

Project Report

# **Predicting Injury Severity in Road Accidents: A Real-Time Classification Approach**

David Cebulla (1922129)  
Gabriel Himmelein (1649181)  
Lukas Ott (1842341)  
Artur Loreit (2268917)  
Aaron Niemesch (1836924)

November 23, 2025

Submitted to  
Data and Web Science Group  
Dr. Sven Hertling  
University of Mannheim

# 1 Application Area and Goals

Modern intelligent and connected vehicle systems, such as the mandatory European eCall service, are designed to automatically transmit crucial accident data to emergency centers when a crash occurs. These transmissions typically include location, timestamp, and the number of passengers but lack information on the severity of injuries: a critical shortcoming for emergency services, as this information is vital for prioritizing rescue efforts and optimizing medical response times.

To address this gap, we focus on leveraging historical accident data provided by the French National Interministerial Observatory for Road Safety (ONISR). This organization maintains the official “Bulletins d’Analyse des Accidents Corporels de la Circulation” (BAAC), a national database that records all injury accidents on public roads in France. The dataset captures detailed multi-table information covering the circumstances of each accident (Caractéristiques), the location and infrastructure (Lieux), the vehicles involved (Véhicules), and the individual users (Usagers). These data entries include rich contextual variables such as road category, lighting and weather conditions, vehicle type, and the user’s role and behavior at the time of the accident.

Each accident record specifies the injury outcome (grav) for every participant, coded as uninjured, lightly injured, hospitalized, or killed. Although the ONISR database provides this information retrospectively (sometimes up to 30 days after the event) it represents a uniquely valuable source for supervised learning aimed at approximating these outcomes in real time.

The goal of this project is to develop a machine learning classifier capable of predicting injury severity immediately after an accident, based solely on the information that would realistically be available to emergency responders or vehicle telematics systems at the moment of impact. Such a model can significantly enhance first-responder coordination by providing an automated injury risk assessment, enabling faster triage and more efficient resource allocation.

## 2 Structure and Size of the Data Set

Our analysis uses the “Annual Road Traffic Injury Databases” from 2019-2023, provided by ONISR. The data is supplied in four files per year (characteristics, locations, users, and vehicles) and includes features such as road conditions, weather, and user information. Recognizing the one-to-many relationship where each accident involves multiple participants, we defined our unit of analysis at the **individual level**. The **users** table serves as the base for our dataset.

Directly after merging the accident characteristics, locations, users, and vehicle tables, and prior to any further preprocessing steps, the consolidated dataset comprised a total of 619,817 records and 71 columns. Processing the yearly data reveals an annual volume ranging between approximately 105,000 and 133,000 records per year. The final consolidated dataset was then partitioned into a training and validation set of **493,214 samples** (covering 2019-2022) and a test set of **125,505 samples** (covering 2023).

The features we have selected are listed below. They are categorized into 23 original features (retained from raw data) and 34 engineered features (calculated to model complex relationships), comprising a total of 57 features.

Aspect	Features	Description
<b>Time context</b>	time_of_day, hour_sin/cos, day_of_week_sin/cos, month_sin/cos, day_of_year_sin/cos	Captures seasonality and daily patterns using cyclical sine/cosine transformations. Includes time of day categories.
<b>Geospatial</b>	latitude, longitude	GPS coordinates (WGS84) for spatial analysis.
<b>Environment</b>	lighting_ordinal, weather_ordinal, location, infrastructure, accident_situation, horizontal_alignment, reserved_lane_present, speed_limit, road_complexity_index, surface_quality_indicator	Combines physical site attributes with risk-based ordinals. Engineered indices quantify road complexity and surface quality.
<b>Crash dynamics</b>	type_of_collision, initial_point_of_impact, fixed_obstacle_struck, mobile_obstacle_struck, main_maneuver_before_accident, impact_score, impact_delta	Describes collision mechanics. Derived metrics quantify relative risk based on vehicle size differences.
<b>Vehicle attributes</b>	motor_type, vehicle_category_simplified, vehicle_category_involved[type]	Specifies primary vehicle type. Includes binary flags for involvement of specific other vehicle types.
<b>Personal attributes</b>	role, sex, age, age_group, position, pedestrian_location, pedestrian_action	Covers demographic data, user's role, seating position, and pedestrian actions.
<b>Safety equipment</b>	used_belt, used_helmet, used_child_restraint, used_airbag	Binary variables indicating use of protective gear or airbag deployment.
<b>Clustering</b>	cluster	Categorical feature from K-Prototypes clustering, grouping accidents into distinct "personas".
<b>Target</b>	injury_target	Engineered ordinal target: 0 (Uninjured), 1 (Lightly Injured), 2 (Hospitalized/Dead).

