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Synopsis

Fatty acid intercalated layered double hydroxides were used as additives for Jojoba oil and polymer matrices. The first phase of the study was to intercalate carboxylic acids (C\textsubscript{14} to C\textsubscript{22}). These were successfully intercalated into layered double hydroxides (LDHs), with the formula [Mg\textsubscript{0.7}Al\textsubscript{0.3}(OH)\textsubscript{2}](CO\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{0.15}·0.5H\textsubscript{2}O. The one-pot synthesis consistently yielded a bilayer intercalated product for the range of acids employed. The intercalated anions had an orientation tilt angle of 55–63°, depending on the length of the fatty acid chain. However, there is an indication that the anion exchange process employed in this study is accompanied by probable dissolution and recrystallisation of the LDH. This is supported by the different growth habits and sizes of platelets observed through scanning electron microscopy (SEM). Moreover, the organo-LDH platelets were found to have varying M\textsuperscript{II}/M\textsuperscript{III} compositions, ranging from 1.65 to 6, indicating that the one-pot synthesis yields an array of mixed metal hydroxides.

Polymer composites, containing 5% and 10 wt.% of stearate intercalated layered double hydroxides (LDH-stearate) and neat layered double hydroxides (LDH-CO\textsubscript{3}), were prepared via melt-compounding to explore the use of LDHs as an additive. The stearate modified starting material was bilayer-intercalated clay. During melt compounding, excess stearates were released and the clay reverted to a monolayer-intercalated form. Comprehensive characterisation and study of the fatty acid-intercalated LDH showed that these organoclay hybrids exhibit thermotropic behaviour. This behaviour ultimately leads to the exudation of
excess fatty acid. The exuded stearates were found to have lubricating and plasticising effects on the poly(ethylene-co-vinyl acetate) (EVA) and linear low density polyethylene (LLDPE) matrices. Strong hydrogen bond interactions between the chains of poly(ethylene-co-vinyl alcohol) (EVAL) and the clay platelet surfaces overwhelmed the lubrication effect and caused an increase in the melt viscosity of this matrix. The notched Charpy impact strength of this composite was almost double that of the neat polymer. It appears that this can be attributed to the ability of the highly dispersed and randomly oriented nanosized clay platelets to promote extensive internal microcavitation during impact loading. The creation of a large internal surface area provided the requisite energy dissipation mechanism.

The study also considered fatty acid-intercalated LDH as an argillaceous mineral for potential use as a rheological additive in Jojoba oil. A minimum of 20 wt.% LDH in Jojoba oil formulation was found to be stable, i.e. it did not form separate layers on standing. The viscosity of the neat Jojoba oil demonstrated Newtonian behaviour, whereas the modified LDH/Jojoba oil formulation shear thinned, which is a typical non-Newtonian behaviour. Viscosity as a function of temperature showed complex rheological behaviour for the long chain fatty acids C_{16} to C_{22}. The viscosity increase is assumed to be due to a combination of three events, which include the formation and changes of LDH microstructures within the oil, the loss of excess fatty acids into the oil matrix, and the formation of fatty acid crystal networks. Shear action also induced some delamination of the clay platelets.
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Preface

The central theme of the study was to explore the nature and properties of fatty acid modified layered double hydroxides (LDHs) and their potential use as additives in polymer matrices and Jojoba oil. The first phase of the project involved intercalating long chain fatty acids, i.e. from C_{14} to C_{22}, and fully characterising the modified LDH. The stearic acid (C_{18}) intercalant was ultimately chosen due to its abundance and availability, its substantially long chain length and its reproducibility during the intercalation trials for the implementation of the stages that followed. The second and third phases entailed the use of stearate modified LDH (LDH-stearate) in the preparation of polymer composites and as an additive in Jojoba oil. The thesis is so structured that these three different phases of the study are presented in self-contained chapters (i.e. Chapters 2–4). The highlight of the work is the improvement of the mechanical properties of LDH-based polymer nanocomposites. LDHs offer an alternative to natural clay minerals such as smectites, which have been traditionally used in clay nanocomposites.

The thesis comprises five chapters, each with its own list of references, and appendices:

**Chapter 1** is an introduction to the study, with a brief overview of the nature and history of layered double hydroxides (LDHs) and of the two main areas under review in this study, i.e. LDH-based polymer composites and the possible use of LDHs as argillaceous material in Jojoba oil.

**Chapter 2** examines the nature, structure, formulae and preparation techniques for LDHs. It further introduces the reader to intercalation, modification methods and the orientation of intercalated fatty acids. It also gives comprehensive details of the intercalation procedure used and the characterisation of the fatty acid-intercalated LDHs used in this study.

**Chapter 3** defines polymer composites and distinguishes nanocomposites from conventional composites. It looks into the different preparation techniques for LDH-based polymer composites. The chapter also reviews the properties observed in the resultant composites. It presents a full characterisation of the LDH-based polymer composites of three different polymer matrices. The composites obtained were fully characterised with
regard to the type of composite, thermal stability, mechanical properties and viscoelastic behaviour.

Chapter 4 examines the anomalous thickening mechanism of LDH-stearate in Jojoba oil as a function of temperature. A brief overview of the colloidal dispersions of LDHs in different media, i.e. aqueous, non-aqueous and emulsions is given.

Chapter 5 summarises the study and the key findings. As the concluding chapter, it provides recommendations on future research in the field and other possible applications of LDHs.

The References provide a record of the literature consulted in the course of this study, which was also used to elucidate the findings of the study.

The Appendices contain complementary and supplementary data generated during the study; these are divided according to the corresponding chapters.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEC</td>
<td>Anionic exchange capacity – Amount of exchangeable anions available with the crystal structure of an adsorbent material, expressed in meq/100 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFM</td>
<td>Atomic force microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>Dynamic mechanical analysis/analyser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>Differential scanning calorimetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>Energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA</td>
<td>Ethylene vinyl acetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>Ethylene vinyl alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTIR</td>
<td>Fourier transform infrared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>Hydrotalcite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP-OES</td>
<td>Inductively coupled plasma optical emission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH</td>
<td>Layered double hydroxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-Be</td>
<td>LDH-behenate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-My</td>
<td>LDH-myristate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-Pa</td>
<td>LDH-palmitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-St</td>
<td>LDH-stearate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDO</td>
<td>Layered double oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE</td>
<td>Linear low-density polyethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFI</td>
<td>Melt flow index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Polyethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLLA</td>
<td>Poly(L-lactide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMMA</td>
<td>Polymethyl methacrylate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>Polarised optical microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Polystyrene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Sodium dodecyl sulphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Scanning electron microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEM</td>
<td>Transmission electron microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG(A)</td>
<td>Thermogravimetry (Thermogravimetric analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV</td>
<td>Ultraviolet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRD</td>
<td>X-ray diffraction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anhedral</td>
<td>Refers to poorly formed crystal with no distinct faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delamination</td>
<td>A process in which layers of a multi-layered structure separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exfoliation</td>
<td>A process in which layers of a multi-layered structure are separated into single sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatty acid</td>
<td>Carboxylic acid, is an organic compound with a –COOH functional group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercalation</td>
<td>A process in which atoms, ions or molecules are inserted between the layers of a two-dimensional crystal lattice host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organo-LDH</td>
<td>Surfactant/fatty acid modified layered double hydroxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peptisation</td>
<td>To disperse a suspension to form a colloid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subhedral</td>
<td>Moderately formed crystals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermotropic</td>
<td>Changes in structure as temperature changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhedral</td>
<td>Fully-faced crystals, well-formed with sharp, easily recognisable crystal faces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

Introduction
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 LAYERED DOUBLE HYDROXIDES

Clays are layered nanostructured materials, widely used as unique additives and fillers in polymeric, cosmetic and pharmaceutical products. For many years they represented the largest and most widely used material. Clay is defined as a hydrous silicate particle less than 2 µm in diameter, composed of silicon, aluminium oxides and hydroxides, as well as structural water. In general, they possess excellent properties, such as low or nil toxicity, biocompatibility and the possibility for use in ‘controlled-release’ pharmaceutical and cosmetic products. A substantial amount of research has been carried out on the application and characterisation of smectite (cationic) clays (Utracki, 2004; Kumar et al., 2009). Smectite or phyllosilicates are predominately natural clays. However, natural clays have drawbacks such as variability in composition, difficulty in purifying, poor reproducibility of the performance of polymer composites, crystallographic defects that prevent total exfoliation and variable colour (Utrakı, 2004). Other layered nanostructured materials, such as layered double hydroxides (LDHs), may be considered as potential alternatives. LDHs possess a higher exchange capacity (typically anionic exchange capacity (AEC) = 0.5 to 6) as compared with cationic clays (cation exchange capacity (CEC) = 0.5–2) (Utraki et al., 2007).

LDHs are referred to as ‘hydrotalcite-like’ compounds. They are also described as mixed metal hydroxides that consist of positively charged metal hydroxide sheets with metals in different oxidation states. The crystallography of these materials is similar to that of hydrotalcite, with a formula of Mg₆Al₂(OH)₁₆(CO₃)₄H₂O (Reichle, 1986). LDHs have various advantages, such as low incidence of impurities since they are synthetic, and a wide variety of metal species and mole ratio compositions can be prepared. However, the high charge density within the interlayer renders LDHs unattractive as they do not easily delaminate or exfoliate in polymers or any media of dispersion. This ‘handicap’ may be counteracted by a process called intercalation. The intercalation process achieves this through the insertion of exchangeable anions, hence reducing the solid-solid interaction within the clay layers. This is essential as the van der Waals interaction between solid surfaces decreases with the square of the separating distance (Utrakı, 2004). The process also improves the compatibility of the clay with the polymer matrices in the preparation of
polymer–nanocomposites (Utraki, 2004). The insertion of anions such as surfactants functionalises the clay by converting the hydrophilic nature of the interlayer into a hydrophobic one. Consequently, non-polar and low-water-soluble organic molecules may be absorbed into the interlayer. Various anions have been exchanged within the interlayer, such as halides (Xu & Zeng, 2001), organic anions, e.g. carboxylates, benzenecarboxylates and alkylsulphates (Meyn et al., 1990; Carlino, 1997; Newman & Jones, 1998), polymeric anions (Oriaki et al., 1996), complex anions (Crespo et al., 1997), macrocyclic ligands and their metal derivatives (Robins & Dutta, 1996), iso- and heteropolyoxometalates (Drezdon, 1998) and biochemical anions (Choy, 2004).

In this study the organo-LDHs were synthesised directly from the LDH-CO$_3^-$ through a surfactant-mediated one-pot synthesis. The method is convenient (low reaction temperature and relatively short reaction time), environmentally friendly (no toxic solvent used) and economical. Although the method does not entail procedures to exclude carbon dioxide or carbonate, such as working in inert environments, its products are of good crystallinity and have minimal carbonate contamination.

The surfactants of choice in the study are fatty acids or carboxylic acids. Fatty acids are normally unbranched and have an even number of carbon atoms. The anions were chosen because they are readily available and at low cost. Fatty acids are derived from the hydrolysis of animal fat or vegetable oil in aqueous NaOH to yield glycerol and fatty acids. However, they may be produced synthetically through hydroxycarboxylation of alkenes.

1.2 LDH-BASED POLYMER COMPOSITES

Composite materials make a large contribution to engineering materials in the form of alloys, reinforced concrete and carbon black in vehicle tyres, etc. Biological systems are also good examples that possess a wide variety of composites. The technological world has a constant demand for multifunctional materials. Hence, numerous researchers have embarked on exploring various methods of synthesising and improving materials properties. The main application markets for clay-based polymer nanocomposites are packaging, flame retardants, aerospace and aviation, and the automotive industry. Figure 1.1. shows the
global application market projections for clay-based polymer composites. Growth is predicted in some areas as, well as greater diversity in their application by 2017.

The dispersion of particles with high aspect ratios, such as fibres and platelets in polymeric matrices, together with adequate interfacial adhesion between the filler and polymer, results in improved properties of the polymer matrices. Nanostructured anionic clays such as LDHs impart these properties and are therefore ideal for polymer-clay nanocomposite preparations. The resulting polymeric hybrids exhibit improved gas barrier properties, strength, dimensional stability, flame retardancy and ultraviolet (UV) stability, etc.

![Figure 1.1. Global application market share projections for polymer composites](Adapted from Research and Markets, http://www.researchandmarkets.com)

Surfactant-intercalated LDHs have been reported to exfoliate in polymer matrices and organic solutions (Leroux & Besse, 2001; Khan & O’Hare, 2002; Fischer, 2003). However, the intercalated anions show thermotropic behaviour (Nhlapo et al., 2008; Focke et al., 2010; Moyo et al., 2012). An example of this behaviour is shown in Figure 1.2 where LDH-stearate intercalated above the AEC level melts below typical polymer processing temperatures (120 °C) (Nhlapo et al., 2008). Droplet formation was observed in hot stage optical microscopy, giving a façade of a completely molten LDH-stearate (Nhlapo et al., 2008). This can be attributed to the excess stearate acid exuding and forming a liquid
droplet that surrounds the parent LDH-stearate platelets. However, droplet formation was not observed when the samples were heated in an environmental scanning electron microscope (SEM) because the acid evaporated. This effusion of the excess stearic acid from the bilayer intercalated LDHs proceeds in stages. It starts with the removal of interlayer water and terminates in a monolayer-intercalated clay residue, depending on the temperatures the material is exposed to.

These observations imply that dispersion of LDH-fatty acids in polymer matrices may perhaps not follow the conventional exfoliation or delamination routes (Adachi-Pagano et al., 2000). The exudation of stearic acid may have implications on the processing behaviour and the composite properties (particularly the mechanical properties). Such thermal events are of concern, hence clarity is required as to whether they are advantageous or detrimental to the resultant composite. It was therefore of interest to carry out a comprehensive study on the properties of fatty acid intercalated layered double hydroxides, as well as to follow the micro- and nanopolymer composites obtained therefrom.

![Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) melting endotherm and hot stage microscopy of LDH-stearate (Nhlapo et al., 2008)](image)

**Figure 1.2.** Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) melting endotherm and hot stage microscopy of LDH-stearate (Nhlapo et al., 2008)
1.3 LDH/JOJOBA OIL SUSPENSIONS

Organoclays are rheological modifiers, used as thickeners and for the control of the thixotropic properties of paints, grease and cosmetics (Jones, 1983). They deliver moderate steady-shear viscosity, together with the formation of a strong gel upon cessation of shear (King et al., 2007). The smectite clay minerals are, however, commonly employed. The thickening of organoclay suspensions is thought primarily to be achieved through exfoliation and/or three-dimensional assemblies of particles into a ‘house-of-cards’ structure (Albiston, 1996).

However, the delamination of LDH is difficult compared with that of montmorillonites and laponites which exfoliate into single clay sheets in aqueous suspensions (Wu et al., 2005; King et al., 2007). The extent of exfoliation is proportional to the number of delaminated single crystal layers or their small stacks in the matrix. As mentioned earlier, the pristine LDHs are modified with different anions to increase the interlayer distance, consequently improving their propensity to delaminate or exfoliate.

The focus in this section of the study will be mainly on an investigation into the change of viscosity as a function of temperature of organo-LDH/Jojoba oil formulations. As has already been stated, organo-LDHs demonstrate ‘thermotropic’ behaviour. Therefore the questions are: What effect will the exuded excess acid have on the matrix? Is full exfoliation of organo-LDH in an oil matrix possible? Why Jojoba oil? Jojoba oil (Simmondsia chinensis) is a widely used oil phase in cosmetic formulations. The oil has numerous benefits, some of which are improvement of skin tone, excellent oxidative stability and relative stability at high temperatures when compared with other vegetable oils.

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The general objective of the study was to investigate the utility of layered double hydroxides as an additive in polymeric materials and Jojoba oil. The specific objectives were as follows:

- Extend and optimise the intercalation techniques originally developed for fatty acids and anionic surfactants in hydrotalcite.
• Characterise modified LDH samples by spectroscopic techniques, thermal analysis, X-ray diffraction and microscopy.
• Investigate the properties affected by the incorporation of intercalated clays into candidate polymers, i.e. ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA), ethylene vinyl alcohol (EVAL) and linear low-density polyethylene (LLDPE).
• Prepare and test such nanocomposites, mouldings and oil formulations to confirm suitability for various applications.
• Study the rheological behaviour of organo-LDHs/Jojoba oil suspensions.

1.4.1 Methodology

• Modification of LDHs with long-chain fatty/carboxylic acids which are intended to functionalise the clay and hence improve their compatibility with the matrix
• Comprehensive characterisation of LDHs
• Dispersion of both unmodified and modified LDH through melt compounding, injection moulding of tensile testing dumbbells and mechanical property testing of specimens
• Full characterisation of polymer composites by thermal analysis, and microscopic and spectroscopic studies
• Dispersion of modified LDHs in Jojoba oil, followed by a study of the rheological behaviour of the resultant suspensions.
1.5 REFERENCES


Chapter 2

Layered double hydroxides and fatty acid intercalation

Monocarboxylic acids $C_{14}$–$C_{22}$ were successfully intercalated into Mg-Al-LDH-CO$_3$. The one-pot synthesis consistently yields a bilayer intercalated product for the range of acids employed. The intercalated anions have an orientation tilt angle of 55–63° depending on the chain length. The thermotropic behaviour of the bilayer fatty acid-intercalated LDHs was studied for each of the fatty acid derivatives within a temperature range of 25–200 °C. The stages followed included removal of water and exudation of excess anions, resulting in a monolayer arrangement.
2 LAYERED DOUBLE HYDROXIDES

2.1 WHAT IS A LAYERED DOUBLE HYDROXIDE?

Layered double hydroxides (LDHs) are also known as hydrotalcite-like compounds. Hydrotalcite was first discovered in Sweden in 1842. The mineral is formed from the weathering of basalts or their precipitation in saline water sources (Braterman et al., 2004). Its name derived from its high water content (hydro) and talc-like properties, translating to hydrotalcite. The synthetic analogues were first prepared in the laboratory by Feitknecht and Gerber in 1942. They possess a brucite Mg(OH)$_2$ structure in which some of the divalent ions are isomorphously replaced by the trivalent ones. The replacement results in a net positive charge which is counterbalanced by the existence of anions and water molecules in the interlayer. The electrostatic interaction and hydrogen bonding between the layers and the interlayer anions help maintain the overall structure and electro-neutrality of the clay (Cavani et al., 1991; Trifiro & Vaccari, 1996). A schematic presentation of layered double hydroxides is shown in Figure 2.1. LDHs have a generic formula as shown below (Brindley & Kikkawa, 1979; Miyata, 1980; Mascolo & Marino, 1980; Cavani et al., 1991).

$$[\text{M}^{2+}_{(1-x)}\text{M}^{3+}_x\text{(OH)}_2]^{z+}(\text{A}^{n-})_{(x/n)} \cdot m\text{H}_2\text{O}$$

where:

$\text{M}^{2+}$ is Mg, Zn, Ni, Co, Ca, Mn, etc.

$\text{M}^{3+}$ is Al, Cr, Fe, Mn, Co, V, etc.

$\text{A}^{n-}$ is CO$_3^{2-}$, Cl$^-$, NO$_3^-$, etc.

The different compositional species derived thereof are referred to as ‘hydrotalcite analogues’. In the Mg-Al LDHs, the $x$-value is the ratio of aluminium to magnesium. It is calculated from the equation below:

$$x = \frac{\text{M(III)}}{\text{M(II)+M(III)}} \quad [1]$$

where M(II) and M(III) are the divalent and trivalent cations respectively. The $x$-value is reported to fall within $0.1 \leq x \leq 0.5$, with pure phases existing for $0.2 \leq x \leq 0.3$ (Cavani et al., 1991; Khan & O’Hare, 2002). When the $x$-value is lower than 0.33, the Al octahedrals...
are not neighbouring, leading to a high density of Mg octahedrals in the brucite–like sheet. In the case of higher values of $x$, the increased number of neighbouring Al octahedrals leads to the formation of Al(OH)$_3$. The $x$-value determines the layer charge density and the anion exchange capacity (AEC) (Utracki et al., 2007).

