise proprietary data treatment techniques, these are often 'black box' processes that can alter output peak impact kinematics unbeknownst to users, and ultimately could lead to the underestimation of kinematics and brain modelling based metrics of TBI.

One aim of valid and reliable iMG systems is to provide input data for accurate brain modelling. Previous work has found that the rotational kinematics significantly affected strain predicted by a range of brain models whilst the linear acceleration did not⁸. It is therefore essential to test instrumented mouthguard devices under conditions that emphasise the rotational kinematics produced by head impacts. Comparison testing of iMGs to date has predominately focused on linear impact kinematics via pendulums and pneumatic impactors^{6,30,32,48}. To the authors knowledge, the influence of iMG on brain strain estimations when compared to the ATD gold standard has been assessed in a single study, whereby iMGs showed a mean relative error in brain strain of 7.5% - 8.9%³⁵, and one of the measured iMGs did not have a sufficient time sampling window for input into the simulation model. While some iMGs may simply be utilised for on-field evaluation of number and intensity of impacts, their efficacy in predicting brain injury measures should be included in holistic system evaluations, as the wider long-term view of researchers and sporting governing bodies and organisations is to understand the effects of head impact exposure on the brain.

Being able to validate instrumented mouthguards in laboratory conditions that are more representative of those reported on field (i.e. in terms of duration and magnitude), and those that test rotational kinematics to a greater degree should be a crucial step in the development of any iMG that plans for clinical implementation. In addition, not only should impact acceleration be compared but also brain strain predictions to understand the effects of real-world head impact kinematics on the brain during contact sports. Furthermore, how the data collected by such systems is processed should also be carefully and openly evaluated. Therefore, the current study had two main aims: i) to compare the iMG against a gold standard measure of impact kinematics and brain simulation metrics under conditions that are

more representative of those observed on-field, and ii) to evaluate the influence of varying filtering cut off frequencies on head kinematics metrics.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Methodological and procedural information are presented in line with the recent Consensus Head Acceleration Measurement Practices (CHAMP) recommendations^{3,18}.

Testing Protocol

Testing was conducted via Imperial College HEAD lab's drop rig to deliver impact to a 50th percentile Hybrid III headform (also called an anthropometric testing device, ATD, in this paper) (Figure 1A). The headform was instrumented with an array of nine PCB piezoelectric accelerometers (PCB 352C23, PCB Piezotronics, Depew, New York, USA), mounted inside the headform in a 3-2-2-2 arrangement. This allowed for the measurement of both linear and rotational accelerations at the centre of mass of the headform (Figure 1B) using Padgaonkar's method⁴² the same as in several previous studies^{1,20,22,52,53}. The acceleration data were recorded at a 50 kHz frequency and filtered with a 4th order Butterworth low-pass filter with a 1kHz cut-off frequency. The ATD was considered the gold standard for measurement of head accelerations during impacts.

The study compared the measurements of ATD against iMG shown in figure 1B. The mouthguard was fitted onto a plastic teeth, which was bolted into place inside and to the top of the ATD device utilising its metal casing to ensure no movement occurred. The headform was then fitted with a cycle helmet (DesignSter Lightweight Helmet) to prevent direct damage to the headform and control the acceleration magnitude and duration. The helmeted headform was lifted from the ground, and dropped onto a metal anvil angled at 45° covered with a grit 80 abrasive paper.




Figure 1: *i*) the testing drop rig: A = helmet, B = headform, C = Anvil. *(ii)* the Hybrid III headform, with mouthguard placement: D = plastic teeth, E = 9-accelerometer array, F = mouthguard.

The headform was subjected to impacts at three locations (front, side and back) and 7 speeds (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 *m/s*). These impact speeds, locations and subsequent impact durations are indicative of those observed in sports such as rugby union, boxing and other contact sports^{30,40,50}. Impacts that exceeded sensor ranges were removed from comparisons. The total number of impacts used were 82 ranging from 10 to 200 *g* in PLA. To reduce the chance of helmet failure, the helmets were only subjected to one impact to the front, side and back before being discarded, which is standard practice from previous work¹. For consistency, checks were performed after each impact to ensure the mouthguard had not come loose before proceeding to the next impact test.

iMG Measurement and Specifications

The *iMG* of the PROTECHT system contained a tri-axial accelerometer (H3LIS331DL, STMicroelectronics, Genova, Switzerland) and a tri-axial gyroscope (LSM9DS1,

STMicroelectronics, Genova, Switzerland). The former was sampled at 1 kHz (± 400 g, 12-bit resolution) and the latter at 1 kHz (± 35 rad.s⁻¹, 12-bit resolution). For each impact, the inertial sensors collected 104 ms of data for the mouthguard and 2 seconds for the ATD. For both the ATD and iMG the trigger-point of the sensors was a raw linear acceleration exceeding 10 g in any one of the three axes. Rotational accelerations were derived from the rotational velocity time-series using a five-point stencil approximation for the mouthguard. Peak values reported were defined as the maximum numerical value of the vector-norm of the respective time-series data. A summary of the specifications and processing is outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: System specifications for the PROTECHT™ SYSTEM and ATD reference data.

