

Head Impact Severity Measures from Small Social Robots Thrown during Meltdown of a child with Autism

Ahmad Yaser Alhaddad · John-John Cabibihan · Andrea Bonarini

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Social robots have gained a lot of attention recently as it has been reported to be effective in supporting therapeutic efforts among children with autism. However, such children may exhibit a multitude of challenging behaviors that could be harmful to themselves and to others around them. Furthermore, social robots are meant as companion and to elicit behaviors, hence, the presence of a social robot during the occurrence of challenging behaviors might increase any potential harm. In this paper, we are quantifying the harm levels based on severity indices for one of the identified harmful scenarios that might emanate between a child and a social robot due to the manifestation of challenging behaviors. Our results revealed that the overall harm levels based on the selected severity indices are relatively low compared to their respective thresholds. However, our investigation of harm due to throwing of a small social robot to the head revealed that it could potentially cause tissue injuries, subconcussive or even concussive events in extreme cases. The existence of such behaviors must be accounted for and considered when developing interactive social robots to be deployed for such children.

Keywords social robots · safety · autism

Ahmad Yaser Alhaddad · John-John Cabibihan
Qatar University, Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Doha 2713, Qatar,
E-mail: john.cabibihan@qu.edu.qa

Ahmad Yaser Alhaddad · Andrea Bonarini
Politecnico di Milano, Department of Electronics, Information and Bioengineering, Piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32, Milano 20133, Italy.

1 Introduction

In the last few decades, the robotic research has witnessed a great changes in the traditional paradigm as it has shifted to cover new areas, such as entertainment, transportation, space, healthcare, and others [100]. Robots are now being considered to be used in many applications (e.g. rehabilitation and elderly care) that require direct physical human-robot interaction [100][37].

Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is a condition that is diagnosed during childhood and affects the neurodevelopment [117]. Previous studies have shown that children on the spectrum have strong interest in technology, such as computer applications [48], virtual environments [86], and robots [15][96]. There has been a growing interest in using robots clinically to assist in the rehabilitation of children with ASD [27][52][9]. The usage of technology, especially robotics, for ASD therapy opens many possibilities in the early intervention for children with ASD, and toward more personalized rehabilitation [90][89]. The application of robots for intervention provides many options and flexibility as it can either be used as an intervention tool to facilitate the therapeutic session, co-therapist with turn-taking with the main therapist or as a sole therapist [9][28].

There has been a growing concern pertaining to the rising and unprecedented rate of ASD among children. For example, the pervasiveness rate of ASD among children is found to be 1 out of 45 in the United States [115] while in the United Kingdom, the estimate is 1 out of 100 [39]. Due to the diverse nature of ASD, the manifestation of behaviors among children on the spectrum varies greatly in their degree. Children with ASD face lifelong impairments in social interaction, communication, and the exhibition of restricted interests or behaviors [4]. Furthermore, children face a multitude of daily




Fig. 1 Some of the robots that have been considered or have the potential for ASD intervention: a) Keepon, a yellow snowman-like robot [68]. b) Chippies, a pack of playful puppies (With kind permission from WowWee Group Ltd). c) SPRK+, a more than just a ball robot (With kind permission from Sphero). d) Lynx, a humanoid robot companion (With kind permission from UBTECH). e) Cozmo, an interactive tiny robot (With kind permission from Anki). f) Leka, an autonomous ball-like robot (With kind permission from Leka Inc). g) Tipster, a fun and interactive robot (With kind permission from WowWee Group Ltd).

behavioral challenges as compared to neurotypical children [21][25]. Early intervention, especially during the early years, seems to play a great role in the treatment, or at least the mitigation, of such behaviors and make these subjects more independent in their lives [91].

The traditional intervention sessions for ASD have been usually conducted relying on human therapists. However, the progress in technology has enabled the introduction of new methods and techniques to facilitate the diagnosis of ASD and rehabilitation therapy [14]. Children are found to be more intrigued to interact with robots as compared to humans due to the limited complexity of robots [15]. There have been many reported evidences of the efficacy of using robots for ASD intervention [101][15][96]. Many studies have demonstrated that robots can be used to elicit many behaviors, such as imitation, joint attention, eye contact, and gestural responses [19][17][18][47][110].

Coincidentally, the diversity that exists within the spectrum of ASD appear to reflect upon the design of social robots that have been considered in this line of research. Many social robots have been developed that took on different appearances, sizes, and shapes that can be broadly categorized as being either anthropomorphic, non-anthropomorphic or non-biomimetic [15]. Kasper [54], a minimally expressive robot is an example of an anthropomorphic robotic design. Keepon [68], a

yellow snowman-like robot, is an example of a non-anthropomorphic design while Roball [79], the spherical robot, is an example of non-biomimetic design. Furthermore, there are many commercially- available social robots and robotic toys that have been developed to assist in ASD therapy or have the potential to be considered (Fig. 1). The introduction of a new eliciting stimulus (e.g. robot) to such children could become a potential harm during the manifestation of unwanted challenging behaviors. Furthermore, children with ASD often exhibit a variety of stereotypical behaviors that are often impulsive and aggressive. Such behaviors could be a response to an unwanted stimulus or as a result from a failed emotional regulation [77].

The rapid evolution of technology has sparked a global interest in robotics and their prospective applications. The International Federation of Robotics (IFR) has predicted that the number of entertainment robots, such as toy robots, personal edutainment robots, and multi-media robots, will rise to 11 million units by 2019 [57]. This dramatic increase in the number of robots, especially the ones with close proximity with humans, has a lot of implications on safety concerns that emphasize the need for standardization. Some of the standards that have been established are ISO 10218 [58][59], which is concerned with safety in industrial robots; ISO/TS15066 [62], which is related to collaborative industrial robots;




Fig. 2 Different forms of challenging behaviors that are exhibited by children with ASD [66][75][72][35].

and the ISO 13482 [60], which is related to personal care robots. Currently, there is no safety standard pertaining social robots or toy robots.

One of the earliest work concerning safety and harm quantification with robotics introduced the human pain tolerance as an indicator for potential risks [111]. In another work, the simulation of impact tests of an industrial robot on a crash test dummy using Finite Element Method (FEM) was proposed and demonstrated as means to assess safety [83]. In later works, actual crash test dummies have been used in impact tests using industrial robotic arms [44][46]. Various safety indices, such as for the head, chest, and neck, have been used in the evaluation of safety and potential injury levels due to impacts. Up to date, limited studies have been conducted on safety in social robotics, especially pertaining the safety of children with ASD [106][38][50].

The objective of this study is to quantify the harm levels based on severity indices for one of the identified potentially harmful scenarios that might arise between a child and a social robot due to the manifestation of challenging behaviors. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes epidemiology of challenging behaviors and the potential risks with robots. Section 3 describes harm quantification and relevant severity indices. Section 4 provides methods. Section 5 describes results that then discussed in Section 6.

2 Challenging Behaviors in Children with ASD

2.1 Overview

Individuals on the spectrum are very unique and complex in their dispositions and their manifestation of ASD. Autism affect such individuals and causes a lot of deficits and challenges in their communication skills, interactions with others, behaviors, sensory inputs perception, and social life [21]. Furthermore, they exhibit self-stimulatory behaviors, perfectionist tendencies, meltdowns, and delayed echolalia [30]. Due to the nature of ASD, children diagnosed with it tend to exhibit more challenging and aggressive behaviors than their neurotypical peers (Fig. 2). For example, those with perfectionist tendencies and emotional regulation deficiencies have shown higher level of aggressive behavior, anxiety, and depression [5][3].

Frustration is another contributing factor toward the exhibition of more challenging behaviors. Children with ASD might face frustration when being exposed to new unpredictable, overwhelming, and noisy environments as that found in hospitals [66][95]. In addition, such environments are rich in stimuli that might overload their body's senses, and that would make meeting their needs even harder due to increased struggle with the new environmental changes [82][95]. Challenging behaviors take on many different forms, such as,

withdrawal, repetitive and stereotypes habits, aggression against others, self-injury, tantrums, meltdowns, and property destruction [66][75][72]. Not only such behaviors pose risks on the children themselves, but also pose a lot of risk on others around them, such as other children, nurses, patients, care givers, parents, and family members [66][87].

