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**A B S T R A C T**

Low-cost natural halloysite (Hal) nanotubes (0.1 μm diameter) were effective for strengthening and stiffening continuous fiber epoxy composites, as shown for cross-ply carbon fiber (5 μm diameter, ~59 vol.%) epoxy nanocomposites under flexure, giving 17% increase in strength, 11% increase in modulus and 21% decrease in ductility. They were less effective than expensive multiwalled carbon nanotubes (0.02 μm diameter), which gave 25% increase in strength, 11% increase in modulus and 14% decrease in ductility. However, they were more effective than expensive silicon carbide whiskers (1 μm diameter), which gave 15% increase in strength, 5% increase in modulus and 20% decrease in ductility. Each filler, at ~2 vol.%, was incorporated in the composite at every interlaminar interface (interface between adjacent fiber laminae) by fiber prepreg surface modification. The flexural strength increase due to Hal nanotubes incorporation corroborated with the interlaminar shear strength increase. The measured values of the composite modulus agreed roughly with the calculated values based on the Rule of Mixtures. The interlaminar interface thickness was higher for the SiC whiskers case than the carbon nanotubes or Hal nanotubes case. The lamina thickness was not affected by the fillers. The composite density was 2% higher for the Hal nanotubes and SiC whiskers cases than the carbon nanotubes case.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Continuous carbon fiber polymer composites are important lightweight structural materials due to their combination of high elastic modulus, high strength and low density. Lightweight structures using these composites include aircrafts, automobiles, bicycles, ships, wind turbines, bridge decks, offshore platforms, sporting goods, etc.

Continuous carbon fibers are more effective as primary reinforcements than discontinuous carbon fibers, carbon nanofibers and carbon nanotubes, because of the continuous length, good alignment and the consequent high maximum volume fraction of continuous fibers in a composite. However, the discontinuous reinforcement may be used as a secondary reinforcement in composites that involve continuous carbon fibers as the primary reinforcement. Throughout this paper, fiber refers to continuous fiber.

Because the continuous fibers render high modulus and strength to the composite anyway, the stiffening and strengthening of continuous fiber composites are more challenging than those of composites without continuous fibers. For structural performance, high values of both modulus and strength are necessary. Furthermore, stiffening without strengthening tends to cause decrease in the ductility. Thus, simultaneous stiffening and strengthening are desired.

Considerable prior work that incorporated carbon nanotubes in continuous fiber polymer composites had been reported. Increases in the interlaminar shear strength (the maximum shear stress that can be borne by the interlaminar interface, which is the interface between adjacent laminae, where a lamina refers to a ply of fibers) (Godara et al., 2010; Gojny et al., 2005; Zhu et al., 2007), high-cycle fatigue life (Grimmer and Dharan, 2008) and delamination (local separation of adjacent laminae) fatigue resistance (Grimmer and Dharan, 2010) in glass fiber composites were achieved. In addition, the carbon nanotubes provided electrical conductivity to the glass fiber composite, thus rendering the composite the ability to sense strain and damage through electrical resistance measurement (Alexopoulos et al., 2010; Gao et al., 2009; Rausch and Mader, 2010; Sureeyatanapas and Young, 2009; Thostenson et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2010) and the ability to shield electromagnetic radiation (Lee et al., 2011). Increases in the interlaminar shear strength (Bekyarova et al., 2007; Cho and Daniel, 2008; F. Zhang et al., 2009; X. Zhang et al., 2009), compressive strength (Cho and Daniel, 2008; Cho et al., 2008), flexural strength and modulus (Kim et al., 2009), fiber–matrix interfacial load transfer effectiveness (Thostenson et al., 2002) and the storage modulus (under dynamic flexure at 1 Hz, increased by 75%) (Kar et al., 2009) were achieved similarly in carbon fiber polymer composites. In spite of the increase in the interlaminar shear strength and flexural strength and modulus, the tensile modulus and strength of carbon fiber epoxy composites were not affected by the incorporation of MWCNT (multiwalled carbon nanotubes) (Bekyarova et al., 2007) or a mixture ofCNT (carbon nanotubes) with 1, 2 and 3 walls (Kim et al., 2009), because the tensile properties were dominated by the continuous fibers.
Various methods were used in prior work to incorporate CNT in continuous fiber polymer nanocomposites. These methods included dispersing the nanotubes in the fiber sizing or coating (Godara et al., 2010; Rausch and Mader, 2010; Sureyyatanapas and Young, 2009; Zhang et al., 2010), dispersing the nanotubes in the matrix (Gao et al., 2009; Godara et al., 2010; Grimmer and Dharan, 2008, 2010; Thostenson et al., 2008), applying the nanotubes to the fiber surface or the fiber fabric surface by electrophoretic deposition (Belyarova et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2010), and grafting the nanotubes onto the fiber surface by chemical vapor deposition (Kar et al., 2009; Thostenson et al., 2002; F. Zhang et al., 2009).

