PPS
PAIN PRACTICE SOLUTIONS

Assessing the relationship between the visibility of vehicle damage and the occurrence of Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD) following motor vehicle accidents

How to cite this paper:
O'Connor, D. (2025). Assessing the relationship between the visibility of vehicle damage and the occurrence of Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD) following motor vehicle accidents.

The author would like to thank colleagues from around the country who have inspired and given guidance for the creation of this document.

Executive Summary

The belief that visible vehicle damage correlates with the severity of injuries sustained in motor vehicle collision (MVC)s (MVAs) is a prevalent misunderstanding. This paper seeks to educate individuals about the lack of connection between visible auto damage and the need for medical care and intervention for injuries.

Key Findings

- The severity of injuries, especially Whiplash-Associated Disorders (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)), does not always correlate with the visible damage to the vehicle.
- Several factors contribute to the onset and persistence of Whiplash-Associated Disorders (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)) following motor vehicle collision (MVC)s, including:
  - Headrest position
  - Distance of head from headrest on impact
  - Position of head at the time of impact
  - Age of the collision occupant
  - Preexisting cervical pathology
  - Improved collision absorption technology in automobiles
  - Role of muscle activation to protect or add to trauma of the spine
  - Type of collision (rear-end, frontal, lateral)

Implications

This paper underscores the importance of seeking medical evaluation after a motor vehicle collision (MVC), regardless of visible vehicle damage. The evidence presented supports the legitimacy of patient symptoms and the need for appropriate medical care. Ultimately, it challenges the misconception that injury severity is determined solely by the extent of vehicle damage.

Introduction

This paper challenges the common misconception that visible vehicle damage reflects the severity of injuries sustained in motor vehicle collisions (MVCs). Focusing on Whiplash-Associated Disorders (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)), it presents research showing that injury severity often bears no direct correlation to the extent of visible damage. The goal is to educate both clinicians and patients, emphasizing the importance of timely medical evaluation regardless of how damaged the vehicle appears.

Experienced physicians understand that Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD) often involves complex pain, dysfunction, and pathology that do not follow a linear relationship with crash severity.[1 2] Research consistently shows that minimal vehicle damage can still result in significant symptoms and long-term impairment.

To illustrate, imagine a dropped carton of eggs: the packaging might appear intact, yet the eggs inside could be broken. Relying solely on external appearance to judge internal damage is flawed. The same logic applies to MVCs, an undamaged bumper does not guarantee an uninjured occupant. A similar principle is seen in NASCAR: race cars are engineered with crumple zones that absorb impact, often appearing destroyed while the driver remains protected.[3] In contrast, consumer vehicles may show little external damage yet transmit substantial forces to the occupants.

Debunking Myths About Vehicle Damage and Injury

Experienced clinicians recognize, based on both research and clinical practice, that vehicle damage does not reliably predict injury severity. Beattie et al. observed that patients involved in low-damage collisions reported back and neck pain at rates similar to those in high-impact crashes, an outcome they found biomechanically unexpected.[4]

Krafft et al. reported that rear-end collisions with speed changes as low as 5 mph resulted in Whiplash-Associated Disorder (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)) symptoms persisting beyond six months in some individuals, while others experienced no symptoms even at 10 mph.[6] Similarly, Kim et al. found that in low-speed rear-end collisions involving vehicles of equal mass, the risk of injury was substantial, 36% at 9 mph and 84% at 12.5 mph, regardless of vehicle weight considerations.[9] Richter et al. found no correlation between the change in vehicle velocity and either the severity or duration of symptoms at six months post-collision. Additionally, none of the assessed anthropometric, clinical, radiological, or technical variables reliably predicted persistent symptoms.[7]

Elliot, et al. identified two items of note relevant to this topic:

> “In the context of this study, it is arguably unrealistic to expect simple, unadjusted, linear bivariate relationships between parameters like the speed of the crash and the magnitude of functional interference reported by patients”.[10]
>
> “The results do not suggest the biomechanics of a motor vehicle collision are unrelated to trauma risk, but they question the ability of low-resolution crash reconstruction methods commonly used in real-world clinical practice and medical-legal cases to predict likelihood of recovery”[10]

Most notable of reviewed research on this topic was the strong state patients from Radanov, et al.: “the occurrence of acute whiplash and chronic whiplash syndrome is independent of the severity of accident”[8].

Evidence-Based Factors Influencing Injury Outcomes

Why does the misconception persist that minor vehicle damage equals minor injury? While it may seem intuitive that a low-speed collision would cause minimal trauma, decades of research have proven otherwise.