	PROTECHT™ SYSTEM	ATD (Reference)
Sampling rate (Accelerometer)	1,000 Hz	50,000 Hz
Sampling rate (Gyroscope)	1,000 Hz	NA
Measurement range and resolution (Accelerometer)	± 400 g	± 1000 g
Measurement range and resolution (Gyroscope)	± 35 rad/s	N/A
Output time windows	[-10, 104] ms	[-2,48] ms (after data processing)
Output coordinate axes direction	Not standard, but transformed to ISO reference frame.	ISO reference frame
Output coordinate origin	Sensor which is then transformed to Centre of Mass	Centre of Mass
Filter	Post analysis identified a 160 Hz low pass 4 th order Butterworth filter	4th order Butterworth low-pass filter with a 1kHz cut-off frequency
Derivation of rotational acceleration	5-point stencil derivative	Padgaonkar's method

Filtering Considerations

The type of filter and filter cut off frequency applied to the acceleration time-series data drastically influence head impact metric measurements⁴⁵. While conventions exist for the standardisation of such inputs within automotive testing – the SAE J211⁴⁶ – no such

convention exists within sports head impact measurement systems, introducing ambiguity into comparisons between systems. We approached this problem with two strategies: firstly, addressed how cut off frequency can influence peak kinematics measures, and secondly, utilised various spectral analysis measures to define the optimal cut off frequency for collected iMG data.

For the former, we compared multiple cut off frequencies to ATD collected data. The 50kHz ATD data (low pass Butterworth filtered with cut off frequency of 1000Hz) was used as a gold standard measure. The iMG from this study compared PLA, PRV and PRA outputs at various low pass, Butterworth filtered cut off frequencies of 300, 200, 100 and 50 Hz, corresponding to the most common frequencies utilised within a recent comparison of multiple iMG systems³⁰. In addition, the ATD was also down-sampled to 3200 Hz to represent the other iMGs reported within the literature³⁰, with the same cut off frequencies of 300, 200, 100 and 50Hz also applied with their corresponding output kinematic metrics compared to the 50kHz ATD data.

To establish optimal filter cut off frequency for iMG data, Fast Fourier transform (FFT) analysis was completed within Matlab R2022a (Signal Processing Toolbox; The Mathworks Inc, Natick, Massachusetts, USA) assessing the x , y , z and resultant components of linear acceleration, rotational velocity and rotational acceleration time-series data for both ATD and iMG systems. To provide further time-resolution to the frequency analysis of signals, continuous wavelet transformations (CWT) were also completed within Matlab (Signal Processing Toolbox; The Mathworks Inc, Natick, Massachusetts, USA), utilizing a ‘bump’ wavelet. Time-series data were zero padded to ensure the impact point lay within the cone of influence and was not subject to boundary effects.

Finite element model of the human head

The Imperial College 3D finite element model of the human head was used to predict brain deformation during impacts. The model incorporates details of the brain anatomy from high-resolution magnetic resonance images of a healthy 34-year-old male subject. The model consists of nearly one million hexahedral elements and a quarter of a million quadrilateral elements, representing 11 tissues, including the scalp, skull, brain, meninges, subarachnoid space and ventricles. The details of the model development, mechanical properties of different tissues and the validation of model prediction of brain displacement against post-mortem human subject experiments can be found in^{21,29,53}. A non-linear transient dynamic

code, LS-DYNA²⁶, was used to set up the model and solve the equations using 20 cores of a high-performance computer and 16 GB RAM.

The head model was loaded by the translational and rotational accelerations obtained from the ATD and iMG head impact data. For each element of the model, the maximum principal value of the Green-Lagrange strain tensor, which the element experienced during the impact, was determined. This quantity is called maximum principal strain (MPS) or strain hereafter. Several previous studies have shown that mechanical strain produced during head impacts can predict changes in brain tissue and vasculature^{4,12-14,16,21,38}.

Statistical Analysis

For filter comparisons, peak resultant rotational velocity (PRV), PLA and PRA data was filtered at 300, 200, 100 and 50Hz cut off frequencies were compared using a one-way ANOVA. If main effects were present, Bonferonni adjusted post-hoc tests were administered comparing against the ATD 50kHz gold standard.

For ATD and iMG comparisons, dependant variables were PLA, PRV and PRA and MPS, as measured by the ATD and the iMG.

Scatterplots and coefficient of determination (R-squared) were calculated to assess the relationship between the ATD and iMG. R-squared values indicates the proportionate amount of variation in the response variable yY explained by the independent variables X in the linear regression model¹⁷. Although a commonly used method within iMG validation methodology^{5,6}, correlation and linear regression model R squared values (interpreted in isolation) do not assess statistical agreement between measures and should not be utilised as a sole statistical test within such methodologies.

Agreement between measures was assessed using a battery of statistical tests: intraclass correlation coefficients (*ICC*), concordance correlation coefficient (*CCC*), Bland-Altman 95% limits of agreement and ordinary least products regression. Intraclass correlation coefficients measure the reliability and validity of measurements for data that have been collected as groups¹⁷. For all variables, ICCs were calculated using the (3,1) convention⁴⁷. The CCC evaluates the degree to which pairs of observations fall on the 45° line through the origin³³; values for linear and rotational kinematics measures and MPS were calculated. The combined CCC value that accounts for peak linear and rotational acceleration represented the

overall iMG in-laboratory validity³². The minimum validity threshold value for both *CCC* and *ICC* values is considered 0.80^{7,32}.

Bland-Altman 95% limits of agreement analysis is a simple method to evaluate the mean difference between measurement systems, and to estimate an agreement interval within which 95% of the differences between methods falls². Bland-Altman analysis was conducted using the “blandr” package¹¹ on RStudio (RStudio, Vienna, Austria). Differences were calculated weighing towards the ATD system, meaning positive bias indicated an underestimation in the iMG. Analyses were expressed using percentage difference. Although *a priori* 95% limits of agreement are usually required for Bland-Altman analysis²³, there is a lack of clinically informed criteria regarding what constitutes ‘agreement’ within head impact sensors. Therefore, ordinary least products regression was also implemented, which assesses fixed and proportional bias between two measurement systems³⁶. If the 95% confidence interval for the intercept did not include 0, then fixed bias was present. If the 95% confidence interval for the slope did not include 1.0, then proportional bias was present. Ordinary least products regression analysis was completed in RStudio using the ‘lmodel2’ package³⁴.