Much less research was reported on the incorporation of fillers other than carbon nanotubes in continuous fiber polymer composites, in spite of the relatively low cost of other fillers. The incorporation of halloysite (Hal) nanotubes (a natural clay mineral, Brigatti et al., 2006) in the matrix of woven carbon fiber epoxy nanocomposites increased the flexural strength by 14% and the interlaminar shear strength by up to 25%, while the flexural modulus was essentially unaffected (Ye et al., 2011a,b). The incorporation of silicon carbide whiskers at the interlaminar interface of unidirectional carbon fiber composites by spraying the whiskers on the prepreg surface improved the interlaminar fracture toughness, though the strength and modulus were not reported (Wang et al., 2002). The incorporation of montmorillonite (Mt) in the carbon fiber epoxy nanocomposites increased the flexural strength and modulus by 31% and 46% respectively (Chowdhury et al., 2007). Mt was not as effective as aluminina particles for increasing the interlaminar shear strength or the transverse flexural strength (Timmerman et al., 2002). The incorporation of aluminina particles (25 nm) in carbon fiber epoxy nanocomposites made by filament winding increased the flexural toughness and interlaminar shear strength (Hussain et al., 1996). The incorporation of 48-μm Al₂O₃ particles in the epoxy matrix of a woven continuous glass fiber composite resulted in 78% increase in flexural modulus and 33% increase in the flexural strength (Asl, 2009). The incorporation of 20–30 nm silica particles to the epoxy matrix of a glass fiber fabric composite increased the interlaminar fracture toughness and the impact resistance (Uddin and Sun, 2008).

Relatively little research was reported on the incorporation of carbon fillers other than carbon nanotubes in continuous fiber polymer composites, in spite of the relatively low cost of these other fillers, such as carbon black and carbon nanofiber. By using carbon black as a filler located at the interlaminar interface of a continuous carbon fiber epoxy composite, the flexural modulus was increased by 6.4% and 11% for unidirectional and cross-ply composites respectively (Han et al., 2008). By incorporating carbon nanofibers (originally known as carbon filaments) in the epoxy matrix of a woven continuous carbon fiber nanocomposite, the flexural strength was increased by 22% while the tensile strength was increased by 11% (Zhao et al., 2006, 2008). However, by using 0.1-μm diameter carbon nanofibers as an interlaminar filler (a filler located at the interlaminar interface) in a continuous carbon fiber epoxy nanocomposite, the tensile modulus and the dynamic flexural modulus were decreased (Hudnut and Chung, 1995; Segiet and Chung, 2000).

The effects of a filler in the absence of continuous fibers (Du et al., 2010; He et al., 2012; Jia et al., 2011; Kong et al., 2011; Lecouvet et al., 2011; Rooj et al., 2011) received more attention than those in the presence of continuous fibers. In spite of the prior work mentioned above on the effects of various fillers in the presence of continuous fibers, comparative evaluation of competing fillers received little or no attention.