For example, Castro et al. (1997) claimed that rear-end impacts with velocity changes under 9 mph were likely harmless and even compared the forces to bumper car rides.[11] Their recommendation to rely on vehicle photos to estimate injury potential has since been undermined by over 20 years of clinical evidence showing that such assumptions often fail to reflect the actual forces transmitted to the body. Despite this, outdated beliefs continue to influence how injuries are perceived and treated.

Recent research highlights the complexity of injury mechanisms in low-speed collisions. Tencer (2019) notes that modern vehicle materials can mask significant impact forces, making superficial damage appear minor. However, detailed inspections often reveal more extensive structural compromise. Additionally, when a braking vehicle is rear-ended, the reduced deceleration time and shorter collision duration can amplify forces on the cervical spine.[12 14]

Multiple factors influence injury outcomes in a motor vehicle collision (MVC), beyond impact speed or vehicle damage. These include occupant posture, head-to-headrest distance, head rotation at the time of impact, pre-existing spinal conditions, biological sex, and whether the individual was startled during the collision. These variables will be examined in greater detail in the following section.

Optimal head restraint positioning is crucial for minimizing whiplash risk. The top of the restraint should align just below the top of the head, with the head no more than four inches away while seated.[15] When not properly positioned, the restraint may fail to prevent cervical spine injury in rear-end collisions.[16] Studies show that improper placement can double the risk of whiplash symptoms.[17] Additionally, poor seating posture increases injury risk due to greater soft tissue strain from excessive body motion.[14]

Ideal posture isn't always maintained during a motor vehicle collision (MVC), especially when the occupant is unaware or not at fault. Brief movements, such as checking a blind spot or leaning forward, can place the head out of alignment, reducing the effectiveness of occupant restraint systems. Deng's cadaveric study showed that varied head positions during impact increased strain on cervical discs, facet joints, and ligaments.[18] Even at low speeds, a rotated or extended head position can significantly elevate injury risk. Additionally, braking at the moment of impact may momentarily shift the occupant out of a protective posture, further increasing vulnerability.[19]

Head rotation at the time of impact significantly increases the risk of injury. Elliott et al. found that whiplash sustained while the head is turned, such as when checking a blind spot, is associated with worse outcomes and greater soft tissue damage.[20] Shateri et al. reinforced this in a biomechanical study using a detailed finite element neck model, showing that out-of-position impacts produce higher tissue strain.[20-21] Additionally, Holm's research found that individuals unaware of their head position during a collision were more likely to report severe cervicalgia.[22]

Even with proper head positioning and restraint use, injury can still occur. Kohles et al. demonstrated that during rear-end collisions, thoracic ramping induces rapid axial compression and cervical flexion. This occurs within 0.05 to 0.2 seconds—too quickly for protective muscle activation.[23] The resulting motion can strain facet joint capsules and cause synovial pinching, even when the neck remains within normal physiological range and the head restraint is engaged.

Individual Patient Factors and Injury

Certain injury risks are beyond a patient's control. Studies show that geriatric patients involved in motor vehicle collisions (MVCs) tend to have worse outcomes, longer recovery times, and require less impact force to sustain injury compared to younger individuals.[26-30] Age-related declines in ligament and joint capsule strength increase susceptibility to sprains and ruptures, even from low-energy trauma.[31]

Pre-existing cervical conditions increase the risk of persistent symptoms following a motor vehicle collision (MVC). Patients with chronic neck issues or a history of headaches are more likely to experience prolonged pain after a collision.[22 32-36] In a study of 5,970 individuals, those with prior neck trauma or headaches reported significantly greater symptom severity.[22] A 2019 study found that 69.6% of patients with moderate facet joint degeneration did not recover, compared to only 23.6% of those without degeneration.[37] A meta-analysis also confirmed that prior cervicalgia or headaches significantly elevate the risk of long-term Whiplash-Associated Disorder (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)).[36] Similarly, another study concluded that preexisting facet degeneration is a moderate predictor of poor Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD) prognosis.[34]

Biological sex is another uncontrollable factor influencing injury outcomes. Female patients have consistently shown poorer recovery following motor vehicle collisions (MVCs), particularly when diagnosed with Whiplash-Associated Disorders (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)).[36] One study emphasized that sex-specific differences in anatomy and physiology may contribute to these outcomes, yet have only recently received focused research attention.[38] Walton et al. found that women are more likely to develop persistent pain post-MVC, with higher initial pain levels serving as a strong predictor of prolonged symptoms.[36 39]

Female patients involved in motor vehicle collisions (MVCs) are more likely to experience prolonged functional impairment and difficulty performing daily activities.[40] Studies by Malfliet and Harder report that women face a higher risk of developing chronic Whiplash-Associated Disorder (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)) and sustain Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD) injuries more frequently than men.[41-42] A 2003 presentation further noted that, across all impact directions, the risk of injury for female occupants was approximately twice that of their male counterparts.[43]

Several theories attempt to explain why females experience higher rates of chronic pain and disability from Whiplash-Associated Disorders (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)) compared to males. Anatomical differences in cervical spine structure and lower average neck strength are believed to contribute to this disparity.[44-46] While no definitive cause has been established, existing evidence clearly shows that females are at greater risk for persistent pain, disability, and functional limitations following Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD).