![Layered structure of LDH-CO$_3$](image)

**Figure 2.1.** Layered structure of LDH-CO$_3$

The ionic radii of the metal species used in the preparation are usually very close to that of Mg$^{2+}$. However, when the metal ion radius is above 0.06 nm, the LDH structure becomes unstable, e.g. with cations such as Ca$^{2+}$ the hydrotalcite structure transforms into hydrocalumite (Forano et al., 2006). Several hybrids of LDHs may be synthesised with different stochiometries and metal compositions. Though most research focuses on the binary metal combinations, ternary and quaternary combinations have also been reported (Kooli et al., 1995; Xiang et al., 2009). Hydrotalcite are attractive compared with other layered compounds due to their versatility, ease of tailoring to suit functionality, simplicity and their low cost in preparation. Synthetic analogues of hydrotalcite can be readily prepared in the laboratory.

Hydrotalcite exists as two polymorphs: the hexagonal (H) and rhombohedral (R). The natural varieties of polymorphs have been described as 1H, 2H$_1$, 3H$_2$, 3R$_1$, 3R$_2$ and 6R. However, they have been found to occur as a mixture. The most common polytype in synthetic varieties is 3R$_1$ (Zaneva & Stanimirova, 2004). The polymorphs are given the above-mentioned designations to describe the stacking sequence of the brucite-like sheets. Table 2.1 is a summary of the different species of layered double hydroxides, polytypes and chemical formulas.
Table 2.1. Summary of layered double hydroxides, year of discovery, polytypes and chemical formulas (Adapted from Zaneva & Stanimirova, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Discovery</th>
<th>Mineral name</th>
<th>Polytype</th>
<th>Chemical formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Hydrotalcite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Mg₆Al₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Pyroaurite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Mg₆Fe₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Woodwardite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Cu₆Al₂(OH)SO₄·2·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Sjogrenite</td>
<td>2H</td>
<td>Mg₆Fe₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Stichtite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Mg₆Cr₃(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Hydrocalumite</td>
<td>2M</td>
<td>Ca₆Al₁₂(OH)₂₄(CO₃,Cl,OH)₁₆·11H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Manasseite</td>
<td>2H</td>
<td>Mg₆Al₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Barbertonite</td>
<td>2H</td>
<td>Mg₆Cr₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Honessite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Ni₆Fe₂(OH)₁₆SO₄·nH₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Takovite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Ni₆Al₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Reevesite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Ni₆Fe₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Iowite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Mg₆Fe(OH)₁₂Cl·2H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Meixnerite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Mg₆Al₁₂(OH)₁₆(OH)₂·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Desautelsite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Mg₆Mn₁₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Comblainite</td>
<td>6R</td>
<td>Ni₆Co₂(OH)₁₆CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Chlormagaluminite</td>
<td>2H</td>
<td>Mg₆Al₁₂(OH)₁₂(Cl,CO₃)·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Caresite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Fe₆Al₁₂(OH)₁₂CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Zincowoodwardite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Zn₆Al₁₂(OH)₁₂SO₄·2·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Kuzelite</td>
<td>6R</td>
<td>Ca₂Al₂(OH)₁₂SO₄·6H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Quintinite-2H</td>
<td>2H</td>
<td>Mg₆Al₁₂(OH)₁₂CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Quintinite-3T</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Mg₆Al₁₂(OH)₁₂CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Zaccagnaite</td>
<td>2H</td>
<td>Zn₆Al₁₂(OH)₁₂CO₃·3H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Charmarite (2H, 3T)</td>
<td>2H, 3R</td>
<td>Mn₆Al₁₂(OH)₁₂CO₃·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Woodallite</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>Mg₆Cr₂(OH)₁₆Cl₂·4H₂O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 LDH PREPARATION ROUTES

2.2.1 Co-precipitation

Co-precipitation is a direct synthesis method that entails nucleation and growth of metal hydroxide layers from two metal species in a basic aqueous solution. The metal salts favoured in this reaction are nitrates and chlorides. This is due to their monovalent charge
which makes them easily exchangeable. Due to the frequent use of the method in the preparation of LDHs, various refinements have been employed. These include:

- Co-precipitation in aqueous solution (Boclar & Braterman, 1999)
- Co-precipitation in non-aqueous solution (He et al., 2005)
- Hydrothermal synthesis by urea hydrolysis (Rao et al., 2005)
- Co-precipitation at low supersaturation (Meyn et al., 1990)
- Co-precipitation at high supersaturation (Constantino & Pinnavaia, 1995)

During synthesis, researchers pay special attention to the nature and mole ratio of the metal species, nature of anions, pH, temperature, precipitation method and the post-preparation treatment of the LDHs. The method allows control of the charge density of the hydroxide layers by regulating the pH of the system. When the pH of the system is too low, not all the mixed metal ions will precipitate, whereas a very high pH leads to the dissolution of one or more of the ion species (Othman et al., 2009). As the precipitate is often in the form of gels, washing tends to be complicated, resulting in very low yields.

2.2.2 Urea hydrolysis

The methods usually follow the principles of the co-precipitation reaction. However, the base or precipitating agent is generated in situ. The method has been used with much success by many researchers (Adachi-Pagano et al., 2003, Rao et al., 2005, He et al., 2005). Urea is a weak Bronsted base, whose hydrolysis rate is controlled by temperature. Hydrolysis proceeds in a two-step process:

(i) The rate-determining step, which entails the formation of ammonium cyanate:

\[ \text{H}_2\text{NCONH}_2 \rightarrow \text{NH}_4^+ + \text{NCO}^- \]

(ii) Fast hydrolysis of the cyanate into ammonium carbonate:

\[ \text{NH}_4\text{CNO} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow (\text{NH}_4)_2\text{CO}_3 \]

The hydrolysis process of ammonium cyanate to ammonia and carbonate to hydrogen carbonate gives a pH of approximately 9, which is ideal for the precipitation of hydroxides. The resulting LDHs show good crystallinity and large particles. Since the reaction
progresses slowly, this leads to low degrees of supersaturation. Temperature control was observed to be a fundamental parameter for obtaining uniformity and particle sizes (Othman et al., 2009). Iyi et al. (2004), used an alternative ammonia releasing/precipitating agent in the form of hexamethylenetetramine (HMT) and they were able to achieve high degrees of crystallinity. However, the production of the carbonate anion is unavoidable in all cases. Microwave synthesis of hydrotalcite by urea hydrolysis was employed by Yang et al. (2007), and the hydrotalcite prepared at 600 W power had the highest crystallinity and a homogeneous crystal size.

2.2.3 Sol-gel

The sol-gel technique was pioneered by Lopez et al. (1996) in the synthesis of hydrotalcite analogues. The sol is prepared by hydrolysis and condensation of the inorganic salt and organic metal compound (alkoxides) in water and/or organic solvent. Variants of the method include heating and using different types of solvent to achieve dissolution of less-soluble reactants (Othman et al., 2009). Ramos et al. (1997) prepared hydrotalcites from magnesium ethoxide using various sources of aluminium, i.e. acetylacetone, nitrate, sulphate and chloride. The crystallinity of the product and sintering behaviour was found to depend on the aluminium precursor. The observed properties followed this trend: aluminium acetylcetonate > aluminium chloride > aluminium nitrate > aluminium sulphate.

Prinetto et al. (2000) also explored sol-gel techniques in the preparation of hydrotalcite and takovite analogues. The starting materials were metal alkoxides and/or acetylacetonate. This preparation method led to pure and well-dispersed nanomaterials. LDH particles derived in this way have a lower particle size and are more reactive compared with those obtained by the co-precipitation reaction (Jitianu et al., 2003). Samples prepared by this method exhibited an increase in specific surface area, which is attributed to an increase in mesopore volume (Forano et al., 2006). These mesoporous structures are ideal for the development of novel catalysts or catalytic systems. Sol-gel LDH properties have been modified by changing the cations used in the sol preparation, the reaction temperature, the ageing time the pH. For example, decreasing the reaction temperature or ageing time increases the specific surface area or particle size of LDHs. The specific surface area of the LDHs was found to be 10–25% greater than that of products achieved from the co-precipitation reaction (Aramendia et al., 2002). Increasing the acid-boehmite molar ratio was
recommended to decrease the porosity of the sintered LDHs (Othman et al., 2009). The areas of concern in this method include the basicity and their M$^{II}$:M$^{III}$ ratio.

Other methods that have been employed in the preparation of LDHs include electrochemical methods (Sugimoto et al., 1999; Indira et al., 1994), steam activation (Abello et al., 2006), hydrothermal crystallisation of the amorphous acidic precursor (Mascolo et al., 1995) and chimie douche (Delmas & Borthomieu, 1993).

2.2.4 Post-preparation techniques

Post-preparation techniques are carried out to improve the quality of crystallites, obtain uniform size distribution and improve the ordering of anions within the interlayer of the LDH. These post-preparation techniques include hydrothermal and solvothermal methods, microwave irradiation and ultra-sound treatments.

Hydrothermal treatment is the most common of the methods used. The sample is subjected to temperatures of up to 200 °C under autogeneous pressure for time periods ranging from hours to days. This treatment has given rise to increases in particle size relative to the ageing time. The LDH platelets obtained thereof are of regular shapes, usually hexagonal morphologies.

Microwave treatments are normally used in combination with hydrothermal methods. However, the advantages of the former over the latter include shorter reaction time. For example, a well-crystallised product was obtained in 12 minutes compared with 1 530 minutes (Kannan et al., 2000). As microwaves interact with liquid or solid materials, they produce a dipole re-orientation in dielectric material and ionic conduction if the ions are mobile. Hence it is possible to achieve a uniform bulk heating of the system, reducing the occurrence of thermal gradients originating from the conventional heating method (Othman et al., 2009).

It is clear from the above preparation methods that hydrotalcites can be tailored to fit their specific requirements and properties. The high charge density on the LDHs renders them unattractive as they do not readily exfoliate or delaminate. LDHs possess an expandable 2-D layer structure which allows the exchange of various anions. Increasing the d-spacing
lowers the van der Waals force between the sheets, hence they can easily be exfoliated or delaminated. Expansion of the interlayer is achieved by a process called intercalation.

2.2.5 Texture and morphology

The texture and morphology of platelets are related to the preparation method and crystal growth habits. Like most clay materials, LDHs exhibit a layered structure. Crystal habits similar to those observed in smectite single crystallites are also observed in LDHs, i.e. laths, fibres, and subhedral and euhedral lamellae (see Figure 2.1). The hexagonal shape obtained mainly from the urea hydrolysis method (Yang et al., 2007) has become the archetype of well-synthesised LDHs. The hexagonal and rhombohedral shapes fall into the euhedral lamellae category. They display the presence of well-developed \( \{hk0\} \) in addition to a very prominent basal reflection (Grim & Güven, 1978). This is typical of crystals that have had ample space for growth. The majority of researchers observed subhedral forms (Nhlapo et al., 2008, Xu and Braterman 2010, Costa et al., 2006); these have irregular outlines, but with a well-defined basal form. Although the lath and fibre forms are rare, they have been reported (Xu & Braterman, 2010, Moyo et al, 2012). Crystallites of this form originate from the folding of thin lamellae (Grim & Güven, 1978). SEM micrographs of the different LDH crystallites observed in this study are shown in a Section 2.6.1 and Appendix B.

![Figure 2.2. Common habits of smectite single crystallites](Adapted from Grim & Güven, 1978)
2.3 INTERCALATION

Intercalation is a form of clay-surface interaction where the anions or surfactant molecules aggregate within the interlayer, i.e. between pairs of adjacent clay sheets (Crepaldi et al., 2002). O’Hare (1991) defined it as “the reversible insertion of mobile guest species into a crystalline layered host lattice, during which the structural integrity of the latter is formally conserved”. Self-assembly drives intercalation. During this process the anions spontaneously organise themselves into an ordered state (see Figure 2.3). The basic mechanism by which intercalation occurs is either through oxidation-reduction, ion-exchange, acid-base or donor-acceptor reactions (Khan & O’Hare, 2002). LDHs are normally non-selective, although shape and stereo-selectivity have been observed (Ikeda et al., 1984; Lotsch et al., 2001). Most recently, chain length selectivity has been encountered in surfactant-mediated exchange of short chain fatty acids, in which the surfactant chain is intercalated preferentially (Moyo et al., 2008). Intercalation is facilitated by interactions such as electrostatic attractions, hydrogen bonding and hydrophobic associations (Whitesides et al., 1991). The separation of the layers is governed by the dimensions and functional group of the anions to be intercalated. Other factors include the AEC level of the anions intercalated, size, orientation and interaction with the hydroxyl lattice (Cavani et al., 1991). The inclusion of organic anions within the interlayer of LDHs is essential to their physical or chemical functionality. Intercalation has been used to change the chemical, electronic, optical and magnetic properties of the host lattice (Khan & O’Hare, 2002).

![Figure 2.3. Intercalation](image-url)
2.3.1 Intercalation methods

Crepaldi et al. (1999) proposed three main LDH intercalation procedures, i.e. direct synthesis, ion exchange and the regeneration or reconstruction method. Direct synthesis is normally achieved by a co-precipitation reaction (Meyn et al., 1990). The LDH is prepared in situ by adding a mixed metal solution dropwise to an alkaline solution containing the anion to be intercalated. The method has been proved to produce highly crystalline products, especially when followed up by hydrothermal treatments. Moyo et al. (2012) employed co-precipitation in the intercalation of dodecyl sulphate, and obtained a pure and highly crystalline bilayer intercalated product.

In the case where the LDH-CO$_3$ is the precursor, the first step is to eliminate the carbonate anion; this is achieved by either calcination or acid treatment of the LDH-CO$_3$ (Iyi et al., 2005; Moyo et al., 2008). Hydrotalcite sheets have a high charge density and as a result a higher affinity for multivalent anions such as carbonates. The carbonate anion is therefore tenaciously held within the interlayer. However, the decarbonation process using mineral acids is a challenge due to the strong acidity of HCl and the low acid tolerance of Mg-Al LDH (Iyi et al., 2005).

The LDH precursor in the ion-exchange method is an LDH-A, where A is a monovalent anion that can be easily exchanged, e.g. chloride or nitrate. Miyata and Okada (1977) found that the ease of exchange or affinity of the LDH lattice was found to be in the following order:

$$\text{CO}_3^{2-} >> \text{SO}_4^{2-} \text{ and }$$

$$\text{OH} > \text{F} > \text{Cl} > \text{Br} > \text{NO}_3^- > \text{I}$$

The LDH-A is suspended in a solution containing the carboxylic acid or its sodium salt. This method has been employed in the intercalation of $\alpha,\omega$ dicarboxylic acids and a range of carboxylic acids (Miyata & Kumura, 1973). Variations of the method have included intercalation of lauric, myristic and palmitic acid carried out in ethanolic solutions (Borja & Dutta, 1992).
The reconstruction method is self-explanatory in that the metal hydroxide is reconstructed from the mixed metal oxides. The carbonate anion is removed from the interlayer by heating the LDH-CO$_3$ at temperatures between 450–550 °C for 3–4 hours. Calcination yields a decarbonised and dehydroxylated layered double oxide (LDO). The LDO is suspended in an alkaline solution containing the anion to be intercalated. The metal hydroxyl lattice reforms under these conditions, at the same time incorporating the anion into the interlayer. The mechanism has been reported to entail a fast rehydration with the intercalation of OH$^-$ anions, which is followed by a slow ion-exchange reaction of the OH$^-$ anions with the desired intercalant (Crepaldi et al., 2002). This is attributed to the memory effect of LDOs. Structure recovery is affected by the calcination conditions, such as temperature, heating rate and duration (Rocha et al., 1999). The method has been used with great success in the intercalation of alkyl-sulphates, aryl sulphonates and carboxylic acids (Miyata & Okada, 1977; Sato et al., 1988; Chibwe & Jones, 1989). Latterini et al. (2002) also successfully intercalated large organic anions such as phenolphthalein. Although the method is considered effective, it produces a non-homogeneous product, comprising a mixture of modified LDH and a small fraction of unmodified LDH (Costa et al., 2011). The calcination process can cause irreversible changes in the crystalline structure (Hibino & Tsunashima, 1988; Stanimirova et al., 2001). The texture and morphology of the intercalates was also found to be affected by the calcination process (Moyo, 2009).

The preparation method employed in this particular study of carboxylic acid intercalated LDHs is basically an ion-exchange reaction. However, it is unique in that the exchange is direct from the LDH-carbonate precursor. The underlying principle for the success of the method is a basic acid-base reaction. Carbonic acid has pKa values of 6.35 and 10.33 at 25 °C for the first and second protonation reactions respectively, whereas the pKa value of fatty acids is approximately 4.8. This implies that the fatty acid would readily protonate the carbonate anion (McMurry, 1999; Landman, 2005). This is similar to the decarbonation method described by Iyi et al. (2005). They suggested a two-step mechanism by which intercalation occurs, the first step being the protonation of the carbonate anion to hydrogen carbonate and the second step involving the instantaneous inclusion of the anions in solution. However, the method utilised strong acids such as HCl. Limited success was achieved due to the low acid tolerance of Mg-Al LDH and difficulty in handling the acid in large-scale experiments. The method was later modified by using an acetate buffer (sodium acetate buffer and acetic acid/NaCl mixed solution) (Iyi & Sasaki 2008).
Post-intercalative treatments are necessary to obtain a highly crystalline well-ordered product with large particle sizes. These include hydrothermal, microwave and ultra-sound treatments, which have been discussed in greater detail in Section 2.2.4.

### 2.3.2 Orientation of intercalated fatty acids

Intercalated anions will always orient themselves in such a manner that they maximise interaction with the hydroxyl layers and adjacent anions. The orientation of intercalated anions is studied by X-ray diffraction (XRD) and the state of anions is investigated through Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy. XRD gives an indication of layer separation and FTIR is used to probe the structure of the interlayer and the phase state of intercalated anions. Changes in the CH\textsubscript{2} stretching and scissoring vibrations are related to interlayer packing density, chain length and temperature (Vaia \textit{et al.}, 1994). These aspects are discussed in Section 2.6 (results) of this chapter. Table 2.2. provides a brief overview of orientation and basal spacing of the fatty acid-intercalated LDHs found in the literature.

**Table 2.2.** Orientation and d-spacing of fatty acid-intercalated LDHs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercalated anion</th>
<th>LDH</th>
<th>M\textsuperscript{2+}/M\textsuperscript{3+} ratio</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>d-spacing (nm)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myristate</td>
<td>Li-Al; Mg-Al</td>
<td>1:2; 3:1</td>
<td>Monolayer</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>Borja &amp; Dutta, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmitate</td>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>Monolayer</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>Itoh \textit{et al.}, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Nymbo \textit{et al.}, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zn-Al</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>Xu &amp; Braterman, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stearate</td>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>Monolayer</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Meyn \textit{et al.}, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>Itoh \textit{et al.}, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>Nhlapo \textit{et al.}, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>2:1; 3:1</td>
<td>Monolayer</td>
<td>2.95; 2.82</td>
<td>Xu &amp; Braterman, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zn-Al</td>
<td>2:1; 3:1</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>5.00; 4.99</td>
<td>Xu &amp; Braterman, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachidate</td>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>Itoh \textit{et al.}, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, two types of orientation have been observed for fatty acid intercalated LDHs, i.e. a monolayer and bilayer, the former being the most common (Figure 2.4). The packing and orientation of carboxylic acids is driven by:
(i) the advanced hydrophobic interaction of long-chain aliphatic carboxylates that intercalate greater-than-normal AEC levels and pack closely in a bilayer format (Itoh et al., 2003)

(ii) molecular packing, which is dependent on the use of excess fatty acids and intercalation temperature (Itoh et al., 2003; Nhlapo et al., 2008)

(iii) the solution pH at which anion-exchange takes place (Kuehn & Poellmann, 2010).

Figure 2.4. Orientation of intercalated fatty acids

Kanoh et al. (1991) suggested that LDHs could intercalate fatty acids greater than their normal AEC through the formation of bilayer structures similar to the Langmuir-Blödgett films. The strength, elasticity and stability of an absorbed surfactant film are influenced by surface activity, chain length compatibility and cohesion. Moreover, interactions between polar groups of the molecules in the monolayer have additional influence. The monolayer film of saturated fatty acids compresses to the same limiting area, e.g. stearic acid has a limiting area of 21 Å (Kanicky & Shah 2002; Itoh et al., 2003). Close chain packing is also driven by the length of the surfactant chain (Figure 2.5). The van der Waals interaction between chains increases with increase in the chain length. Hence long-chain surfactants will pack closely and readily as compared with the short-chain carboxylates. This would explain the difficulty encountered by researchers in intercalating chains lengths of C₁ to C₈ (Costa et al., 2011; Nhlapo et al., 2008).
Intercalation is pH dependent: at high pH the surfactant head groups are completely ionised (Figure 2.6). This results in the repulsion of similarly charged molecules, which ultimately leads to expansion of the monolayer and a weak, unstable film. Close packing is achieved when intercalation is carried out close to its pKa value, as seen from Figure 2.6.