The objectives of this paper are (i) to provide a cost-effective method of strengthening and stiffening continuous carbon fiber polymer composites, (ii) to investigate the effectiveness of Hal nanotubes incorporation for strengthening and stiffening carbon fiber polymer composites, (iii) to compare the effects of various high-elastic-modulus fillers, namely an expensive nanofiller (carbon nanotubes), an inexpensive nanofiller (Hal nanotubes) and a microfiller (silicon carbide whiskers of diameter 1 μm, chosen due to their effectiveness for strengthening polymers (Li and Chung, 1994), aluminum (Lai and Chung, 1996), copper (Yih and Chung, 1996), brass (Yih and Chung, 1999) and silicon nitride (Wang and Chung, 1997)), on the mechanical properties of the composites, and (iv) to correlate the structure and the mechanical properties of these composites.

2. Experimental methods

2.1. Materials

Composite specimens were fabricated by hand lay-up and compression molding of a stack of cross-ply carbon fiber epoxy prepreg sheets. The curing conditions were 90 min at 177 °C and a pressure of 0.5 MPa, unless noted otherwise.

Unless noted otherwise, the carbon fiber prepreg had RS-36 epoxy, with uncured resin density 1.20–1.25 g/cm³, resin content (33 ± 2) wt.%, uncured prepreg density 1.394 ± 0.006 g/cm³ (measured in this work) and fiber volume fraction (obtained from the uncured prepreg density, based on the Rule of Mixtures, i.e., a method of estimating composite properties based on the averaged properties of the components) 0.274 ± 0.010. The prepreg was manufactured by Tencate Advanced Composites USA, Inc., Morgan Hill, CA. Unless noted otherwise, the carbon fibers had designation Torayca M46JB, in the form of 12 K PAN-based fibers, with tensile modulus 436 GPa, tensile strength 4.0 GPa, fiber diameter 5.0 ± 0.3 μm (measured in this work), and elongation at break 1.0%.

For the short-beam shear testing only, the carbon fiber prepreg was from Tencate Advanced Composites USA, Inc., with the carbon fibers designated Pyrofil TRS05 15 K (with diameter 7 μm, density 1.82 g/cm³, tensile modulus 235 GPa, tensile strength 4.9 GPa and elongation at break 2.1%) and with TC275 epoxy; the resin content of the prepreg was 34 ± 2 %. Curing was conducted at 177 °C and 0.1 MPa for 120 min.

Specimens with and without modification were prepared for comparative evaluation. Two lay-up configurations were studied, namely unidirectional and cross-ply configurations. The cross-ply configuration was symmetrical around the central 90° lamina.

The fillers were MWNT, silicon carbide whiskers and Hal nanotubes. Unless stated otherwise, the MWNT was from Nanothix S.A., Greece, NTX1, with 15–35 nm diameter, 15–35 layers, ≥ 10 μm length, 97% nanotubes purity, 3% metal particles, < 1% amorphous carbon, and 1.4 g/cm³ density. For the short-beam shear testing specimens only, the MWNT was from ILJIN, S. Korea, as prepared by chemical vapor deposition, with purity above 95%, length exceeding 60 μm, average diameter 50 nm and density 1.4 g/cm³. The silicon carbide whiskers (abbreviated SiCw) had a cubic crystal structure, with 1.4 μm mean diameter, 18.6 μm mean length, 99 wt.% SiC, 0.4 wt.% SiO₂ and density 3.21 g/cm³, provided by Advanced Refractory Technologies, Inc., Buffalo, NY. The Hal nanotubes were in the form of natural hollow tubes, as provided by NaturalNano, Inc., Rochester, NY. They were heated by NaturalNano at 600 °C (abbreviated HHal). Based on powder x-ray diffraction patterns obtained using CuKα radiation and a Siemens Kristalloflex diffractometer (Fig. 1), HHal was highly disordered, with a basal spacing of 7 Å, indicating that it was unhydrated Hal (Huertas et al., 2004; Wada, 1965). The diameter and length of HHal were roughly 0.1–0.2 and 0.4–0.5 μm respectively, as shown by scanning electron microscopy (Fig. 2); the density was 2.53 g/cm³.

