

November 2, 2016 11:47 WSPC/245-JMM 1640008

1 Journal of Multiscale Modelling  
2 Vol. 7, No. 4 (2016) 1640008 (7 pages)  
3 © World Scientific Publishing Europe Ltd.  
4 DOI: 10.1142/S1756973716400084



6 **Toughness Enhancement of Commercial Poly**  
7 **(Hydroxybutyrate-co-Valerate) (PHBV) by Blending**  
8 **with a Thermoplastic Polyurethane (TPU)**

9 Jennifer González-Ausejo\*, Estefania Sánchez-Safont<sup>†</sup>,  
10 Luis Cabedo<sup>‡</sup> and Jose Gamez-Perez<sup>§</sup>

11 *Polymer and Advanced Materials Group (PIMA)*  
12 *Universidad Jaume I, 12071, Castellon, Spain*

13 \**ausejo@uji.es*

14 †*ausejo@uji.es*

15 ‡*cabedo@uji.es*

16 §*gamez@uji.es*

17 Accepted 8 September 2016

18 Published

19 Poly(hydroxyl butyrate-co-valerate) (PHBV) is a biopolymer synthesized by microor-  
20 ganisms that is fully biodegradable with improved thermal and tensile properties with  
21 respect to some commodity plastics. However, it presents an intrinsic brittleness that  
22 limits its potential application in replacing plastics in packaging applications. Films made  
23 of blends of PHBV with different contents of thermoplastic polyurethane (TPU) were  
24 prepared by single screw extruder and their fracture toughness behavior was assessed  
25 by means of the essential work of fracture (EWF) Method. As the crack propagation  
26 was not always stable, a partition method has been used to compare all formulations  
27 and to relate results with the morphology of the blends. Indeed, fully characterization  
28 of the different PHBV/TPU blends showed that PHBV was incompatible with TPU.  
29 The blends showed an improvement of the toughness fracture, finding a maximum with  
30 intermediate TPU contents.

31 *Keywords:* Poly(3-hydroxybutyrate-co-3-hydroxyvalerate); polyurethane; biodegradable;  
32 blends; essential work of fracture.

33 **1. Introduction**

34 The fracture behavior of materials that present high plastic deformation can be  
35 described by post-yielding fracture mechanics (PYFM).<sup>1</sup> The essential work of frac-  
36 ture (EWF) method provides a technique for obtaining toughness parameters for  
37 the ductile fracture process in either tensile or tearing configurations. Deeply dou-  
38 ble edge notched tensile (DDENT) specimens are the most used geometry in EWF  
39 determinations in tensile mode.<sup>2,3</sup>

40 The EWF concept initially states that the energy involved during a ductile  
41 fracture ( $W_f$ ) can be partitioned into two components. One component, the essen-  
42 tial work ( $W_e$ ) is associated with the energy spent at the fractured surface and is

*J. González-Ausejo et al.*

1 therefore proportional to the fracture area ( $\ell \cdot t$ ), where  $\ell$  is the ligament length  
 2 and  $t$  is the specimen thickness. The second component is the non-essential work  
 3 of fracture or plastic work ( $W_p$ ), which is related to the energy of the process that  
 4 takes place out of the fracture surface and involves extensive plastic deformation  
 5 and other dissipative energy processes.  $W_p$  is proportional to the volume of the  
 6 deformed region surrounding the crack process zone, that is proportional to  $\ell^2 \cdot t$ .  
 7 The relation between  $W_f$ ,  $W_e$ , and  $W_p$  is described in Eq. (1):

$$W_f = W_e + W_p = w_e \ell \cdot t + \beta \cdot w_p \ell^2 \cdot t, \quad (1)$$

8 where  $w_e$  and  $w_p$  are the specific EWF and the specific non-essential work of fracture,  
 9 respectively, whereas  $\beta$  is a dimensionless shape factor for the plastic zone.  
 10 Dividing both terms of Eq. (1) by the ligament section,  $\ell \cdot t$ , we obtain that the  
 11 specific work of fracture,  $w_f$  is then:

$$W_f/(\ell \cdot t) = w_f = w_e + \beta \cdot w_p \ell. \quad (2)$$

12 According to this equation,  $w_e$  and  $\beta \cdot w_p$  can be obtained from linear regression  
 13 of a set of values represented in a diagram of specific total fracture energy versus  
 14 ligament length. It has been shown that the specific essential work,  $w_e$  is in theory  
 15 of a material constant dependent only on thickness and equivalent to  $J_{IC}$ ,<sup>4</sup> which  
 16 has also been supported experimentally and compared with the CTOD values.<sup>5</sup> It  
 17 is assumed that for the correct application of the EWF method, some experimental  
 18 constraints must be accomplished, including pure plane stress conditions, no border  
 19 effect, full yielding of the ligament length prior to crack propagation, a geometrical  
 20 similarity between the fracture load versus. displacement ( $L-d$ ) curves (Fig. 1(a))  
 21 of specimens with different ligament lengths and steady crack propagation during  
 22 fracture.<sup>6</sup> If these criteria are not accomplished, the results cannot be regarded as  
 23 true fracture toughness values.