2.2 Epidemiology of Challenging Behaviors

Among all the children without and even with developmental disabilities, challenging behaviors and anxiety problems seem to have higher prevalence rate among children with autism [32][42]. Even within children on the spectrum themselves, those with more severe ASD have showed higher rate of challenging behaviors as compared to those with less ASD severity [81][76]. Furthermore, studies have shown that even infants or toddlers that are diagnosed with ASD do exhibit challenging behaviors at a higher rate compared to their neurotypical counterparts [35][69]. Due to difficulties in using proper communication to satisfy their needs, children with autism might turn to challenging behaviors as a form of communication to express themselves [55].

The pervasiveness of challenging behaviors among individual with autism is relatively high. One study surveying 222 children reported 50% occurrence rate while another study surveying 32 adults reported a rate of 69% [6][12]. A more recent study with larger sample size of 1,380 children has reported a high aggression prevalence rate of 68% against caregivers and 49% against others [67]. The majority of previous studies have reported the occurrence of at least one or more challenging behaviors among at least half of the individuals with ASD [35]. The existence of such behaviors has many implications on those providing treatments and services to individuals with ASD [55].

2.3 Robots and Potential Risks

Technology offers a lot of potential to therapeutic sessions, such as, but not limited to, independent learning, individualizing, motivation, reinforcement, social and communicative skills practice, hands-on learning, and others [31]. The advancement in several Artificial Intelligence (AI) fields has enabled robots to function independently and more naturally for effective social interactions. **Social robots differ from typical toys in many ways, such as the way they engage people at an interpersonal level to achieve positive outcomes in different domains [13]. Furthermore, social robots should be able**




Fig. 3 The identified possible risky scenarios that might occur between a child and social robot due to some challenging behaviors.

to convey emotions, form social relationships, demonstrate personality, use natural communication cues, and to understand their social partners [49]. Child-robot interactions are characterized beyond traditional toys by the form of robot's embodiment, the interface of communication, two-ways reciprocally interaction, and the robot's adaptability to the child [36],[22].

Children interacting with social robots are prone to touching the robot. In some cases, they might show aggression toward the robot [10][104]. This requires that the existing design guidelines must ensure the safety of the children and the physical integrity of the robot, especially during meltdowns [15]. While some of the existing developed robots could meet many of therapy objectives, they are still not adequate enough to be used with some of the children on the spectrum that exhibit high activity and aggression levels [53]. The majority of the social robots used in the literature are just prototypes, not commercially available, and have yet to find their ways into therapy sessions or schools [52]. Hence, the exposure to such technology is still very limited worldwide, and the need to identify potential safety issues arise. The wide adoption of social companions and smart toys would introduce some concerns and ethical considerations that must be addressed early on [98],[20], [74],[22]. Furthermore, the introduction of robots to children with ASD represents a new stimulus from their environment that must be taken into account and consideration because of their potentially challenging behaviors when interacting with them.

The occurrence of challenging behaviors, such as kicking objects, throwing objects at others, banging on objects, and harming oneself by hitting [75], when a robot is present increases the chances of potentially

risky scenarios (Fig. 3). Depending on the size of the social robot being used, the magnitude of potential risks might change accordingly. For instance, kicking a large robot will inflict an initial harm to the kicker and secondary damage on others in case of the robot falling down on them. On the other hand, kicking a small robot might impact on others and cause harm. Another challenging behavior that could inflict harm on others is throwing, especially in the case of small and light robots. The child could use the small robot involuntary as an object to be thrown on others. Self-inflicted harmful behaviors, such as banging and hitting, could be increased with the presence of a robot as it can be used by the child as an object to stimulate oneself. All the aforementioned scenarios must be accounted for when designing robots and solutions to mitigate them must be investigated.

3 Quantifying Harm

3.1 Overview

The human head is susceptible to traumatic brain injury (TBI) when it is receiving blows or bumps, or subjected to impacts with projectiles, such as a baseball [11]. TBI is categorized as either being mild or severe, and could cause permanent disability or, in severe cases, death. Most occurring type of mild TBI is concussion. It is not considered a life threatening, however, the results on the affected can be serious [29]. In the United States and in 2013 alone, a total of 2.8 million (i.e. 50,000 deaths, 282,000 hospitalizations, and 2.5 million emergency department visits) cases of TBI have been reported with falls being the lead cause followed by getting struck by or against an object [105]. Furthermore, it has been reported that 1 in 5 cases of TBI occurred among children (age < 15 years old) to the second leading cause. TBIs among young children may impair the neurological development and cause a multitude of challenges, such as depression, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and in attaining academic achievements [1][2][88][113].

Challenging behaviors, as summarized in Section 2, that are exhibited by children on the spectrum pose a potential harm to themselves and to the ones around them. With the presence of a robot, the child might involuntary use it to harm others (Fig. 3). Throwing objects, especially in the case of small robots, pose a great risk to the head and need to be quantified. The objective of this study is to simulate objects (i.e. representing a small robot) being thrown at the head to quantify harm levels. Hence, this section describes related studies and relevant severity indices.

3.2 Related Studies

Laboratory settings using anthropomorphic test dummies (ATD) are typically used to simulate potentially dangerous scenarios to evaluate the possible harm to a human, such as that used in car crash tests. Furthermore, similar setups have been used to quantify harm due to impacts in some sports and to evaluate protective gears, such as helmets [78][112][84]. One study used similar settings to assess the influence of taekwondo kicks and peak velocity of the foot on the dynamics of the head [34]. In that study, a crash test dummy head was secured to an aluminum frame and it was used as a target for the kicks performed. The head form was equipped with an accelerometer to measure the dynamics of the head (i.e. changes in acceleration) as it was being hit by the participants. The data generated was used to assess the potential of concussion based on the head injury criterion (HIC).

Similar studies were conducted in industrial robotics to quantify the potential harm due to different possible impact scenarios between a human and robotic arm. For example, few studies have conducted impact tests of a manipulator to a dummy at a standard automobile crash test facility [44][46][45]. In such studies, impacts by robotic arms using flat surface impactors were performed against a standard crash test dummy in three regions (i.e. head, chest, and neck). The potential of injury or harm levels were evaluated based on the respective severity index or indices for each region. The evaluations were based on varying some robotic-dependent variables, such as mass and velocity, and their relation on the resultant severity indices. In some studies, low-cost body part models, such as using a head model or an arm model, and low-cost sensors were considered and used to carry out experimental tests to evaluate human-robot impacts [24][45].

3.3 Severity Indices

Severity indices are associated with injury scaling, such as the Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) [40]. AIS is a tool that provides a simple way to grade the observed injury based on a scoring criteria (Table. 1). AIS and together with various severity indices give an estimation of the potential for an injury and its respective severity.

The investigation in this study is limited to the head, hence, only relevant head indices, namely, head injury criterion (HIC), 3ms criterion, peak linear acceleration, impact forces, and tissue injuries, are summarized.

Table 1 Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and the corresponding injury classification

AIS score	Injury classification
1	Minor
2	Moderate
3	Serious or severe, but not life threatening
4	Severe and life threatening
5	Critical and uncertain survival
6	Unsurvivable

3.3.1 Head Injury Criterion (HIC)

One of the most commonly used severity indices to measure the possible injury to the head in many applications, such as in vehicles and in sports [107]. HIC is defined as:

$$HIC = (t_2 - t_1) \left[\frac{1}{(t_2 - t_1)} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} a(t) dt \right]^{2.5} \quad (1)$$

where $a(t)$ is based on the resultant acceleration of the head and measured in terms of gravity acceleration ($g = 9.81 \text{ m/s}^2$) and $\Delta t = t_2 - t_1$ is the duration of the impact considered in calculating the resultant HIC. The two most commonly used durations to evaluate the severity of injury to the head are 36 ms and 15 ms. Throughout this study, the 36 ms duration only will be used (Fig. 5).