The interlaminar interface modification was performed by wet application of the filler on both opposite surfaces of a prepreg sheet. During the wet application, the filler was dispersed in a solvent at a solid content that was low enough for good workability (spreadability) of the dispersion. The content of 2 mass % was used for HHal and SiCw dispersions and the content of 0.8 mass % was used for the MWNT dispersion. Higher contents were not used in order to maintain low viscosity for effective application on the prepreg surface. Thus, the
different fillers were used at different contents, such that the contents used gave similar workability of the filler dispersion. The solvent was such that it could evaporate at room temperature within a day after application of the dispersion on a prepreg sheet by immersion. The ethylene glycol monoethyl ether (EGME) solvent (Han et al., 2008) dissolved a part of the excessive resin on the surface of the prepreg, so that the thickness of the interlaminar interface region of the resulting composite was kept close to that of the unmodified composite. After solvent evaporation, 15 prepreg sheets were stacked, thus resulting in 14 interlaminar interfaces. In the unmodified composite, none of the 14 interlaminar interfaces was modified. In a modified composite, all of the 14 interlaminar interfaces were modified. The curing conditions (time, temperature and pressure) were essentially those recommended by the prepreg manufacturer (90 min, 177 °C and 0.5 MPa).

2.2. Density measurement

The density was derived from the mass and dimensions of 15-lamina composite specimens of size 15 × 11 × 2.0 mm. The composite thickness of each type of composite was determined by a micrometer, with the measurement performed for 5 (or more) specimens. Three specimens of each type were measured in terms of the density.

The composite density was used to obtain the fiber volume fraction, based on the Rule of Mixtures. For this purpose, the densities of the fiber and matrix were needed. According to Tencate, the densities of the carbon fiber and epoxy matrix in the carbon fiber prepreg were 1.84 and 1.23 g/cm³, respectively.

2.3. Flexural testing

Mechanical testing was performed on 15-lamina specimens under three-point bending up to failure, using a hydraulic mechanical testing system (MTS Systems Corp., Eden Prairie, MN). The specimen size was 80 × 11 × 2.0 mm. The span was 58 mm. The flexural strength was the highest stress prior to failure (not necessarily the first abrupt decrease in stress in the stress–strain curve). The flexural modulus was obtained from the slope of the straight-line portion of the curve of flexural stress vs. flexural strain. This portion constituted most of each curve. The flexural ductility was the strain at failure, which was the last abrupt drop in stress in the stress–strain curve. Other than the unmodified cross-ply carbon fiber composite, only one abrupt drop in stress occurred en route to failure. At least four specimens of each composition were tested.

2.4. Short-beam shear strength testing

Cross-ply composite specimens with 33 laminae, fabricated at a curing pressure of 0.1 MPa and of size 35 × 15 × 4.3 mm were tested for the short beam shear (SBS) strength, i.e., the interlaminar shear strength. The test was conducted under flexure at a span of 20 mm and a span-to-thickness ratio of 4.7:1. Six specimens of each type were tested.

The SBS strength (F) was calculated using the equation

\[
F = 0.75 \frac{P}{bd}
\]

where \( P \) is the force at the composite failure load, \( b \) is the specimen width (15 mm), and \( d \) is the specimen thickness (4.3 mm).

2.5. Microscopy

Optical microscopy was conducted at the mechanically polished edge of each composite, i.e., the surface perpendicular to the plane of the laminate. The interlaminar interface thickness and lamina thickness were thus measured. The former was determined by measurement at 10 points located at various interlaminar interfaces in the composite. The latter was determined by measurement at 5 (or more) points located at various laminae in the composite.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Composite density, constituent volume fractions and composite architecture

Based on the measured density of the unmodified and modified composites (Table 1), the Rule of Mixtures and the measured mass and known density of the filler incorporated, the volume fractions of the carbon fiber, matrix and filler were obtained (Table 1).

The volume fraction of the filler was small, ranging from 0.014 to 0.024. The dominant constituent was the carbon fiber, which ranged in volume fraction from 0.579 to 0.599. Any of the fillers caused the fiber volume fraction to increase slightly and caused the matrix volume fraction to decrease slightly. This was partly due to the partial removal of the interlaminar resin during prepreg surface modification.