Finally, root mean-square errors were calculated to assess the accuracy of the overall time-series data, following a modified procedure from previous research¹⁰. For RMS, the peaks of corresponding impacts were first temporally aligned. They were then time-normalised based on the local minima either side of the peak value, which were identified in the ATD data. The RMS errors were also normalised (nRMS) based on the kinematics magnitude:

$$RMS = \sqrt{\sum_i^n \left(\frac{iMG_i - ATD_i}{n}\right)^2}$$
$$nRMS = \frac{RMS}{ATD_{max} - iMG_{max}} \times 100$$

where n is the number of measurements, and ATD_{max} and ATD_{min} are the maximum and minimum values recorded by the ATD during the impact.

RESULTS

ATD vs iMG Comparisons

For ATD and iMG comparisons, 82 total impacts were completed, with a mean impact duration of 9 ms ranging from 6 - 18 ms. Due to issues with iMG pre-sampling time, only 66 trials were utilised to calculate RMSE and nRMSE. Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for PLA, PRV, PRA and MPS data for all 82 impacts, which confirms a large range of kinematics achieved in the tests.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of all impacts for ATD and iMG.

	PLA (g)		PRV (rad/s)		PRA (rad/s/s)		MPS	
	ATD	iMG	ATD	iMG	ATD	iMG	ATD	iMG
<i>n</i>	82	82	82	82	82	82	81	81
Median	103.0	106.2	30.1	28.6	6069	5839	0.189	0.187
Mean	99.2	102.2	29.1	28.2	6116	5627	0.187	0.184
St Dev	40.4	43.8	9.48	8.56	2366	2011	0.06	0.06
Minimum	16.0	14.5	11.3	11.9	1331	1381	0.058	0.059
Maximum	175.4	191.4	52.0	42.8	11021	8851	0.280	0.287

Representative examples of the time-normalised vector norms of the measured time-series data are presented in Figure 2. Solid and dashed curves represent ATD and iMG time-series data (respectively) for impacts at 2, 4 and 6 m/s for linear acceleration, rotational velocity and rotational acceleration.




Figure 2: Examples of the ATD (solid line) and iMG (dashed line) measured head kinematics. The curves are synched using the peak values and then used to calculate RMS and NRMS errors. Column 1 represents linear acceleration curves, column 2 rotational velocity curves, and column 3 rotational acceleration curves. Row 1 represents a 2m/s impact, row 2 a 4 m/s impact, and row 3 a 6 m/s impact.

Figure 3 presents scatter plots and R^2 values for PLA ($R^2 = 0.9$), PRV ($R^2 = 0.93$), PRA ($R^2 = 0.95$) and MPS ($R^2 = 0.94$) for the iMG system compared to the ATD reference system. Statistical results are presented in table 3, which report the ICC values, CCC values, RMSE, nRMSE and Bland-Altman statistics for PLA, PRV and PRA for the iMG compared to the ATD reference system. As a short summary, all ICC values indicated excellent reliability; all CCC values indicated substantial agreement and exceeded the minimum required value of 0.8³² and minimal bias was detected within Bland-Altman analysis. Bland Altman plots, for both absolute and % difference measures, are presented in figure 4.

Table 3: Agreement statistics for biomechanical metrics: Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC), Concordance correlation coefficients (CCC), RMSE, nRMSE and Bland Altman Statistics for PLA, PRV and PRA in the ATD and iMG for the subset of 66 impacts.

	CCC	ICC	Mean Relative Error %	RMSE (\pm SD)	nRMSE (\pm SD; %)	Bland Altman (% Difference)		
	(95% CI)	(95% CI)				Bias (95% CI)	Lower Limit	Upper Limit
PLA (g)	0.989 0.984-0.992	0.992 0.987-0.995	2.20%	6.73 (\pm 3.23)	6.45 (\pm 1.96)	-2.16% (-4.51% - 0.19%)	-14.43%	10.10%
PRV (rad/s)	0.970 0.953-0.980	0.971 0.955-0.981	-0.70%	2.18 (\pm 1.13)	7.57 (\pm 2.71)	0.69% (-2.07% - 3.46%)	-13.74%	15.12%
PRA (rad/s²)	0.945 0.921-0.962	0.965 0.946-0.977	-6.20%	375 (\pm 209)	6.13 (\pm 2.37)	6.16% (3.31% - 9.02%)	-8.72%	21.04%
MPS	0.970 0.955-0.981	0.972 0.957-0.982	1.30%	N/A	N/A	1.35% (-1.59% - 4.29%)	-13.85%	16.59%




Figure 3: Scatter plots for peak linear acceleration, peak rotational velocity, peak rotational acceleration and maximal principal strain, measured by the ATD and iMG. Linear regression trendline ($\pm 95\%$ CI on line) and R squared values displayed on each graph.




Figure 4. Bland Altman Plots for 95% Limits of agreement between ATD (left column) and iMG (right column) for PLA (1st row), PRV (2nd row), PRA (3rd row) and MPS (4th row).

Ordinary least products regression analysis found evidence of fixed (intercept = 3.707; 95% CI 1.37 – 5.99) and proportional (slope = 0.93; 95%CI 0.91 – 0.95) bias for PLA; and evidence of fixed (intercept = 1.15; 95% CI 1.09 – 1.21) and proportional (slope = -400; 95% CI -726 – -89) bias within PRA. There was no evidence of fixed (intercept = -0.5; 95% CI 0.98 – 1.09) or proportional (slope = 1.03; 95% CI 0.98 – 1.08) bias for PRV. There was no evidence of fixed (intercept = -0.0000683; 95% CI -0.0108 – 0.00892) or proportional (slope = 1.021; 95% CI: 0.9688 – 1.0762) bias for MPS.