24 However, there are some works<sup>7-9</sup> in which the energy spent on the fracture  
 25 process is split into different terms (initiation, necking, plastic work, viscoelastic  
 26 energy, etc.), so called “partition energy” approaches. The main terms are, gener-  
 27 ally the initiation process (mainly yielding of ligament section,  $w_{f,y}$ ) and crack  
 28 propagation process (i.e., ligament necking and tearing,  $w_{f,n}$ ), treated as if they  
 29 were independent phenomena. According to the approach described in Ref. 7 these  
 30 terms can be related with the fracture  $L-d$  curves, as shown in Fig. 1(b). Hence,  
 31 Eq. (2) can be rewritten as:

$$w_f = w_y + w_n = (w_{e,y} + \beta \cdot w_{p,y} \ell) + (w_{e,n} + \beta \cdot w_{p,n} \ell) \quad (3)$$

32 where  $w_y$  and  $w_n$  can be calculated from  $L-d$  curves for each specimen and therefore  
 33 the specific initiation EWF parameters ( $w_{e,y}$ ,  $\beta \cdot w_{p,y}$ ) and propagation ones ( $w_{e,n}$ ,  
 34  $\beta \cdot w_{p,n}$ ) can be obtained.

35 From this approach, if the criteria previously exposed for applying the EWF  
 36 method applies to the initiation part of the fracture of DDENT specimens, the  
 37 EWF technique can be used to assess toughness and resistance to initiation of

## Toughness Enhancement of PHBV Films by Blending with TPU




Fig. 1. Schema showing the  $L-d$  curves where the work of fracture can be obtained, the partition energy based on yielding criterion and the  $w_f$  versus  $\ell$  theoretical plots for assessment of fracture parameters.

1 crack propagation in materials which show overall ductile fracture behavior, even  
 2 though the propagation of the crack does not fulfill the self-similarity or steady  
 3 crack growth conditions.

4 In this work Polyhydroxybutyrate-co-valerate) (PHBV) films have been pre-  
 5 pared, with different percentages of thermoplastic polyurethane (TPU) as an addi-  
 6 tive in order to improve the fracture toughness and brittleness of virgin PHBV.  
 7 PHBV is a biopolymer synthesized by microorganisms that is fully biodegradable  
 8 with improved thermal and tensile properties with respect to some commodity plas-  
 9 tics but too brittle to replace commodity plastics in day-to-day packaging appli-  
 10 cations. As the crack propagation was not always stable in those films, in order  
 11 to optimize the TPU content in the film formulations, the EWF energy partition  
 12 approach has been used, in combination with other techniques that provide infor-  
 13 mation about the morphology and tensile behavior.

## 14 2. Experimental

15 PHBV with 3 mol% hydroxyvalerate (HV) content was supplied by Tianan Bio-  
 16 logic Material Co. (Ningbo, P. R. China) in pellet form (ENMATTM Y1000P).  
 17 The TPU Elastollan<sup>®</sup> 880<sup>a</sup> 13N000 was purchased from BASF. Both materials  
 18 were used as received. PHBV and the TPU used in this study were dried at 80°C  
 19 for 2 h before use. The PHBV/TPU blends were obtained by a single screw extruder  
 20 (Haake Rheomex 252p) with a Maddock screw with an  $L/D$  ratio of 25. The tem-  
 21 perature profile was set to 120°C/160°C/750°C, a die temperature of 175°C and  
 22 a typical residence time of 3 min. Films of nominal thickness of 0.2 mm with dif-  
 23 ferent TPU contents were obtained: 0% (referred as Neat PHBV), 15wt% TPU  
 24 (15-TPU), 20wt% TPU (20-TPU) and 25wt% TPU (25-TPU). The morphology

AQ: Please check the edit.

*J. González-Ausejo et al.*

1 of the cryofractured surface of the films and post-mortem DDENT specimens was  
2 observed by Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) using a JEOL 7001F.

3 DDENT and tensile dumbbell specimens (ASTM D638 Type IV) were cut from  
4 the films.<sup>7</sup> For EWF tests, five ligament lengths between 5 mm and 15 mm with  
5 a step of 2–3 mm were prepared and for each ligament length, three replicas were  
6 tested. All the experiments were conducted in a universal testing machine, Shi-  
7 mazdu AGS-X 500N. The crosshead speed for mechanical and fracture characteri-  
8 zation was 5 mm/min and tests were conducted at room temperature ( $22 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ ).