The density was increased slightly upon addition of the filler. The density for the cases of HHal and SiCw was 2% higher than that for the MWCNT case, due to the relatively high densities of HHal and SiCw.

The composite architecture is described in terms of the thicknesses of the laminae and of the interlaminar interfaces (Table 2). The
Composite thickness was due to these two contributions, i.e., the composite thickness was contributed by the thickness of the 14 interlaminar interfaces and those of the 15 laminae. The volume fraction of interlaminar interface was obtained by dividing the total thickness of all 14 interlaminar interfaces by the composite thickness.

The optical microscope photograph of the edge of a cross-ply unmodified (Fig. 3) or modified (Fig. 4) composite shows an interlaminar interface and parts of the two laminae proximate to it. The interface region was the region without fibers and located between adjacent laminae. Individual SiC whiskers were observed (Fig. 4(c)), though individual fiber units were not observed for the other fillers. This was because of the relatively large diameter of the whiskers. Comparison of Figs. 3 and 4 showed that the filler caused the interlaminar interface thickness to change negligibly.

Table 2 lists the interlaminar interface thickness, lamina thickness, composite thickness and interlaminar interface volume fraction of unmodified and modified composites. The interlaminar interface thickness was below about 11 μm for all of the modified and unmodified composites, such that the thickness was slightly higher for the SiCw case than the MWCT or HHal case. That the filler incorporation had little effect on the interlaminar interface thickness is consistent with the fact that a part of the excessive resin in the interface region had been removed by solvent dissolution during the process of filler incorporation. The relatively large thickness for the SiCw case is attributed to the relatively large diameter of the whisker. The lamina thickness and the composite thickness were essentially not affected by the filler incorporation. Hence, the interlaminar interface thickness appeared to be the main dimensional parameter that was affected by the filler, as expected.

The interlaminar interface volume fraction (Table 2) was less than about 7% for all of the modified and unmodified composites. It was highest when the filler was SiCw, due to the relatively high interlaminar interface thickness.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filler content</th>
<th>Density of composite (g/cm³)</th>
<th>Volume fraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiber³</td>
<td>Matrix³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.583 ± 0.005</td>
<td>0.579 ± 0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8% MWCT</td>
<td>1.592 ± 0.001</td>
<td>0.586 ± 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% HHal</td>
<td>1.618 ± 0.007</td>
<td>0.599 ± 0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% SiCw</td>
<td>1.620 ± 0.002</td>
<td>0.593 ± 0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Fraction of mass of dispersion.

³ Obtained by dividing the mass of the fiber by the volume of the composite, with the volume of the fiber obtained by dividing the mass of the fiber by the density of the fiber.

³ Calculated from the measured density, based on the Rule of Mixtures.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filler content</th>
<th>Interlaminar interface thickness (μm)</th>
<th>Lamina thickness (μm)</th>
<th>Composite thickness (μm)</th>
<th>Interlaminar interface volume fraction (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.1 ± 3.1</td>
<td>139.4 ± 6.8</td>
<td>2300 ± 75</td>
<td>5.4 ± 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8% MWCT</td>
<td>7.6 ± 3.1</td>
<td>139.4 ± 8.1</td>
<td>2312 ± 30</td>
<td>5.0 ± 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% HHal</td>
<td>7.5 ± 3.1</td>
<td>1376.5 ± 7.9</td>
<td>2090 ± 50</td>
<td>5.0 ± 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% SiCw</td>
<td>10.5 ± 3.7</td>
<td>1415.3 ± 8.1</td>
<td>2174 ± 54</td>
<td>6.7 ± 3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Fraction of mass of dispersion.

### 3.2. Flexural properties

For all the cross-ply composites, the curve of the flexural stress versus flexural strain during static three-point bending in the longitudinal direction up to failure (Fig. 5) was essentially a straight line up to the first abrupt drop in stress, which corresponded to the first major damage. Up to several abrupt drops in stress occurred in the route to failure. The occurrence of multiple abrupt drops in stress was probably due to the fracture of the 0° fibers of the surface lamina occurring not all at once.

