

SIMULATION OF ROUGH SEAS IN A WATER IMMERSION FACILITY:
PART II - COMPARISON OF LABORATORY TO FIELD DATA

Nancy A. Pimental, Barbara A. Avellini, Joseph W. Giblo,
and Alan M. Steinman*

Navy Clothing and Textile Research Facility
Natick, Massachusetts, USA

*U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters
Washington, DC, USA

INTRODUCTION. To examine the effects of rough compared to calm seas on human thermal responses to cold water immersion, **two unique** field evaluations were **previously** conducted by the U.S. Coast Guard (1, 2). Testing **was** conducted in a river in the Northwestern US, when water temperatures averaged 6-11°C. In these studies, body cooling rates with wet suit **garments** were 1.5 to 2.0 **times** faster in rough compared to calm seas. To simulate the cooling effect of rough seas in the laboratory, the Navy Clothing and Textile Research Facility **has** evaluated a number of **techniques** utilizing compressed air and water **surface current** to create turbulence in a water immersion **tank**. Initial work was conducted on a thermal **manikin** to compare eight methods of water agitation for their effectiveness in reducing the thermal insulation (clo) of an anti-exposure garment. A **diffuse** compressed air methodology **was** found to be both effective in reducing thermal insulation and practical for routine laboratory use. To **evaluate** the validity of this technique, human testing was then conducted both in the laboratory and during a rough seas field evaluation.

METHODS. Eight male subjects (age, 25 yr; ht, 175 cm; wt, 68 kg; body **surface area**, 1.8 m²; body fat as determined by hydrostatic weighing, =%) underwent a total of nine, 90-minute cold water immersions. Three immersions were conducted in an Atlantic Ocean inlet, with the subjects wearing a) a closed-cell foam jacket with beaver tail (loosely-fitted, wet suit concept), b) a closed-cell foam coverall (**also** loosely-fitted, wet suit concept), and c) the coverall over a **tightly-fitted**, shorty wet **suit**. Both water and air temperatures averaged 10°C; wind averaged 4 m/s wind. The **subjects** were **tethered** via a safety harness to a nearby pier. A Coast Guard vessel was used to create a 1.2-m breaking wave **over** the **subjects** approximately **once** every 50-60 seconds. Following the field **testing**, the **same subjects** participated in six immersions in the laboratory immersion tank. The environmental conditions measured during the field testing were duplicated in the laboratory. To create water turbulence, **compressed air** was released from Lines located at the bottom of the pool. During the six laboratory immersions, the amount of compressed air and the subject's position in the water were varied. Two garments - the beaver-tail jacket and the coverall - were evaluated. For both field and laboratory evaluations, exposures were terminated when rectal temperature decreased to 35°C or the subject or medical monitor requested termination because of severe cold discomfort.

RESULTS. Field Testing. After the first 20 minutes of water immersion, the decrease in **rectal** temperature **was** greater with both the jacket and the coverall than with the coverall/shorty wet suit combination ($p < 0.05$). By 40 minutes of immersion, the decrease in rectal temperature with the jacket was also greater than with the coverall ($p < 0.05$). The decrease in rectal temperature after 50 minutes averaged 0.6, 1.3, and 1.9°C with the coverall plus shorty wet **suit**, coverall, and jacket,

respectively. (Note: Because of the significantly reduced tolerance time when the jacket was worn, physiological responses for all three ensembles were statistically analyzed only up until 50 minutes of exposure.)

Laboratory Testing. During the first hour of water immersion, there were no significant differences in the rectal temperature response between the coverall and the jacket ($p > 0.05$). From 70 minutes on, the decrease in temperature was greater with the jacket than with the coverall ($p < 0.05$). After 90 minutes, the decrease in temperature averaged 1.2°C with the coverall and 1.6°C with the jacket. **Comparison of Field and Laboratory Data.** With one exception, the methods used to simulate rough seas in the laboratory resulted in slower body cooling rates than those obtained during field testing. When the beaver-tail jacket was worn, the decrease in rectal temperature after 60 minutes of immersion averaged 1.1°C in the laboratory compared to 2.6°C in the field. When the coverall was worn, the decrease in rectal temperature after 80 minutes averaged 1.0°C in the laboratory and 1.9°C in the field. The one laboratory technique which reproduced the field results utilized the maximum amount of compressed air and created a geyser effect about the subject's head. Because this technique caused an unacceptable risk of water aspiration, it was not considered feasible for continued use.

RESULTS OF FURTHER TESTING. Modifications were made to the rough sea simulator and further thermal manikin and human testing was conducted. The modified methodology combined compressed air with a water surface current. The cooling rates that resulted using this technique, however, were generally lower than desired. In addition, duplicate tests demonstrated that reproducibility of the data was poor. When the test with the coverall was repeated, the decrease in rectal temperature after 50 minutes of immersion averaged only 0.6°C , compared to 1.3°C for the previous immersion. It was hypothesized that the subjects learned after the first exposure to reduce the flushing of water through the neck seal by holding the back of their necks more tightly against the life jacket.

CONCLUSIONS. While using water surface current and/or compressed air to agitate the water in a laboratory immersion tank results in a faster cooling rate than calm water testing, these techniques may not duplicate the cooling effects of actual rough seas. This may be because actual waves cause a greater degree of flushing of water through the garments' seals and/or a greater heat loss from the head. To simulate the cooling effect of actual waves and currents, a laboratory technique which involves periodically dunking the subject may be required.

REFERENCES

1. Steinman, A. M., Hayward, J. S., Nemiroff, M. J. and Kubilis, P. S., Immersion hypothermia: comparative protection of anti-exposure garment³ in calm versus rough seas. *Aviat. Space Environ. Med.*, **58**: 550-558, 1987.
2. Steinman, A. M. and Kubilis, P. S., Survival at sea: the effects of protective clothing and survivor location on core and skin temperatures. U.S. Coast Guard Report No. CG-D-26-86, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia, 1986.