Effects of the Filter Cut Off Frequency – Downsampled ATD Data

For filter cut off frequency comparisons, 82 impacts were utilised. For ATD data that was down sampled to 3200Hz, there was a significant main effect of filter condition for PLA ($F_{(4,445)} = 22.158$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.166$) and PRA ($F_{(4,445)} = 45.455$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.290$) but not PRV ($F_{(4,445)} = 0.570$, $p = 0.684$, $\eta^2 = 0.005$). Post hoc comparisons and descriptive statistics are shown in Figure 5.

Effects of the Filter Cut Off Frequency – iMG Data

For iMG data, there was a significant main effects for filter condition for PLA ($F_{(5,378)} = 14.203$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.158$) with only the 50Hz condition significantly underestimating the reference ATD value by 40.7 g (95%CI = 19.2 to 62.2; $p < 0.001$). There was a significant main effect for filtered condition on PRA ($F_{(5,378)} = 34.398$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.313$), with the 50Hz condition significantly underestimating the reference ATD value by 4470 rads/s² (95% CI = 3395 to 5545; $p < 0.001$). There was no significant main effect for filter condition for PRV ($F_{(5,378)} = 0.283$, $p = 0.923$, $\eta^2 = 0.004$). Post hoc comparisons and descriptive statistics are shown in Figure 5 and Table 4 by breakdown of linear magnitude intensity buckets.




Figure 5. Box plots comparing filter conditions for PLA, PRV and PRA for downsampled ATD data. * = $p < 0.05$, *** = $p < 0.001$, **** = $p < 0.0001$; all comparisons made against reference category of ATD 1kHz.

Table 4. Descriptive stats for mean PLA, PRV and PRA for iMG data unfiltered, and filtered at 50-300 Hz cut off frequencies compared to the gold standard ATD data set using a 1000 Hz cut off frequency.

Impact Magnitude	Filter CutOff Frequency	Mean PLA (g)	% Difference from ATD	Mean PRV (rads/s)	% Difference from ATD	Mean PRA (rads/s/s)	% Difference from ATD
0-50g	ATD	37.8	NA	13.065	NA	2250	NA
	Raw iMG	36	4.82%	12.9	1.16%	2373	5.47%
	300Hz iMG	35.4	6.36%	12.9	1.32%	2090	7.11%
	200Hz iMG	35.2	6.85%	12.9	1.30%	2119	5.82%
	100Hz iMG	32	15.35%	13	0.71%	1795	20.22%
	50Hz iMG	22.9	39.43%	13	0.51%	1251	44.40%
50-100g	ATD	76	NA	27	NA	5066	NA
	Raw iMG	84.5	11.29%	26.2	3.12%	5869	15.85%
	300Hz iMG	83.2	9.48%	26.1	3.41%	5230	3.24%
	200Hz iMG	82.6	8.79%	26.1	3.57%	4969	1.91%
	100Hz iMG	73.9	2.68%	26.1	3.54%	4101	19.05%
	50Hz iMG	48.6	36.00%	25.5	5.81%	2399	52.65%
100g-150g	ATD	127	NA	31.5	NA	7182	NA
	Raw iMG	139.9	10.18%	31.2	1.22%	8016	11.61%
	300Hz iMG	137.5	8.28%	30.9	1.98%	7081	1.41%
	200Hz iMG	136	7.13%	31	1.68%	6771	5.72%
	100Hz iMG	117.6	7.40%	30.8	2.20%	5263	26.72%
	50Hz iMG	74.9	41.00%	29.6	6.07%	2884	59.84%
150g+	ATD	167.8	NA	37.9	NA	9728	NA
	Raw iMG	204.4	21.77%	37.5	0.99%	11876	22.08%
	300Hz iMG	198.7	18.42%	37.4	1.42%	10544	8.39%
	200Hz iMG	192.8	14.88%	37	2.38%	9150	5.94%
	100Hz iMG	162.2	3.36%	36.5	3.72%	6289	35.35%
	50Hz iMG	101.1	39.76%	35.4	6.57%	3417	64.87%
Total	ATD	103.827	NA	28.787	NA	6198	NA
	Raw iMG	116.302	12.02%	28.26	1.83%	7077	14.18%
	300Hz iMG	114.134	9.93%	28.106	2.37%	6273	1.21%
	200Hz iMG	112.707	8.55%	28.108	2.36%	5910	4.65%
	100Hz iMG	98.042	5.57%	27.988	2.78%	4617	25.51%
	50Hz iMG	63.04	39.28%	27.115	5.81%	2607	57.94%

Optimal Filter Cut Off Frequency

FFT and CWT outputs determined the use of a 160 Hz Low-pass 4th order Butterworth filter for iMG data. This universal cut off frequency best represents previous work³¹ and the interpretation of the FFT outputs. Example FFT and CWT graphs for 2 m/s, 4 m/s and 6 m/s impacts, and the MATLAB code used to generate them, can be seen in supplementary materials. Optimal cut off frequency was chosen as the point at which the FFT graph appears to visually plateau following the large spike in the early frequencies. The representative graphs show this point with a red line. This point varied across impacts with different speeds, with linear acceleration values varying between 130Hz and up to 200Hz for the higher speed impacts. 160Hz was chosen as an optimum cut off frequency value that best represented all measured impacts. It is acknowledged that the point of inflection/visual plateau within the rotational velocity curves falls earlier than 160Hz for the majority of impacts, but as a higher cut off frequency did not appear to introduce additional noise into the velocity signal, 160Hz was also used. Further investigation identified that the impact velocity affected the frequency domain to individual axis components seen in the CWT graphs, and though a universal filter elicited close agreement with the ATD, a future refined approach of using a moving cut-off frequency dependant on the impact magnitude and change to the frequency domain should be explored.