Another uncontrollable factor in motor vehicle collisions (MVCs) is the startle response, an involuntary, protective reflex triggered by sudden stimuli. This response causes rapid muscle contraction, particularly in the cervical region, which can amplify spinal loading beyond safe limits.[47-49] Mang et al. noted that while this reflex may stabilize the head and neck, it can also intensify strain on tissues.[47] Studies have shown that individuals who develop cervicalgia after whiplash often exhibit a stronger startle response.[50] Loud auditory cues during testing have been found to reduce neuromuscular control and increase neck strain.[47] Siegmund et al. further concluded that reflex activation of the multifidus muscles—due to their insertion into the facet joint capsules—can increase mechanical loading on those structures during impact.[51]

Anticipating a collision can influence injury risk. When individuals brace for impact—such as flexing the head and leaning the torso forward, they may unintentionally place the cervical spine in a more vulnerable position, increasing strain on capsular ligaments.[52] Fice et al. found that pre-impact bracing, such as pressing the arms against the steering wheel, stabilizes the torso but not the head, potentially increasing cervical loading depending on the direction of impact.[53]

Differences in Impact Direction and Injury

Impact direction plays a significant role in the severity and type of Whiplash-Associated Disorders (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)). While rear-end collisions are most commonly studied, Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD) can result from impacts in any direction.[54] Different spinal regions are affected depending on the vector of force. Park et al. identified the C5/C6 intervertebral disc as especially vulnerable in both frontal and rear impacts, with additional strain on upper cervical levels like C2/C3 during frontal collisions.[55] Panjabi et al. observed increased strain in the supraspinous and interspinous ligaments, ligamentum flavum, and capsular ligaments during 10g frontal impacts.[56] Lateral collisions generate greater rotational forces, which may contribute to worse prognoses.[57] Limited cervical retraction following rear-end collisions has also been linked to cervicogenic headache symptoms.[58-59]

Next Steps

It is important for patients and their care teams to understand the concepts outlined in this white paper. The evidence presented supports the validity of patient symptoms, reduces uncertainty, and reinforces treatment decisions made by healthcare providers.

Conclusion

Despite strong evidence to the contrary, misconceptions about injuries from low-impact motor vehicle collisions (MVCs) remain widespread. Understanding current research helps clarify how Whiplash-Associated Disorders (Whiplash-Associated Disorders (WAD)) can occur—even when vehicle damage is minimal—resulting in pain, disability, and functional limitations. Applying this knowledge leads to more accurate assessments and improved patient care.