The HIC standard is converted to a corresponding AIS based on the following relation [70]:

$$p(\text{head injury}) = \phi \left(\frac{\ln(HIC_{36}) - \mu}{\sigma} \right) \quad (2)$$

where ϕ is the cumulative normal distribution, and μ is the population mean, and σ is the standard deviation (Table. 2). These values are originally specified for a test dummy head, hence, they will only be used for comparison purposes. At a particular HIC value, the probability of injury occurrence differs between each of the AIS scores (Fig. 4).

Table 2 The values of population mean μ and standard deviation σ corresponding to different scores of Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS)

AIS score	μ	σ
2	6.96352	0.84664
3	7.45231	0.73998
4	7.65605	0.60580

**Fig. 4** The relationship between the Head Injury Criterion (HIC) and the probability of injury according to different Abbreviated Injury Scales (AIS) [70].

3.3.2 The 3 ms Criterion

This criterion requires that the maximum mean value over 3 ms duration of the resultant head acceleration is less than a certain threshold when there is no hard contact (Fig. 5). This criterion is used as part of the regulations pertaining the safety of occupants in vehicles and also used in helmet testing [97].

The European National Car Assessment Protocol (EuroNCAP) states that the thresholds for 3 ms criterion for a child occupant should not exceed 87 g in case of frontal impact and 72 g in case of side impact [33].

3.3.3 Peak Linear Acceleration

Peak linear acceleration has been used as one of the biomechanical measures for head impact to investigate its association with concussion events [41][93]. A study investigating the head impact exposure in youth football has reported linear accelerations due to impacts anywhere in the range of 10 g to 111 g [114]. While that study did not report the occurrence of any concussions, however, it is believed that concussions could occur within that range based on the reported football-related concussions [7]. One study based on a finite element head model validated from field collisions has estimated a probability of mild TBI to be 25%, 50%, and 80% corresponding to maximum accelerations of 66 g, 82 g and 106 g, respectively [116]. One study has reported the occurrence of a concussive event at a relatively low linear acceleration value of 31.8 g [80]. Some




Fig. 5 Sample of the generated linear acceleration data demonstrating the durations of both, the Head Injury Criterion (HIC) and the 3 ms Criterion, and the instance of peak linear acceleration that were considered in the data analysis.

of these studies did not report the duration of impacts while others reported impact durations of 30 ms or less.

3.3.4 Impact Forces

The HIC severity index is not enough for the assessment of head safety, especially for what concerns any potential damage to the skull and brain injury [108]. Contact force is another indicator to predict the fracture tolerance of the human bone structure. There have been many studies conducted on heads from cadavers to




Fig. 6 Injury risk function for facial fractures of the face (i.e. maxilla and zygoma) [26][8]. Dashed red line represents a facial fracture probability of 50% corresponding to a force value of 755 N.

Table 3 Classification of tissue injury based on depth [103]

Classification	Affected Skin Layer	Depth
Superficial	Only the epidermis	<1 mm
Partial-thickness	The epidermis and into the dermis	1 - 4 mm
Full-thickness	Through the epidermis and the dermis into subcutaneous tissue	>4 mm
Subcutaneous	Extends into and beyond the subcutaneous tissue	>4 mm

measure fracture forces of the skull. Experiments conducted were either by dropping heads from different heights or impacting the head with an impactor at various velocities. A summary of the studies conducted on facial fracture (i.e. maxilla, zygoma, frontal bone, nasal bone, and mandible) revealed peak force tolerance anywhere in the range of 610 - 9,880 N [8]. An injury risk function with comparable consistency to facial fracture data has been proposed based on Weibull distribution to identify forces that at which facial fracture starts for and impactor with an area of 13.8 cm², and it is defined as [26][8]:

$$P_{fracture}(F) = 1 - \exp \left[- \left(\frac{F}{B} \right)^\alpha \right] \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha = 2.27$ is the Weibull shape parameter, and $B = 887.7$ N is Weibull scale parameter, and F is the impact force. According to this function, a force of 755 N would have 50% chance of fracture risk (Fig. 6).

3.3.5 Tissue Injuries

Tissue injuries as a result of impacts with objects could take on different forms, such as skin tears, lacerations and abrasions. The magnitude and the depth of the resultant injury depends on the geometry of impactors or penetrators and pressure forces in effect [99]. Classification by depth is often used as indicator for wounds and tissue injuries [103]. According to this classification, tissue injuries could either be superficial wounds, partial-thickness, full-thickness or subcutaneous skin loss (Table. 3). This classification will be used as a reference and indicator for the possible tissue injury in our study.




Fig. 7 The developed low-cost 3D printed head form with the embedded sensors.




Fig. 8 The experimental setup used in this study.

4 Materials and Methods

4.1 Dummy Head Development

A 3D printed head form made of polylactide (PLA) was augmented with clay to reach a weight of 3.1 kg that is comparable to the weight of scaled 50th percentile 3-6 years children dummy heads [102]. A 2 mm layer of deformable soft material made of silicone (Ecoflex 00-30, Smooth-On, USA) was added to the head form to add more lifelike skin [16]. This silicon layer will be used in estimating potential tissue injuries due to its close shore hardness value to that of human skin [85]. The developed setup focuses on the dynamics of the head only, because for short impact durations the effects of the neck and body mass on the head are believed to be minimum [109].

A low-cost triple-axis accelerometer (ADXL 377, SparkFun Electronics, Colorado, USA) was placed at the center of the head to measure the linear acceleration of the head. A force-sensing resistor (FlexiForce Force Sensor, Tekscan Inc, USA) was placed at the center of the forehead to measure the impact forces (Fig. 7). The force sensor was calibrated according to the manufacturer's guide and a small puck (i.e. disk-like force concentrator)

was placed at the center of the sensing area to ensure that most of the force applied can be detected. In case the embedded sensor failed to properly register some of the impacts, digital force gauge (FGE-100X, Shimpo Instruments, USA) was used in separate experiments to measure the impact forces by attaching it to the top of the head. Thus, increasing the total weight of the head to 3.5 kg.

4.2 Experimental Setup

The experimental setup was based on a low-cost head model situated in a dedicated frame (Fig. 8). The dimensions of the frame used were (94.0 x 94.0 x 94.0 cm³). Nylon coated wire ropes were used to situate the head at the center of the frame. Both sensors (i.e. accelerometer and force) were interfaced to a computer through a data acquisition card (PCI-6031E, National Instrument, USA). The sampling rate was 20 kHz and signals were filtered according to Channel Frequency Class 60 [23].




Fig. 9 The impactor representing a small social robot that has been used in the experiments. a) Perspective view. b) Side view.

4.3 Impactor

The goal of this study is to quantify the potential harm due to the throwing action of a small robot (i.e. impactor). Hence, to represent a small social robot, a simple and small 3D model with minimum features was designed and then fabricated using a 3D printer (Repliator 5th Generation, MakerBot Industries, USA) (Fig. 9). The dimensions of the impactor are (18.0 x 8.0 x 17.0 cm³) and weighs around 0.55 kg. The surface roughness of the printed robot model was limited to the resolution of the 3D printer.

While there are many large social robots, the smaller ones are more affordable and are more suited for typical home users. The advancement in technology is allowing smaller robots to be more compact and intelligent. Hence, the size and mass of the proposed dummy robot falls according to such projections. Furthermore, the proposed parameters are within the potentially throwable range for the targeted users.

4.4 Procedures

4.4.1 Setup Validation

To verify the reliability of the developed setup in reporting a comparable HIC values, six impact tests at different velocities were conducted. The impactor used was a 2 kg mass attached to a beam (Fig. 10a). The beam was attached to the main frame of the setup and allowed for free motion that enabled it to hit the frontal side of the head at various velocities (See supplementary material). All impact tests were recorded and the corresponding HIC, 3 ms criterion, and impact velocities were calculated.




Fig. 10 Experiments that were conducted in this study. a) Validation experiment with the 2 kg impactor b) Harm quantification experiment with the dummy robot.