Table 1: Feature overview and descriptions from the ONISR accident dataset.

## 3 Preprocessing

Given the nature of the "Annual Road Traffic Injury Database" as a raw database output provided by ONISR in multiple separate tables with complex many-to-one relationships, extensive preprocessing was required. The pipeline is designed to transform the disjointed raw data into a singular, model-ready tabular representation.

### 3.1 Data Standardization and Key Generation

The initial step involved normalizing column names to English equivalents. A critical challenge was the inconsistency in user identification across years. Data from 2022 onwards included a distinct `id_user`, whereas data from 2019 and 2020 did not. To ensure a consistent unit of analysis across all years, we implemented a synthetic key generation strategy. For older data, we generated a unique identifier by combining the accident ID with a cumulative count of users within that accident (e.g., 2019000001\_U1). This ensured that every individual involved in an accident could be uniquely tracked and merged with their respective vehicle and accident characteristics.

### 3.2 Advanced Data Merging strategies

A user-centric view was adopted for merging, treating each participant as an independent instance. While accident characteristics (weather, time) could be joined directly, the relationship between users, their vehicles, and opposing vehicles required complex logic.

#### Vehicle Antagonist Resolution

A significant predictor of injury severity is the disparity between the user's vehicle and the "opposing" entity (the antagonist). Since a simple join cannot determine which of the multiple vehicles in an accident caused the injury, we engineered a selection algorithm. We assigned an `impact_score` to vehicle categories based on mass and risk (e.g., HGV Truck = 6, Bicycle = 2). For multi-vehicle accidents, the pipeline identifies the "antagonist" vehicle as the one involved in the same accident with the highest impact score, excluding the user's own vehicle. For pedestrians, the striking vehicle is explicitly identified. This allows us to calculate an `impact_delta`, representing the structural disadvantage of the user (e.g., a cyclist hit by a truck results in a high negative delta).

#### Location Deduplication

Contrary to the dataset description, multiple location entries were found for single accident IDs, likely due to first responders logging entries for every intersecting street. To resolve this, we implemented a `completeness_score`. We assigned weights to critical columns (Road Category: 2.0, Speed Limit: 2.0, others: 1.0). For each accident, the location entry with the highest weighted score, indicating the most data-rich description of the scene, was selected, ensuring the model trains on the highest quality data available.

### 3.3 Feature Selection & Cleaning

The dataset underwent a rigorous cleaning process. Invalid data, such as speed limits exceeding 130 km/h or negative values for age, were filtered out. We removed high-cardinality identifiers (IDs, address strings) and columns with excessive missingness (e.g., `width_central_reservation`) that offered little predictive value. Hereof, we distinguished between "structural missingness" (values that should not exist) and "data quality missingness" (values that are unknown).

- **Structural Missingness:** Pedestrians, by definition, do not have a vehicle category or motor type. For these cases, we explicitly imputed a value of `-1` or `'none'` to indicate "Not Applicable". Missing values for the driver, indicating a hit and run, were imputed with `0` or `Unknown` to keep the information.
- **Data Quality Missingness:** Columns with  $\approx 5\%$  missing values were dropped, alongside rows missing values in columns without special NaN meaning.
- **Other Vehicle Imputation:** If no opposing vehicle was involved, columns related to the "other" vehicle were set to `-1`. However, if a second vehicle ID existed but its characteristics were missing, we imputed `Unknown` to differentiate this state from single-vehicle accidents.

Rows missing the target variable `injury_severity` were dropped as well, as they cannot be used for supervised learning. In addition, an isolation forest was used for simple outlier elimination considering the dataset's size.

### 3.4 Feature Engineering

To capture complex non-linear relationships, we generated 34 new features across four domains. The final dataset consists of 57 refined features ready for the modeling pipeline.

#### Temporal Cyclical Features

Raw timestamps are ill-suited for many models due to the discontinuity between 23:59 and 00:00. We decomposed time into cyclical components using Sine and Cosine transformations for hours, days of the week, and months. Additionally, we bucketed hours into a `time_of_day` feature (Night, Morning Rush, Midday, Evening Rush) to assist tree-based models in identifying high-level patterns.