DISCUSSION

One aim of this study was to compare the ATD reference system against an iMG system under large range of impact conditions that represented those observed on field, taking current comparison studies one step further. The results showed good agreements and strong positive correlations between the head kinematics measured by the iMG and ATD. In addition, predicted brain strains based on ATD and iMG systems showed good agreement. As the second aim, multiple low-pass filter cut off frequencies were compared to assess their influence on peak kinematics metrics. This analysis showed that low cut off frequencies of 100 and 50Hz significantly lowers peak linear and rotational accelerations, but not rotational velocity. A cut off frequency of 160 Hz was determined suitable for the large range of head kinematics achieved in our experiments.

The measured iMG acceleration time-series data had a total *CCC* value of 0.970 when compared to the ATD reference measurement system, under conditions that expose the iMG device to PLA ranges of 10-200 g and impact durations of 6 - 18 *ms*. This is the first time from which an iMG device has been tested under these conditions, which produce PLAs almost double those reported in previous literature. The reported *CCC* value have met the threshold (>80%) outlined by Kieffer et al.³² in their two-phase approach to quantifying head impact sensor accuracy, indicating the iMG would be suitable to complete the second stage of evaluation measuring on-field kinematics. The total *CCC* value reported in the current study is similar to those reported by previous literature evaluating a cohort of instrumented mouthguards³⁰. The authors reported total *CCC* values of 0.953-0.983 from the highest performing iMG systems when compared with the ATD reference system. A previous validation reported *CCC* values of 0.967 of an older version of the PROTECHT system iMG³¹. However, testing conducted by both aforementioned studies utilised an alternative experimental set up: the testing conducted by Jones et al.³⁰ used a pendulum impactor on a bareheaded ATD headform, and the testing reported by Jones & Brown³¹ used a pneumatic linear impactor on a helmeted ATD headform, with both studies achieving PLAs up to 100 g due to equipment limitations. PLAs of over 100 g have been reported in sports such as boxing, American football and rugby^{9,25,30,39}. Such high acceleration magnitudes have an increased chance of causing traumatic brain injuries, although it should be noted that increased strain magnitudes of brain tissues are predominantly due to the increased rotational kinematics accompanying high linear kinematics⁴⁴. As the reconstruction and modelling of concussive impacts could enable researchers to better investigate causal mechanisms of

injury, the validity and reliability of on field kinematics inputs is vital, requiring iMGs to be validated within a large range of kinematics likely to occur on the field as done in this study.

The measured iMG and ATD data were positively correlated, with R-squared values of 0.99 for PLA, PRV and PRA and relative errors of 2.2%, -0.7% and -6.2% for PLA, PRV and PRA. Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) values of 0.992, 0.971 and 0.965 for PLA, PRV and PRA respectively met the minimum acceptability for reliability and validity measures of >0.80 ⁷. The findings of this study are consistent with previous research that has compared the accuracy of other instrumented mouthguards for collision sports, with Greybe et al.,²⁴ reporting *ICC* values of 0.95 and 0.99 for PLA and PRV respectively and those reported by Jones and Brown.³¹ with *ICC* values of 0.96 and 0.99 and 0.95 for PLA, PRV and PRA respectively.

Ordinary least products regression analysis showed fixed and proportional bias for both linear and rotational acceleration. To some degree this is evident with the Bland-Altman plots reported in figure 4, where there is slope evidence within both the linear and angular acceleration plots for absolute values. Proportional bias could suggest that as the magnitude of impact increase, the amount of variability within the agreement of the two methods also increases. However, when analysed via percentage difference, data conformed to a homoscedastic distribution, suggesting the magnitude of error only increases in line with the magnitude of impact. Such approaches were also used by previous mouthguard evaluations³⁰. Bland-Altman analysis showed slight overestimation of PLA within the iMG of 2.2% and larger underestimation of PRA by 6.16%. Limits of agreement ranged between -14.4 to 10% for PLA, between -13.7 to 15% for PRV and between -8.7 to 21% for PRA. There are currently no clinically meaningful criteria for what represents acceptable agreement with iMGs. However, these results were comparable to previous mouthguard validations, where the top performing mouthguard reported 31.7% and 29.7% limits agreement for PLA and PRA respectively^{24,30}.

It is also important to evaluate the accuracy of the overall shape of the time-series data as many in-house machine learning classification processes utilise time-series feature analysis¹⁰. To that end, RMS and NRMS errors of the time-series data were calculated utilising a modified methodology of Camarillo et al.¹⁰. In that study, the RMS error was calculated over a 25-ms period, centred on the impact maximum, which was assumed to capture the relevant portion of the impact trace. In the present study, we calculated the RMS (and NRMS) error

over the impact portion of the measured trace. The mean RMS (and NRMS) error for the linear acceleration and rotational velocity was 6.7 ± 3.2 g ($6.5 \pm 1.9\%$) and 2.2 ± 1.1 rad/s ($2.6 \pm 2.7\%$), respectively. These errors are comparable with – and on a normalised basis, lower than – those reported by Camarillo et al¹⁰, where the mean RMS (and NRMS) errors for the linear acceleration and rotational velocity were 3.9 ± 2.1 g ($9.9 \pm 4.4\%$) and 1.0 ± 0.8 rad/s ($10.4 \pm 9.9\%$), respectively. The small RMS error between the measured timeseries data (both linear acceleration and rotational velocity) indicates high comparability of the overall shape of the waveforms measured by the two sensor systems.