References

1. Conroy C, Tominaga GT, Erwin S, et al. The influence of vehicle damage on trauma severity of drivers in head-on motor vehicle crashes. Accident Analysis & Prevention 2008;40:1589-1594.
2. Quddus. Analysis of motorcycle trauma and vehicle damange severity using ordered probit models. Journal of safety research 2002.
3. Hill M MJ. NASCAR Safety Improvemale patientsts Save Lives: Reinsurance Group of America, Inc., 2012.
4. Beattie N, Lovell ME. Can patients with low energy whiplash associated disorder develop low back pain? Injury 2010;41:144-146.
5. Giummarra MJ, Elliott JM, Heinrichs BE, et al. Motor vehicle crash reconstruction: Does it relate to the heterogeneity of whiplash recovery? Plos One 2019;14.
6. Krafft M, Kullgren A, Ydenius A, et al. Influence of Crash Pulse Characteristics on Whiplash Associated Disorders in Rear Impacts--Crash Recording in Real Life Crashes. Traffic Injury Prevention 2002;3:141-149.
7. Richter M. Correlation of clinical findings, collision parameters, and psychological factors in the outcome of whiplash associated disorders. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry 2004;75:758-764.
8. Radanov BP, Sturzenegger M, Di Stefano G. Long-term outcome after whiplash trauma: a 2-year follow-up considering features of trauma mechanism and somatic, radiologic, and psychosocial findings. Medicine 1995;74:281-297.
9. Kim M, Yun I. Whiplash Injury Conditions of Rear-End Collisions at Low-Speed. The Journal of The Korea Institute of Intelligent Transport Systems 2019;18:58-76.
10. Elliott JM, Heinrichs BE, Walton DM, et al. Motor vehicle crash reconstruction: Does it relate to the heterogeneity of whiplash recovery? PLoS one 2019;14:e0225686.
11. Castro WH, Schilgen M, Meyer S, et al. Do "whiplash injuries" occur in low-speed rear impacts? European spine journal : official publication of the European Spine Society, the European Spinal Deformity Society, and the European Section of the Cervical Spine Research Society 1997;6:366-375.
12. Tencer AF. Low speed rear end automobile collisions and whiplash trauma, the biomechanical approach. Medicine, Law & Society 2019;12:1-20.
13. Emori RI, Horiguchi J. Whiplash in low speed vehicle collisions: SAE Technical Paper, 1990.
14. Han J, Kim HJ, Song L, et al. Characteristics of human responses in a braked stationary lead vehicle during low-speed, rear-end collisions. International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing 2019;20:1255-1264.
15. DARCIN M. USE OF PROPERLY POSITIONED HEAD RESTRAINT. CLEAR International Journal of Research in Commerce & management 2013;4.
16. DeRosia J, Yoganandan N, Pintar FA. Rear impact responses of different sized adult Hybrid III dummies. Traffic trauma prevention 2004;5:50-55.
17. Viano DC, Olsen S. The effectiveness of active head restraint in preventing whiplash. Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery 2001;51:959-969.
18. Deng B. Kinematics of human cadaver cervical spine during low-speed rear-end impacts: Wayne State University, 1999.
19. Kaale BR, Krakenes J, Albrektsen G, et al. Head position and impact direction in whiplash injuries: associations with MRI-verified lesions of ligaments and membranes in the upper cervical spine. Journal of neurotrauma 2005;22:1294-1302.
20. Elliott JM, Noteboom JT, Flynn TW, et al. Characterization of acute and chronic whiplash-associated disorders. journal of orthopaedic & sports physical therapy 2009;39:312-323.
21. Shateri H, Cronin DS. Out-of-Position Rear Impact Tissue-Level Investigation Using Detailed Finite Elemale patientst Neck Model. Traffic Injury Prevention 2015;16:698-708.
22. Holm LW, Carroll LJ, Cassidy JD, et al. Factors influencing cervicalgia intensity in whiplash-associated disorders. Spine 2006;31:E98-E104.
23. Kohles SS, McClaren JW. A stochastic model validated with human test data causally associating target vehicle Delta V, occupant cervicocranial biomechanics, and trauma during rear-impact crashes. Journal of forensic and legal medicine 2022;91:102431.
24. Elkin BS, Elliott JM, Siegmund GP. Whiplash trauma or concussion? A possible biomechanical explanation for concussion symptoms in some individuals following a rear-end collision. Journal of orthopaedic & sports physical therapy 2016;46:874-885.
25. Kang Y-S, Stam J, Ramachandra R, et al. Biomechanical responses and trauma assessmale patientst of post mortem human subjects in various rear-facing seating configurations: SAE Technical Paper, 2021.
26. Yoganandan N, Chirvi S, Voo L, et al. Role of age and trauma mechanism on cervical spine trauma tolerance from head contact loading. Traffic trauma prevention 2018;19:165-172.
27. Suissa S. Risk Factors of Poor Prognosis after Whiplash Injury. Pain Research and management 2003;8:69-75.
28. Scholten-Peeters GGM, Verhagen AP, Bekkering GE, et al. Prognostic factors of whiplash-associated disorders: a systematic review of prospective cohort studies. Pain 2003;104:303-322.
29. Ritchie C, Sterling M. Recovery pathways and prognosis after whiplash trauma. journal of orthopaedic & sports physical therapy 2016;46:851-861.
30. Holm LW, Carroll LJ, Cassidy JD, et al. Expectations for recovery important in the prognosis of whiplash injuries. PLoS medicine 2008;5:e105.
31. Buckwalter JA, Woo SL-Y. Age-related changes in ligaments and joint capsules: implications for participation in sports. Sports Medicine and Arthroscopy Review 1996;4:250-262.
32. Alalawi A, Devecchi V, Gallina A, et al. Assessmale patientst of Neuromuscular and Psychological Function in People with Recurrent Neck Pain during a Period of Remission: Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Analyses. Journal of Clinical Medicine 2022;11.
33. Sarrami P, Armstrong E, Naylor JM, et al. Factors predicting outcome in whiplash trauma: a systematic meta-review of prognostic factors. Journal of Orthopaedics and Traumatology 2016;18:9-16.
34. Malik K, Eseonu KC, Pang D, et al. Is Preexisting Cervical Degeneration a Risk Factor for Poor Prognosis in Whiplash-Associated Disorder? International Journal of Spine Surgery 2021;15:710-717.
35. Tameem A, Kapur S, Mutagi H. Whiplash trauma. Continuing Education in Anaesthesia Critical Care & Pain 2014;14:167-170.