#### Road Complexity Index

We hypothesized that complex road environments increase accident probability but might decrease severity due to lower speeds. We engineered a `road_complexity_index`, a composite score normalized between 0 and 10. This index aggregates weighted scores from:

- **Intersection Type:** High weights for roundabouts and multi-branch intersections.
- **Road Category:** Higher weights for urban communal ways vs. motorways.
- **Traffic Regime:** Penalties for variable assignment lanes.
- **Lane Count:** Higher complexity for multi-lane roads.

Complementing this, a binary `surface_quality_indicator` was created, set to 1 only if both the pavement condition was normal and the longitudinal profile was flat.

### Vehicle and User Attributes

Vehicle categories were simplified from over 30 specific codes into 6 broad classes (Bicycle, Powered 2-3 Wheeler, Light Motor Vehicle, HGV/Truck, Bus/Coach, Other) to reduce dimensionality. For users, we transformed the `year_of_birth` into an `age` feature and further binned it into sociologically relevant `age_groups` (e.g., Child/Teen, Senior). Safety equipment flags (seatbelts, helmets, airbags) were consolidated from three separate columns into binary "Used/Not Used" indicators to resolve data sparsity.

### 3.5 Resampling

Regarding the target value of injury severity, the dataset exhibits a clear class imbalance towards less severe cases (47% non-injured, 36% injured, and 16% heavily injured) biasing models trained towards the majority class. To address this, the raw target variable `injury_severity` (4 classes) was re-mapped to an ordinal `injury_target` (0: Uninjured, 1: Light Injury, 2: Hospitalized/Dead), both adjusting for updates received up to 30 days afterwards and better reflecting the triage needs of first responders.

Given the importance of correctly assessing cases of heavy injury, resampling was applied to the dataset to remove class imbalance. Both over- (SMOTE) and undersampling were considered and tested. Given the large amount of data at disposal (>400k) and considering compute constraints, random undersampling (130k) was ultimately chosen.

## 4 Data Mining

We partition the dataset into a training set (2019-2022) and a test set (2023). Our primary evaluation metric is the macro F1-score, chosen to prioritize recall for the critical "severely injured" class without introducing the sensitivity of arbitrary cost matrices. Instead of using a simple majority-vote baseline, we implemented a domain-specific baseline that relies exclusively on the speed-limit feature to predict accident severity:

$$\hat{y} = \begin{cases} \text{uninjured,} & \text{if speed\_limit} \leq 50, \\ \text{injured,} & \text{if speed\_limit} < 100, \\ \text{severely injured,} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Model	Hyperparameter	Search Space	Best Value	F1-Macro
<b>Ridge</b>	alpha	$\{0.05, 0.10, \dots, 10\}$	1.5	0.654
<b>BRF</b>	n_estimators	$[50, 400] \cap \mathbb{Z}$	400	0.674
	max_depth	$\{3, \dots, 20\}$	18	
	min_samples_leaf	$\{1, \dots, 20\}$	1	
	replacement	$\{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$	False	
	sampling_strategy	$\{\text{all}, \text{not minority}\}$	all	
<b>CatBoost</b>	iterations	$\{1000, \dots, 5000\}$	4139	0.696
	learning_rate	$[0.01, 0.2]$	0.01	
	depth	$\{4, \dots, 10\}$	10	
	l2_leaf_reg	$[10^{-2}, 10]$	0.1887	
	border_count	$\{32, \dots, 255\}$	255	

Table 2: Search space and optimal hyperparameters for Ridge, BRF and CatBoost.

Given the ordinal nature of the target variable, we also considered weighted Cohen’s kappa. However, considering the high cost of missing a severe injury in an emergency response context, optimizing macro-F1 ensures that the minority class (severe injuries) is not overwhelmed by the majority class (uninjured).

#### 4.1 Classification: Model Selection

To gain an initial understanding of the difficulty of the prediction task, we experimented with a broad range of machine learning models while applying only minimal hyperparameter tuning including models based on logistic regression (ordinal, lasso, ridge), ensembles (Random Forests, HistGradientBoosting, CatBoost) and simple neural networks. Across these experiments, we observed that all machine learning models substantially outperformed the baseline method. While originally considered, methods explicitly designed to leverage the ordinal structure of the target variable did not achieve better performance compared to other approaches in terms of both F1 and misclassifications error types, eliminating them from consideration. Applying Occam’s Razor, our focus was narrowed to three models for fine-tuning and selection: Ridge Classification, Balanced Random Forest and CatBoost. While the first is Logistic Regression with applied L2-regularization and the second a random forest with rebalancing during subsampling, CatBoost is a boosting algorithm similar to XGBoost chosen for its improved support for categorical data, fitting to our data composition.