4.4.2 Harm Quantification

Two different experiments of 15 trials each were conducted. Experiment 1 was in more controlled condition as the dummy robot was tied with a rope to the frame to freely allow it to swing while making its left side facing the forehead of the head (Fig. 10b). Experiment 2 was in a more comparable condition to the realistic scenario, and that involved the throwing of the dummy robot at various velocities from a distance of 1 m away from the head model. The velocities used were in the range of 2.5 - 8 m/s, which was within the range of a previously reported throwing speed of tennis ball performed by children of different ages (i.e. 3 - 9 years) [94]. We believe this range is reasonable and comparable to the throwing velocities that might be exhibited by children on the spectrum.

All experiments were recorded using a video camera (FDR-X1000V, Sony, Japan) in slow-motion mode (240 fps, 720 pixels). All videos were analyzed using the open-source video analysis software Tracker (v4.10.0, Douglas Brown, Open Source Physics). A LabView (v2014, National Instrument, USA) script was used to obtain the raw data from the data acquisition card, processes it and then stores it in a worksheet file. The data were post-processed by a Matlab (v2015, MathWorks, Massachusetts, USA) script that generates the HIC and 3 ms criterion values.

5 Results

5.1 Setup Validation

To validate the head model setup, results were compared to previous studies of similar nature [45][44], where a low-cost dummy head was developed and an impactor of a mass of 1 kg was used for validation. The impact tests were conducted using robotic arms of different masses at different velocities and their results were then compared to that obtained with ATD. Their setup was able to reproduce comparable numerical HIC values.




Fig. 11 Head Injury Criterion (HIC) values generated by the developed experimental setup due to different impact velocities with a 2 kg impactor. The results were compared with similar impacts conducted by different industrial robots.

The generated HIC values from the validation impact tests in our study were comparable to that conducted previously (Fig. 11). For example, impacting at a velocity of around 1 m/s has generated a HIC value in the range of 3 - 10. The trend is also similar as the values of HIC obtained have increased proportionally with the applied impacts velocities. As for the 3 ms criterion, the values at around 1 m/s were in the range of 8 - 16 (Fig. 12). The differences in the values obtained are attributed to the differences in the mass of the im-




Fig. 12 The 3 ms criterion values generated due to different impact velocities with a 2 kg impactor. The results were compared with similar impacts conducted by an industrial robot.




Fig. 13 The corresponding Head Injury Criterion (HIC) values for impact experiments conducted in Experiment 1 and 2. Experiment 1 where the dummy robot was attached to the experimental setup while Experiment 2 where the experimenter conducted the throwing of the dummy robot. The results were compared with HIC values generated by an industrial robot.

pectors used (i.e. 2 kg vs 1 kg) and the mass of the developed dummy heads (i.e. 3.1 kg vs 4.5 kg) [73][56].

5.2 Harm Quantification Measures

5.2.1 Head Injury Criterion (HIC)

In Experiment 1, there is a more consistent trend as the velocity of impact increases the corresponding numerical HIC value increases (Fig. 13). The lowest recorded HIC value was 0.013 and it occurred at a velocity of 0.6 m/s while the highest recorded HIC value was 8.568 corresponding to a velocity of 5 m/s.

In Experiment 2, the overall trend is less consistent at certain velocities as compared to Experiment 1, especially around 4 m/s. However, there is an increase in the recorded HIC values as overall speed of throwing increases. The lowest HIC value obtained was 0.114 corresponding to a velocity of 3.9 m/s while the highest recorded HIC value was 7.066 at a velocity of 7.48 m/s.

5.2.2 The 3 ms Criterion

In Experiment 1, the lowest recorded 3 ms value was 1.425 g and it occurred at a velocity of 0.6 m/s while the highest recorded 3 ms value was 21.476 g corresponding to a velocity of 5 m/s (Fig. 14). The trend of the 3 ms values are linearly increasing with the applied velocities.

In Experiment 2, The lowest 3 ms value obtained was 2.96 g corresponding to a velocity of 2.97 m/s while




Fig. 14 The corresponding 3 ms criterion values for impact experiments conducted in Experiment 1 and 2. Experiment 1 where the dummy robot was attached to the experimental setup while Experiment 2 where the experimenter conducted the throwing of the dummy robot. The results were compared to the 3 ms criterion thresholds for child occupant [33].

the highest recorded 3 ms value was 18 g at a velocity of 7.48 m/s (Fig. 14). the trend is less consistent as compared to Experiment 1 as evident around 4 m/s.

5.2.3 Peak Linear Acceleration

In Experiment 1, the lowest recorded peak linear acceleration value was 1.5 g and it occurred at a velocity of 0.6 m/s while the highest recorded peak value was 23 g corresponding to a velocity of 5 m/s (Fig. 15). The peak acceleration values are increasing linearly with throwing velocity.

In Experiment 2, The lowest peak linear acceleration value obtained was 3 g corresponding to a velocity of 2.97 m/s while the highest value was 19 g at a velocity of 7.48 m/s (Fig. 14). the trend is less consistent as compared to Experiment 1, especially around 4 m/s.

5.2.4 Impact Forces

The embedded force sensor approach has failed in registering some of the impacts or maximum values due to the lack of sufficient contact between the dummy robot and the effective area of the sensor. However, the maximum force recorded in all of the experiments was 28 N at a velocity of 5.75 m/s.

In order to get a better understanding of the potential impact forces involved, four separate experiments at different velocities were conducted using a stand-alone force gauge. These experiments were conducted similar




Fig. 15 The corresponding peak linear acceleration values for impact experiments conducted in Experiment 1 and 2. Experiment 1 where the dummy robot was attached to the experimental setup while Experiment 2 where the experimenter conducted the throwing of the dummy robot. The highlighted area represents the range of peak linear accelerations that is associated with the occurrence of subconcussive events [92].

to Experiment 1 method (Fig. 10b). The lowest value was around 30.1 N corresponding to velocity of 0.75 m/s while the maximum value was 91.3 N at a velocity of 2.15 m/s. There is a trend and linear relationship between the applied velocities and the measured resultant peak force values (Fig. 16).




Fig. 16 The corresponding impact force values for impact experiments that were conducted using the stand-alone digital force gauge. The right axis represents their corresponding probabilities of causing facial fracture.




Fig. 17 The observed tissue damage to the artificial skin. a) Abrasions-like skin damage of depth that is less than 1 mm. b) Laceration-like skin damage of depth that is equal or greater than 2 mm.

5.2.5 Tissue Injuries

The evaluation of tissue injuries was based on the visual inspection of the artificial skin. All observations were made after conducting Experiment 1 and Experiment 2. In terms of depth, the majority of the observed damage to the artificial skin were less than 1 mm (Fig. 17a). There were some instances where the depth of the observed damage was more than the thickness of the artificial skin (i.e. greater than 2 mm) and piercing the dummy head (Fig. 17b).

6 Discussion

For HIC values to be meaningful, they need to be translated to a corresponding metric for potential injury based on AIS scaling. From reported equations in Section 3, the probabilities of injury due to all impact tests conducted in both Experiment 1 and 2 are negligible (i.e. close to 0%). Even though all the estimated potential for injuries in our experiments are low, there is still a potential for serious harm based on the reported catastrophic injuries and fatalities that occurred due to impacts with lighter objects (e.g. baseball) among children [71][11]. While HIC severity index is significant in giving an estimation of the potential for head injury, it is insufficient to estimate pain and assess tissue injuries.

As for the 3 ms criterion, the maximum values obtained for both sets indicate a low potential for harm. The highest value for Experiment 1 is around 25% of the frontal 3 ms criterion impact limit of 87 g and around 30% of the side impact limit of 72 g. As for the Experiment 2, the corresponding percentages for the highest 3 ms value are around 20% and 25% for frontal and side impact limits, respectively.




Fig. 18 Surface areas of the dummy robot that hit the head. a) frontal edge. b) Chimney. c) Back. d) Side.