Maximal principal strain measures predicted by inputs from ATD or iMG showed high levels of agreement, with a CCC value of 0.971, an ICC of 0.972 and mean relative error of 1.3%. Bland-Altman 95% limits of agreement analysis reports a bias of 1.35% with limits ranging between -13.85% and 16.59%, and ordinary least products regression reported no fixed or proportional bias. As previously discussed, although Bland-Altman analysis usually requires an *a priori* set level of agreement between the two measurements, there is currently no set level of agreement informed by clinical measures within the brain modelling literature. The greatest relative error for MPS occurred in the test with the largest difference in rotational acceleration between the ATD and iMG systems. The linear acceleration had no effect on the MPS, in agreement with the findings of previous research¹⁵. Hence, an accurate measurement of rotational kinematics is important for an accurate prediction of the MPS value. Only one previous study has compared the predicted brain strain across ATD and iMG input kinematics, where mean relative errors ranged between 7.5% and 8.9% for various iMGs³⁵, compared to the 1.3% relative error in the current study.

Filter comparisons show that the choice of cut off frequency can have a profound effect on impact kinematics. Chosen to reflect filtering techniques from iMGs used in previous research³⁰, the choice of cut off frequency significantly influenced linear and rotational acceleration, both with large effect sizes ($\eta^2 = 0.166$ and $\eta^2 = 0.290$, respectively). Specifically, a 50 Hz cut off frequency significantly reduced PLA and PRA when compared to the ATD 1kHz gold standard, and a 100 Hz cut off frequency significantly reduced rotational accelerations compared to the gold standard measure. Though not significant for PLA, there were differences reported when using 100 Hz cut off frequency at a number of impact magnitude ranges as seen in Figure 2. Filter cut off frequencies of 300Hz and 200Hz did not significantly attenuate impact kinematics. Given the importance of rotational kinematics for brain strain predictions, the use of iMG data with low cut off filters could lead

to an underestimation of strain predictions. While it is acknowledged that the choice of cut off frequency is likely to be related to the characteristics of impact, a lack of consensus on impact data treatment could lead to ambiguity when impact kinematics from different systems are compared.

A limitation of the current study is the placement of the iMG at the top of ATD, as the headform used could not facilitate for placement within the 'jaw', similar to procedures of previous studies²⁴. While a jaw placement would emulate *in vivo* conditions to a greater extent, it has been noted that maintaining the position of the 'jaw' within a headform is problematic due to no active mandible contraction³⁵. Regardless, the iMG accelerations were still transformed to the ATD headform centre of mass to match the reference sensors. Furthermore, rigid coupling of the iMG to the ATD also allowed for the repeatable testing of impacts particularly those that produced large accelerations. Future research shall address on field testing validity and reliability, and player and practitioner feasibility and useability to allow for comparisons with other iMG systems³⁰.

This is the first study to measure the agreement between the ATD reference system and an iMG system for impacts producing PLAs over 100 g and impact durations that are compatible with those observed on field in sport with reported *CCC* values of 0.970. The ability to validate under conditions that reflect on field kinematics in terms of measured impact magnitudes and durations is essential to ensure the values reported on field are correct. In this study the iMG system was comparable to that of a gold standard measure, measuring impacts magnitudes up to 200 g and impact durations ranging from 6 -18 ms. As such, the iMG system can be utilised by applied practitioners to validly and reliably measure head impact kinematics within real world game scenarios. The methods presented here can be used in future studies to validate iMG systems under laboratory conditions that reflect those observed on field to provide confidence in results and to determine optimal cut off frequencies for reliable data processing and reporting.

Funding

Independent laboratory testing and brain simulations completed at Imperial College London HEAD lab were funded by Sport & Wellbeing Analytics (SWA).

Conflict of Interests

CJ, KA and KN are all employed by Sports & Wellbeing Analytics (SWA), manufacturers of the PROTECHT mouthguard. ML is part of the SWA executive board. All data testing and brain simulations were completed independently by MG, XY and CB at Imperial College London and the subsequent analyses were completed by CJ, KA and KN. Statistical analyses and integrity of results were confirmed by an independent researcher (SA) who is not employed by, or receives no benefit from, SWA. The results of the current study do not constitute endorsement of the product by the authors or the journal.

Data Availability Statement

Data is available upon request by emailing the lead author, CJ.

Ethical approval

Not applicable

References

1. Abayazid, F., K. Ding, K. Zimmerman, H. Stigson, and M. Ghajari. A new assessment of bicycle helmets: The brain injury mitigation effects of new technologies in oblique impacts. *Ann Biomed Eng* 49:2716–2733, 2021.
2. Altman, D. G., and J. M. Bland. Measurement in Medicine: the Analysis of Method Comparison Studies. *The Statistician* 32:307–317, 1983.
3. Arbogast, K. B., J. B. Caccese, T. A. Buckley, A. S. McIntosh, K. Henderson, B. D. Stemper, G. Solomon, S. P. Broglio, J. R. Funk, and J. R. Crandall. Consensus Head Acceleration Measurement Practices (CHAMP): origins, methods, transparency and disclosure. *Ann Biomed Eng* 1–29, 2022.
4. Bain, A. C., and D. F. Meaney. Tissue-level thresholds for axonal damage in an experimental model of central nervous system white matter injury. *J Biomech Eng* 122:615–622, 2000.
5. Bartsch, A. J., D. S. Hedin, P. L. Gibson, V. J. Miele, E. C. Benzel, J. L. Alberts, S. Samorezov, A. Shah, B. S. Stemper, and M. M. McCrea. Laboratory and on-field data collected by a head impact monitoring mouthguard. , 2019.
6. Bartsch, A., S. Samorezov, E. Benzel, V. Miele, and D. Brett. Validation of an “intelligent Mouthguard” Single Event Head Impact Dosimeter. *SAE Technical Papers* 2014-Novem:, 2014.
7. Baumgartner, T. a., and H. Chung. Confidence Limits for Intraclass Reliability Coefficients. *Meas Phys Educ Exerc Sci* 5:179–188, 2001.
8. Bian, K., and H. Mao. Mechanisms and variances of rotation-induced brain injury: a parametric investigation between head kinematics and brain strain. *Biomech Model Mechanobiol* 19:2323–2341, 2020.
9. Broglio, S. P., A. Lapointe, K. L. O’Connor, and M. McCrea. Head impact density: a model to explain the elusive concussion threshold. *J Neurotrauma* 34:2675–2683, 2017.
10. Camarillo, D. B., P. B. Shull, J. Mattson, R. Shultz, and D. Garza. An Instrumented Mouthguard for Measuring Linear and Angular Head Impact Kinematics in American Football. *Ann Biomed Eng* 41:1939–1949, 2013.