Considering the size of our dataset and computational constraints, model selection in terms of hyperparameter tuning was conducted for each model using 3-fold cross validation with shuffling to avoid biases from the original ordering, utilizing Bayesian Optimization and F1-Macro for the ensembles. While Ridge Regression could only be tuned regarding its regularization strength  $\alpha$ , both ensemble methods offered more options regarding tree pruning relevant for avoiding overfitting. Table 2 shows the hyperparam-

eters considered. Selection was similarly achieved using both F1-Macro and confusion matrices, used to evaluate recall/misclassifications on (high) injury cases, with the same 3-fold cross validation. Given our results, CatBoost would be selected.

## 4.2 Clustering: Strategy

To identify distinct "Accident Personas," we explored four clustering algorithms, each chosen for a specific capability:

- **K-Prototypes:** A hybrid extension of K-Means that handles mixed data types (numerical and categorical) natively. This is critical for our dataset, where features like 'road category' or 'vehicle type' carry significant semantic weight that cannot be captured by Euclidean distance alone.
- **HDBSCAN:** A density-based algorithm chosen for its ability to detect noise and clusters of varying shapes. Unlike partition-based methods, it does not force every point into a cluster, which is useful for identifying "outlier" accident types.
- **Agglomerative Clustering:** Used with Gower distance to explore hierarchical structures in the mixed dataset, offering a visual way to assess natural groupings via dendrograms.

**Cluster Profiling Methodology:** To derive meaningful profiles from the clustered dataset, we conducted a structured categorical overrepresentation analysis. For each cluster and each categorical feature, we computed the conditional distribution  $P(X = x \mid C = c)$  and compared it to the global distribution  $P(X = x)$ . A category was considered *cluster-characteristic* if it satisfied the following criteria:

- **Lift filter:** A minimum overrepresentation of  $\text{lift}(x, c) = \frac{P(X=x|C=c)}{P(X=x)} > 1.5$ .
- **Support filter:** The category must represent more than 3% of observations within the cluster.
- **Dominance filter:** Features were excluded if the same dominant category appeared in all clusters (e.g., "Daylight").

## 5 Evaluation

### 5.1 Classification

The models were evaluated on the held-out test set (2023) which exhibits a similar target value distribution as the previous years, thus naturally ensuring stratification. For the hyperparameters, the choices listed in Table 2 found during model selection were chosen. Each model was systematically evaluated using an automated pipeline for reporting the metrics listed in Table 3. Cohen's kappa was additionally included to evaluate ordinal performance.






Figure 1: Generalization Performance: Confusion Matrices

	RC			BRF			CB			BL		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
<b>Uninjured</b>	0.84	0.72	0.78	0.88	0.72	0.79	0.88	0.73	0.80	0.50	0.64	0.56
<b>Injured</b>	0.59	0.46	0.52	0.62	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.60	0.62	0.34	0.30	0.32
<b>Severe</b>	0.40	0.77	0.53	0.47	0.70	0.56	0.46	0.73	0.57	0.16	0.08	0.10
<b>Macro F1</b>		0.61			0.66			0.66			0.33	
<b>Cohen's <math>\kappa</math></b>		0.59			0.63			0.6342			0.0910	

Table 3: Test Performance: Ridge Classifier, Balanced Random Forest, CatBoost, Baseline.

CatBoost achieves the highest F1 and Cohen's  $\kappa$ , followed by BRF and RC, while the baseline performs substantially worse, following the results obtained in model selection. While models reliably predict low severity cases (e.g. F1 [0.78, 0.80]), differentiation between injured and heavily injured cases remains challenging, contributing the most to performance loss.

Figure 1 yields clearer insight into the classification errors made. While all models seldom conduct greater misclassifications (uninjured vs. heavily injured), the line between injured and heavily injured is non-well defined, resulting mix-ups between the two.

Later iterations of the data mining process focused tried to alleviate this issue through various means, including OneVsOne, hierarchical (first 0 vs 1,2, then 1 vs 2) and stacking classification, as well as regression with custom threshold, but were unable to achieve meaningful improvements. Considering this result and based on the misclassification costs involved, model training and selection could be altered to prefer one over the other, depending on the exact requirements.