**Figure 2.5.** Effect of chain length on the close packing of intercalated fatty acids

(Adapted from Kanicky & Shah, 2002)

**Figure 2.6.** Effect of pH on the close packing intercalated fatty acid

(Adapted from Kanicky & Shah, 2002)
2.4 CHARACTERISATION OF LDH AND MODIFIED DERIVATIVES

A combination of characterisation techniques is employed in the structural elucidation of LDH, its composition and the orientation of intercalated anions. The most common techniques are powder XRD, FTIR, thermogravimetry (TG), scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM).

XRD is the main technique used in determining the extent of intercalation through changes in the d-spacing. It is also used to determine the degree of crystallinity, which is a direct function of the organisation within the hydroxide layer. FTIR provides information on the organic species that has been intercalated and the vibrational spectroscopy of the LDH octahedral lattice and hydroxyl groups. Thermogravimetric methods are essential in studying the thermal stability/behaviour of pristine LDHs and their intercalated derivatives. These methods also allow a comprehensive study of the decomposition pathways of LDHs. SEM and TEM are used to study the different textures and morphologies exhibited by LDHs. In addition, they give an appreciation of the lateral dimensions of the LDH platelets.

The other characterisation techniques used in the study are differential scanning calorimetry (DSC), TG-FTIR, temperature scan XRD and FTIR, and inductively coupled plasma optical emission (ICP-OES) spectrometry.

In this phase of the project the aim was to intercalate straight-chain carboxylic acids from C_{14}–C_{22} and fully characterise the organo-LDH obtained thereof.

2.5 EXPERIMENTAL

2.5.1 Materials

The layered double hydroxide LDH-CO_3 (hydrotalcite grade HT-5) was supplied by Nkomazi Chemicals, South Africa. The particle size of the LDH was determined in a Malvern Mastersizer 2000 instrument and the particle size distribution was found to be d(0.1): 1.19 μm; d(0.5): 3.94 μm and d(0.9): 23.93 μm. Various fatty acids were used in the intercalation reactions; their properties are summarised in Table 2.3. They were all saturated.
fatty acids (C\textsubscript{14}–C\textsubscript{18}), with the exception of oleic acid and Jojoba oil. Jojoba oil is composed of unsaturated liquid wax esters ranging from C\textsubscript{36}–C\textsubscript{42}.

### Table 2.3. Summary of fatty acids used in the intercalation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acid</th>
<th>IUPAC name</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Molar mass</th>
<th>Melting point (°C)</th>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Purity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myristic</td>
<td>Tetradecanoic</td>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{13}\text{H}</em>{27}\text{COOH})</td>
<td>228.37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>≥ 98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmitic</td>
<td>Hexadecanoic</td>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{15}\text{H}</em>{31}\text{COOH})</td>
<td>256.42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>≈ 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stearic</td>
<td>Octadecanoic</td>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{17}\text{H}</em>{35}\text{COOH})</td>
<td>284.48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Biozone - Chemicals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behenic</td>
<td>Docosanoic (9z)-Octadec-9-enoic</td>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{21}\text{H}</em>{43}\text{COOH})</td>
<td>340.58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Fluka</td>
<td>≥ 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleic</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{17}\text{H}</em>{32}\text{COOH})</td>
<td>282.46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Merck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2 Preparation of organo-LDH

The Mg-Al-LDH-stearate was prepared as reported by Nhlapo et al. (2008). A typical intercalation procedure was carried out as follows: 40 g of surfactant (Tween 60) was dissolved in 1.5 litres of preheated distilled water and the temperature was kept at 80 °C. The addition of excess stearic acid (0.384 mol which is an equivalent of four times the AEC) was added in a three-part series. The total amount of 109g was added. The mixture was heated at 80 °C for 8 h and cooled overnight at room temperature. The process was repeated over four days with continuous stirring. On the fourth the day there was no acid addition. The pH of the mixture was maintained by adding ammonia solution, with each correction carried out once each day and corrected to a pH of approximately 9–10. The mixture was allowed to cool and the solids were separated by centrifugation, washing the mixture four times with water and once each with ethanol and acetone respectively. The LDH-stearate solids were dried at room temperature. The other fatty acids, namely myristic, palmitic and behenic acids, were intercalated in a similar manner. Detailed experimental parameters are documented in Appendix B.

The above procedure was repeated using the exact AEC and twice the AEC. The products were labelled LDH-stearate 1AEC and 2AEC respectively. Another experiment was carried out without stearic acid; this was done to determine whether the Tween 60 could intercalate into the LDH-CO\textsubscript{3} on its own. In addition, the neat magnesium stearate and aluminium stearate were subjected to a similar procedure, but in the absence of the LDH-CO\textsubscript{3}. 26
Re-crystallisation of the magnesium stearate (20 g Mg stearate + 40 g surfactant (Tween 60)) was carried out by suspending it in distilled water. The reaction temperature was adjusted to 80 °C with pH ≈ 9-10 and it was left to run for 24 h. The samples were recovered by centrifugation, washed once with water, three times with ethanol and once with acetone.

A 2:1 molar mixture of magnesium stearate and aluminium stearate was reacted using a very similar process. A mixture of 40 g of Tween 60, 28.38 g (0.048 mol) of magnesium distearate and 21.06 g (0.024 mol) of aluminium tristearate was suspended in 1000 ml of distilled water and heated to 70 °C. As before, NH₄OH was added to control the pH (pH = 10). The product was recovered as described above. This product was named magnesium/aluminium stearate.

Finally, LDH-oleate was synthesised by the co-precipitation method. Solutions (0.5 and 0.25 mol respectively) of Mg(NO₃)₂·6H₂O and Al(NO₃)₃·9H₂O were prepared. The mixture of the metal salts solution was added dropwise to an alkaline solution containing 0.35 mol of oleate anions. The pH was adjusted using 2M NaOH to a pH of 10. The temperature was controlled at 80 °C and the solution left to stir for three days. Solids were again recovered by centrifugation and washed with distilled water – four times with ethanol and once with acetone. The solids were oven dried at 60 °C.

### 2.5.3 Characterisation

ICP-OES was used to determine the elemental composition of the fatty acid-intercalated LDH. Five milligrams of LDH and fatty acid-intercalated LDH samples were leached in an aqua regia solution. The aliquots were left to cool; 1 ml of aliquot was diluted with 9 ml of de-ionised water. These were then analysed on a Perkin Elmer SPECTRO ARCOS ICP-OES spectrometer to quantify the amount of Mg and Al present. Calibration was carried out using a multi-element standard (ICP grade). Each sample was measured three times and the average ICP value was recorded.

Powder samples were viewed on a JEOL 5400 SEM and a JEOL JSM-6010LA analytical SEM. They were prepared as follows: a small quantity of the LDH-fatty acid and the LDH-CO₃ precursor was placed onto carbon tape on a metal sample holder. Excess powder was
removed using a single blast of compressed air. The samples were then coated three times with gold under argon gas using the SEM autocoating unit E5200 (Polaron Equipment Ltd). Elemental analysis of the LDHs was done on the JEOL 5400SEM with Energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS). Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) was carried out on a JEOL 2100 TEM. A small quantity of LDH-CO$_3$ was added to 5 ml of methanol. A homogeneous dispersion was obtained through sonication for 5 to 10 s. Drops of the colloidal liquid were placed on an Agar scientific 300 µm holey carbon film coated copper grid. The solution was allowed to dry out prior analysis.

Phase identification was carried out by XRD analysis on a PANalytical X-pert Pro powder diffractometer with variable divergence and receiving slits and an X’celerator detector using Fe-filtered Co K-alpha radiation (0.17901 nm). X’Pert High Score Plus software was used for phase identification. Temperature-resolved XRD traces were obtained using an Anton Paar HTK 16 heating chamber with a Pt heating strip. Scans were measured between $2\theta = 1^\circ$ to $40^\circ$ in a temperature range of 25 to 200 °C in intervals of 10 °C with a waiting time of 1 min and measurement time of 6 min per scan. Si (Aldrich 99% pure) was added to the samples so that the data could be corrected for sample displacement using X’Pert High Score plus software.

Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) data were collected on a Perkin Elmer DSC instrument. Samples of 5–10 mg were placed in a 40 µl alumina pan and heated from -40 to 200 °C and then cooled back to -40 °C at a scan rate of 5 °C/min and a N$_2$ flow rate of 50 ml/min.

Thermogravimetric analysis was carried out on the neat LDH-CO$_3$ and the fatty acid-intercalated LDH. A powder sample of 15 mg was analysed on a Mettler Toledo TGA A851 TGA/SDTA machine. The sample was placed in 70 µl alumina open pans. The temperature was scanned at 10 °C/min in air, ranging from 25 to 1 200 °C.

Standard FTIR was carried out on a Perkin Elmer 100 Spectrophotometer with a MIRacle ATR attachment with diamond Zn/Se plate; spectra were recorded between 4000 and 650 cm$^{-1}$ at a resolution of 2 cm$^{-1}$, and the data collected over 32 scans.
2.6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

2.6.1 Composition and morphology

The ICP data are reported as mol ratio relative to aluminium (Table 2.4). The LDH-CO$_3$ precursor used in the study is represented by the formula $[\text{Mg}_{1-x}\text{Al}_x(\text{OH})_2](\text{CO}_3)_{x/2} \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$, where $x$ quantifies the fractional replacement of Mg by Al ions in the hydroxide sheets. Several studies have cited the tendency of fatty acids to co-intercalate with their sodium salts (Kanoh et al., 1999; Itoh et al., 2003; Nhlapo et al., 2008). To cater for this scenario the general formula for the intercalated LDH was $[\text{Mg}_{1-x}\text{Al}_x(\text{OH})_2]\{(\text{CHO})_x(\text{NaCHO})_y\} \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$.

Table 2.4. Compositional data and formulae for the LDH-CO$_3$ precursor and intercalated products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDH</th>
<th>Aluminium mol ratio to</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myristate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmitate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stearate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behenate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pristine LDH-CO$_3$ has a sand-rose morphology when viewed under the SEM. Several researchers have described the morphology of pristine LDH particles as having a plate-like hexagonal shape (Yang et al., 2007). However, their form is not well defined as viewed in the micrographs below. It is composed of very small subhedral platelets with a lateral average size of 1–5 μm. The particle size distribution will differ from one synthesis method to another (Costa et al., 2008). The same morphology can be observed from both SEM (Figure 2.7a) and TEM Figure 2.7b, c & d. In the case of an LDH-platelet placed on edge, the different stratification of the layers can be observed (Figure 2.7d).
Figure 2.7. (a) SEM; (b), (c) and (d) TEM micrographs of neat LDH-CO$_3$

The modified LDH appears to have larger platelets (Figure 2.8). This suggests that the modification process involves dissolution and recrystallisation of the parent LDH to the organo-LDH (Cavani et al., 1991). The organo-LDHs generally exhibited irregular subhedral shapes, with the exception of the LDH-palmitate which showed distinct euhedral platelets with a rhombohedral shape.
The composition of the platelets was probed by energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS). The ratio of Mg to Al is similar or very close to those reported in ICP results. However, it is interesting to note that the well-defined rhombohedral-shaped platelets showed varying Mg:Al ratios. Figures 2.9(a) & (b) shows a typical example with a variety of compositions obtained in LDH-palmitate platelets. The EDS data of the other fatty acid-LDH derivatives are given in Appendix B. This could be an indication that the intercalation process used in the study is followed by dissolution and recrystallisation of the LDH lattice. This is similar to the findings of Grover et al. (2010), who explained the changes in the morphology of arsenic-intercalated LDH and hydrocalumite in terms of the anion-exchange mechanism which occurs via a dissolution–precipitation reaction.
Figure 2.9. EDS data showing different compositions of LDH-palmitate platelets with Mg:Al ratios of (a) 2.09 and (b) 6.95

The elemental analysis by EDS indicates the existence of Mg and Al, with their atomic composition ranging from 1.65 to 6. However, some of the platelets were composed of only Mg; the data on this sample is shown in Appendix B. Zhang et al. (2012) also found that increasing concentrations of sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) during intercalation resulted in
the product changing from CaAl-SDS to Ca-SDS. The interlayer spacing increased from 2.72 to 3.25 nm.

2.6.2 X-ray diffraction analysis

The morphology, particle size and crystallinity of LDHs are directly related to the organisation of the metal hydroxide lattice. Reaction parameters such as preparation time, temperature, concentrations of reactants, post-preparation treatments and reaction solvents all contribute to these properties (Braterman et al., 2004). Broad powder XRD peaks are normally assigned to phases that lack order, while the narrow sharp peaks are indicative of well-ordered and crystalline phases. A high degree of crystallinity is indicated by the presence of well-resolved XRD patterns (Forano et al., 2006). XRD may also be used as an indicator of phase purity.

Assuming the LDH has a rhombohedral stacking order, the basal reflections may be indexed as 003, 006, etc. (Braterman et al., 2004). The characteristic peaks of LDH-CO$_3$ are observed at 20 values of 13.5 and 27.2°. These 20 values are typical for LDH-CO$_3$, with a d-spacing ($d_L$) of 0.76 nm. A shift to lower 20 values is an indication of layer separation or an increase in d-spacing. All the fatty acid-intercalated LDHs showed an increase in the d-spacing; these were observed to be 4.13, 4.46, 4.98 and 6.08 nm for the myristate, palmitate, stearate and behenate respectively (see Figure 2.10). The peak positions are consistent with a bilayer orientation of fatty acid ions. The d-spacing increases linearly with the increase in the number of carbon atoms of the carboxylic acids, as shown in Figure 2.11.

![Figure 2.10. WAXS diffractograms of the neat and modified LDH](image-url)
The intercalated fatty acid anions are envisaged to have a tilt angle of 56–59°, basing the calculation on the equation given below (Carlino, 1997; Xu & Braterman, 2010).

\[ d = 1.48 + 0.26(n - 2)\sin \theta \]  

where

- \( d \) is the d-spacing
- \( n \) is the carbon number in the stearate chain
- \( \theta \) is the slant angle of the intercalated fatty acid anions.

The data obtained experimentally fit well with the theoretical calculation and those obtained from other studies, as seen in Table 2.2. Trace LDH-carbonate phases were present, particularly in the myristate and palmitate. The peaks are sharp and symmetric, which is an indication of good ordering in the synthesised intercalates.

![Graph showing the increase in basal spacing with increase in alkyl chain lengths](image)

**Figure 2.11.** Increase in basal spacing with increase in alkyl chain lengths (○) obtained experimentally in this study and (♦) obtained from theoretical calculations

### 2.6.3 Fourier transform infrared analysis (FTIR)

This technique helps to identify the type of intercalated species and their state within the interlayer.
Figure 2.12 shows FTIR peaks that are typical for the pristine LDH-CO$_3$ used in the study. The broad band in the range of 3400–3500 cm$^{-1}$ was assigned to $\nu_{\text{OH}}$ OH···HOH vibrations. The shoulder at 3000–3100 cm$^{-1}$ was attributed to the OH vibrations of hydroxyl groups co-ordinated to the interlayer carbonate OH-CO$_3^{2-}$ through hydrogen bonding. A bending vibration ($\delta_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$) from the interlayer water is observed at 1600–1650 cm$^{-1}$. Carbonate anions peaks are observed at 850–880 cm$^{-1}$ ($\nu_2$), 1350–1380 cm$^{-1}$ ($\nu_3$) and 670–690 cm$^{-1}$ ($\nu_4$). These were assigned to non-planar bending, asymmetric stretching mode and bending angular mode respectively (Braterman et al., 2004). However, these have been observed to split or shift to lower values if the symmetry of the carbonate anions is compromised. This is due to ionic and/or hydrogen bonding interaction of the CO$_3^{2-}$ with the metal hydroxide lattice, hence interfering with the normal vibrations of the bonds. The position of the $\nu_3$ peak (1370–1355 cm$^{-1}$) is sensitive to the M$^{II}$/M$^{III}$ ratio. Costa et al. (2007) suggested that a strong electrostatic attraction between the interlayer anions is indicated by a decrease in the metal ratio (increase in the $x$-value). Hernendaz-Moreno et al. (1985) found that the $\nu_3$ peak position shifted to lower wavenumbers with a decrease in the metal ratio, i.e. the M$^{II}$/M$^{III}$ ratios equal to 3:1 and 2:1 had peaks positioned at 1370 and 1355 cm$^{-1}$ respectively. The $\nu_3$ peak was observed at 1358 cm$^{-1}$ in this current study, which is in good agreement with the literature for an Mg$^{2+}$/Al$^{3+}$ ratio that is close to 2:1.
The FTIR spectra were observed to vary for the different orientations of anions within the interlayer, i.e. monolayer or bilayer (Braterman et al., 2004). A monolayer stearate-intercalated LDH was found to have two distinct peaks at 1549 cm\(^{-1}\), attributed to the COO\(^{-}\) asymmetric stretching, and at 1412 cm\(^{-1}\) for the COO\(^{-}\) symmetric stretching. In the bilayer stearate-intercalated Zn\(_3\)Al-LDH, peaks were observed at 1597 cm\(^{-1}\) with shoulders at 1620 and 1398 cm\(^{-1}\); these were assigned to H-bonded COOH vibration (Braterman et al., 2004). Figure 2.13 shows the spectra of the fatty acid-modified LDHs. The observed spectra are typical for a bilayer fatty acid-intercalated LDH. The different fatty acid:LDH derivatives had similar spectra. The broad band between 3447 and 3391 cm\(^{-1}\) was assigned to hydroxyl groups on the LDH lattice and the presence of the intercalated water molecules. However, it is clear to see this particular peak becomes very broad and somewhat weak in the fatty acid-intercalated LDH as compared with the pristine LDH. This may be explained by the exclusion of a sizable quantity of intercalated water molecules due to the hydrophobisation of the interlayer by the fatty acids. A more detailed view of the peaks present and their exact positions is given in Figure 2.14.
The peaks in the fatty acid intercalated product in the regions 2956, 2915 and 2848 cm\(^{-1}\) are attributed to CH\(_2\) symmetric and asymmetric stretching modes. The \(\nu_{as}\)CH\(_2\) band was observed at a substantially low wavenumber (2915 cm\(^{-1}\)), which is an indication of a highly ordered all-trans conformation. The bending vibration of the intercalated water, \(\delta(\text{H}_2\text{O})\), was observed at 1636 cm\(^{-1}\). Peaks at 1583 cm\(^{-1}\) were attributed to the carboxylic acids being intercalated in the –RCOOH form (Borja & Dutta, 1992). Carlino & Hudson (1994) assigned the 1535 cm\(^{-1}\) peak to the asymmetric stretching mode of ionised –RCOO\(^-\). However, they found that this particular mode may be positioned anywhere within the range of 1558–1536 cm\(^{-1}\). The asymmetric mode was observed by Perez-Ramirez \textit{et al.} (2001) in the range of 1425–1411 cm\(^{-1}\). In the current study these are detected as weak peaks at 1428 and 1411 cm\(^{-1}\). A medium peak around 1466 cm\(^{-1}\) was attributed by Borja & Dutta (1992) to CH\(_2\) bending of the carboxylic acid chain. This band was also found to be sensitive to interchain interactions and the packing arrangement (Vaia \textit{et al.}, 1994). The LDH-myristate exhibits a much broader peak and a slightly lower wavenumber. This is an indication of an increase in the chain motion or liquid-like character of the fatty acid chains. The peak at 1368 cm\(^{-1}\) shows a broad and very weak band, which is an indication of a slight carbonate impurity.

The summation of the peaks observed is evidence of the presence of carboxylate within the interlayer. It also substantiates the fact that for a bilayer to form, the fatty acid should be intercalated in both an ionised and unionised fatty acid form (Kuehn & Poellman, 2010).