11. Datta, D. blandr: a Bland-Altman Method Comparison package for R. , 2017.
12. Donat, C. K., M. Yanez Lopez, M. Sastre, N. Baxan, M. Goldfinger, R. Seamber, F. Müller, P. Davies, P. Hellyer, and P. Siegkas. From biomechanics to pathology: predicting axonal injury from patterns of strain after traumatic brain injury. *Brain* 144:70–91, 2021.
13. Duckworth, H., A. Azor, N. Wischmann, K. A. Zimmerman, I. Tanini, D. J. Sharp, and M. Ghajari. A Finite Element Model of Cerebral Vascular Injury for Predicting Microbleeds Location. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol* 10:, 2022.
14. Elkin, B. S., and B. Morrison III. Region-specific tolerance criteria for the living brain. *Stapp Car Crash J* 51:127, 2007.
15. Fahlstedt, M., F. Abayazid, M. B. Panzer, A. Trotta, W. Zhao, M. Ghajari, M. D. Gilchrist, S. Ji, S. Kleiven, and X. Li. Ranking and rating bicycle helmet safety performance in oblique impacts using eight different brain injury models. *Ann Biomed Eng* 49:1097–1109, 2021.
16. Farajzadeh Khosroshahi, S., X. Yin, C. K Donat, A. McGarry, M. Yanez Lopez, N. Baxan, D. J Sharp, M. Sastre, and M. Ghajari. Multiscale modelling of cerebrovascular injury reveals the role of vascular anatomy and parenchymal shear stresses. *Sci Rep* 11:1–12, 2021.
17. Field, A. Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. sage, 2013.
18. Gabler, L., D. Patton, M. Begonia, R. Daniel, A. Rezaei, C. Huber, G. Siegmund, T. Rooks, and L. Wu. Consensus Head Acceleration Measurement Practices (CHAMP): Laboratory Validation of Wearable Head Kinematic Devices. *Ann Biomed Eng* 1–16, 2022.
19. Gallo, V., K. Motley, S. P. T. Kemp, S. Mian, T. Patel, L. James, N. Pearce, and D. McElvenny. Concussion and long-term cognitive impairment among professional or elite sport-persons: a systematic review. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 91:455–468, 2020.
20. Ghajari, M., U. Galvanetto, L. Iannucci, and R. Willinger. Influence of the body on the response of the helmeted head during impact. *International journal of crashworthiness* 16:285–295, 2011.

21. Ghajari, M., P. J. Hellyer, and D. J. Sharp. Computational modelling of traumatic brain injury predicts the location of chronic traumatic encephalopathy pathology. *Brain* 140:333–343, 2017.
22. Ghajari, M., S. Peldschus, U. Galvanetto, and L. Iannucci. Effects of the presence of the body in helmet oblique impacts. *Accid Anal Prev* 50:263–271, 2013.
23. Giavarina, D. Understanding Bland Altman analysis. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)* 25:141–151, 2015.
24. Greybe, D. G., C. M. Jones, M. R. Brown, and E. M. P. Williams. Comparison of head impact measurements via an instrumented mouthguard and an anthropometric testing device. *Sports Engineering* 23:1–11, 2020.
25. Guskiewicz, K. M., and J. P. Mihalik. Biomechanics of sport concussion: Quest for the elusive injury threshold. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 39:4–11, 2011.
26. Hallquist, J. LS-DYNA keyword user’s manual. California: 2013.
27. Hoshizaki, T. B., A. Post, M. Kendall, J. Cournoyer, P. Rousseau, M. D. Gilchrist, S. Brien, M. Cusimano, and S. Marshall. The development of a threshold curve for the understanding of concussion in sport. *Trauma* 19:196–206, 2017.
28. Jansen, A. E., M. McGrath, S. Samorezov, J. Johnston, A. Bartsch, and J. Alberts. Characterizing head impact exposure in men and women during boxing and mixed martial arts. *Orthop J Sports Med* 9:23259671211059816, 2021.
29. Ji, S., M. Ghajari, H. Mao, R. H. Kraft, M. Hajiaghamemar, M. B. Panzer, R. Willinger, M. D. Gilchrist, S. Kleiven, and J. D. Stitzel. Use of brain biomechanical models for monitoring impact exposure in contact sports. *Ann Biomed Eng* 1–20, 2022.
30. Jones, B., J. Tooby, D. Weaving, K. Till, C. Owen, M. Begonia, K. A. Stokes, S. Rowson, G. Phillips, S. Hendricks, É. C. Falvey, M. Al-Dawoud, and G. Tierney. Ready for impact? A validity and feasibility study of instrumented mouthguards (iMGs). *Br J Sports Med* bjsports-2022-105523, 2022.doi:10.1136/bjsports-2022-105523
31. Jones, C., and R. Brown. VALIDATION OF AN INSTRUMENTED MOUTHGUARD. *medRxiv*, 2022.