### 9 3. Results and discussion

10 Blends showed a continuous PHBV matrix with evenly distributed TPU fibers  
11 oriented along the melt flow axis during film processing in all case, as shown in  
12 Fig. 2. The size of the fibrils did not vary significantly with the TPU content.  
13 However, in post-mortem DDENT specimens, the PHBV containing 25% TPU  
14 showed some necking with extensive plastic deformation and a close look revealed  
15 formation of fibrils along the crack propagation direction.

16 With respect to tensile performance, all films showed strong anisotropy between  
17 the extrusion direction (MD) and the transverse one, as observed in the repre-  
18 sentative stress versus strain curves in Fig. 3. This behavior is quite typical for extruded  
19 films, being especially enhanced in highly crystalline systems, such as PHBV, where  
20 crystals grow in a preferred orientation [REF]. Neat PHBV showed brittle behavior  
21 without yielding, whereas blends with TPU showed in all cases a yielding point with  
22 some plastic deformation. The films blended with TPU showed fast crack propa-  
23 gation after yielding, always at higher deformation values than those obtained by  
24 Neat PHBV. Table 1 summarizes the main values obtained from tensile tests; it

AQ: Please check the edit.




Fig. 2. Morphological and fractographic SEM micrographs.

## Toughness Enhancement of PHBV Films by Blending with TPU




Fig. 3. Representative stress versus strain curves of all compositions studied.

Table 1. Summary of tensile and fracture properties of PHBV and PHBV-TPU films.

	Tensile Properties			Fracture Parameters			
	$E$ (MPa)	$\sigma_y$ (MPa)	$\varepsilon_r$ (mm/mm)	$w_e$ (kJ/m <sup>2</sup> )	$\beta w_p$ (J/m <sup>3</sup> )	$w_{e,y}$ (kJ/m <sup>2</sup> )	$\beta w_{p,y}$ (J/m <sup>3</sup> )
Neat PHBV TD	2200 ± 200	33 ± 1	0.021 ± 0.003				
15-TPU TD	1800 ± 100	31.6 ± 0.5	0.034 ± 0.002	3.4	0.19	2.9	0.16
20-TPU TD	1800 ± 100	32.5 ± 0.7	0.032 ± 0.002	2.0	0.45	0.7	0.45
25-TPU TD	1500 ± 100	27 ± 1	0.034 ± 0.002	5.1	0.75	0.9	0.83
Neat PHBV MD	2500 ± 100	42 ± 1	0.027 ± 0.003				
15-TPU MD	2000 ± 200	41 ± 1	0.047 ± 0.002	8.8	0.23	6.3	0.18
20-TPU MD	2000 ± 100	41 ± 1	0.047 ± 0.004	4.8	1.38	2.4	0.93
25-TPU MD	1700 ± 100	36.0 ± 0.8	0.09 ± 0.02	4.3	0.82	0.8	0.84

1 can be seen as a trend where there is an increase in deformation at rupture as more  
2 TPU is added.

3 Even though adding TPU reduced the Young Modulus in all cases by at least  
4 20%, the values obtained for tensile strength did not vary that much in formulations  
5 with 15% and 20% TPU content. The reason for such small differences is the fact  
6 that Neat PHBV films break before reaching plastic yielding by spontaneous crack  
7 generation and propagation.

8 In terms of fracture behavior, Load versus displacement curves, like the ones  
9 shown in Fig. 4, were self-similar up to yielding in all PHBV-TPU systems. After  
10 maximum load, some sort of disagreement in the tails of the curves was observed.  
11 Generally, this type of behavior would prevent from applying the EWF method  
12 or, at least, the values obtained should be taken carefully. However, by using the  
13 partition approach with the energy values corresponding to the yielding of the  
14 DDENT samples, some certitude can be obtained in terms of energy absorbed to  
15 crack initiation.

*J. González-Ausejo et al.*




Fig. 4.  $L$ - $d$  curves and  $w$  versus  $l$  plots for determination of EWF parameters for films 15-TPU MD.

1 Therefore, the specific work of fracture as well as the specific initiation work of  
 2 fracture were determined and plotted as a function of the ligament length to assess  
 3 the EWF parameters and the parameters corresponding to the proposed energy  
 4 partition procedure. The values obtained for all films are summarized in Table 1.  
 5 As Neat PHBV did not show yielding at all, the EWF method did not provide any  
 6 valid parameter.