36. Walton DM, MacDermid JC, Giorgianni AA, et al. Risk factors for persistent problems following acute whiplash trauma: update of a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy 2013;43:31-43.
37. Rydman E, Kasina P, Ponzer S, et al. Association between cervical degeneration and self-perceived nonrecovery after whiplash trauma. The Spine Journal 2019;19:1986-1994.
38. Carmo GP, Grigioni J, Fernandes FA, et al. Biomechanics of traumatic head and neck injuries on female patients: a state-of-the-art review and future directions. Biology 2023;12:83.
39. Callan B, Walton DM, Cleland J, et al. Exploring sex as a moderator of other prognostic variables in whiplash associated disorder: An observational study. PLoS one 2023;18:e0282640.
40. Suissa S. The Quebec whiplash-associated disorders cohort study. Spine 1995;20:12S-20S.
41. Malfliet A, De Kooning M, Inghelbrecht E, et al. Sex differences in patients with chronic pain following whiplash trauma: the role of depression, fear, somatization, social support, and personality traits. Pain Practice 2015;15:757-764.
42. Harder S, Veilleux M, Suissa S. The effect of socio-demographic and crash-related factors on the prognosis of whiplash. Journal of clinical epidemiology 1998;51:377-384.
43. Cappon H ea. Whiplash injuries, not only a problem in rear-end impact. ESV Conference 2003:1-9.
44. Yoganandan N, Stemper BD, Rao RD. Patient mechanisms of trauma in whiplash-associated disorders. Seminars in spine surgery 2013;67-74.
45. Vasavada AN, Danaraj J, Siegmund GP. Head and neck anthropometry, vertebral geometry and neck strength in height-matched patients and female patients. Journal of biomechanics 2008;41:114-121.
46. Stemper BD, Yoganandan N, Pintar FA, et al. Anatomical gender differences in cervical vertebrae of size-matched volunteers. Spine 2008;33:E44-E49.
47. Mang DWH, Siegmund GP, Inglis JT, et al. The startle response during whiplash: a protective or harmful response? Journal of Applied Physiology 2012;113:532-540.
48. Blouin JS, Inglis JT, Siegmund GP. Startle responses elicited by whiplash perturbations. The Journal of physiology 2006;573:857-867.
49. Mang DW, Siegmund GP, Blouin J-S. Whiplash evokes descending muscle recruitmale patientst and sympathetic responses characteristic of startle. The Journal of the Canadian Chiropractic Association 2014;58:109.
50. Blouin J-S, Inglis JT, Siegmund GP. Auditory startle alters the response of human subjects exposed to a single whiplash-like perturbation. Spine 2006;31:146-154.
51. Siegmund GP, Blouin J-S, Carpenter MG, et al. Are cervical multifidus muscles active during whiplash and startle? An initial experimale patientstal study. BMC musculoskeletal disorders 2008;9:1-9.
52. Omerovic S, Tomasch E, Gutsche AJ, et al. Comparative study of potential whiplash injuries for different occupant seated positionsm during rear end accidents. Acta of Bioengineering and Biomechanics 2016;18.
53. Fice JB, Mang DW, Ólafsdóttir JM, et al. Neck muscle and head/neck kinematic responses while bracing against the steering wheel during front and rear impacts. Annals of biomedical engineering 2021;49:1069-1082.
54. van der Horst MJ. Human head neck response in frontal, lateral and rear end impact loading: modelling and validation. 2002.
55. Park D. The Pathophysiology and Mechanism of Acute and Chronic Whiplash Injury: A Narrative Review. International journal of Pain 2022;13:20-24.
56. Panjabi MM, Ito S, Pearson AM, et al. Injury mechanisms of the cervical intervertebral disc during simulated whiplash. Spine 2004;29:1217-1225.
57. Sanchez EJ. Evaluation of the Efficacy of Head and Brain Injury Risk Functions: University of Virginia, 2017.
58. Bunketorp OB, Elisson LK. Cervical status after neck sprains in frontal and rear-end car impacts. Injury 2012;43:423-430.
59. Bogduk N. Cervicogenic headache: anatomic basis and pathophysiologic mechanisms. Current pain and headache reports 2001;5:382-386.

