



# Real-world benefits of crash avoidance technologies

HLDI and IIHS study the effects of crash avoidance features by comparing rates of police-reported crashes and insurance claims for vehicles with and without the technologies.



## Forward collision warning

- ▼ 27% Front-to-rear crashes
- ▼ 20% Front-to-rear crashes with injuries
- ▼ 7% Claim rates for damage to other vehicles
- ▼ 14% Claim rates for injuries to people in other vehicles

## Forward collision warning plus autobrake

- ▼ 50% Front-to-rear crashes
- ▼ 56% Front-to-rear crashes with injuries
- ▼ 13% Claim rates for damage to other vehicles
- ▼ 21% Claim rates for injuries to people in other vehicles



## Lane departure warning

- ▼ 11% Single-vehicle, sideswipe and head-on crashes
- ▼ 21% Injury crashes of the same types

## Blind spot detection

- ▼ 14% Lane-change crashes
- ▼ 23% Lane-change crashes with injuries
- ▼ 9% Claim rates for damage to other vehicles
- ▼ 12% Claim rates for injuries to people in other vehicles



## Rear automatic braking

- ▼ 62% Backing crashes
- ▼ 13% Claim rates for damage to the insured vehicle
- ▼ 26% Claim rates for damage to other vehicles

## Rearview cameras

- ▼ 17% Backing crashes

## Rear cross-traffic alert

- ▼ 22% Backing crashes



## Added costs

Lower crash rates are a clear benefit of these technologies, but some features can lead to higher repair costs in the crashes that do happen. That's because sensors and other components are often located on the vehicle's exterior. For example, in the case of forward collision warning without autobrake, the average payment per claim for damage to the insured vehicle goes up \$109 for vehicles equipped with the feature.