The values for the peak linear accelerations for both experiments are around 40 g far away from most of the reported peak accelerations (e.g. 66 - 106 g) that are associated with concussive events [116]. However, most of the obtained peak acceleration values fall within the range (i.e. 6 - 46 g) that is associated with subconcussive events (Fig. 14). Furthermore, two peak linear acceleration values are at or above the reported median value of 19 g that has been associated with the occurrence of subconcussive impacts, where the occurrence of which has been linked to neurocognitive deficits [92]. More research need to be done to understand the biomechanical variables and its relation to causing concussion or mild TBI among children.

For HIC, 3ms criterion, and peak linear acceleration results, there was a noticeable disparity in Experiment 2 at a velocity of around 4 m/s. For example, HIC values range was from 0.114 to 2.834. This discrepancy can be attributed to the surface or area of the dummy robot that hit the head (e.g. chimney vs side) as observed from the analysis of the recorded videos (Fig. 18). This implies that at higher velocities, the harm level could even be larger depending on the contact area.

The peak force values for all the experiments were translated to percentages corresponding to the potential of causing fracture to the skull based on the previously stated relation (Fig. 6). All the recorded peak forces have low potential to cause real harm to any of the facial bones. For example, a peak value of 91.3 N (i.e. the maximum value obtained) corresponds to




Fig. 19 The sustained damage on the small robot after finishing all of the experiments.

around 0.6% chance of causing fracture to the bones of the face. However, assuming the linear relation holds true for higher velocities (Fig. 16), the chance for facial fracture increases up to 20% at a hypothetical throwing velocity of 10 m/s for the same robot.

The depth of the observed artificial skin damage were interpreted to a corresponding tissue injuries based on the classification listed in Section 2 (Table. 3). Most of the damage caused by the impacts conducted in this study falls into superficial category that affects the epidermis layer, and they were in the form of abrasions. There were few lacerations that are classified as partial-thickness skin loss that would require medical care. No instances of full-thickness (i.e. depth greater than 4 mm) skin loss were observed.

The dummy robot has sustained a considerable damage (Fig. 19). The damage was more apparent after performing Experiment 2 (i.e. mimicking real throwing scenario). Some of the lacerations on the artificial skin of the head could have resulted from the newly formed sharp edges on the robot due to the sustained damage from some of the initial impacts. This implies that any robotic design should remain robust and safe, especially after being subjected to similar impacts and conditions. Superficial injury as an indicator for potential harm could serve better than some of the typical severity indices. Similar conclusion has been reached in studies investigating the potential harm due industrial robots [44][43].

The safety investigations conducted in this study were limited to one potential scenario that may happen between a child and a social robot, which is harm to the head due to throwing. The developed experimental setup was limited to the head, but to better understand the overall dynamics involved due to impacts, a child dummy model should have been used. Quantifying harm was limited to the head, however, the actual harm could potentially affect other areas, such as the neck or the chest. Measurements of harm to the head was limited to the existing severity indices and to the closest available data. Thus, some aspects can not be

measured, such as pain levels. The tissue injury investigations were limited to artificial skin and not a live skin. Thus, actual depth of lacerations on an actual live skin might differ. Finally, the study was limited to small form factor impactor representing a small social robot, hence, the obtained results are only applicable to closely comparable robots in terms of mass, design, material and size.

7 Conclusion

The motivation of this study is to investigate the potential for harm due to the interaction between social robots and children with ASD, especially during the manifestation of challenging behaviors. Throwing, kicking, hitting, and self-harming are some of the challenging behaviors that during the exhibition of which, especially in the presence of a social robot, could inflict some harm to the children themselves and those around them. Our investigation of harm due to throwing of a small social robot revealed that it could potentially cause tissue injuries, subconcussive or concussive event in extreme cases.

Social robots have gained a lot of attention in health care generally, and specifically in therapy, due to the increased number of studies reporting the efficacy of using such technology. Among children with ASD, social robots have been reported to effectively help in the elicitation of some positive behaviors. This has been attributed to the fact that social robots are simpler and less complicated than humans. The advancement in technology has enabled robots to be more autonomous, intelligent and opened for new possibilities of smaller social robotic forms exhibiting high interactivity and capabilities. While larger social robots can be used in therapeutic settings, especially for training, the smaller form of social robots are more affordable and suitable options to be considered in home usage for continuous monitoring and support complementing rehabilitation efforts. The introduction of a new variable, such as a social robot, that is meant to evoke behaviors to the surrounding of such children could pose as new source of harm to themselves or others, especially during the manifestation of challenging behaviors.

Children on the spectrum lack the ability to properly communicate their needs and the case of harm due to impacts might be problematic, especially during therapeutic sessions [101][64]. Generalization of skills is usually done with other children. Hence, being subjected to pain due to impacts might affect any positive outcomes, and potentially cause more challenging behaviors. With children generally, and those with ASD especially, any source of potential harm, pain or even

annoyance must be kept to minimum or eliminated all together.

More research needs to be done investigating the potential for harm due to different robotic forms and to search for means to mitigate them through both hardware and software approaches [63][65]. For small social robots, regulations from standards that are concerned with the safety of toys can readily be adopted. For example, ISO 8124-1:2014, which is related to mechanical and physical properties safety aspects of toys [61]. Another direction for safer social robots is the adoption of some of the techniques and advances in soft robotics [51]. In the worst case scenario, where a potential harm can not be eliminated or reduced from a design perspective, a family member or caretaker must be present all time to ensure the safety of the child in case of the emergence of challenging behaviors while interacting with a social robot. New social robotic safety standards targeting and tailored for special end-users, such as children with ASD, must be established to ensure their safety and to take into consideration their needs.