Tables 3 and 4 show that the various types of filler differed in their effectiveness for stiffening and strengthening. The MWCT (2.4 vol%) was most effective, giving 11% increase in the modulus, 25% increase in the strength and 14% decrease in the ductility, such that the fractional changes in modulus and strength were relative to the unmodified composite having the same fiber volume fraction (since the fiber volume fraction differed between unmodified and modified composites). The HHal (1.7 vol%) was almost as effective as MWCT, giving 11% increase in the modulus and 17% increase in the strength, though the 21% decrease in the ductility was relatively high. The SiCw (1.4 vol%) was slightly less effective than HHal, giving 9% increase in modulus, 15% increase in strength and 20% decrease in ductility. The finding that SiCw was less effective than HHal, in spite of their high reinforcing ability for other types of composite (Lai and Chung, 1996; Li and Chung, 1994; Yih and Chung, 1996, 1999), is attributed mainly to the relatively large diameter of SiCw and the consequent heterogeneity in the filler distribution in the interlaminar interface region (Fig. 4(c)).

Among the various types of filler, MWCT was the most expensive, followed by SiCw. The HHal was much less expensive than both MWCT and SiCw. Thus, with both cost and performance taken into consideration, HHal is particularly attractive.

Interlaminar fracture (Bazhenov, 1995) was observed for both modified and unmodified cross-ply composites. Fiber fracture was observed on the compression surface shortly before the occurrence of interlaminar fracture only for some of the specimens of cross-ply carbon fiber composites (both modified and unmodified). This fiber fracture resulted in a crack extending along the full width of the composite at the midspan position, as previously reported (Wang and Chung, 2006).

In practice, multidirectional composites such as quasi-isotropic composites are used for structural applications. Due to their transverse weakness, unidirectional composites are not used in practice. From a scientific viewpoint, cross-ply composites are akin to multidirectional composites, whereas unidirectional composites are much different.
Therefore, the observed attractiveness of the cross-ply composites will likely also apply to multidirectional composites in general.

Unmodified unidirectional composites were tested along the longitudinal (0°) and transverse (90°) directions for the purpose of obtaining the effective fiber modulus in these two directions from the measured composite modulus values. The longitudinal and transverse composite modulus values were 214 ± 6 and 7.5 ± 1.0 GPa respectively; the longitudinal and transverse composite strength values were 1561 ± 30 and 59 ± 3 MPa respectively; the associated plots of flexural stress vs. flexural strain are shown in Fig. 6.

The fractional increases in flexural modulus and strength due to MWCNT incorporation (Table 4) were similar to those previously reported for woven carbon fiber epoxy nanocomposites with MWCNT incorporated in the matrix (Kim et al., 2009). The MWCNT content was 0.27 vol.% in prior work (Kim et al., 2009), compared to 2.4 vol.% in this work. This prior work (Kim et al., 2009) reported a fractional increase of ductility of 11% due to the MWCNT incorporation, in contrast to the fractional decrease of ductility of 14% obtained in this work. This large difference in the ductility effect was due to the fact that the

