College of Engineering Department of Mechanical & Industrial Engineering College of Engineering School of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science

## To Predict ► To Design ► To Perform

## **ME, ECE Capstone Design Programs**

## Team#5: Improving Outcomes in Cervical Spine Trauma – Building a Better Cervical Collar LSU NEW ORLEAN Avesha Badat, Don Ho, Cade Lonibos, Alack Patel, Annie Rickman, Joshua Showers, Kyle Wilson **Objective Statement Cervical Collar Design Compliance Device** Analysis Design an adjustable cervical collar for adults that Microcontroller: Chin **FEA: Back Piece and Side Piece:** 1 immobilizes the cervical spine, while also TinyLily Mini (ATmega328P) Attachment monitoring compliance. Operating Voltage: 2.7-5.5V 629 Adjustable 2 571 1KB EEPROM Columns Background 514 Sensor: 3 **Chest Plate** Cervical Collar Purpose: APDS-9960 Proximity Sensor Immobilize the neck Δ Side Piece 1 Operating Voltage: 3.3V Properly heal and fuse the cervical spine for 5 Back Piece • Operating Range: 4-8in postoperative patients Batterv: Pins 6 114 CR2032 Coin Cell Battery **Engineering Specifications** 10 \* Convergence was checked and verified Monitoring 3V • 7 Device (under Tracheostomy • 13.8mm diameter opening in **Boundary Conditions:** padding) 10 Opening front of the neck Back Piece (pictured center-right): > Applied Force of 278N normal to the Battery life of 6 weeks 8 surface (red arrows) without recharging or > Hinged fixture applied to the back replacing between doctor Results Testing Monitor piece visits Compliance Safety Factor of 4 Where: Record and store the time the Criteria Data Side Piece (pictured left): LSU Kinesiology Motor Control Lab collar is worn with 98% ▶ Applied force of 75.5N normal to the Preliminary data shows that the Method: accuracy prototype limits motion better than surface (blue arrow) IRB approval (21 subjects tested) Immobility Flexion/Extension: 20% the competition in about 80% of Columns (pictured bottom-right): Subjects were randomly fitted with the decrease in ROM compared participants prototype collar, Aspen, and Miami-J > FMEA determined that the most catastrophic to Aspen Immobility failure would be with the columns. Kinematic data was collected to compare Not obstructive to users, recorded Lateral Flexion/Rotation: 25% Bending and Buckling calculations were performed degrees of ROM for each collar Compliance time accurately, and displayed data to decrease in ROM compared monitor to Aspen Budget ←With the subjects • Fits the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile of Comfort Aspen Vista: -16%, Miami-J: -8% informed consent. the \$70\_\_\_\$39\_ \$65 \_\$115 female head & necks to the prototype collar is being Adjustability \$68 Fit Aspen Vista: +33%, Miami-J: +29% Sensor properly fitted for Batterv 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of male head testing. Three reflective & necks in the US Available: Microcontroller Testing markers can be seen Aspen Vista: -27%, Miami: -36% Aesthetics \$442 \$5,000 which are depicted by 15% greater than the average Manufacturing Padding the grey dots on the Comfort, Fit, rating for Miami-J and Aspen Weight 0.8 lbs. subjects head. Utilized: Aesthetics Collar Structure Connection Vista (competitor's collars) \$1,603 Compression \$395 Memory Held target load of 50 lbs. Weight Less than 3 lbs. **Test-Columns** anuary February September November: March April Present fina December: Continued oiect kickoff and IRB Prototype testing and otype and publi Engineering analysis supplies ordere anufacturing and and IRB applicatio and initial testing analysis of results sults for further and design revisior and collar olunteers recruited

Sponsor: Dr. Abhishek Kumar

Advisers: Dr. Hunter Gilbert & Linda Cross