Acknowledgements The work is supported by a research grant from Qatar University under the grant No. QUST-1-CENG-2018-7. The statements made herein are solely the responsibility of the authors. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Anderson, V., Moore, C.: Age at injury as a predictor of outcome following pediatric head injury: A longitudinal perspective. *Child Neuropsychology* **1**(3), 187–202 (1995)
2. Anderson, V.A., Catroppa, C., Dudgeon, P., Morse, S.A., Haritou, F., Rosenfeld, J.V.: Understanding predictors of functional recovery and outcome 30 months following early childhood head injury. *Neuropsychology* **20**(1), 42 (2006)
3. Ashburner, J., Ziviani, J., Rodger, S.: Surviving in the mainstream: Capacity of children with autism spectrum disorders to perform academically and regulate their emotions and behavior at school. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* **4**(1), 18–27 (2010)
4. Association, A.P., et al.: Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®). American Psychiatric Pub (2013)
5. Auger, R.: Autism spectrum disorders: A research review for school counselors. *Professional school counseling* **16**(4), 256–268 (2013)
6. Baghdadli, A., Pascal, C., Grisi, S., Aussilloux, C.: Risk factors for self-injurious behaviours among 222 young children with autistic disorders. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* **47**(8), 622–627 (2003)
7. Bakhos, L.L., Lockhart, G.R., Myers, R., Linakis, J.G.: Emergency department visits for concussion in young child athletes. *Pediatrics* **126**(3), e550–e556 (2010)
8. Bass, C.R., Yoganandan, N.: Skull and facial bone injury biomechanics. In: *Accidental Injury*, pp. 203–220. Springer (2015)
9. Begum, M., Serna, R.W., Yanco, H.A.: Are robots ready to deliver autism interventions? a comprehensive review. *International Journal of Social Robotics* **8**(2), 157–181 (2016)
10. Boccanfuso, L., Barney, E., Foster, C., Ahn, Y.A., Chawarska, K., Scassellati, B., Shic, F.: Emotional robot to examine differences in play patterns and affective response of children with and without asd. In: *The Eleventh ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human Robot Interaction*, pp. 19–26. IEEE Press (2016)
11. Boden, B.P., Tacchetti, R., Mueller, F.O.: Catastrophic injuries in high school and college baseball players. *The American journal of sports medicine* **32**(5), 1189–1196 (2004)
12. Bodfish, J.W., Symons, F.J., Parker, D.E., Lewis, M.H.: Varieties of repetitive behavior in autism: Comparisons to mental retardation. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders* **30**(3), 237–243 (2000)
13. Breazeal, C., Dautenhahn, K., Kanda, T.: *Social robotics*. In: Springer handbook of robotics, pp. 1935–1972. Springer (2016)
14. Cabibihan, J.J., Javed, H., Aldosari, M., Frazier, T.W., Elbashir, H.: Sensing technologies for autism spectrum disorder screening and intervention. *Sensors* **17**(1), 46 (2016)
15. Cabibihan, J.J., Javed, H., Ang Jr, M., Aljunied, S.M.: Why robots? a survey on the roles and benefits of social robots in the therapy of children with autism. *International journal of social robotics* **5**(4), 593–618 (2013)
16. Cabibihan, J.J., Joshi, D., Srinivasa, Y.M., Chan, M.A., Muruganatham, A.: Illusory sense of human touch from a warm and soft artificial hand. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* **23**(3), 517–527 (2015)
17. Cabibihan, J.J., So, W.C., Nazar, M., Ge, S.S.: Pointing gestures for a robot mediated communication interface. In: *International Conference on Intelligent Robotics and Applications*, pp. 67–77. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2009)
18. Cabibihan, J.J., So, W.C., Pramanik, S.: Human-recognizable robotic gestures. *Autonomous Mental Development, IEEE Transactions on* **4**(4), 305–314 (2012)
19. Cabibihan, J.J., So, W.C., Saj, S., Zhang, Z.: Telerobotic pointing gestures shape human spatial cognition. *International Journal of Social Robotics* **4**(3), 263–272 (2012)
20. Casey, D., Felzmann, H., Pegman, G., Kouroupetroglou, C., Murphy, K., Koumpis, A., Whelan, S.: What people with dementia want: designing mario an acceptable robot companion. In: *International Conference on Computers Helping People with Special Needs*, pp. 318–325. Springer (2016)
21. Cashin, A., Barker, P.: The triad of impairment in autism revisited. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing* **22**(4), 189–193 (2009)
22. Chaudron, S., Di Gioia, R., Gemo, M., Holloway, D., Marsh, J., Mascheroni, G., Peter, J., Yamada-Rice, D.: Kaleidoscope on the internet of toys-safety, security, privacy and societal insights (2017)
23. Comm, S.T.I.S.: Instrumentation for impact test-part 1-electronic instrumentation (j211/1). Warrendale, PA: Society of Automotive Engineers (2003)
24. Cordero, C.A., Carbone, G., Ceccarelli, M., Echávarri, J., Muñoz, J.L.: Experimental tests in human-robot collision evaluation and characterization of a new safety index for robot operation. *Mechanism and machine theory* **80**, 184–199 (2014)

25. Cotugno, A.J.: Social competence and social skills training and intervention for children with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders* **39**(9), 1268–1277 (2009)
26. Davis, M.B.: Facial fracture and eye injury tolerance from night vision goggle loading. Ph.D. thesis, University of Virginia (2004)
27. Desideri, L., Negrini, M., Malavasi, M., Tanzini, D., Rouame, A., Cutrone, M.C., Bonifacci, P., Hoogerwerf, E.J.: Using a humanoid robot as a complement to interventions for children with autism spectrum disorder: a pilot study. *Advances in Neurodevelopmental Disorders* pp. 1–13 (2018)
28. Diep, L., Cabibihan, J.J., Wolbring, G.: Social robots: Views of special education teachers. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd 2015 Workshop on ICTs for improving Patients Rehabilitation Research Techniques*, pp. 160–163. ACM (2015)
29. for Disease Control, C., Prevention, et al.: Report to congress on mild traumatic brain injury in the united states: Steps to prevent a serious public health problem. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention **45** (2003)
30. Ennis-Cole, D.L.: Strategies for supporting students with asd. In: *Technology for Learners with Autism Spectrum Disorders*, pp. 15–27. Springer (2015)
31. Ennis-Cole, D.L.: *Technology for learners with autism spectrum disorders*. Springer (2015)
32. Estes, A., Munson, J., Dawson, G., Koehler, E., Zhou, X.H., Abbott, R.: Parenting stress and psychological functioning among mothers of preschool children with autism and developmental delay. *Autism* **13**(4), 375–387 (2009)
33. Euro, NCAP: Assessment protocol-child occupant protection (2016)
34. Fife, G.P., O’sullivan, D.M., Pieter, W., Cook, D.P., Kaminski, T.W.: Effects of olympic-style taekwondo kicks on an instrumented head-form and resultant injury measures. *Br J Sports Med* pp. bjsports–2012 (2012)
35. Fodstad, J.C., Rojahn, J., Matson, J.L.: The emergence of challenging behaviors in at-risk toddlers with and without autism spectrum disorder: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities* **24**(3), 217–234 (2012)
36. Fong, T., Nourbakhsh, I., Dautenhahn, K.: A survey of socially interactive robots. *Robotics and autonomous systems* **42**(3-4), 143–166 (2003)
37. Ge, S.S., Cabibihan, J.J., Zhang, Z., Li, Y., Meng, C., He, H., Safizadeh, M., Li, Y., Yang, J.: Design and development of nancy, a social robot. In: *Ubiquitous Robots and Ambient Intelligence (URAI), 2011 8th International Conference on*, pp. 568–573. IEEE (2011)
38. Giuliani, M., Lenz, C., Müller, T., Rickert, M., Knoll, A.: Design principles for safety in human-robot interaction. *International Journal of Social Robotics* **2**(3), 253–274 (2010)
39. Green, H., McGinnity, Á., Meltzer, H., Ford, T., Goodman, R., et al.: Mental health of children and young people in great britain, 2004 (2005)
40. Greenspan, L., McLellan, B.A., Greig, H.: Abbreviated injury scale and injury severity score: a scoring chart. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery* **25**(1), 60–64 (1985)
41. Greenwald, R.M., Gwin, J.T., Chu, J.J., Crisco, J.J.: Head impact severity measures for evaluating mild traumatic brain injury risk exposure. *Neurosurgery* **62**(4), 789–798 (2008)
42. Gurney, J.G., McPheeters, M.L., Davis, M.M.: Parental report of health conditions and health care use among children with and without autism: National survey of children’s health. *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine* **160**(8), 825–830 (2006)
43. Haddadin, S., Albu-Schaffer, A., Haddadin, F., Rosmann, J., Hirzinger, G.: Study on soft-tissue injury in robotics. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine* **18**(4), 20–34 (2011)
44. Haddadin, S., Albu-Schäffer, A., Hirzinger, G.: Safety evaluation of physical human-robot interaction via crash-testing. In: *Robotics: Science and Systems*, vol. 3, pp. 217–224 (2007)
45. Haddadin, S., Albu-Schaffer, A., Hirzinger, G.: The role of the robot mass and velocity in physical human-robot interaction-part i: Non-constrained blunt impacts. In: *Robotics and Automation, 2008. ICRA 2008. IEEE International Conference on*, pp. 1331–1338. IEEE (2008)
46. Haddadin, S., Albu-Schäffer, A., Hirzinger, G.: Requirements for safe robots: Measurements, analysis and new insights. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* **28**(11-12), 1507–1527 (2009)
47. Ham, J., Cuijpers, R.H., Cabibihan, J.J.: Combining robotic persuasive strategies: the persuasive power of a storytelling robot that uses gazing and gestures. *International Journal of Social Robotics* **7**(4), 479–487 (2015)
48. Hart, M.: Autism/excel study. In: *Proceedings of the 7th international ACM SIGACCESS conference on Computers and accessibility*, pp. 136–141. ACM (2005)
49. Hegel, F., Muhl, C., Wrede, B., Hielscher-Fastabend, M., Sagerer, G.: Understanding social robots. In: *Advances in Computer-Human Interactions, 2009. ACHI’09. Second International Conferences on*, pp. 169–174. IEEE (2009)
50. Herrmann, G., Melhuish, C.: Towards safety in human robot interaction. *International Journal of Social Robotics* **2**(3), 217–219 (2010)
51. Hoa, T.D., Cabibihan, J.J.: Cute and soft: baby steps in designing robots for children with autism. In: *Proceedings of the Workshop at SIGGRAPH Asia*, pp. 77–79. ACM (2012)
52. Huijnen, C., Lexis, M., de Witte, L.: Robots as new tools in therapy and education for children with autism. *Int J Neurorehabilitation* **4**(278), 2376–0281 (2017)
53. Huijnen, C.A., Lexis, M.A., Jansens, R., de Witte, L.P.: How to implement robots in interventions for children with autism? a co-creation study involving people with autism, parents and professionals. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders* **47**(10), 3079–3096 (2017)
54. Huijnen, C.A., Lexis, M.A., de Witte, L.P.: Matching robot kaspar to autism spectrum disorder (asd) therapy and educational goals. *International Journal of Social Robotics* **8**(4), 445–455 (2016)
55. Hutchins, T.L., Prelock, P.A.: Using communication to reduce challenging behaviors in individuals with autism spectrum disorders and intellectual disability. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics* **23**(1), 41–55 (2014)
56. Hutchinson, T.P.: Peak acceleration during impact with helmet materials: effects of impactor mass and speed. *European journal of sport science* **14**(sup1), S377–S382 (2014)
57. International Federation of Robotics: Executive summary world robotics 2016 industrial robots. URL <https://ifr.org/>. (Date last accessed 1-Jan-2018)
58. International Organization for Standardization: Iso 10218-1: 2011: Robots and robotic devices–safety requirements for industrial robots–part 1: Robots.

- Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization (2011)
59. International Organization for Standardization: Iso 10218-2: 2011: Robots and robotic devices—safety requirements for industrial robots—part 2: Robot systems and integration. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization (2011)
 60. International Organization for Standardization: Iso 13482: 2014: Robotic devices—safety requirements—nonmedical personal care robot. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization (2014)
 61. International Organization for Standardization: Iso 8124-1: 2014: Safety of toys – part 1: Safety aspects related to mechanical and physical properties. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization (2014)
 62. International Organization for Standardization: Iso/ts 15066:2016: Robots and robotic devices – collaborative robots. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization (2016)
 63. Javed, H., Cabibihan, J.J., Al-Attayah, A.A.: Autism in the gulf states: Why social robotics is the way forward. In: ICTA, pp. 1–3 (2015)
 64. Javed, H., Cabibihan, J.J., Aldosari, M., Al-Attayah, A.: Culture as a driver for the design of social robots for autism spectrum disorder interventions in the middle east. In: International Conference on Social Robotics, pp. 591–599. Springer, Cham (2016)
 65. Javed, H., Connor, O.B., Cabibihan, J.J.: Thomas and friends: Implications for the design of social robots and their role as social story telling agents for children with autism. In: Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO), 2015 IEEE International Conference on, pp. 1145–1150. IEEE (2015)
 66. Johnson, N.L., Lashley, J., Stonek, A.V., Bonjour, A.: Children with developmental disabilities at a pediatric hospital: Staff education to prevent and manage challenging behaviors. *Journal of pediatric nursing* **27**(6), 742–749 (2012)
 67. Kanne, S.M., Mazurek, M.O.: Aggression in children and adolescents with asd: Prevalence and risk factors. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders* **41**(7), 926–937 (2011)
 68. Kozima, H., Michalowski, M.P., Nakagawa, C.: Keepon. *International Journal of Social Robotics* **1**(1), 3–18 (2009)
 69. Kozlowski, A.M., Matson, J.L.: An examination of challenging behaviors in autistic disorder versus pervasive developmental disorder not otherwise specified: Significant differences and gender effects. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* **6**(1), 319–325 (2012)
 70. Kuppa, S.: Injury criteria for side impact dummies. Washington, DC: National Transportation Biomechanics Research Center, National Highway Saftety Administration, US DOT **67** (2004)
 71. Kyle, S., Adler, P., Monticone, R.: Reducing youth baseball injuries with protective equipment. *Consumer Product Saf Rev* **1**(1), 1–4 (1996)
 72. Machalicek, W., O'Reilly, M.F., Beretvas, N., Sigafos, J., Lancioni, G.E.: A review of interventions to reduce challenging behavior in school settings for students with autism spectrum disorders. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* **1**(3), 229–246 (2007)
 73. Martin, R., Liptai, L., Yerby, S., Williams, K.: The relationship between mass and acceleration for impacts on padded surfaces. *Journal of biomechanics* **27**(3), 361–364 (1994)
 74. Mascheroni, G., Holloway, D.: The internet of toys: A report on media and social discourses around young children and iotoys. (2017)
 75. Matson, J.L., Gonzalez, M.L., Rivet, T.T.: Reliability of the autism spectrum disorder-behavior problems for children (asd-bpc). *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* **2**(4), 696–706 (2008)
 76. Matson, J.L., Shoemaker, M.: Intellectual disability and its relationship to autism spectrum disorders. *Research in developmental disabilities* **30**(6), 1107–1114 (2009)
 77. Mazefsky, C.A., Herrington, J., Siegel, M., Scarpa, A., Maddox, B.B., Scahill, L., White, S.W.: The role of emotion regulation in autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* **52**(7), 679–688 (2013)
 78. McIntosh, A.S., Janda, D.: Evaluation of cricket helmet performance and comparison with baseball and ice hockey helmets. *British journal of sports medicine* **37**(4), 325–330 (2003)
 79. Michaud, F., Caron, S.: Roball, the rolling robot. *Autonomous robots* **12**(2), 211–222 (2002)
 80. Mihalik, J.P., Blackburn, J.T., Greenwald, R.M., Cantu, R.C., Marshall, S.W., Guskiewicz, K.M.: Collision type and player anticipation affect head impact severity among youth ice hockey players. *Pediatrics* **125**(6), e1394–e1401 (2010)
 81. Murphy, O., Healy, O., Leader, G.: Risk factors for challenging behaviors among 157 children with autism spectrum disorder in ireland. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* **3**(2), 474–482 (2009)
 82. Myers, S.M., Johnson, C.P., et al.: Management of children with autism spectrum disorders. *Pediatrics* **120**(5), 1162–1182 (2007)
 83. Oberer, S., Schraft, R.D.: Robot-dummy crash tests for robot safety assessment. In: Robotics and Automation, 2007 IEEE International Conference on, pp. 2934–2939. IEEE (2007)
 84. O'sullivan, D.M., Fife, G.P., Pieter, W., Shin, I.: Safety performance evaluation of taekwondo headgear. *Br J Sports Med* **47**(7), 447–451 (2013)
 85. Panduri, S., Dini, V., Romanelli, M.: The durometer measurement of the skin: Hardware and measuring principles (2016)
 86. Parsons, S., Mitchell, P., Leonard, A.: The use and understanding of virtual environments by adolescents with autistic spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental disorders* **34**(4), 449–466 (2004)
 87. Plant, K.M., Sanders, M.R.: Reducing problem behavior during care-giving in families of preschool-aged children with developmental disabilities. *Research in developmental disabilities* **28**(4), 362–385 (2007)
 88. Rivara, F.P., Koepsell, T.D., Wang, J., Temkin, N., Dorsch, A., Vavilala, M.S., Durbin, D., Jaffe, K.M.: Incidence of disability among children 12 months after traumatic brain injury. *American journal of public health* **102**(11), 2074–2079 (2012)
 89. Robins, B., Dautenhahn, K., Dickerson, P.: From isolation to communication: a case study evaluation of robot assisted play for children with autism with a minimally expressive humanoid robot. In: Advances in Computer-Human Interactions, 2009. ACHI'09. Second International Conferences on, pp. 205–211. IEEE (2009)
 90. Robins, B., Otero, N., Ferrari, E., Dautenhahn, K.: Eliciting requirements for a robotic toy for children with autism—results from user panels. In: Robot and Human interactive Communication, 2007. RO-MAN 2007. The