**Table 3**

Flexural modulus/strength/ductility and their fractional change due to the presence of the filler for cross-ply carbon fiber epoxy composites fabricated at a curing pressure of 0.5 MPa with and without the interlaminar filler.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filler content</th>
<th>Modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Ductility (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>123 ± 2</td>
<td>789 ± 17</td>
<td>0.85 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8% MWCNT</td>
<td>138 ± 6 (124.5)</td>
<td>1002 ± 11 (799)</td>
<td>0.65 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% HHal</td>
<td>141 ± 3 (127.2)</td>
<td>958 ± 72 (816)</td>
<td>0.67 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% SiCw</td>
<td>137 ± 3 (126.0)</td>
<td>933 ± 51 (808)</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filler content</th>
<th>Fractional change in modulus</th>
<th>Fractional change in strength</th>
<th>Fractional change in ductility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.8% MWCNT</td>
<td>12% ± 6% (11% ± 6%)</td>
<td>27% ± 4% (25% ± 5%)</td>
<td>−14% ± 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% HHal</td>
<td>15% ± 4% (11% ± 5%)</td>
<td>21% ± 12% (17% ± 12%)</td>
<td>−21% ± 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% SiCw</td>
<td>11% ± 5% (9% ± 4%)</td>
<td>18% ± 9% (15% ± 9%)</td>
<td>−20% ± 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fraction of mass of dispersion.
* Values at the first abrupt decrease in stress, which differs from the point of failure only for the case of 0% filler.
* Calculated value of the unmodified composite, obtained by scaling the measured value of the unmodified composite to the value for the higher fiber volume (Table 1) of the modified composite.
* Fractional change relative to the calculated value obtained for the unmodified composite by scaling the measured value of the unmodified composite to the value for the higher fiber volume of the modified composite (Table 1).
prior work (Kim et al., 2009) did not measure the ductility (with no ductility or strain data presented) but probably calculated the ductility from the measured strength and modulus by assuming that the stress–strain curve was a straight line up to failure. In contrast, this work measured the ductility. The fractional increases in flexural modulus and strength due to HHal incorporation (Table 4) were comparable to or higher than those of prior work (Ye et al., 2011a,b), whereas it was incorporated at the interlaminar interface in this work, and (ii) the woven nature of the continuous fibers in the prior work (Ye et al., 2011a,b) and the consequent spaces within the fabric for occupation by the filler.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filler content (fraction of mass of dispersion)</th>
<th>Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Fractional change in strength relative to the case without filler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>53.0 ± 1.6</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8 wt.% MWCT†</td>
<td>54.2 ± 1.6</td>
<td>+2% ± 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 wt.% HHal</td>
<td>60.6 ± 4.9</td>
<td>+14% ± 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% SiCw</td>
<td>50.5 ± 4.7</td>
<td>−5% ± 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MWCTN, From IIJIN. S. Korea, as prepared by chemical vapor deposition, with purity higher than 95%, the length > 60 μm and average diameter 50 nm.

The difference in the results of this work compared to those of prior work (Kim et al., 2009) was due to (i) the filler being incorporated in the matrix in prior work (Asi, 2009; Kim et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2002; Ye et al., 2011a,b), whereas it was incorporated at the interlaminar interface in this work, and (ii) the woven nature of the continuous fibers in the prior work (Asi, 2009; Kim et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2002; Ye et al., 2011a,b), and the consequent spaces within the fabric for occupation by the filler.

3.3. Short-beam shear strength

The short-beam shear strength (interlaminar shear strength) was increased by the addition of HHal (Table 4). The fractional increase was greater than that of prior work (Ye et al., 2011a) for woven carbon fiber epoxy composite with Hal nanotubes (presumably without heat-treatment). This strength was essentially unaffected by the addition of MWCTN or SiC whisker (Table 4). This was probably due to the very small length of HHal compared to MWCTN or SiC whisker. A smaller length increases the likelihood for the filler to stand up in a direction roughly perpendicular to the plane of the interlaminar interface within the interface thickness and consequently enabling more effect of the filler on the interlaminar shear strength.

The flexural strength (Table 3) was increased by all three fillers (MWCTN, HHal and SiC whisker), such that the increase was greatest for MWCTN and least for SiC whisker. These results on flexural strength and short-beam shear strength mean that the increase in flexural strength upon HHal addition was at least partly due to an increase in the interlaminar shear strength, whereas the increase in flexural strength upon the addition of MWCTN or SiC whisker was essentially not due to an increase in the interlaminar shear strength, but was possibly due to the partial penetration of the laminae by the filler. This penetration is expected to be easier for MWCTN than SiC whisker, due to the relatively small size of MWCTN. As a consequence, the flexural strength enhancement was greater for MWCTN than SiC whisker.

4. Modeling

The calculation of the flexural modulus was based on the Rule of Mixtures, as explained below. This calculation required the volume fractions of the constituents. The volume fractions were obtained from the measured density of the composite and the Rule of Mixtures for the density (Table 1). The composite modulus values yielded the fiber modulus values (Table 5).