\textbf{Figure 2.14.} FTIR zoom of the modified LDH
2.6.4 Thermal analysis

The thermal behaviour, stability and decomposition pathways of the organo-LDH hybrids were studied by means of DSC, temperature scan FTIR and XRD, TG and TG-FTIR.

2.6.4.1 Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)

In Figure 2.15 the red dotted and solid black lines denote the neat fatty acid and intercalated LDHs respectively. The DSC scans of the organo-LDH show that the intercalation of the fatty acids results in a shift of the melting temperature to a higher temperature. The confinement of the fatty acids within the LDH layers prevents their premature melting. All the intercalated samples exhibit two or three endotherms, which may be attributed to the different phase transitions undergone by the bilayer intercalated LDH as the temperature increased. The multiple peaks could be an indication of mixed layers as already indicated in the EDS results, where the ratios of Mg to Al vary from platelet to platelet. Another contributing factor to the peaks observed is the water of hydration of the organo-LDH.

![Figure 2.15. DSC traces of neat fatty acids in red and LDH-fatty acids as a solid line: (a) myristate, (b) palmitate, (c) stearate and (d) behenate](image)

Figure 2.15. DSC traces of neat fatty acids in red and LDH-fatty acids as a solid line:
(a) myristate, (b) palmitate, (c) stearate and (d) behenate
The dominant peaks have been assigned to the melting of the interlayer anions. It is clear from the traces that there is a slight fatty acid impurity for the LDH-stearate and -behenate samples.

2.6.4.2 Temperature scan XRD and FTIR

Figure 2.16 shows the effect of temperature on the crystal structure. Generally, the fatty acid-intercalated LDH has the primary basal reflection shifting to higher \(2\theta\) values, indicating a reduction in the d-spacing. The first shift to lower \(2\theta\) values is due to the removal of interlayer water, accompanied by a reduction in the d-spacing of 0.3 nm (Pesic \textit{et al.}, 1994). At temperatures higher than 120 °C, another transition occurs, which is accompanied by the disappearance of the 2nd and 3rd reflections. The primary reflection either broadens progressively or disappears completely with increase in temperature; this is attributed to the organo-LDH becoming amorphous. The LDH-stearate exhibits reductions in the basal spacing from 4.98 to 4.26 to 2.92 nm at 25, 90 and 150 °C respectively. The last spacing is consistent with a monolayer arrangement. Similar transitions were observed in the LDH-palmitate with the changes in d-spacing being 4.46 to 4.05 to 2.76 nm at 25, 120 and 200 °C respectively. These transitions, however, were difficult to follow due to peak broadening and disappearance in the LDH-behenate. The LDH-myristate, however, showed an increase in the d-spacing; this deviation from the normal trend is still not fully understood. Dutta & Borja (1992), however, observed a similar phenomenon in myristate-intercalated Li-Mg LDH.
Figure 2.16. Temperature scan XRD of LDH-fatty acids

LDH-stearate was used to further illustrate the thermotropic behaviour of LDH-carboxylate. Figure 2.17 shows the effect of temperature on the peak position of the $\nu_{as}(\text{CH}_2)$ band in the FTIR spectra. Vaia et al. (1994) proposed that the wavenumber and width of the above-mentioned band are sensitive to the gauche trans conformer ratio and the packing density of the methylene chains. This band ranges from 2917 to 2929 cm$^{-1}$ for the methylene chains in the all-trans ordered state and when in a liquid-like environment respectively. It showed a shift from values observed for crystalline well-ordered chains (2916.8 cm$^{-1}$) to higher values of 2925 cm$^{-1}$. This is consistent with an increase in conformational disorder in the intercalated chains as the temperature increases. The intermediate wavenumber values (2924 cm$^{-1}$) obtained in our study suggest that the chains still retained a degree of order above the transition temperature, i.e. that they are not completely molten. The investigation also revealed a greater amount of disorder for short-chain fatty acids (laurate) as compared with longer stearate chains (Focke et al., 2010).
From Figure 2.17 it is clear that following the phase changes through temperature scan FTIR is a more sensitive method than following them through XRD. It is evident that the movement of intercalated anions begins at much lower temperatures (≈ 45 °C) as observed in FTIR, whereas in XRD the movement is clearly seen at a much higher temperatures (≈ 90 °C).

2.6.4.3 Decomposition pathway of organo-LDH

The decomposition pathways of LDH and its derivatives were followed by means of TGA (Figure 2.18). The organic content was also derived from these results. The calculation is based on the differences in mass observed at temperatures of 150 and 900 °C relative to the corresponding values for the LDH-CO$_3$ precursor. A detailed calculation for the degree of intercalation appears in Appendix B, along with the results of the other trials. Pristine LDH-CO$_3$ follows three distinct steps, i.e. dehydration, dehydroxylation and elimination of interlayer anions. The temperatures at which each of the individual events occur varies with different metal ion species and ratios (Ross & Kodama, 1967), intercalated anions (Xu & Zheng, 2001; Mascolo & Marino, 1982) and post-treatment of the LDH (Hussein et al., 2000). The different stages observed in this study fit well with the decomposition pathway of (Mg-Al)-LDH-CO$_3$ as proposed by Bera et al. (2000):
I \[ \text{Mg}_{(1-x)}\text{Al}_x(\text{OH})_2(\text{CO}_3^{2-})_{x/2} \cdot m\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Mg}_{(1-x)}\text{Al}_x(\text{OH})_2(\text{CO}_3^{2-})_{x/2} + m\text{H}_2\text{O} \uparrow \]

II \[ \text{Mg}_{(1-x)}\text{Al}_x(\text{OH})_2(\text{CO}_3^{2-})_{x/2} \rightarrow x/2\text{MgAl}_2\text{O}_4 + (1-\frac{3x}{2}) \text{MgO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \uparrow + \text{CO}_2 \uparrow \]

III \[ x/2\text{MgAl}_2\text{O}_4 + (1-\frac{3x}{2}) \text{MgO} \rightarrow \text{MgO} + \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \]

Figure 2.18. TG and DTG of the LDH-CO$_3$ indicating the different decomposition stages

The first event is usually assigned to the loss of physisorbed interlayer water. The onset of this step begins at about 50 °C and is perceived to be complete at 150 °C (Carlino & Hudson 1994; Kandare and Hossenlopp, 2006; Frost et al. 2003). The second step is due to a dehydroxylation process, immediately followed by an oxidative degradation of the carbonate anions within the interlayer, with the former occurring at about 280 °C and the latter above 450 °C.

The difference in mass loss between the LDH-CO$_3$ and the fatty acid modified LDH was used to calculate the percentage organic and the AEC level (Figure 2.19a). The percentages organic for each respective organo-LDH were as follows: 74, 73, 79 and 81% for LDH-myristate, -palmitate, -stearate and -behenate respectively. The modified LDHs appear to follow the same decomposition pattern as the pristine LDH-CO$_3$ (Figure 2.19b). It is evident
that the breakdown of the hydroxyl lattice and degradation of anions occurs at temperatures above 280 °C, well above polymer processing temperatures. Mass loss is effectively complete above 700 °C, leaving a residue of MgO and Al₂O₃. The water loss occurs at substantially lower temperatures than with the LDH-CO₃. However, the dehydroxylation process seems to occur simultaneously with the removal of anions (de-anionation). LDH-behenate showed a higher decomposition temperature peak and LDH-myristate the lowest.

![Figure 2.19. Thermogravimetric analysis: (a) % mass loss and (b) derivative mass loss of pristine and modified LDHs](image)

To confirm the decomposition pathway, evolved gas analysis was carried out by means of TG-FTIR (Figure 2.20). The water loss is, however, not detected by the FTIR. The regions that would exhibit water peaks (3700–3400 cm⁻¹) are characterised by noise-like signals on the spectra. Decomposition of the LDH-stearate begins at about 268 °C. Methylene groups

![Figure 2.20. Evolved gas analysis for LDH-stearate](image)
(2943 cm$^{-1}$) and CO$_2$ asymmetric stretching (2385–2303 cm$^{-1}$) are detected, but the intensities of the peaks are weak. At 410 °C the peak intensities are relatively larger and were distinguished as follows: alkyl groups CH-symmetric and asymmetric stretching (2943 cm$^{-1}$), 2385–2303 cm$^{-1}$; 2193 and 2162 cm$^{-1}$ peaks are assigned to CO vibrations; 1743 cm$^{-1}$ was attributed to carboxylic acid groups C=O stretching vibration; and CH bending vibrations are picked up at 1412 cm$^{-1}$. The carbonyl species are identified in the range of 1545–882 cm$^{-1}$ by a very broad peak. At around 535 °C only a CO$_2$ peak was present.

**Table 2.5. Summary of thermogravimetric data and estimates for the degree of intercalation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample identity</th>
<th>Residual mass loss (%) at 150 °C</th>
<th>Residual mass loss (%) at 900 °C</th>
<th>Carboxylate:Al mol ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>98.10</td>
<td>57.68</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate</td>
<td>96.88</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate</td>
<td>95.73</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate</td>
<td>95.40</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-behenate</td>
<td>96.04</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The thermogravimetric data and estimates of the degree of carboxylate intercalation are summarised in Table 2.5. Nhlapo et al. (2008) calculated the theoretical possible amount to be 2.39 times the AEC for close-packed carboxylate chains. It is evident that intercalation occurs at higher than the AEC expected for LDHs, implying that the excess exists as un-ionised fatty acids. It is worth noting that the TGA data indicates variable levels of intercalation amongst the different batches prepared in this study (compare Tables 2.5, 2.6, B6 and B7). This could be explained by changes in the pH during modification due to the evaporation of ammonia and inadequate/too many washes.

A complete conversion of the LDH-CO$_3$ precursor to magnesium distearate and aluminium tristearate would result in an apparent degree of intercalation of 6.93. The magnesium/aluminium stearate sample was synthesised in order to explore this possibility. Figure 2.21 compares the XRD diffractograms of this product with those of the two precursors. It clearly shows that heating these two stearates together results in a new product with a larger d-spacing. The TGA data shown in Table 2.6 indicate that there was a net loss of stearic acid. There is also an indication that not all of the aluminium stearate was converted. Furthermore, it is clear that the product is not a simple LDH-stearate but rather a
mixed magnesium/aluminium stearate with a d-spacing that is very similar to that of bilayer-intercalated LDH. This experiment confirms that such a compound can form through partial hydrolysis of the metal stearates. It is therefore conceivable that LDH-stearates that have an exceptionally high AEC and may contain mixed layers of such a product, as well as the conventional LDH-stearate. The EDS analysis (Figure 2.9) of the LDH-palmitate with an AEC of 2.24 shows areas that have the correct Mg:Al ratios, as well as some platelets that are either Mg-rich or Al-rich.

**Table 2.6.** Summary of XRD and TGA results for the LDH-CO$_3$, LDH-stearates and magnesium stearate and aluminium stearate samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>d-spacing (nm)</th>
<th>TG residue* (wt%)</th>
<th>Intercalation** (multiples of AEC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-CO$_3$ + Tween 60</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium/aluminium stearate</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium stearate</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>(5.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium stearate</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>(5.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mass loss at 700 °C relative to the mass loss at 150 °C

**Apparent degree of stearate intercalation expressed as multiples of AEC, assuming that the basis is an LDH clay

**Figure 2.21.** X-ray diffractograms for magnesium stearate, aluminium stearate and magnesium/aluminium stearate prepared by heating an aqueous suspension of the former two reagents in the presence of Tween 60
2.7 CONCLUSIONS

The carboxylate intercalated LDHs were successfully obtained from direct ion exchange of the fatty acid with the interlayer carbonate. The method employed is reproducible with respect to a bilayer intercalated product. It is evident from the FTIR results and the high AEC of intercalated fatty acids that in bilayers orientation will always co-intercalate the carboxylates, as well as the free fatty acid molecules. The incorporation of excess fatty acids is envisaged to be driven by hydrophobic interactions. The presence of the free fatty acids facilitates dense packing, improving the van der Waals interaction between the chains and giving better charge shielding of the same-charge surfactant head group. The high degree of chain order leads to more efficient packing and increased cohesive van der Waals interaction between chains and, ultimately, to a greater interlayer solid-like character as observed in FTIR analysis.

The fatty acid-intercalated LDHs showed structural changes as a function of temperature. They undergo melt-like transitions at elevated temperatures. Above the melting point they assume a liquid-crystalline ‘rotator’ state owing to the localisation of the ionised head group and the two-dimensional confinement imposed by the planar clay sheets. Hence, this event is followed by a reduction in the d-spacing. At higher temperatures the LDH-fatty acid-based materials become XRD-amorphous: basal reflections disappear or become very broad. The LDH-stearate and -palmitate clearly showed a reduction in d-spacing, where the bilayer arrangement collapses to a monolayer.

The study also revealed that various intercalation products can be obtained from the one-pot synthesis as shown by the EDS results. Platelets with different Mg/Al ratios were observed specifically in the well-crystallised LDH-palmitate. This is an indication that the method employed entailed dissolution and recrystallisation of the pristine LDH and organo-LDH respectively. It is further substantiated by changes in the platelet morphology (from subhedral to rhombohedral-shaped platelets) and size. The unusually high AEC values obtained for some of the fatty acid-intercalated LDHs are attributed to the formation of Mg- and Al-rich platelets.
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Chapter 3

Properties of LDH/polymer micro- and nanocomposites

Carbonate- and stearate-intercalated layered double hydroxides were used as fillers to prepare polymer micro- and nanocomposites respectively. The stearate-modified LDH starting material was a bilayer intercalated clay. During melt compounding, excess stearates were released and the clay reverted to a monolayer-intercalated form. The exuded stearate acted as a lubricant, lowering the melt viscosity of the poly(ethylene-co-vinyl acetate) and linear low-density polyethylene matrices. Strong hydrogen bond interactions between the chains of poly(ethylene-co-vinyl alcohol) and the clay platelet surfaces overwhelmed the lubrication effect and caused an increase in the melt viscosity of this matrix. The notched Charpy impact strength of this composite was almost double that of the neat polymer. It appears that this can be attributed to the ability of the highly dispersed and randomly oriented nanosized clay platelets to promote extensive internal microcavitation during impact loading. The creation of a large internal surface area provided the requisite energy-dissipation mechanism.
3 PROPERTIES OF LDH/POLYMER AND NANOCOMPOSITES

3.1 POLYMER COMPOSITES

Polymer composites have attracted attention due to their unique structure and enhanced properties. IUPAC defines a composite as “a multicomponent material comprising multiple different (non-gaseous) phase domains in which at least one type of phase is a continuous phase” according to specifications (Work et al., 2004). A nanocomposite refers to every type of composite materials having one of the components in the nanometre size range at least in one dimension. Manias et al., (2007) defined a nanocomposite as a “fundamentally new material (hybrid) in which the nanometre scale component/structure gives rise to intrinsically new properties not present in the respective macroscopic composites or pure components”. New properties are envisaged to originate from the interaction of the polymer and filler at the interface. A polymer composite is made of three constituents, i.e. the matrix, the filler (LDH in this study) and the interfacial region. The interfacial region is a ‘communication bridge’ between the filler and matrix and is conventionally ascribed properties different from those of the bulk matrix because of its proximity to the surface of the filler (Vaia & Wagner, 2004). These authors further expound it in terms of the radius of gyration of the matrix (Rg), which is the key spatial parameter to which the majority of the polymer’s static and dynamic properties can be ultimately related and has a value in a few tens of nanometres. How then do nanocomposites differ from conventional composites? Vaia and Wagner (2004) cited six interrelated distinguishing qualities of polymer nanocomposites:

- Low percolation threshold (~0.1–2 vol %)
- Particle-particle correlation (orientation and position) arising at low volume fraction (φc < 0.001)
- Large number density of particles per particle volume (10^6–10^8 particles/µm³)
- Extensive interfacial area per volume of particles (10^3–10^4 m²/mL)
- Short distances between particles (10–50 nm at φ ~ 1–8 vol %)
- Comparable size scales among the rigid nanoparticle inclusions, distance between particles and the relaxation volume of polymer chains.

Due to the small aspect ratio of spherical particles, the first two points do not apply to them.
Additive/filler materials are used to reduce costs or enhance properties such as tensile strength and modulus of polymer matrices (Hancock, 1995). Different types of filler are used to obtain polymer nanocomposites based on dimensionality/geometry. These include zero-dimensional nanoparticles (inorganic nanoparticles), one-dimensional nanoparticles (carbon nanotubes), two-dimensional nanoparticles (clays and LDHs), and three-dimensional nanoparticles (polyhedral oligomeric silsesquioxanes). The filler employed in this study falls under the two-dimensional category. Table 3.1 is a summary of other nanostructured layered materials that can be used as additives in polymer matrices. The two-dimensional platelet fillers lead to a lamellar microstructure. Hence the polymer composites have found application for their barrier properties such as reduced gas and vapour permeability. Depending on the aspect ratio of the platelets, they may be used to improve mechanical properties.

Table 3.1. Layered nanostructured materials for potential use in polymer composites
(Adapted from Utracki et al., 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clay type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllosilicates</td>
<td>Montmorillonite (MMT), bentonite (BT), hectorite, talc, vermiculite, micas, illite, attapulgite, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layered silicic acid</td>
<td>Kanemite, layered organosilicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral layered hydroxides</td>
<td>Brucite [Mg(OH)₂], gibbsite [Al(OH)₃]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layered double hydroxides (LDHs)</td>
<td>[M²⁺(1−x)M³⁺x(OH)₂]⁺⁺(Aⁿ⁻/2)mH₂O, e.g. Mg₆Al₃.₆(OH)₁₈.₈(CO₃)₁.₇H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layered aluminophosphates</td>
<td>Berlinite (AlPO), vantasselite [Al₆(PO₄)₃(OH)₉H₂O]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M⁺⁺ phosphates and phosphonates</td>
<td>M⁺⁺= Ti, Zr, or Sn, e.g. α-form: Zr(HPO₄)₂H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorides</td>
<td>FeCl₃, FeOCl, CdI₂, CdCl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalcogenides</td>
<td>TiS₂, (PbS)₁.₁₈(TiS₂)₂, MoS₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyanides</td>
<td>Ni(CN)₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxides</td>
<td>H₂Si₂O₅, graphite oxide, V₆O₁₃, HTiNbO₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Graphite, boron nitride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pioneering work done by Toyota into clay-based polymer nanocomposites increased interest and research into clay-based polymer composites, dating back to 1986 (Kawasumi,
Research has focused mostly on smectite-based polymer composites. Anionic clays such as layered double hydroxides (LDHs) are a potential alternative for the preparation of polymer composites. This can be achieved since LDHs possess a layered structure similar to that of layered silicates or cationic clays. It is well established that the dispersion of particles with high aspect ratios, e.g. fibres and platelets, in polymeric matrices improves the mechanical properties. However, good interfacial adhesion and a homogeneous dispersion are prerequisites (Pradhan et al., 2008). Nanostructured clays can improve a wide range of polymer properties and are therefore ideal for polymer-clay nanocomposite preparations. The resulting polymeric hybrids exhibit improved gas barrier properties, mechanical properties (Hsuesh & Chen, 2003; Wang et al., 2006), enhanced flame retardancy (Zammarano et al., 2005; Costa et al., 2005; Chen & Qu, 2003 & 2004; Zubitur et al., 2009), UV and photo-stability (Bocchini et al., 2008) or ease of photo prodegradability (Magagula et al., 2009), etc.

3.2 POLYMER COMPOSITE STRUCTURES

Organoclay dispersion within a polymer matrix gives rise to three possible structures, i.e. phase separated, intercalated and/or delaminated/exfoliated composites, as shown in Figure 3.1. These structures are usually probed by two complementary techniques, namely X-ray diffraction (XRD) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). The former gives the degree of separation and the latter serves as a visual confirmation of the XRD analysis.

3.2.1 Phase separated composites

Phase separation results from the polymer chains failing to penetrate the interlayer space of the layered material. The composite retains the same properties as conventional microcomposites. Hence the d-spacing remains the same as that of the clay.