### Feature Importance Analysis

Table 4 lists the top three features per model. Ridge importance is derived from coefficient magnitudes, BRF importance from mean decrease in impurity, and CatBoost importance from built-in feature attribution. Feature importance analysis shows that the comparison of vehicles involved in an accident matters heavily for injury prediction, as denoted by the reappearance of `mobile_obstacle_struck (mos)` in all classifiers or in-

Rank	RC	BRF	CB
1	mobile_obstacle_struck_1	mobile_obstacle_struck	type_of_collision
2	vehicle_category_other_none	impact_delta	mobile_obstacle_struck
3	sex_2 (Female)	fixed_obstacle_struck	age_group
4	mobile_obstacle_struck_4	type_of_collision	initial_point_of_impact
5	vehicle_2_3_wheeler	speed_limit	speed_limit

Table 4: Feature Importances per Classifier

clusion of `impact_delta` in BRF. A pedestrian or train being struck by oneself is a strong indicator for the well-being of the former or the later (`mos_1` and 4). Additionally, as denoted by `type_of_collision` and `initial_point_of_impact`, the exact impact side of a vehicle is together with the vehicles speed is highly relevant for prediction as well.

## 5.2 Clustering Evaluation

Cluster	Persona Description
0	Midday pedestrian-related accidents with older road users in semi-urban areas.
1	Night-time accidents involving younger adults (18-30 years) under low visibility.
2	Morning rush-hour collisions linked to commuter traffic and congestion.
3	High-complexity urban intersection accidents with notable pedestrian involvement.
4	Low-speed urban maneuver collisions (parking, turning) in narrow streets, usually minor but risky for vulnerable users.

Table 5: Identified accident personas (features with lift  $> 1.5$ ).

Clustering performance was assessed via Silhouette scores (Table 6). While HDBSCAN and Agglomerative Clustering yielded higher raw scores ( $> 0.08$ ), deeper inspection revealed they produced degenerate solutions where over 85% (HDBSCAN) or 100% (Agglomerative) of the data collapsed into a single giant cluster. Such partitions offer no analytical value for differentiating accident types. In contrast, K-Prototypes with  $k = 5$  produced a more balanced distribution (largest cluster  $\approx 39\%$ ) with clear semantic distinctions, offering the best trade-off between mathematical cohesion and practical interpretability.

Algorithm	Param	Silhouette	Largest Cluster [%]
K-Prototypes	5	0.041	38.8
Agglomerative	3	0.107	100.0
HDBSCAN	10	0.089	85.4

Table 6: Comparison of clustering algorithms (abbreviated).

## 6 Results

### 6.1 Identified Accident Personas

Clustering analysis revealed five accident personas (features with lift  $> 1.5$ ):

Micro and macro AUC scores confirm that CatBoost produces the most separable precision-recall curves (micro\_AUC=0.80404; macro\_AUC=0.72929), slightly outperforming the Balanced Random Forest (micro\_AUC = 0.78559, macro\_AUC = 0.72296). Ridge and the baseline cannot be evaluated due to lack of calibrated probabilities.

#### Summary

The results highlight the benefits of flexible, non-linear models, especially CatBoost, in capturing the complex interactions underlying road traffic injury severity. The CatBoost confusion matrix shows that about 95% of severely injured cases are at least classified as injured, so a real-time system could flag most severe accidents early and support faster emergency response. However, this comes at the cost of inefficient resource allocation, because also around 5% of non-injury cases would be predicted as severely injured and trigger unnecessary deployments, illustrating a fundamental trade-off between saving lives and resource efficiency. Moreover, the remaining 5% of severely injured cases that are predicted as uninjured are a critical limitation: such a system cannot replace emergency calls or human judgment but should instead be viewed as a decision-support tool that helps responders prioritize and detect severe accidents that might otherwise be recognized too late.

## Ehrenwörtliche Erklärung

Ich versichere, dass ich die beiliegende Bachelor-, Master-, Seminar-, oder Projektarbeit ohne Hilfe Dritter und ohne Benutzung anderer als der angegebenen Quellen und in der untenstehenden Tabelle angegebenen Hilfsmittel angefertigt und die den benutzten Quellen wörtlich oder inhaltlich entnommenen Stellen als solche kenntlich gemacht habe. Diese Arbeit hat in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form noch keiner Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegen. Ich bin mir bewusst, dass eine falsche Erklärung rechtliche Folgen haben wird.

### Declaration of Used AI Tools

Tool	Purpose	Where?	Useful?
Gemini 2.5/3 Pro	Rephrasing	Throughout	+++
Gemini 2.5/3 Pro	Code Generation and Code Debugging	Throughout	+++

Unterschrift

Mannheim, den 30. Oktober 2025