32. Kieffer, E. E., M. T. Begonia, A. M. Tyson, and S. Rowson. A Two-Phased Approach to Quantifying Head Impact Sensor Accuracy: In-Laboratory and On-Field Assessments. *Ann Biomed Eng* 48:2613–2625, 2020.
33. Lawrence, I., and K. Lin. A concordance correlation coefficient to evaluate reproducibility. *Biometrics* 255–268, 1989.
34. Legendre, P. Package “lmodel2.”, 2018.
35. Liu, Y., A. G. Domel, S. A. Yousefsani, J. Kondic, G. Grant, M. Zeineh, and D. B. Camarillo. Validation and comparison of instrumented mouthguards for measuring head kinematics and assessing brain deformation in football impacts. *Ann Biomed Eng* 48:2580–2598, 2020.
36. Ludbrook, J. A primer for biomedical scientists on how to execute model II linear regression analysis. *Clin Exp Pharmacol Physiol* 39:329–335, 2012.
37. Mckee, A. C., M. Alosco, and B. R. Huber. Repetitive Head Impacts and Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy. , 2016.
38. Morrison III, B., H. L. Cater, C. C. B. Wang, and F. C. Thomas. A tissue level tolerance criterion for living brain developed with an in vitro model of traumatic mechanical loading. *Stapp Car Crash J* 47:93, 2003.
39. O’Keeffe, E., E. Kelly, Y. Liu, C. Giordano, E. Wallace, M. Hynes, S. Tiernan, A. Meagher, C. Greene, and S. Hughes. Dynamic blood–brain barrier regulation in mild traumatic brain injury. *J Neurotrauma* 37:347–356, 2020.
40. O’Keeffe, E., E. Kelly, Y. Liu, C. Giordano, E. Wallace, M. Hynes, S. Tiernan, A. Meagher, C. Greene, S. Hughes, T. Burke, J. Kealy, N. Doyle, A. Hay, M. Farrell, G. A. Grant, A. Friedman, R. Veksler, M. G. Molloy, J. F. Meaney, N. Pender, D. Camarillo, C. P. Doherty, and M. Campbell. Dynamic Blood-Brain Barrier Regulation in Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma* 37:347–356, 2020.
41. Owens, T. S., T. A. Calverley, B. S. Stacey, A. Iannatelli, L. Venables, G. Rose, L. Fall, H. Tsukamoto, R. M. G. Berg, G. L. Jones, C. J. Marley, and D. M. Bailey. Contact events in rugby union and the link to reduced cognition: evidence for impaired redox-regulation of cerebrovascular function. *Exp Physiol* 106:1971–1980, 2021.

42. Padgaonkar, A. J., K. W. Krieger, and A. I. King. Measurement of angular acceleration of a rigid body using linear accelerometers. , 1975.
43. Patton, D. A., C. M. Huber, D. Jain, R. K. Myers, C. C. McDonald, S. S. Margulies, C. L. Master, and K. B. Arbogast. Head Impact Sensor Studies In Sports: A Systematic Review Of Exposure Confirmation Methods. *Ann Biomed Eng* 48:2497–2507, 2020.
44. Post, A., T. Blaine Hoshizaki, M. D. Gilchrist, and M. D. Cusimano. Peak linear and rotational acceleration magnitude and duration effects on maximum principal strain in the corpus callosum for sport impacts. *J Biomech* 61:183–192, 2017.
45. Post, A., J. M. Clark, D. G. E. Robertson, T. B. Hoshizaki, and M. D. Gilchrist. The effect of acceleration signal processing for head impact numeric simulations. *Sports Engineering* 20:111–119, 2017.
46. SAE. Instrumentation for Impact Test - Part 1 - Electronic Instrumentation. 2014.
47. Shrout, P. E., and J. L. Fleiss. Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychol Bull* 86:420, 1979.
48. Stitt, D., N. Draper, K. Alexander, and N. Kabaliuk. Laboratory validation of instrumented mouthguard for use in sport. *Sensors* 21:6028, 2021.
49. Tyson, A. M., S. M. Duma, and S. Rowson. Laboratory Evaluation of Low-Cost Wearable Sensors for Measuring Head Impacts in Sports. *J Appl Biomech* 34:320–326, 2018.
50. Waldron, M., C. M. Jones, L. Melotti, R. Brown, M, and L. P. Kilduff. Collision monitoring in elite male rugby union using a new instrumented mouth-guard. *The Journal of Sport and Exercise Science*, , 2021.
51. Wu, L. C., V. Nangia, K. Bui, B. Hammoor, M. Kurt, F. Hernandez, C. Kuo, and D. B. Camarillo. In Vivo Evaluation of Wearable Head Impact Sensors. *Ann Biomed Eng* 44:1234–1245, 2016.
52. Yu, X., I. Logan, I. de Pedro Sarasola, A. Dasaratha, and M. Ghajari. The protective performance of modern motorcycle helmets under oblique impacts. *Ann Biomed Eng* 1–15, 2022.

53. Zimmerman, K. A., J. Kim, C. Karton, L. Lochhead, D. J. Sharp, T. Hoshizaki, and M. Ghajari. Player position in American football influences the magnitude of mechanical strains produced in the location of chronic traumatic encephalopathy pathology: a computational modelling study. *J Biomech* 118:110256, 2021.