3.2.2 Intercalated composites

In these composites the polymer chain(s) is intercalated within the interlayer of the LDH. They normally exhibit a well-ordered morphology with alternating inorganic and polymeric layers or periodically stacked layers. The composite is made of alternating polymer and inorganic layers. The resulting clay-polymer hybrid exhibits increased d-spacing.
### 3.2.3 Exfoliation/delamination composites

This structure describes a case where the LDH layers are completely and uniformly dispersed in a polymer matrix. It is identified by the absence of diffraction peaks or basal reflection. This observation is thought to be due to a large increase in the layer separation > 8 nm or lack of ordering or registry (Alexandre & Dubois, 2000). In some instances intercalated and exfoliated structures may co-exist; this is illustrated by the broadening of primary diffraction peaks. To eliminate ambiguous conclusions, TEM is normally used to confirm the results obtained from XRD. Some studies report the exfoliation of surfactant-intercalated LDHs (Leroux et al., 2001; Khan and O’Hare, 2002; Fischer, 2003). In general, a higher degree of exfoliationdispersion of LDHs has been observed in polar rather than in non-polar matrices. The preparation of polymer composites from polyolefins is difficult due to their low polarity. Hence they do not interact effectively with the LDHs. Dispersion of LDHs in non-polar matrices through melt compounding has been explored using maleic anhydride grafted polyethylene (PE-g-MA) as a compatibiliser (Costa et al., 2005). It is important to note that full exfoliation and full intercalation are seldom observed in nanocomposites.

![Diagram of polymer composite structures](image)

**Figure 3.1.** Polymer composite structures
The structures that arise are related to the types of interfacial interaction that are favoured between the polymer and the clay. Vaia and Giannelis (1997) proposed three main clay-polymer interactions: polymer-surface, polymer-surfactant and surfactant-surface. They concluded that to achieve complete clay sheet dispersion, a very favourable polymer-surface interaction was necessary (Vaia and Giannelis 1997; Fischer 2003). Therefore the properties displayed by the polymer composite result from these associations.

3.3 LDH-BASED POLYMER COMPOSITE PREPARATION

Polymer-clay composites are mainly prepared in three ways, namely in situ polymerisation (Moujahid et al., 2002; Lee & Im, 2007; Huang et al., 2011), solution-intercalation methods (Ramaraj et al., 2010) and melt-processing (Zammarano et al., 2006).

3.3.1 In situ polymerisation

This is the first and most widely used mode of preparation of clay-based nanocomposites. It has been adopted for the preparation of LDH-based nanocomposites. It combines the basic principles of intercalation of LDHs, namely co-precipitation, regeneration and intercalation via organic/inorganic pillared LDHs (ion exchange), as shown in Figure 3.2. In the case of pillared LDHs, the pillaring agent is chemically active and hence interacts with the polymer chain (Hseuh & Chen, 2003). Usually, the first step entails the intercalation of the monomers/ionomers into the LDH. Polymerisation is initiated by thermal or radiation treatment and is also facilitated by organic initiator and catalyst (Whilton et al., 1997). Recently, polymerisation has been reported to be initiated by microwave irradiation (Herreo et al., 2011). This type of polymerisation makes thermosetting polymer-nanocomposites possible, e.g. epoxy-organoclay nanocomposites.
Figure 3.2. Schematic pathways of in situ polymerisation within the LDH layers in the preparation of polymer/LDH nanocomposites (Adapted from Costa et al., 2008)

However, in-situ polymerisation has two limitations. Firstly, there is the distance between the monomers when they are strongly anchored to the host matrix. Secondly, there is the condition that when polymerisation takes place (temperature, pH or redox reaction), it must leave the layered structure intact. This method has been employed with success in the preparation of the LDH-based nanocomposites listed in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2. Summary of in situ polymerisation in LDH-based nanocomposites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDH</th>
<th>Monomer</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Dimethyl terephthalate</td>
<td>Ethylene glycol catalyst</td>
<td>Cui et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-Al</td>
<td>Amino benzoic acid (different isomers)</td>
<td>Ion exchange</td>
<td>Isupov et al., 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn-Al</td>
<td>Vinyl benzene sulphonate</td>
<td>Co-precipitation</td>
<td>Moujahid et al., 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Aspartate</td>
<td>Co-precipitation</td>
<td>Whilton et al., 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca-Al</td>
<td>Styrene-4-sulphonate</td>
<td>Co-precipitation</td>
<td>Vieille et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn-Al</td>
<td>Styrene sulphonate</td>
<td>Co-precipitation</td>
<td>Vieille et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Methyl methacrylate (MMA)</td>
<td>Via 10-undecenoate pillared LDH, Catalyst (2,2'-azobisisobutyronitrile) used to prepolymerise MMA</td>
<td>Wang et al., 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Cr</td>
<td>Analine</td>
<td>Via terephthalate or hexacyanoferate pillared LDH</td>
<td>Challier &amp; Slade, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Al</td>
<td>Acrylate</td>
<td>Via dodecylsulphate pillared LDH</td>
<td>O’Leary et al., 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Solution intercalation

Solution intercalation is also referred to as solution blending and solution casting. This particular method entails the solubilisation of the polymer resin in an organic solvent. The solvents employed include toluene, chloroform, acetonitrile, xylene and dimethylacetamide. The mixed metal aqueous salts may be precipitated into the former solution. In other cases organo-modified LDHs are added to the polymer solution. Chen et al. (2003, 2004) synthesised the same polymer composite using the solution intercalation synthesis method. The organo-LDH was added to a solution of PE-g-MA in xylene and the mixture was refluxed in nitrogen for 24 h. The polymers used in this method are normally water soluble, such as PEO, poly(vinyl alcohol) and poly(vinyl pyrrolidone). Table 3.3 provides a summary of a few selected solution intercalation formulations.
Table 3.3. Summary of solution intercalation in LDH-based nanocomposites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDH</th>
<th>Polymer</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>PE-g-MA</td>
<td>Xylene</td>
<td>Chen <em>et al.</em>, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn-Al</td>
<td>LLDPE</td>
<td>Xylene</td>
<td>Chen <em>et al.</em>, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Poly(styrene-co-methylstyrene) grafted polyaniline</td>
<td>Xylene</td>
<td>Abbasian, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn-Al</td>
<td>PVA</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Marangoni <em>et al.</em>, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Silicone rubber</td>
<td>Chloroform</td>
<td>Pradhan <em>et al.</em>, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>PVA</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Ramaraj <em>et al.</em>, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Polyurethane</td>
<td>Tetrahydrofuran (THF)</td>
<td>Kotal <em>et al.</em>, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Poly(propylene carbonate)</td>
<td>Cyclohexanone</td>
<td>Du <em>et al.</em>, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Poly(vinyl chloride)</td>
<td>THF</td>
<td>Liu <em>et al.</em>, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Ethylene vinyl acetate</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>Kuila <em>et al.</em>, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Ethylene propylene diene terpolymer</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>Achyra <em>et al.</em>, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the use of organic solvents makes the method environmentally unfriendly and they are not easily removed. In some cases small solvent particles intercalate into the clay gallery rather than the polymer.

### 3.3.3 Melt processing

This method has been considered to be most challenging, yet it can be easily adopted for industrial product manufacture. It involves the incorporation of the filler into a molten polymer through extrusion, kneading and, to a lesser extent, injection moulding (Manias *et al.*, 2007). In addition to the thermodynamic driving force for filler dispersion, mechanical shear has kinetic contributions. A high degree of dispersion is obtained, depending on the processing conditions and the polarity/affinity of the polymer to the organoclay. Good exfoliated structures have been reported as a result of adequate mean residence time, viscosity of the matrix and shear rate (Cho & Paul, 2001). This method is environmentally friendly and economically advantageous due to the absence of solvents and is a cost-
effective way to prepare samples in large quantities. It has been successfully employed by the researchers cited in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4. Summary of melt-processing examples in LDH based nanocomposites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDH</th>
<th>Organic modifier</th>
<th>Polymer</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Dodecylbenzene sulphonate (DBS)</td>
<td>Poly(p-dioxanone)</td>
<td>Zubitur et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Lauric acid</td>
<td>Poly(L-lactic acid)</td>
<td>Katyar et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Dodecyl sulphate</td>
<td>LLDPE</td>
<td>Costa et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Dodecyl sulphate Dodecyl benzene sulphonate Octyl sulphate</td>
<td>PET</td>
<td>Lee et al., 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn-Al</td>
<td>Dodecyl sulphate</td>
<td>Polylactic acid</td>
<td>Wang et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg/Al</td>
<td>Stearic acid</td>
<td>Poly(vinyl) chloride</td>
<td>Chen, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Dodecyl benzene sulphonate</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
<td>Wang et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Dodecyl benzene sulphonate</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
<td>Coiai et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>2-ethyhexyl sulphate Dodecyl sulphate Eicosyl sulphate</td>
<td>LDPE</td>
<td>Muksing et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Dodecyl sulphate</td>
<td>Nylon 6 (polycaprolactam)</td>
<td>Du et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-Al</td>
<td>Dodecyl sulphate</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
<td>Lonkar et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the non-polar matrices, such as polyethylene and polypropylene matrices, compatibilisers such as polyethylene grafted maleic anhydride (PE-g-MA) are used to improve the compatibility between the clay and the polymer.

Other methods used in the preparation of polymer nanocomposites, though used to a lesser extent, include co-vulcanisation (Okada & Usuki, 1995), solid state intercalation (Gao et al.,
2001) and sol-gel methods (Carrado & Xu, 1999). Vaysse et al. (2003) combined chimie douche and redox exchange for the preparation of monomeric intercalated LDH, followed by its in situ polymerisation, resulting in a polyacrylate-intercalated composite.

3.4 PROPERTIES OF LDH-BASED POLYMER NANOCOMPOSITES

**Figure 3.3.** Characterisation of LDH-based polymer composites
Figure 3.3 shows a wide variety of characterisation techniques available for the analysis of the properties of polymer nanocomposites. These include X-ray diffraction (XRD), transmission electron microscopy (TEM), scanning electron microscopy (SEM), atomic force microscopy (AFM), thermogravimetric analysis (TGA). Mechanical properties are probed by tensile testing, impact testing and dynamic mechanical analysis (DMA). Chemical changes in the polymer composite matrix are examined through rheology, infrared and UV spectroscopy, gel permeation chromatography, etc. The properties discussed in the following sections are those that were also investigated in this study.

3.4.1 Physical properties

3.4.1.1 Morphology

Among the previously mentioned characterisation techniques, XRD and TEM are the most frequently used for the determination of the composite structure and degree of dispersion. The increase in the d-spacing has been explained as an indication of successful intercalation of the polymer, whereas its loss is evidence of an exfoliated structure. In this context, most researchers publish work on LDH-based nanocomposites as either intercalated or exfoliated. However, the loss of the primary reflection can be easily misinterpreted as exfoliation yet technical errors, such as a low starting angle, misalignment of sample holder, wrong slit setting or orientation, or the resolution limitations of XRD apparatus (i.e. $2\theta < 2$), will give similar results (Chen & Qu, 2004). In other cases, the disappearance of the primary peak could also be a result of a very low filler loading and crystal defects caused by processing. TEM allows a qualitative understanding of the internal structure and the spatial distribution of various phases, and direct visualisation of the defect structure (Ray & Okamoto, 2003).

Compatibility studies of LDHs with polypropylene (PP), polystyrene (PS), polyethylene (PE) and poly(methyl-methacrylate) (PMMA) were carried out by Nyambo et al. (2009.) Good dispersion and nanocomposite formation was obtained from the LDH/PMMA composite. Complete exfoliation in polystyrene/ZnAl LDH composite (derived from solution intercalation) was achieved by decreasing the LDH content, extending the reflux time and employing rapid precipitation (Qui et al., 2005). It is clear from the above that the success of preparing a well-dispersed polymer composite depends on the polarity of the polymer and the chemistry of the filler. In the preparation of LDH-based nanocomposites in
non-polar matrices, maleic anhydride grafted polyethylene is normally employed to improve the compatibility of the LDH with the matrix (Costa et al., 2006).

### 3.4.1.2 Thermal behaviour

LDH-based polymer composites have been studied particularly for improving the thermal stability of the matrix. The mechanism by which LDHs achieve this is in the same manner as traditional metal hydroxide fillers. LDHs contain bound water, interlayer free water and OH-groups on the metal hydroxide lattice. The decomposition of LDHs is endothermic and releases water vapour, which reduces the amount of combustible volatiles at the surface of the polymer (Costa et al., 2007). The incorporation of LDHs improved the thermal stability of the polymer, but the degradation mechanism remained the same (Zubitur et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2009; Nyambo et al., 2008). Low LDH loading also gave improved thermal stability; this is explained by the nanoscale dispersion. Other factors that affect thermal stability include the intrinsic thermal resistance of the polymer matrix, the nanofiller content, the chemical constitution of the organic modifier, the chemical character of the polar compatibiliser, and lastly access of oxygen to composite material during heating. However, the thermal stability of LDH-based nanocomposites was not improved in all cases. Chiang and co-workers (2011) found deterioration of the thermal stability of poly(L-lactide) (PLLA)/layered double hydroxide composites. They attributed this anomaly to the LDH derivative used (P-LDH) which was considered to accelerate thermal decomposition of the polymer. Thermal behaviour is particularly linked with flame retardation studies in LDH-based polymer composites. A number of researchers have embarked on research into the flame-retardant properties of LDHs in their polymer composites (Costache and Wang, 2006; Jaio et al., 2006; Nyambo et al., 2008). This is important since most flame retardants are halogen-based and these tend to be corrosive and toxic. Hence LDHs are more environmentally friendly alternatives.

Thermal behaviour may also be studied by DSC to follow changes in the melting and crystallisation in the composite matrix. The technique measures temperatures and heatflows associated with transitions in the materials as a function of time and temperature in a controlled atmosphere. The fundamental equation for DSC heatflow is give below, under the assumption that work and mass loss are equal to zero:

\[ q = -\Delta H \frac{dT}{dt} \]
\[ \Delta H = C_p \Delta T \quad [3] \]

In differential form it is represented as:

\[ \frac{dH}{dt} = C_p \frac{dT}{dt} \quad [4] \]

where:

- \( C_p \) = *specific heat capacity (J/g°C)*
- \( T \) = *temperature (°C)*
- \( H \) = *heat (J)*
- \( \frac{dH}{dt} \) = *heat flow (J/min)*
- \( \frac{dT}{dt} \) = *heating rate (°C/min)*

Crystallinity is calculated as:

\[ C = \frac{\Delta H}{\Delta H100\%} \times 100\% \quad [5] \]

where

- \( C \) = *crystallinity (%)*
- \( \Delta H \) = *heat of fusion (J/g)*
- \( \Delta H100\% \) = *heat of fusion of 100% crystalline polymer*

The crystallisation of a polymer is governed by polymer molecules having adequate regular structure and mobility; the temperature should be \( T_g < T < T_m \), presence of a nuclei and the rate of crystallisation to be sufficiently high (Utracki 2004). Crystallisation is either homogeneous or heterogeneous; the former occurs when the polymer molecules self-assemble into an ordered state, while in the latter molecules assemble on the surface of a foreign body. In the case of LDH-based composites, LDHs act as heterogeneous nucleation sites. The crystallisation behaviour of LDH-based polymer composites was studied by Ramaraj et al. (2010). The LDH particles were found to have a nucleating effect in the polymer matrix.
3.4.2 Mechanical properties

Mechanical properties are investigated by tensile and impact testing, and by dynamic mechanical analysis. The reinforcing property of organoclay in polymer composites depends on the aspect ratio of the fillers, the particle size and distribution, its degree of dispersion and orientation in the matrix, the porosity of the composite and the adhesion at the filler-matrix interface (Cho & Paul 2001; Verbeek & Focke, 2002). The micromechanics of tensile testing of laminated composite materials are represented in a simple mathematical model in which the tensile modulus is described in terms of isostrain and isostress, as illustrated in Figure 3.4. The elastic properties of the composite depend on the orientation of the filler to the applied stress. The effective moduli when the layers are in parallel or in series yield the Voight and Ruess moduli respectively (Ward & Hadley, 1993).

An isostrain condition applies when the strain is the same in all composite layers. Hence maximum stiffness is achieved when the stress is applied parallel to the layers. An isostress condition applies when the layers are orientated transverse to the applied stress and each layer is subjected to the same force. This is under the assumption that the area remains constant through the stack and the stress is the same in all the layers. The effective Young’s moduli are given by the equations below (Verbeek & Focke, 2002):

\[
\text{Isostrain: } E_c = E_m v_f + E_p v_p \tag{6}
\]

\[
\text{Isostress: } 1/E_c = v_f/E_m + v_p/E_p \tag{7}
\]

where

\(E_c\) = the tensile modulus of the composite
\(E_p\) = the tensile modulus of the polymer
\(E_m\) = tensile modulus of the filler

\(v_p\) and \(v_f\) = volume fraction associated with zero porosity of the polymer and filler respectively.
The particles are assumed to adhere perfectly to the matrix. Several empirical modifications to the model have been made by Nicolais & Narkis; Kerner, Faber & Farris; and Nielson, Haplin-Tsai to mention a few (cited in Utracki, 2004).

Camino et al. (2001) found that tensile tests indicate that as far as the elongation to break and ultimate strength are concerned, the LDH system behaves similarly to other fillers. Lonkar et al. (2012) prepared PP/LDH nanocomposites using PP-g-MAH as a compatibiliser. The specimens showed an increase in modulus and tensile strength parameters, which is an indication of the reinforcing property of LDHs. However, they found that the impact strength and elongation at break steadily decrease with increase of the organo-LDH content.

The incorporation of fillers in the polymer matrix results in a heterogeneous system. When an external load is applied, these particles act as stress concentrators and the magnitude is dependent on the geometry of the particles (Zuiderduin et al., 2003). Rigid fillers to be used as polymer-toughening agents must meet the following prerequisites as given by Zuiderduin et al. (2003):

- The particles should be small in size (less than 5 µm). These provide a stable free volume, whereas larger particles act as initiation sites for fracture.
- The aspect ratio must be close to unity to avoid high stress concentrations.

---

**Figure 3.4.** Mixing rule conditions for layered composites (Adapted from Verbeek & Focke, 2002)
The particles must debond prior to the yield strain of the polymer matrix in order to allow the stress state of the matrix material to change.

The particle must be dispersed homogeneously in the polymer matrix; aggregation should be avoided.

Polymer-toughening modifiers alter the stress state in the material around the particles and induce extensive plastic deformation, e.g. multiple crazing (see Figure 3.5), shear banding (see Figure 3.6), crazing with shear yielding, rubber particle stretching or tearing, and debonding at the inorganic filler particles (Kim et al., 1998). These deformations constitute a range of different energy-absorption mechanisms, hence preventing premature fracture.

Crazes are stabilised stress cracks whose separation surfaces are bridged by stretched fibrils and films (see Figure 3.5). A typical fibril diameter is 0.01–0.1 μm. A craze differs from a crack in that it continues to support a load. Craze propagation absorbs fracture energy and effectively increases the toughness of a polymer. It is typically identified by whitening of the crazed region. The white colour is caused by light scattering. Necking of tensile test specimens is not observed in a crazing scenario. However, it is observed in shear banding. The typical size of a craze is approximately 0.5 μm.

Figure 3.5. Craze yielding (Adapted from MIT Open Course Ware, 2009)
Figure 3.6. Shear banding (Adapted from MIT Open Course Ware, 2009)

Figure 3.7. Polymer-toughening mechanism with rigid particles (Kim et al., 1998)
(Figure adapted from Zuiderduin et al., 2003)

Figure 3.7. shows a polymer-toughening mechanism proposed by Kim et al. (1998). The filler is required to debond, hence creating free volume at a sub-micron level, which is a cavitation mechanism similar to that found in rubber-toughened matrices. The figure depicts the following:
I. **Stress concentration** – The modifier act as stress concentrators, because they have different elastic properties from those of the polymer matrix.

II. **Debonding** – Stress concentration gives rise to a build up of triaxial stress around the filler particles and leads to debonding at the particle-polymer interface.

III. **Shear yielding** – The voids caused by debonding alter the stress in the polymer matrix surrounding the voids. This reduces sensitivity towards crazing since volume strain is released. The shear yielding mechanism becomes operative and the material is able to absorb large quantities of energy upon fracture.

Generally, very few works of literature site mechanical property improvement for LDH-based polymer composites (Lonkar *et al.*, 2012).