7 From the EWF values, some general trends can be appreciated, like the  
 8 anisotropy found in tensile behavior with higher  $w_e$  and  $\beta w_p$  values in MD than in  
 9 TD, or the fact that as TPU content increases, there is higher deviation of  $w_e$  values  
 10 with respect to  $w_{e,y}$ . A close look to these values show that the  $w_{e,y}$  decreases as  
 11 TPU content increases. This indicates that the contribution of generation of two  
 12 new surfaces at the initiation of the crack propagation decreases by adding TPU.

13 However, during this process there is also some plastic deformation with the liga-  
 14 ment yielding, which also contributes to energy absorption, represented by the term  
 15  $\beta \cdot w_{p,y}$ . This term, however, is tricky to evaluate, since it represents the plastic work  
 16 developed by initial volume unit, and this value depends on the stress required to  
 17 produce plastic work and the extension at which the plastic deformation has been  
 18 carried out. An increase in TPU makes on one hand to decrease the stress required  
 19 to produce plastic deformation and on the other hand, to absorb more energy  
 20 because more plastic deformation is promoted, in agreement with the tensile char-  
 21 acterization.

22 So the global balance in the fracture process initiation is either to ease the plastic  
 23 deformation at lower energy levels, which decreases  $w_e$  but increases the extension  
 24 of plastic work or difficult the plastic deformation with higher  $w_e$  values and a raise  
 25 in the stress needed to produce plastic deformation. In any case, the EWF method  
 26 and its partition energy approach allow to determine parameters that can be used  
 27 to tune the amount of TPU to be used and predict the different fracture behavior  
 28 of the films.

*Toughness Enhancement of PHBV Films by Blending with TPU*

1        There is also another observation that is worth to comment with respect to the  
2 energy partition analysis. By looking at the differences between  $w_e$  and  $w_{e,y}$  and  
3  $\beta \cdot w_p$  and  $\beta \cdot w_{p,y}$ , it can be argued that most of the fracture energy spent in  
4 15-TPU films is produced during initiation of the crack (similar values of initiation  
5 and overall fracture parameters), whereas the TPU content increases, more energy  
6 is dissipated during the crack growth and hence initiation values differ more from  
7 the overall fracture ones.

#### 8        4. Conclusions

9        As the PHBV-TPU films show ductile behavior, EWF approach is the only one that  
10 can be used to assess fracture parameters. It has been shown that increasing TPU  
11 content decreases stiffness and yield strength, but allows higher plastic deformation  
12 in tensile tests. By using the partition energy approach of the EWF method, it has  
13 been shown and quantified the influence of the aforementioned phenomena on the  
14 initiation of the crack propagation of the films.

#### 15        Acknowledgments

16        Financial support for this research from Ministerio de Economía y Competitivi-  
17 dad (project AGL2015-63855-C2-2-R (MINECO/FEDER) and Pla de Promoció de  
18 la Investigació de la Universitat Jaume I (PREDOC/2012/32 and E-2015-22) is  
19 gratefully acknowledged.

#### 20        References

- 21        1. K. B. Broberg, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **23** (1975) 215–237.
- 22        2. A. B. Martínez, J. Gamez-Perez, M. Sanchez-Soto, J. I. Velasco, O. O. Santana and  
23        M. L. Maspocho, *Eng. Fail. Anal.* **16**(8) (2009) 2604–2617, doi:10.1016/j.engfailanal.  
24        2009.04.027.
- 25        3. J. G. Williams and M. Rink, *Eng. Fract. Mech.* **74**(7) (2007) 1009–1017,  
26        doi:10.1016/j.engfracmech.2006.12.017.
- 27        4. Y.-W. Mai, B. Cotterell, R. Horlyck and G. Vigna, *Polymer Eng. Sci.* **27**(11) (1987)  
28        804–809, doi:10.1002/pen.760271106.
- 29        5. A. B. Martínez, A. Segovia, J. Gamez-Perez and M. L. Maspocho, *Eng. Fract. Mech.*  
30        **77**(14) (2010) 2654–2661, doi:10.1016/j.engfracmech.2010.07.017.
- 31        6. ESIS-TC4. (n.d.). *Testing protocol for essential work of fracture (revised by Clutton,*  
32        *1997)*.
- 33        7. M. L. Maspocho, J. Gamez-Perez and J. Karger-Kocsis, *Polymer Bull.* **50**(4) (2003)  
34        279–286.
- 35        8. M. M. Hossain, C.-F. Lee, D. M. Fiscus and H.-J. Sue, *Polymer* **96** (2016) 104–111,  
36        doi:10.1016/j.polymer.2016.04.070.
- 37        9. P.-Y. B. Jar and W. Cao, *Eng. Fract. Mech.* **96** (2012) 179–191, doi:10.1016/  
38        j.engfracmech.2012.07.019.