- 16th IEEE International Symposium on, pp. 101–106. IEEE (2007)
91. Rogers, S.J.: Brief report: Early intervention in autism. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders* **26**(2), 243–246 (1996)
 92. Rowson, S., Duma, S.M.: Development of the star evaluation system for football helmets: integrating player head impact exposure and risk of concussion. *Annals of biomedical engineering* **39**(8), 2130–2140 (2011)
 93. Rowson, S., Duma, S.M.: Brain injury prediction: assessing the combined probability of concussion using linear and rotational head acceleration. *Annals of biomedical engineering* **41**(5), 873–882 (2013)
 94. Sakurai, S., Miyashita, M.: Developmental aspects of overarm throwing related to age and sex. *Human Movement Science* **2**(1), 67–76 (1983)
 95. Scarpinato, N., Bradley, J., Kurbjun, K., Bateman, X., Holtzer, B., Ely, B.: Caring for the child with an autism spectrum disorder in the acute care setting. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing* **15**(3), 244–254 (2010)
 96. Scassellati, B., Admoni, H., Mataric, M.: Robots for use in autism research. *Annual review of biomedical engineering* **14**, 275–294 (2012)
 97. Schmitt, K.U., Niederer, P.F., Muser, M.H., Walz, F.: *Trauma Biomechanics: Accidental injury in traffic and sports*. Springer Science & Business Media (2009)
 98. Share, P., Pender, J.: Preparing for a robot future? social professions, social robotics and the challenges ahead. *Irish Journal of Applied Social Studies* **18**(1), 4 (2018)
 99. Shergold, O.A., Fleck, N.A.: Experimental investigation into the deep penetration of soft solids by sharp and blunt punches, with application to the piercing of skin. *Journal of biomechanical engineering* **127**(5), 838–848 (2005)
 100. Siciliano, B., Khatib, O.: *Springer handbook of robotics*. Springer (2016)
 101. So, W.C., Wong, M.Y., Cabibihan, J.J., Lam, C.Y., Chan, R.Y., Qian, H.H.: Using robot animation to promote gestural skills in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* **32**(6), 632–646 (2016)
 102. Solutions, Humanetics Innovative: Hybrid iii 3 year old child. *Child Dummies*, URL: <http://www.humaneticsatd.com/crash-test-dummies/children/hiiii-3yo> (2017). (Date last accessed 1-Jan-2018)
 103. Sussman, C., Bates-Jensen, B.M.: *Wound care: a collaborative practice manual*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins (2007)
 104. Taheri, A., Meghdari, A., Alemi, M., Pouretamad, H.: Human–robot interaction in autism treatment: A case study on three pairs of autistic children as twins, siblings, and classmates. *International Journal of Social Robotics* pp. 1–21 (2017)
 105. Taylor, C.A.: Traumatic brain injury–related emergency department visits, hospitalizations, and deaths united states, 2007 and 2013. *MMWR. Surveillance Summaries* **66** (2017)
 106. Teo, H.T., Cabibihan, J.J.: Toward soft, robust robots for children with autism spectrum disorder. In: *FinER@ IROS*, pp. 15–19 (2015)
 107. Versace, J.: A review of the severity index. Tech. rep., SAE Technical Paper (1971)
 108. Willinger, R., Baumgartner, D.: Human head tolerance limits to specific injury mechanisms. *International journal of Crashworthiness* **8**(6), 605–617 (2003)
 109. Wu, J.Z., Pan, C.S., Wimer, B.M., Rosen, C.L.: Finite element simulations of the head–brain responses to the top impacts of a construction helmet: Effects of the neck and body mass. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of engineering in medicine* **231**(1), 58–68 (2017)
 110. Wykowska, A., Kajopoulos, J., Obando-Leiton, M., Chauhan, S.S., Cabibihan, J.J., Cheng, G.: Humans are well tuned to detecting agents among non-agents: examining the sensitivity of human perception to behavioral characteristics of intentional systems. *International Journal of Social Robotics* **7**(5), 767–781 (2015)
 111. Yamada, Y., Hirasawa, Y., Huang, S., Umetani, Y.: Fail-safe human/robot contact in the safety space. In: *Robot and Human Communication, 1996., 5th IEEE International Workshop on*, pp. 59–64. IEEE (1996)
 112. Yang, N.H., Rodowicz, K.A., Dainty, D.: Baseball head impacts to the non-helmeted and helmeted hybrid iii atd. In: *ASME 2014 International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition*, pp. V003T03A007–V003T03A007. American Society of Mechanical Engineers (2014)
 113. Yeates, K.O., Swift, E., Taylor, H.G., Wade, S.L., Drotar, D., Stancin, T., Minich, N.: Short-and long-term social outcomes following pediatric traumatic brain injury. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society* **10**(3), 412–426 (2004)
 114. Young, T.J., Daniel, R.W., Rowson, S., Duma, S.M.: Head impact exposure in youth football: elementary school ages 7-8 years and the effect of returning players. *Clinical journal of sport medicine* **24**(5), 416–421 (2014)
 115. Zablotzky, B., Black, L.L., Maenner, M.J., Schieve, L.A., Blumberg, S.J.: Estimated prevalence of autism and other developmental disabilities following questionnaire changes in the 2014 national health interview survey. *National health statistics reports* (87), 1–21 (2015)
 116. Zhang, L., Yang, K.H., King, A.I.: A proposed injury threshold for mild traumatic brain injury. *Transactions-American Society of Mechanical Engineers Journal of Biomechanical Engineering* **126**(2), 226–236 (2004)
 117. Zwaigenbaum, L., Bryson, S., Rogers, T., Roberts, W., Brian, J., Szatmari, P.: Behavioral manifestations of autism in the first year of life. *International journal of developmental neuroscience* **23**(2-3), 143–152 (2005)
- Ahmad Yaser Alhaddad** obtained his Bachelor degree in robotics and automation from Multimedia University (MMU), Malaysia in 2011; and obtained his Master degree in Mechatronics and Automatic Control from Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), Malaysia in 2013. Through his studies, he has worked on many engineering projects involving circuit design, microcontroller and control that gave him a lot of experience in these areas. For his Master’s project, he has worked on creating new platform for microbioreactors system that involved working on microcontrollers, electronic circuits and mechanical design. He is currently doing his PhD in Mechanical and Information technology, from Qatar University and Politecnico di Milano, as part of the double doctorate programme. His research interests include social robotics, haptics, control and mechatronic systems.

John-John Cabibihan received the Ph.D. degree in bioengineering, with specialization in biorobotics, from the Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy, in 2007. From 2008 to 2013, he was an Assistant Professor at the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, National University of Singapore. He is currently an Associate Professor at the Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Department, Qatar University. He is Lead/Co-Lead Principal Investigator of several projects under the National Priorities Research Program of Qatar National Research Fund. He serves on the Editorial Boards of the International Journal of Social Robotics, the International Journal of Advanced Robotics Systems, Frontiers in Bionics and Biomimetics, Frontiers in Special Education Needs, and Computational Cognitive Science. He was the General Chair of the 6th IEEE International Conference on Cybernetics and Intelligent Systems (Manila, 2013); Program Chair of the International Conference on Social Robotics (ICSR) 2012 in Chengdu, China, and ICSR 2016 in Kansas City, USA; and Program Co-Chair of ICSR 2010 (Singapore) and ICSR 2017 (Tsukuba, Japan). Over the years, his work has been focused toward assistive and social robotics for the therapy of children with autism, lifelike prosthetics, bioinspired tactile sensing, and human-robotic touch and gestures.

Andrea Bonarini is full professor and coordinator of the AI and Robotics Lab at Politecnico di Milano. His current research interests are on machine learning and emotional human-robot interaction, with special focus on robotic games and toys for entertainment and social, psychological and physical development of people with and without special needs. Since 1989, he has realized with his collaborators and students more than 50 autonomous robots. In 2015, he co-funded Nova Labs, to share experience and tools to produce professional robots in a short time at low cost. He is collaborating with toys companies to introduce technology in their products. He has an active role in the COST European network "LUDI: play for children with disabilities". He published more than 150 peer-reviewed papers.