Various investigations have demonstrated the thermotropic behaviour of the interlayer anions in surfactant-intercalated LDHs (Nhlapo *et al.*, 2008; Focke *et al.*, 2010). Nhlapo *et al.* (2008) showed that fatty acid-intercalated LDH that was beyond the AEC levels appeared to melt partially without reforming, below polymer processing temperature (120 °C). Globular residues were observed, giving a façade of a completely molten LDH-stearate. However, this was attributed to the exuded stearate anions which formed a droplet on the remaining LDH-stearate platelet. The transudation of the interlayer anions in bilayer intercalated LDHs is envisaged to include stages of removal of interlayer water and excess anions, giving a monolayer orientated residue. The study by Nhlapo *et al.* (2008) suggested that the LDH-fatty acid dispersion in polymer matrices would not result in ordinary exfoliation or delamination. It was therefore of interest to explore this anomaly further with regard to the effect of the exuded anions on the matrix and the utility of LDHs as functional fillers. Hence in the present investigation both the unmodified LDH-carbonate (LDH-CO$_3$) and the modified LDH-stearate (LDH-St) were compounded into polyethylene copolymers of differing polarities.

The polymers of choice were poly(ethylene)-co-vinyl alcohol (EVAL), poly(ethylene)-co-vinyl acetate (EVA) and linear low-density polyethylene (LLDPE). EVAL is widely used in the packaging of foods and non-foods because of its excellent gas- and flavour-barrier properties. EVAL is a crystalline random copolymer of ethylene and vinyl alcohol with the molecular formula represented by the structure (EVAL EUROPE Product Sheet):
EVA is a copolymer of ethylene and vinyl acetate. It has applications in packaging (cling wrap), electrical insulation, hot-melt adhesives, foam rubber and biomedical engineering (drug delivery). Its molecular formula is:

\[
\left[\text{CH}_2\text{--CH}_2\right]_n \left[\text{CH}--\text{CH}_3\right]_m
\]

LLDPE is a copolymer of ethylene which has a short-branched hydrocarbon chain. Like the other polymers used in the study, it finds application mainly in the packaging industry and flexible tubing. Its formula is:

\[
\left[\text{CH}_2\text{--CH}_2\right]_n \left[\text{CH}_2--\text{CH}_2\right]_m
\]

In this study a combination of complementary techniques was employed to investigate the structure-property relationship of the composites obtained there.
3.5 EXPERIMENTAL

3.5.1 Materials

The 1-hexene random copolymer-based linear low density polyethylene (LLDPE) was supplied by Sasol Polymers (South Africa) rotomolding grade HR411 (density 0.939 g cm\(^{-3}\)). Poly(ethylene-co-vinyl acetate) (EVA) grade EV101 (density 0.941 g cm\(^{-3}\)) containing 18 mol % vinyl acetate was supplied by Asia Polymer Corporation, Taiwan. Poly(ethylene-co-vinyl alcohol) (EVAL) grade T101B (density 1.17 g cm\(^{-3}\)) containing 68 mol % vinyl alcohol was obtained from Kuraray, Belgium. The melt flow index (MFI) values measured at 190 °C/2.16 kg in units of g/10 min were 3.5, 1.8 and 1.7 for the LLDPE, EVA and EVAL respectively. The materials required for the modification of LDH have been described in Chapter 2.

3.5.2 Preparation of LDH-stearate

A detailed experimental procedure was described in Section 2.5.2 for the intercalation of stearic acid into LDH. The results of the repeat experiments are shown in Appendix B.

3.5.3 Preparation of polymer/LDH-St

The polymer composites in the study were prepared with both pristine and modified LDHs. The constitutive proportions of the LDHs in the composites prepared were 5 and 10 by wt% of organoclay. The polymer/LDH composites were prepared by the melt-compounding process in a TX28P co-rotating twin screw extruder, with a screw diameter of 28 mm with an L/D ratio of 18. The temperature profile from the feed to the die of the extruder was between 100 and 220 °C. An average screw speed of about 170 rpm was used. The extruded polymer and polymer composite strands were water-cooled as they came out of the die. The extrudents were granulated and left to dry overnight at 60 °C. A portion of each sample was used to injection mould dumbbells for the tensile tests. Injection moulding was carried out on an Engel injection moulding machine. The set temperature for zones 1/2/3 and nozzle were 200/210/220/220 °C for LLDPE and EVAL composites and 140/150/160/170 °C for the EVA composites respectively.
3.5.4 Characterisation

Imaging of fractured surfaces was carried out in a JEOL 5400 SEM and in a JEOL 5400 SEM. The polymer composite samples were fractured after they had been placed in liquid nitrogen. The composites were mounted on the sample holder and coated five times with gold under argon gas using the SEM autocoating unit E5200 (Polaron equipment Ltd).

The degree of dispersion was studied by use of transmission electron microscopy (TEM). Analysis was carried out on a JEOL 2100F, at an accelerated voltage of 200 kV. The samples were prepared by means of cryo-ultramicrotomy in a Leica-Riechert Ultracut R with EMFCS cryo-attachment, with a nominal thickness of 90 ± 10 nm, and sliced at -80 °C using a diamond knife. Each section was then mounted on a 300 mesh copper/palladium grid and viewed.

Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) was conducted on a Mettler Toledo A851 TGA/SDTA machine. A small piece of sample (ca. 10 mg) was placed in 70 \(\mu\)l alumina open pans. The temperature was scanned at 10 °C/min in air in the range from 25 to 800 °C.

Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) data were collected from a Mettler Toledo DSC 1 instrument. Approximately 5–10 mg of sample was placed in an aluminium pan. A pin hole was made in the lid. The sample was heated from 0 to 250 °C at a scan rate of 10 °C/min and at a \(N_2\) flow rate of 50 ml/min.

Viscoelastic behaviour was studied with a Perkin Elmer DMA 8000 dynamic mechanical analyser (DMA) using the single cantilever bending mode. The applied frequency was 1 Hz. The temperature was scanned at 2 °C min\(^{-1}\) from -20 to 180 °C, -80 to 150 °C and -50 to 80 °C for EVAL, LLDPE and EVA respectively.

Melt flow viscosity was determined with a Göttfert High-Pressure Capillary Rheograph 2000 rheometer. The capillary die had a 180 ° entrance angle, a diameter of 1 mm and a length of 30 mm. Measurements were done at 190 °C with shear rates ranging from 1 to 5 000 s\(^{-1}\).
FTIR spectra were recorded on a Perkin Elmer 100 Spectrophotometer with a MIRacle ATR attachment with diamond Zn/Se plate. A piece of solid sample was pressed onto the Zn/Se plate. The reported spectra were obtained over the range 650–4 000 cm\(^{-1}\) and represent an average of 32 scans at a resolution of 2 cm\(^{-1}\).

Phase identification was carried out by X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis on a PANalytical X-pert Pro powder diffractometer. The instrument features variable divergence and receiving slits and an X’celerator detector using Fe-filtered Co K-\(\alpha\) radiation (0.17901 nm). X’Pert High Score Plus software was used for data manipulation.

Tensile testing was carried out on a Lloyds Instruments LRX Plus machine according to ASTM D 638 using Type IV dumbbells. Five specimens were tested for each compound. Charpy impact testing was carried out on a Zwick Impact Tester using the 0.5 J hammer. Tensile impact tests were carried out according to ASTM D1822-06 on Type S and L test specimens.

Polarised optical microscopy (POM) was used to study the crystallisation morphology. The samples were sandwiched between two glass slides and heated on a Linkam THMS hot stage (Linkam Scientific Instruments Ltd) from room temperature to 135 °C for LLDPE and its respective composite at a rate of 10 °C/min, and then held at this temperature for 5 min before being cooled at the same rate to 125.5 °C. They were then held isothermally for 10 min, during which time images were taken using a Carl Zeiss POM.

3.6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The two fillers considered in this study are distinguished by the nature of the external planar surface. The LDH-CO\(_3\) featured sheets with exposed hydroxyl groups. They allow strong hydrogen bonding with the alcohol functional groups present in polar matrices such as EVAL. However, these highly polar surfaces would be incompatible with the non-polar LLDPE matrix. In the case of the LDH-stearate, the particles are at least partially covered by stearate anions (Focke et al., 2010). Such surface modification with aliphatic chains should provide improved compatibility with the aliphatic LLDPE chains. The second consideration is the strength of interactions within the clay interlayers. The high charge density and the hydrophilicity of the layers in LDH-CO\(_3\) encumber delamination or
exfoliation of the clay sheets (Adachi-Pagano et al., 2000; Leroux et al., 2001; Hibino & Jones, 2001). In the LDH-stearate, the fatty acid chain ends in the bilayers interact via weak van der Waals forces only. Hence it is much easier to delaminate and disperse this clay in polymer matrices.

The results described below pertain to the 10 wt.% of each respective composite unless stated otherwise. Detailed results of the 5 wt.% composite are presented in Appendix C.

Figures 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10 are SEM images that show the general morphology and texture of freeze-fractured surfaces. In the EVA/LDH-CO$_3$ and LLDPE/LDH-CO$_3$ composite (see Figures 3.8 and 3.10), there is clear phase separation of the clay and the polymer. The LDH-CO$_3$ particles appear to form agglomerates within the polymer matrix. Poor interfacial adhesion is evident in both the LLDPE composites (Figure 3.10). This is shown by the formation of wells around the filler particles. This is also the case for the EVA/LDH-stearate composite. In all the other samples there was relatively good adhesion between the matrix and the filler, shown by the absence of cavities previously occupied by particles. Some spherical cavities were also seen in all the EVAL samples, including the neat polymer. However, they are attributed to volatilisation of residual water during the moulding process.
Figure 3.8. Freeze-fractured surface of neat EVA, EVA/LDH-St and EVA/LDH-CO$_3$. The latter two samples contained 10 wt.% filler.
**Figure 3.9.** Freeze-fractured surface of neat EVAL, EVAL/LDH-St and EVAL/LDH-CO$_3$.

The latter two samples contained 10 wt.% filler.
Figure 3.10. Freeze-fractured surface of neat LLDPE, LLDPE/LDH-St and LLDPE LDH-CO$_3$. The latter two samples contained 10 wt.% filler.
3.6.1 X-ray diffraction

Figure 3.11. XRD diffractograms (WAXS) of the pristine, modified LDH and the 10 wt.% polymer composites indicating the relevant basal spacing

The degree of clay layer separation in the modified LDHs and the clay dispersion in the polymer composite was studied by X-ray diffraction (XRD) (Figure 3.11). The 2θ values of 13.5 and 27.2 °, which are typical for LDH-CO$_3$, indicate a d-spacing (d$_L$) of 0.76 nm. These reflections were also observed in the LDH-stearate, indicating LDH-CO$_3$ as an impurity phase. They were also noted in all the LDH-CO$_3$ and LDH-stearate polymer
composites, indicating that either this clay phase was retained during melt compounding or more of it was generated by decomposition of the LDH-stearate. The diffractogram for LDH-stearate showed three basal reflections positioned at 2.0°, 4.1° and 6.1°, the 20 value corresponding to a d-spacing of 5.1 nm. This is consistent with bilayer intercalation of stearate moieties beyond the anion-exchange capacity of the clay (Nhlapo et al., 2008). These diffractions were absent in the diffractograms of the LDH-stearate composites. The first reflection observed at high 20 values indicated a reduction in the d-spacing of the LDH-stearate in the EVA and LLDPE composites (Figure 3.11b). The interlayer spacing of 3.1 nm determined for the LLDPE composite is consistent with monolayer-intercalated stearic acid (Xu & Braterman, 2010; Braterman et al., 2004). This collapse in the d-spacing implies that the neutral stearic acid molecules, initially present in the interlayer beyond the AEC, were removed during the melt compounding process. As discussed in the Section 3.1, this was expected in view of the results obtained by Nhlapo et al. (2008). A collapse was also observed in the d-spacing value for the clay in the EVA composite. However, here the d-spacing was lower and this could be due to a less ordered arrangement of the intercalated chains and/or the loss of the interlayer water. Vestiges of the LDH-stearate reflections were seen in the EVAL composite. Finally, reflections typical for LDH-CO$_3$ were present in all composite diffractograms. This is attributed to the impurity of the LDH-stearate but it is possible that some could have formed by decomposition of the LDH-stearate during melt processing of the polymer composite. In summary, the XRD data indicated that the LDH-based polymer composites contained two types of filler particle (LDH-CO$_3$ and monolayer stearate-intercalated LDH) dispersed within the polymer matrices. Furthermore, no evidence for co-intercalation of polymer chains was found.

The neat polymer samples had basal reflections at 20 values of 23.4°, 24.7° and 25.0° for EVAL, EVA and LLDPE respectively. In the composites these peaks appear to be broader and of reduced intensity. This indicates that the incorporation of LDHs increased the disorder in the packing of polymer chains during crystallisation. Eckel and Blaogh (2004) observed similar behaviour in their clay-based polymer nanocomposites, indicating that there was increased disorder in the polymer matrix.

However, as discussed in the literature review (Section 3.2), XRD analysis alone is insufficient for the assessment of the degree of dispersion in the polymer composite. TEM is used as a visual confirmation of the results obtained from XRD.
3.6.2 Transmission electron microscopy (TEM)

Figure 3.12. TEM images of the 10 wt.% polymer/LDH composites of (a) EVA/ LDH-St; (b) EVAL/LDH-St; (c) LLDPE/LDH-St; (d) EVA/LDH-CO$_3$; (e) EVAL/LDH-CO$_3$ and (f) LLDPE/ LDH-CO$_3$

The LDH-CO$_3$ composites featured distinct particles in the sub-micrometre range, but also some particle agglomerates (Figure 3.12 and 3.13). In the LDH-stearate composites the filler particles were much smaller, whereas in powder form they featured much larger platelets ranging up to 10 µm. They appeared as planar tactoids with a length up to about 500 nm, but with a thickness of less than 100 nm (Figure 3.12). This considerable reduction in dimensions has two possible origins. LDH platelets are weaker and less rigid than smectite clays and hence more prone to breakage. Each LDH sheet is composed of three atomic layers, whereas layered silicates have 6 to 7 atomic layers; hence LDHs tend to rupture under the shear action during extrusion (Solin et al., 1995). Apart from such breakage, partial delamination may have occurred during the high-shear compounding process. The EVA and LLDPE matrices of the LDH-stearate composites appeared to contain very few tactoids. In summary, the TEM results showed that a combination of microcomposites and nanocomposites were obtained using LDH-CO$_3$ and LDH-stearate as fillers in the polymer matrices considered.
Figure 3.13. Agglomeration observed in the different matrices in SEM micrographs
The matrices of LDH-CO$_3$ were characterised by the existence of agglomerates/tactoids as those are shown in all the 10wt.% composites (Figure 3.13). One factor in favour of this observation is the differences in polarity between the polymer and the LDH. LDHs contain hydroxyl groups that render them polar and hence they are more compatible with polar polymer matrices, e.g. EVAL. The LDH-CO$_3$/EVAL composite appears to have agglomerated LDH platelets; this could be due to the high charge density which exists within the layer, hence not permitting effective dispersion/exfoliation (Adachi-Pagano et al., 2000; Leroux et al., 2001; Hibino & Jones, 2001). Another contributing factor is the particle-particle interactions; these are usually strong as a result of the interaction of hydroxyl groups. These interactions can either be face-to-edge (‘house-of-cards’ structure) or edge-to-edge. Gursky et al. (2006) attributed the former arrangement to lack of coordination in microscale LDH particles. A greater effect is experienced at the edges, ultimately influencing edge-to-surface interactions (see Figure 3.14).

\[ \text{Figure 3.14. Schematic of the ‘house-of-cards’ structure: (a) LLDPE/LDH-CO}_3\text{ showing an agglomerate with face-to-edge interactions and (b) with edge-to-edge interactions} \]

### 3.6.3 Melt viscosity

It is worth noting that the results obtained are for the polymers and composites prepared without processing aids or other additives.
Figure 3.15 presents the melt viscosity results for the composites obtained at 190 °C. All the samples showed strong shear-thinning behaviour. The EVA and EVAL polymer/LDH-CO$_3$ composites featured higher apparent viscosity values than the parent polymers. The melt viscosity of the LLDPE/LDH-CO$_3$ composite was marginally higher than that of the neat polymer. This is attributed to weak interactions between the polar filler surface and the non-polar matrix. The unmodified LDH is hydrophilic owing to the external hydroxyl groups. This results in platelet interactions such as edge-to-face or ‘house of cards’ arrangement, which is clearly demonstrated in Figure 3.14. This microstructure leads to high viscosities at low shear and is possibly responsible for the high viscosities observed in the LDH-CO$_3$ polymer composites. As the shear rates increase, the platelet aggregation breaks down and the platelets align themselves to the direction of flow, hence recording a low viscosity or one close to that of the neat polymer. The apparent melt viscosities of the EVA and the LLDPE polymer/LDH-stearate composites were lower than that of the neat polymers. This is attributed to the lubricating effect of the exuded stearic acid present in these compounds.

The EVAL/LDH-stearate composite had the highest melt viscosity. This means that the interaction of the filler with the polymer chains must have overwhelmed the lubricating effect of the free stearic acid present. The surfaces of the LDH-stearate filler are partially covered with the chains of the electrostatically attached stearate anions. So it is expected that the interaction of these clay surfaces with the EVAL chains would be weaker than the interactions with the uncoated surfaces of the LDH-CO$_3$ particles. However, the melt viscosity of the LDH-CO$_3$ composite was lower, despite its higher surface polarity. Furthermore, according to the TG results, the inorganic content of the LDH-stearate is only 20 wt.%.

Taking this into consideration, these observations suggest that the clay surface area available for interaction with the polymer chains must have been much higher for LDH-stearate.
Figure 3.15. Effect of LDH incorporation on the viscosity of the polymers LLDPE, EVA and EVAL at 190 °C
3.6.4 Viscoelastic properties

Figures 3.16 to 3.18 present the DMA viscoelastic properties of the 10 wt.% composites. Results for the 5 wt.% composite may be found in Appendix C. The storage moduli ($E'$) of all the LLDPE (Figure 3.16), EVA (Figure 3.17) and EVAL composites (Figure 3.18) were slightly higher than that of the neat polymer. This stiffening effect was more pronounced in the rubbery region than in the glassy region for both the EVA and EVAL composites. However, at higher temperatures the LLDPE/LDH-stearate deviated from the LDH-CO$_3$ composite trend and approached the behaviour of the neat polymer. This could be explained by the melting of the free stearic acid present and it acting like a plasticiser and lubricant, which facilitates the motion of the polymer chains.

The glass transition temperature ($T_g$) of the EVA composites was the same as that of the neat polymer. However, the $T_g$ of the EVAL composites shifted to higher temperatures. There are two possible explanations for this observation. The exuded stearic acid might have had an anti-plasticisation effect or the mobility of the EVAL polymer chains might have been affected by strong interactions with the surface of the filler particles. Clearly, only the latter explanation can hold for the LDH-CO$_3$ composite as no stearic acid was present. Based on the viscosity behaviour of the EVAL/LDH-stearate composite, it can be concluded that this explanation also holds for this system.

![Figure 3.16. DMA data for the storage modulus and tan δ of LLDPE and its 10 wt.% derivative composites](image-url)
The storage modulus for the LLDPE composites (Figure 3.16) was higher than that of the neat polymer within both the glassy and rubbery regions. However, as the temperature increased, the LLDPE/LDH-St deviated from the LDH-CO$_3$ composite, conforming to a behaviour similar to that of the neat polymer. This could be explained by the probable melting of excess stearic acid, which in turn acts as a plasticiser and lubricant. This facilitates the motion of polymer chains. The damping factor (tan $\delta$) remained unchanged, signifying poor interfacial adhesion between the fillers and the polymer matrix. A similar trend is observed with the EVA composites, where the storage modulus is higher than that of the neat polymer in both regions.

The storage modulus ($E'$) of the EVA composite matrices (Figure 3.17) was slightly higher than that of the neat polymer in the glassy region. However, in the rubbery region the storage modulus is distinctly higher, indicating that the incorporation of the filler yields a stiffer material. The $T_g$ of the composites was the same as for the neat polymer. This implies that the inclusion of LDHs within its matrix did not interfere with the molecular motion of the polymer chains. It also points to minimal interaction between the filler and the polymer. However, the EVA/LDH-St composite showed a reduction in the maximum tan $\delta$ value, implying that the modification of the LDH with stearate anions improves interaction between the filler and the polymer.