The modulus $E_c$ of the unmodified unidirectional composite was given by

$$E_c = E_f v_f + E_m v_m,$$

where $E_f$ and $E_m$ were the moduli of the fiber and matrix respectively and $v_f$ and $v_m$ were the volume fractions of the fiber and matrix respectively. The values of $E_m$, as obtained from TenCate, was 3.48 GPa for the matrix. The composite modulus $E_c$ was measured by static flexural testing in this work (Table 3 and Fig. 6). Thus, $E_c$ was calculated by using Eq. (2), as shown in Table 5 for the longitudinal fiber modulus.

The modulus $E'_c$ of the modified unidirectional composite was given by

$$E'_c = E_f v'_f + E_m v'_m + E_{filler} v_{filler},$$

where $v'_f$, $v'_m$, and $v_{filler}$ were the volume fractions of the fiber, matrix and filler respectively, as obtained from the measured density values and the Rule of Mixtures for the density (Table 1). $E_{filler}$ was the
MWCNT, HHal and SiCw (with diameter 0.02, 0.1 and 1 μm respectively) in relation to the effectiveness for strengthening and stiffening the unidirectional composite was given by

\[
E_c = E_f \left(\frac{V_f}{2}\right) + E_m V_m + E_{\text{filler}} V_{\text{filler}},
\]

where \(E_f\), \(E_m\), and \(V_{\text{filler}}\) were the volume fractions of the fiber, matrix and filler respectively.

As shown in Table 5, there was reasonably good agreement between the corresponding calculated and measured modulus values, in spite of the limitations of the Rule of Mixtures and the inaccuracy of the values of the filler modulus. However, discrepancies were substantial. The model considered the filler volume fraction, but did not consider the interlaminar interface thickness.

The Rule of Mixtures model used in this work was adequate for comparing the interlaminar and intralaminar fracture modes in 0/90° cross-ply composites. Each filler was incorporated at the interlaminar interface by prepreg surface modification and amounted to ~2 vol.% of the composite.

The MWCNT was most effective, giving 25% increase in the strength, 11% increase in the modulus and 14% decrease in the ductility; HHal was almost as effective, giving 17% increase in the strength, 11% increase in the modulus and 21% decrease in the ductility; SiCw was slightly less effective, giving 15% increase in strength, 9% increase in modulus and 20% decrease in ductility. The flexural strength increase due to Hal nanotube incorporation corroborates with the interlaminar shear strength increase. However, the interlaminar shear strength was essentially not affected by the incorporation of MWCNT or SiCw.

For both modified and unmodified composites, the interlaminar interface thickness was below about 11 μm. The interlaminar interface thickness was higher for the SiC whisker case than the carbon nanotube or Hal nanotube case. The lamina thickness was not affected by the fillers. The composite density was 2% higher for the Hal nanotube and SiC whisker cases than the carbon nanotube case.

Acknowledgments

Technical assistance by Professor Rossman F. Giese, Jr., and Dr. Shoukai Wang of University at Buffalo, State University of New York, is gratefully acknowledged. This work was supported in part by Mark Diamond Research Fund, Graduate Students Association, University at Buffalo.

References


Table 5: Measured and calculated values of the composite modulus of cross-ply carbon fiber epoxy composites fabricated at a curing pressure of 0.5 MPa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filler content*</th>
<th>Volume fraction</th>
<th>Fiber modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Composite modulus (GPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>Filler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8% MWCNT</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% HHal</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% SiCw</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fraction of mass of dispersion.

b Calculated value of the unmodified composite, obtained by scaling the measured value of the unmodified composite to the value for the higher fiber volume (Table 1) of the modified composite.

modulus of the fillers. The modulus values were taken as the following, in spite of the limited accuracy of available literature values: HHal (60 GPa (Lu et al., 2011)), SiC whisker (550 GPa (X. Zhang et al., 2009)), and MWCNT (800 GPa (Demczyk et al., 2002)).
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