**Figure 3.17.** DMA data for the storage modulus and tan $\delta$ of EVA and its 10 wt.% derivative composites
The storage modulus for the EVAL/LDH-St composite (Figure 3.18) was slightly lower than that of LDH-CO$_3$, which is attributed to the plasticising effect of the free stearic acid. The EVAL composites appear to have strong interfacial adhesion between the filler and the polymer, resulting from the probable formation of hydrogen bonds between the EVAL side groups and the LDH hydroxyl. This is demonstrated by restricted segmental motion, which leads to a positive shift and broadening of the tan δ peak. It is also accompanied by a decrease in the tan δ$_{max}$ value. The T$_g$ of the LDH-St composite is higher than that of the LDH-CO$_3$ due to the probable interaction of LDH hydroxyl groups and stearate anions with the polymer matrix.

3.6.5 Mechanical properties

The mechanical properties are listed in Table 3.5 and Appendix C. All the filled samples, except for the EVAL/LDH-St composite, featured higher tensile moduli than the neat polymers. Both LDHs fillers had a reinforcing effect on EVA and LLDPE as both the yield strength and the modulus increased. Enhanced elongations were obtained in the EVA composites, but a decrease was observed for the EVAL and LLDPE composites. The LLDPE/LDH-St 5 wt.% featured an outstanding increase in tenacity.
Table 3.5. Summary of the mechanical properties of LDH/polymer composites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polymer composite</th>
<th>Young’s modulus/ (MPa)</th>
<th>Yield strength/ (MPa)</th>
<th>Elongation at break/ (%)</th>
<th>Charpy impact strength/ (kJ/m²)</th>
<th>Tensile impact strength/ (kJ/m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat EVA</td>
<td>27 ± 2</td>
<td>10 ± 0.4</td>
<td>277 ± 30</td>
<td>No break</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA / 5% LDH-St</td>
<td>34 ± 3</td>
<td>11 ± 0.1</td>
<td>330 ± 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.6 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA / 10%LDH-St</td>
<td>40 ± 5</td>
<td>12 ± 0.1</td>
<td>422 ± 23</td>
<td>No break</td>
<td>4.3 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA / 5% LDH-CO³</td>
<td>30 ± 1</td>
<td>10 ± 0.1</td>
<td>305 ± 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.4 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA / 10% LDH-CO³</td>
<td>37 ± 2</td>
<td>13 ± 1</td>
<td>424 ± 60</td>
<td>No break</td>
<td>5.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat LLDPE</td>
<td>171 ± 14</td>
<td>16 ± 0.1</td>
<td>509 ± 29</td>
<td>22 ± 2</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE / 5%LDH-St</td>
<td>192 ± 6</td>
<td>24 ± 3</td>
<td>1097 ± 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE / 10%LDH-St</td>
<td>196 ± 7</td>
<td>17 ± 0.4</td>
<td>495 ± 43</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE / 5%LDH-CO³</td>
<td>219 ± 43</td>
<td>17 ± 0.2</td>
<td>477 ± 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE / 10%LDH-CO³</td>
<td>213 ± 12</td>
<td>17 ± 0.2</td>
<td>460 ± 21</td>
<td>11 ± 1</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat EVAL</td>
<td>843 ± 16</td>
<td>64 ± 2</td>
<td>41 ± 21</td>
<td>4.9 ± 1</td>
<td>2 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL / 5%LDH-St</td>
<td>869 ± 23</td>
<td>71 ± 0.2</td>
<td>42 ± 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL / 10%LDH-St</td>
<td>718 ± 40</td>
<td>59 ± 6</td>
<td>18 ± 5</td>
<td>9.7 ± 3</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL / 5% LDH-CO³</td>
<td>969 ± 22</td>
<td>77 ± 1</td>
<td>31 ± 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL / 10% LDH-CO³</td>
<td>1025 ± 18</td>
<td>76 ± 0.4</td>
<td>37 ± 2</td>
<td>4.6 ± 1</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Polymer toughness is governed by parameters such as the degree of particle dispersion within the polymer matrix, filler mobility, delamination and intrinsic changes to polymer properties promoted by the filler (Chen et al., 2008). The EVA composites did not fracture in the notched Charpy tests because of the rubbery nature of the matrix. The tests were basically carried out at room temperature, so well above the T_g of this polymer matrix; in this case the mobility of the polymer chains is higher. This aspect facilitates the mobility of the LDHs to form temporary bonds which in turn dissipate energy. Hence the clay platelets are able to rotate and align themselves in the direction of the applied stress. During the matrix deformation process, the filler is squeezed tight by the cavity walls as it elongates and narrows. The resulting friction forces generate a region of enhanced strength which
retards the growth of the cavity and thus delays polymer failure (Gersappe, 2002). The
tensile impact properties of the filled EVA composites were better than those of the neat
polymer. However, the opposite was true for the other polymer matrices. In the tensile
strength impact tests the LDH-CO$_3$ filler gave better results than the LDH-St (see
Table 3.5). Considering Figure 3.8, this can be attributed to better interfacial adhesion
between the polar filler and the polar EVA matrix.

With the exception of the 10 wt.% EVAL/LDH-St composite, all the other composite
samples had poor notched Charpy impact properties compared with the parent polymers.
Development of strong energy dissipation mechanisms is a prerequisite for good impact
properties. The poor interface adhesion between both the fillers and the polyethylene matrix
is evident in Figure 3.10. This means that the incorporation of the fillers led to the creation
of internal flaws. These acted as stress concentrators which led to premature mechanical
failure. The LLDPE/LDH-St composite had slightly better impact strength properties than
the LLDPE/LDH-CO$_3$. This can be attributed to the slightly better compatibility with the
polymer matrix contributed by the exuded stearic acid coating on the LDH particles (Figure
3.10). However, it is clear from the XRD diffractogram (Figure 3.11) that the presence of
this filler also affected the morphology of the parent polymer. This is confirmed by the
broadening and shift in position of the main reflections attributable to the polymer matrix.
This change in the morphology of the polymer matrix could also have affected the impact
properties.

Unexpectedly, the notched Charpy impact strength of EVAL increased from 4.9 kJ m$^{-2}$ to
9.7 kJ m$^{-2}$ when 10 wt.% LDH-stearate was added (Table 3.5). Top-view SEM imaging of
the fracture surfaces was inconclusive. The images did not reveal a mechanism that could
explain the improved impact behaviour. Figure 3.19 shows side-view images of the fracture
surfaces of Charpy impact specimens obtained for the EVAL composites using an optical
microscope. The neat EVAL sample and EVAL/LDH-CO$_3$ composite sample showed clean
fractures. In contrast, the EVAL/LDH-St sample showed an extensive stress-whitened
damage region which extended deep into the sample. It seems that the clay particles
transmitted an incoming crack as multiple crack fronts travelling in different directions.
This dissipates mechanical energy by creating numerous internal cracks with a very large
total surface area. This ability of the LDH-stearate might derive from its sheet-like nature
and random orientation in the glassy matrix. It is noteworthy that the stress-whitened
damage region was located in a narrow region towards the back of the sample. Extensive stress whitening is usually an indication of crazing and/or microfibril formation. The white appearance of the crazed region is due to light scattering.

**Figure 3.19.** Optical light microscope side-views of Charpy impact test specimen of EVAL: (a) neat, (b) LDH-stearate composite and (c) LDH-CO$_3$ 10 wt.% composite

However, for the tensile impact specimen there is a clear indication of debonding and the matrix has areas of extensive fibrillation (see Figure 3.20). More views are shown in Appendix C.
Figure 3.20. Top view of the EVAL/LDH-St tensile impact test specimen showing: (a) debonding and (b) fibrillation
3.6.6 Thermal analysis

The thermal data are summarised in Table 3.6, comparing the temperature changes at 10 and 50% weight loss between the neat polymers and composite samples, i.e. $T_{0.1}$ and $T_{0.5}$ respectively. The addition of LDHs within the different polymer matrices improves the thermal stability at $T_{0.1}$ and $T_{0.5}$, with an increase in the char residue levels in all composite samples. The thermal degradation temperature for the EVA and LLDPE composites was 2-16 °C above that of the neat polymers. However, the improvement was less for the EVA when compared with the LLDPE matrix. EVA and its composites undergo two main thermal events, the first occurring between 220 and 405 °C due to deacetylation with the release of gaseous acetic acid, and the final event as a result of main chain scission (between 410 and 510 °C) associated with polyolefinic groups (Camino et al., 2000; Riva, 2002; Peeterbroeck et al., 2005; Jiao et al., 2006).

Table 3.6. Thermal stability data at $T_{0.1}$, $T_{0.5}$, % residue and change in temperature ($\Delta T$), results pertaining to 10 wt.% composites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$T_{0.1}$ (°C)</th>
<th>$T_{0.5}$ (°C)</th>
<th>Residue (%)</th>
<th>$\Delta T_{0.1}$ (°C)</th>
<th>$\Delta T_{0.5}$ (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neat EVA</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA/LDH-St</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA/LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat EVAL</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL/LDH-St</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL/LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-74</td>
<td>-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat LLDPE</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE/LDH-St</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE/LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the EVAL samples the first event occurs at about 358 °C and the same applies for all the composite samples (see Figure C-16 in Appendix C). The second event is shifted to a higher temperature, from 440 °C to 443 and 453 °C for the EVA/LDH-St and LDH-CO$_3$ composites respectively. The EVA/LDH-CO$_3$ composite showed greater thermal stability at $T_{0.5}$ than the neat polymer. A marked difference is observed in the EVAL composites where
the temperature difference between the onset decomposition temperatures, $T_{0.1}$ and $T_{0.5}$, is a magnitude of 88–115 °C lower than that of the neat polymer. This could be explained by the formation of metal oxides and/or radical species that catalyse the thermal degradation of the polymer; hence a significant difference is observed. In addition, it may be explained as a result of thermo-oxidative degradation of the polymer. In the thermogram (Figure 3.21), one can clearly observe the shift at which thermal degradation occurs for the EVAL composites.

![Figure 3.21. TG data for EVAL and derivative composites](image)

### 3.6.6.1 Differential scanning calorimetry

Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) was employed to study thermal transitions and follow the changes in enthalpies in the composites (see Table 3.7). The data discussed pertain to those obtained from the second heating and first cooling. There is a general increase in the melting temperature in the filled polymers. The same trend is observed in the crystallisation temperature in Figure 3.22, with the exception of the EVAL composite for which a distinct difference is observed. An increase in the crystallisation temperature of the composites of EVA and LLDPE is an indication of the nucleating effect of the LDH incorporation. However, the enthalpy of the melting endotherms of the polymer composites decreases; this is a result of a decrease in crystallinity or a change in the ordering of the polymer chains induced by the filler materials (Ramaraj & Yoon, 2008). It is established that fillers can affect the crystallinity of some polymers, and consequently affect their mechanical properties. An inverse correlation was obtained between the nucleating ability of fillers and loss of impact strength in the filled systems (Hutley & Darlington, 1985).
same correlation is observed in the LLDPE composites where the crystallisation temperature increases. However, the impact strength reduces by a magnitude of almost 50%, as seen in Tables 3.5 and 3.7.

**Figure 3.22.** DSC cooling traces of each of the 10 wt.% polymer composite systems

To further study the nucleating effect of LDH in the LLDPE matrix, POM analyses were carried out (see Figure 3.23). The samples show a reduction in the grain size of crystallites in the composites. This is attributed to the availability of numerous nuclei (LDH particles) in the composite, resulting in very small crystallites. Though the LLDPE/LDH-CO$_3$ sample generally exhibits a reduced crystallite size, there are areas with large crystals which are indicated by arrows in Figure 3.23. Such big crystallites may act as stress concentrators, leading to premature fracture.
The same fillers retarded the crystallisation of the EVAL (Figure 3.22). This is attributed to a strong interaction of the EVAL polymer chains with well-dispersed clay platelets and the higher melt viscosity which suppresses the diffusion processes required for the chains to orient and pack into crystallites.

**Figure 3.23.** POM images of neat LLDPE and derivative composites (scale bar is 40 µm)
Table 3.7. DSC data indicating the onset temperature and melting endotherm of the 10 wt.% polymer composites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Onset melting temperature °C</th>
<th>Melting temperature, $T_m$ °C</th>
<th>Melting endotherm (J/g)</th>
<th>Onset of crystallisation °C</th>
<th>Crystallisation temperature, $T_c$ °C</th>
<th>Crystallisation exotherm (J/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neat EVA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA/LDH-St</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA/LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat EVAL</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL /LDH-St</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL /LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat LLDPE</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE/LDH-St</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDPE /LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 CONCLUSION

Anionic clay/polymer composites were prepared by melt compounding two different LDH fillers into polyethylene random copolymers. In order of increasing polarity, the latter were 1-hexene-based LLDPE, EVA and EVAL. A standard carbonate form (LDH-CO$_3$) and a stearate-modified LDH (LDH-St) were used as fillers. The latter comprised a bilayer-intercalated form containing ca. 50% more stearic acid than expected from the anionic exchange capacity of the parent clay. The composite materials were characterised by XRD, SEM, TEM, TGA, DSC, DMA and capillary rheology. Mechanical testing in tensile mode and Charpy impact tests were also conducted.

During melt compounding of the LDH-stearate composites, the excess stearic acid in the clay was released and the clay reverted to a monolayer-intercalated form. This conclusion is supported by XRD data and the reduction in melt viscosity observed for the LLDPE and EVA polymer/LDH-stearate composites. The latter is caused by the lubrication effect of the free stearic acid present. The EVAL/LDH-stearate nanocomposite featured the highest melt viscosity. This suggests that the clay surface area available for interaction with the EVAL polymer chains must have been very high in the EVAL/LDH-stearate composite in order to overwhelm the lubrication effect. Such strong interaction in this system is supported by the increase in the glass transition temperature ($T_g$) observed by DMA.

XRD confirmed that the presence of LDH-stearate-based polymer composites contained two types of filler particle (LDH-CO$_3$ and monolayer stearate-intercalated LDH) dispersed within the polymer matrices. The TEM results showed that microcomposites and nanocomposites were obtained using LDH-CO$_3$ and LDH-St as fillers in the polymer matrices considered. SEM images of freeze-fractured surfaces indicated good interfacial adhesion between the clay and the matrix, not only in the EVAL composites, but also in the EVA/LDH-CO$_3$ composite.

DSC showed that the presence of the fillers interfered with the polymer crystallisation processes. Both fillers acted as nucleating agents in LLDPE and EVA. The degree of crystallinity of the EVA even improved, as shown by an increase in the enthalpy of crystallisation. The XRD results confirmed that the crystal morphology of the LLDPE was changed. Both fillers retarded the crystallisation of the EVAL. This is attributed to the strong
interaction of the EVAL polymer chains with the well-dispersed clay platelets and the higher melt viscosity, which suppresses the diffusion processes required for the chains to orient and pack into crystallites.

Both LDHs fillers had a reinforcing effect on EVA and LLDPE as both the yield strength and the modulus improved. Better elongations were obtained in the EVA composites, but a decrease was observed for the EVAL and LLDPE composites. Both fillers improved the tensile impact strength of EVA. Unexpectedly, the notched Charpy impact strength of EVAL increased significantly (from 4.9 to 9.7 kJ m⁻²) when 10 wt.% LDH-stearate was added. This is attributed to the ability of the highly dispersed and randomly oriented nanosized clay platelets to promote extensive internal microcavitation during impact loading. The creation of a large internal surface area provided the requisite energy-dissipation mechanism.
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Chapter 4

Organo-LDH/Oil suspensions

The study considers fatty acid-intercalated Mg₂Al-LDH as a rheological additive in Jojoba oil. The 20 wt.% LDH in the Jojoba oil formulation was found to be stable (does not bleed out). In this investigation 30 wt.% LDH-stearate was selected. The viscosity of the neat Jojoba oil is Newtonian, whereas the LDH/oil formulation shows shear thinning, which is a typical non-Newtonian behaviour. The viscosity was observed to increase rapidly with an increase in LDH content. The viscosity, at a constant shear rate, shows complex temperature behaviour for the long-chain fatty acids C₁₆–C₂₂. Although LDH-palmitate and LDH-behenate also showed complex viscosity behaviour, particular attention was paid to LDH-stearate. The viscosity increase is assumed to be caused by a reversible loss of excess fatty acid and/or the insertion of Jojoba oil constituents.

The preliminary investigation of the suitability of LDH-stearate as a rheology modifier for Jojoba oil revealed that:

- The viscosity of the 30% LDH-stearate formulation showed complex temperature behaviour at a constant shear of 30 s⁻¹.
- FT-IR analysis showed changes in the configuration of the surfactant chains of the 30% LDH-stearate formulation, which changes as temperature increases.
- XRD analysis showed that the LDH-stearate in the formulation is no longer intercalated.
4 ORGANO-LDH/OIL SUSPENSIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Organoclay suspensions are of importance in that rheological properties are achieved economically (i.e. at low volume fraction); organoclays exhibit good thermal stability (may be used where polymer thickening agents would fail); and the gels formed are resistant to gel-breaking effects from other chemicals. In addition, the dispersion of organoclay is seen as essential in property enhancement for clay-based polymer composites (King et al., 2007). The dispersion of organoclays, particularly in their delaminated form, is of importance in self-assembling monolayers (SAM), Langmuir Blodgett film preparation, as well as emulsion stabilisation (Adachi-Pagano et al., 2000).

This section discusses the potential use of stearate-intercalated LDS as a rheological modifier in Jojoba oil. It is a liquid wax ester mixture with an average molecular weight of 606 g/mol (MSDS). The ester mixture is composed mostly of eicosenyl eicosenoate, docosenyl docosenoate, eicosenyl docosenoate and docosenyl eicosenoate, as well as wax esters from C\textsubscript{36}–C\textsubscript{46} (Miwa, 1971; Spencer et al., 1976). Its chemical composition is closest to that of human sebum and it can therefore control the natural balance of the skin, while maintaining the flow of sebum. Jojoba oil possesses non-allergenic and non-comedogenic (non-clogging) properties (Sandha & Swami, 2009).

4.2 RHEOLOGY

Rheology was defined as the study of deformation and flow by Professor Bingham. This definition was accepted by the American Society of Rheology in 1929. In 1687 Isaac Newton made the hypothesis, ‘The resistance which arises from lack of slipperiness of the parts of the liquid, other things being equal, is proportional to the velocity with which the parts of the liquid are separated from one another’ (Barnes et al., 1989). Viscosity can therefore described as the resistance of a substance to flow. It is best understood by considering the flow between parallel plates (see Figure 4.1). The viscosity law states that the force per unit surface area (shear stress) is proportional to the velocity gradient (shear rate), i.e. for laminar flow in a Newtonian fluid.
Dynamic viscosity or shear viscosity ($\eta$) is expressed as a ratio of shear stress ($\tau$) to the corresponding shear rate ($\dot{\gamma}$):

$$\eta = \frac{\tau}{\dot{\gamma}}$$ [8]

Shear stress is given by the expression:

$$\tau = \frac{F}{A}$$ [9]

where

$F =$ shear force (N)
$A =$ shear area ($m^2$)

The shear rate $\dot{\gamma}$ is given by the equation:

$$\dot{\gamma} = \frac{v}{h}$$ [10]

where

$v =$ velocity (m/s)
$h =$ distance between the plates

The flow behaviour of fluids can be described as either Newtonian or non-Newtonian. A Newtonian fluid exhibits a directly proportional relationship between the applied shear stress and the rate of shear. It has no solid-like properties and has a characteristic viscosity. Examples of Newtonian fluids include mineral oil, water, sugar solution, etc. Non-Newtonian fluids have a non-linear relationship between the applied shear stress and the rate of shear, as shown in Figure 4.2. Typical non-Newtonian fluids include pastes, emulsions and cosmetic...
formulations. In this particular study we refer to clay particles dispersed in Jojoba oil; this system is more likely to exhibit complex viscosity behaviour. Under non-Newtonian flow behaviour there are further classifications (see Table 4.1 for definitions and examples).

![Figure 4.2. Viscosity curve of (a) Newtonian and (b) non-Newtonian fluids](image)

Viscosity is affected by temperature, pressures and additives. It is also affected by the size and shape of the molecules/additives. In addition, intermolecular forces play a role in changes in viscosity, i.e. if the forces of attraction are high, then the viscosity of the liquid will be high.
Table 4.1. Different types of non-Newtonian fluids (Adapted from Shenoy, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluid type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Typical examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudoplastic</td>
<td>Exhibit decrease in viscosity with increasing shear rate and hence are often referred to as shear-thinning fluids.</td>
<td>Filled polymer systems, Shampoo, Lotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilatant</td>
<td>Materials that depict an increase in viscosity with increasing shear rate and hence are often referred to as shear thickening fluids.</td>
<td>Wet sand, Starch suspension, Gum solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham plastics</td>
<td>Fluids that do not flow unless the stress applied exceeds a certain minimum value, referred to as yield stress, and then show a linear shear stress vs shear rate relationship.</td>
<td>Toothpaste, Tomato ketchup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudoplastic with a yield stress</td>
<td>Fluids that exhibit a non-linear shear stress vs shear rate relationship in addition to the presence of yield stress.</td>
<td>Heavy crude oils with high wax content, Filled polymer systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thixotropic</td>
<td>These fluids depict a reversible decrease in shear stress with time at a constant rate of shear and fixed temperature. However, the shear stress approaches a limiting value.</td>
<td>Mayonnaise, Brush paint, Synovial fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheoplectic</td>
<td>Fluids that show a reversible increase in shear stress with time at a constant rate of shear and fixed temperature. At a given shear rate, the shear stress increases to approach an asymptotic maximum value.</td>
<td>Some clay suspensions, e.g. laponite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscoelastic</td>
<td>These fluids have an added feature of elasticity apart from viscosity. They exhibit properties that lie in between those of viscous liquids and elastic solids.</td>
<td>Filled polymer systems, Polymer melts, Polymer solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 THICKENING MECHANISM

Thickening agents may act as gelling agents by dissolving in the liquid phase as a colloid that forms a weakly cohesive internal structure. Pastes are complex fluids with the properties of both solids and liquids. An underlying feature of these materials is the presence of an internal structure that gives a space-filling network capable of supporting its own weight under gravity (see Figure 4.3). They consist of ordered nanostructures and microstructures. Stokes and Frith (2008) describe such materials as “soft matter”, which they further categorise as either “soft-glass” or gel. The elasticity of soft glass arises from caging effects, whereas gels
arise from a percolated network structure that typically occurs due to attractive interactions between at least one of its components (Stokes & Frith, 2008).

**Figure 4.3.** Soft microstructure, characterising the system as a “soft-glass” or “gel” (Stokes & Frith, 2008)

### 4.4 COLLOIDAL DISPERSIONS

IUPAC defines a *colloidal dispersion* as a system in which particles of colloidal size (at least in one direction a dimension roughly between 1 nm and 1 µm) of any nature (e.g. solid, liquid or gas) are dispersed in a *continuous phase* of a different composition (or state). On the other hand, a *suspension* describes solid particles that are dispersed in a liquid. Forano *et al.* (2006) interpreted the colloidal solutions of LDHs in two ways: firstly as a suspension of LDH particles, and secondly as a dispersion of exfoliated single layers of LDH (i.e. delaminated LDH). The delamination of surfactant intercalated LDH was pioneered by Adachi-Pagano and co-workers (2000). The hydrophobisation of clay minerals is a prerequisite for the
preparation of stable dispersion of clays in organic solvents (Lagaly & Malberg, 1990). Dispersibility is governed by:

- Degree of hydrophobisation
- Polarity and chemical nature of the solvent molecules
- Extent of intercrystalline swelling
- Water content (Yun & Pinnavaia 1995; Adachi-Pagano et al., 2000; Leroux et al., 2001).

4.4.1 Clay dispersion in aqueous media

These types of dispersion are not as common as those in non-aqueous media. The delamination of LDHs in water was pioneered by Hibino and co-worker (Hibino & Jones, 2001; Hibino, 2004; Hibino & Kobayashi, 2005). Hibino (2010) prepared an aqueous colloidal dispersion of delaminated LDH-lactate in a hot aqueous solution of agarose. The mixtures gelled when cooled to room temperature. A uniform dispersion was obtained for the modified LDH; in contrast, the LDH-CO$_3$ particles agglomerated (Hibino, 2010). Albiston (1996) considered the rheology and microstructure of LDHs in aqueous suspension. Thickening and gelling was controlled by addition of electrolytes; the latter was found to be driven by the interaction of predominately rod-shaped aggregates formed from face-to-face association of the primary LDH particles. Iyi and co-workers (2011) studied the delamination of LDHs intercalated with short chain organic sulphonates. The LDH-isethionate exhibited water-swelling behaviour and formed viscous gels on contact with water (Iyi et al., 2011). In another study, they delaminated LDHs intercalated with short chain carboxylates in water, which yielded a colloidal suspension via a gel state (Iyi & Sasaki, 2008).

4.4.2 Clay dispersion in non-aqueous media

The dispersion of LDH is widely reported in alcohols (Adachi-Pagano et al., 2000; Leroux et al., 2001; Venugopal et al., 2006). Alcohols are composed of non-polar and polar segments that can interact with the alkyl chains and hydroxyl groups of the metal hydroxides respectively, leading to good solvation/delamination (Jones, 1983; Venugopal et al., 2006). The study by Venugopal and co-workers (2006) revealed that the degree of dispersion differs among alcohols. An increase in the chain length of the alcohol led to an increased degree of
dispersion. A typical delamination entails refluxing the organo-LDH in the alcohol at 120 °C (Adachi-Pagano et al., 2000). Peptisation has also been achieved by amino acid intercalation and subsequent treatment with formamide (Hibino & Jones, 2001, 2004). Although delamination of modified LDH was stated to occur readily in organic solvents, poor dispersion was observed in non-polar organic solvents such as hexane (Venugopal et al., 2006). Moreover, dispersions of modified LDHs in more polar solvents are kinetically and thermodynamically unfavourable.

An increase in the dipole moment of the solvent molecules decreases chain solvation, which consequently depresses the rate of solvent incorporation within the interlayer (Jobbágy & Regazzoni, 2004). A higher extent of delamination and stability of colloids was obtained in LDHs containing long surfactant anions and a low M^{II}:M^{III} ratio (Venugopal et al., 2006). Jobbágy and Regazzoni (2004) reported delamination and restacking of LDH-DS in chloroform (CCl₄) and toluene. They rationalised delamination in terms of the miscibility of the organo-LDH and the selected solvent. In their study, dispersion was viewed as a two-component solution. Each dodecyl sulphate-LDH platelet was regarded as a solute molecule, hence the solubility in a given solvent was determined by interplay of the main attractions, i.e. chain-chain, solvent-chain and solvent-solvent. They also attributed it to an entropic contribution due to the loss of the interdigitated dodecyl chain structure, caused by the incorporation of the solvent in the hydrophobic gallery space. These researchers further explained delamination by means of Flory-Huggins theory in which the entropic contribution is modified. This correction was made to account for changes in the interdigitation of aliphatic chains. Hence, above a critical temperature (T_c), the transition from a swollen LDH-DS to delaminated form must be continuous and take place once a critical concentration is surpassed. Below T_c, delamination is only possible at higher dilutions (Jobbágy & Regazzoni, 2004).

Dèkány et al. (1997) reported that hydrophobisation of LDHs led to an increase in the adsorption capacity towards organic liquids. Interlamellar swelling of both the LDH-DS and DBS was observed in n-heptane. On the other hand, preferential adsorption of propanol by the dodecyl benzene sulphonate derivative was observed, whereas the dodecylsulphate derivatives adsorbed propanol and toluene in almost equal amounts (Dèkány et al., 1997).
Martin et al. (1991) explored the potential use of intercalated-LDHs as argillaceous minerals in various oils for gel formulations. The organically modified LDHs were found to demonstrate good swelling properties. The study reported negative aspects of the use of montmorillonite in gel formulations. These included the fact that during gel formulation a high percentage of activators, such as alcohols, acetone and quaternary ammonium salts, could possibly cause skin irritations and allergic reactions. The impurities in the montmorillonite clay and organic additives give it an unpleasant colour and odour. However, LDHs are white in colour and would be advantageous to use as a substitute for montmorillonite.

4.4.3 Clay dispersion in emulsions

Solid particles of colloidal size are employed as stabilisers for Pickering emulsions. These emulsions are encountered in cosmetics, food, pharmaceuticals, oil recovery and waste treatment (Yang et al., 2006). A combination of LDHs and smectite clays was used in the stabilisation of paraffin oil-in-water emulsions, by forming envelopes around the oil droplet (Abend et al., 1998; Lagaly et al., 1999). LDHs have also been employed in the stabilisation of Pickering emulsions (Yang et al., 2006; Yang et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2010). The use of such particulate emulsifiers has the following advantages (Abend et al., 1998):

- The amount of emulsifier may be reduced and/or organic emulsifying agents can be completely replaced.
- The Pickering emulsions obtained therefrom are difficult to break by changing the chemical parameters such as pH, salt concentration, temperature and composition of the oil phase.
- Changes in the solid content or type of solid result in changes in viscosity and type of flow. Hence the emulsifier is easily adjusted to the required practical applications.
- The type of emulsion – oil-in-water (O/W) or water-in-oil (W/O) – changes at different compositions of the solid stabiliser.

Yilmaz et al. (1999) studied kaolinite dispersions in water and water-alcohol mixtures. They attributed the increase in viscosity to ‘face-to-edge’ interaction between clay particles at the lower alcohol concentration on the other hand the viscosity decreases again because, the kind of interaction between the particles changes ‘edge-to-edge’ interaction at higher alcohol
concentration. This non-ideal plastic behavior is characteristic of flocculated/aggregated colloidal dispersion, in which every collision between particles results in the formation of a temporary or permanent association.

Yan and co-workers (1991a, 1991b) studied the rheology of oil-in-water emulsions with added solids. The addition of solids appeared to increase viscosity and shear-thinning tendencies (non-Newtonian behaviour). Viscosity was also found to be influenced by other aspects, such as:

- Solids with irregular shapes or surface irregularities gave a much higher viscosity than spherical solids (glass beads), i.e. at the same solids volume fraction.
- Smaller solids gave higher viscosity than larger solids. However, as size ratio of the solids to the oil droplets increases, the size effect decreases.

It is clear that the delamination of organoclays plays a vital role in the formation of stable gels, in either aqueous or non-aqueous media. Limited literature is available on the use of LDHs as rheological modifiers in oils. A preliminary study showed that the viscosity at constant shear of the Jojoba oil /LDH-stearate formulation presented complex temperature behaviour. However, it is important to note that this observation is consistent with a certain morphology and size. This investigation reports anomalous viscosity-temperature behaviour of Jojoba oil LDH-stearate suspensions.

4.5 EXPERIMENTAL

4.5.1 Materials

The materials used in the modification of LDHs are stated in Section 2.5.1. Jojoba oil (100% pure cold pressed) was obtained from Credé Natural Oils.

4.5.2 Preparation of fatty acid-intercalated hydrotalcite

Fatty acid-intercalated LDHs were prepared using the same procedure described in Section 2.5.2 and Appendix B.
4.5.3 Preparation of 30 wt.% LDH-fatty acid/Jojoba oil formulation

Preliminary studies showed that the formulation should contain at least 20 wt.% LDH-stearate, otherwise the oil bleeds out. For this investigation 30 wt.% LDH-stearate was selected. Other formulations using LDH-laurate, -myristate, -palmitate, -oleate and -behenate were also attempted. Three grams of LDH-derivative and 7 g of Jojoba oil were mixed using a pestle and mortar at room temperature. The formulation was then heated up to 80 °C in an oven with occasional stirring to ensure good mixing. The product was allowed to cool down to room temperature overnight. Additional samples were prepared at room temperature, with no heating employed. The samples showed no marked difference as both exhibited complex rheological behaviour.

The 30 wt.% Mg-stearate and 30 wt.% Al-stearate formulations were prepared according to the above procedure, but replacing the LDH-derivatives with Mg-stearate and Al-stearate respectively. In addition, formulations containing stearic acid and Jojoba oil were prepared, having percentage weight ratios of Jojoba oil to fatty acid of 95:5, 90:10, 80:20 and 70:30 respectively.

4.5.4 Characterisation

Phase identification was carried out by XRD analysis on a PANalytical X-pert Pro powder diffractometer with variable divergence and receiving slits and an X’celerator detector using Fe-filtered Co K-alpha radiation (0.17901 nm). X’Pert High Score Plus software was used for phase identification. Temperature-resolved XRD traces were obtained using an Anton Paar HTK 16 heating chamber with a Pt-heating strip. Scans were measured between 20 = 1° to 40° in a temperature range of 25 to 45 °C at intervals of 5 °C, with a waiting time of 1 min and a measurement time of 6 min per scan. Si (Aldrich 99% pure) was added to the samples so that the data could be corrected for sample displacement using X’Pert High Score Plus software. In the case of the Jojoba/LDH-stearate formulation, the formulation was pocketed in a plastic film and analysed from 25–50 °C.

Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC) data were collected on a Mettler Toledo DSC 1 instrument. Samples of 5–10 mg were placed in a 40 µl alumina pan and heated from -40 °C
to 150 °C and then cooled back to -40 °C at a scan rate of 10 °C/min and an N₂ flow rate of 50 ml/min. A pin hole was made in the lid.

Polarised optical microscopy (POM) was used to study the crystallisation behaviour of the formulations using a Carl Zeiss POM. The samples were sandwiched between two glass slides and heated on a Linkam THMS hot stage (Linkam Scientific Instruments Ltd) from room temperature (∼ 25 °C) to 90 °C at a rate of 10 °C/min, and held at this temperature for 2 min before being cooled back to room temperature.

Standard FTIR was carried out on a Perkin Elmer 100 Spectrophotometer with a MIRacle ATR attachment with diamond Zn/Se plate; spectra were recorded between 4000 and 650 cm⁻¹ at a resolution of 2 cm⁻¹ and the data collected after 32 scans. The temperature scan FTIR spectra were traced between 4000 and 400 cm⁻¹ on a Perkin Elmer Spectrum RX I FTIR. The sample was heated from 25 to 130 °C at a ramp rate of 5 °C/min. Data were obtained from an average of 32 scans, recorded at a resolution of 2 cm⁻¹, background-corrected, using the KBr windows which sandwiched the sample.

Viscosity measurements were carried out on an Anton Paar MCR 301 Rheometer with a Peltier heating system using a 50 mm parallel-plate measuring system. The effect of temperature on the viscosity was measured by placing the sample in the centre of the stationary plate, and the shear rate of the rotating plate was kept constant at 5 s⁻¹. Different shear rates were explored, i.e. 10 and 50 s⁻¹, but no substantial difference was noted. The formulation was heated from 10 to 90 °C and cooled back down to 10 °C. The temperature ramp was 10 °C/min.

The effect of shear rate on the viscosity of the sample was investigated, during which the temperature of the system was maintained at 30 °C. The shear rate of the rotating plate was increased from 1 to 100 s⁻¹.
4.6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.6.1 Organo-layered double hydroxides (organo-LDHs)

The properties of the organo-LDHs are briefly revisited here as the study showed that intercalation results in different products.

The main difference in the LDH-stearates used is in the platelet size and shape (see Figure 4.4). LDH-stearate (E) had very large rhombohedral-shaped (euhedral) platelets ranging from 10 to 50 µm, and showed very little particle-particle interaction. On the other hand, LDH-stearate (S) had a combination of anhedral- and subhedral-shaped platelets with a size less than 5 µm. Heavy agglomeration was also observed. Euhedral crystals have flat, easily recognisable faces with sharp angles. The well-defined edges are oriented in a specific way relative to the underlying atomic arrangement of the crystal. Crystal faces are defined by indicating their intercepts on the crystallographic axes; this is usually denoted by their Miller indices.

![Figure 4.4. SEM micrographs of the LDH-stearates E and S used in the Jojoba oil formulation](image)
Figure 4.5. (a) Schematic illustration of silicon dangling bond (Kasap 2001) and (b) euhedral and subhedral crystals arrows indicating dangling bonds

A hypothetical 2-D crystal (Figure 4.5a) has on its surface atoms that cannot fulfil their bonding requirements and therefore have broken or dangling bonds (Kasap 2001). These surface atoms can either bond with each other in the case of surface reconstruction or have physisorbed and chemisorbed atoms (Kasap 2001). The rough edges have a lot of ‘dangling’ bonds (Figure 4.5b), to which new atoms/molecules can easily bond to, as the crystal grows. The smooth planes have fewer dangling bonds, and new atoms cannot easily attach, so these planes grow outwards more slowly. This is corroborated by the findings of Schofield and Samson (1954). In their studies they found that the edges of kaolinite crystals with imperfections are a result of bond breakages and these sites carry positive charges. These broken bonds can therefore act as sites for further chemical reaction.
Figure 4.6. XRD diffractograms of: (a) LDH-St (E) and (b) LDH-St (S)

Figure 4.6 shows the diffractograms of each of the respective species of platelets. It is evident that the LDH-stearate (E) had a well-developed crystal form and good ordering, due to the symmetry of the reflections observed. On the other hand, the LDH-stearate (S) exhibited a strong primary basal reflection, although the other peaks are not symmetrical, this is an indication of crystal irregularities. These observations support the observed morphology of platelets.

The properties of the LDH used in the formulation with Jojoba oil are summarised in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2. Summary of XRD and TGA results for the LDH-CO$_3$, LDH-stearates (E and S), magnesium stearate and aluminium stearate samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>d-spacing (nm)</th>
<th>TG residue (wt.%)</th>
<th>Intercalation (multiples of AEC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-CO$_3$ + Tween 60</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate E</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate S</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-St/Al-St</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium stearate</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>(5.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium stearate</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>(5.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.7. shows the FTIR spectrum of the LDH-stearate. The observed bands are consistent with those found in previous investigations (Nhlapo et al., 2008; Focke et al., 2010). Each respective assignment is found in the caption to the figure. Being a bilayer intercalated LDH-stearate, both derivatives (S) & (E) have very similar spectra.
**Figure 4.7.** FTIR spectrum of the LDH-St

**Legend:** (A) broad O-H stretch, 3460 cm\(^{-1}\); (B) C-H stretch, 2954, 2917, 2870 cm\(^{-1}\); (C) H\(_2\)O bending modes, 1637 cm\(^{-1}\); (D) asymmetric carboxylic C=O stretch, 1588, 1554 and 1540 cm\(^{-1}\); (E) C-H bend (scissoring), 1472, 1466 cm\(^{-1}\); (F) C-O-H bend (involving O-H interaction), 1415 cm\(^{-1}\); (G) CO\(_3^{2-}\) \(v_3\) antisymmetric vibration, 1367, 1363 cm\(^{-1}\); (H) -CH\(_2\)-wagging bands; (I) \(v_1\) CO\(_3^{2-}\), 1114 cm\(^{-1}\); (J) M-OH deformation modes, 984, 877 cm\(^{-1}\); (K) M–OH translation mode, 757 cm\(^{-1}\); (L) -CH\(_2\)- in-phase rocking vibrations, 724, 716 cm\(^{-1}\); (M) \(v_4\) (in-plane bending) vibrations of CO\(_3^{2-}\), 668 cm\(^{-1}\)

In all other characterisation techniques the two LDH-stearates showed similarities. However, the dispersion of LDHs resulted in different viscosity and flow behaviours as a function of temperature. The LDH-stearate (S) in Jojoba oil had a substantially higher viscosity and a
complex flow behaviour as temperature was increased. On the other hand, LDH-stearate (E) had a much lower viscosity and showed a slight bump in the very same area (see Figure 4.8). This anomaly is thought to be attributable to the shape and size of the LDH particles. The LDH-stearate (S) has a considerably smaller particle size, which leads to a greater area of contact and, in turn, a greater particle interaction. In addition, the unassociated atoms/ions shown in Figure 4.5 could potentially be ‘active sites’ for further chemical reactions. When a crystal grows, new atoms attach easily to the rougher and less stable parts of the surface, but less easily to the flat, stable surfaces. Therefore, the flat surfaces tend to grow larger and smoother, until the whole crystal surface consists of all plane surfaces.

It was therefore of interest to explore this anomaly, clearly seen with the LDH-stearate. However, from this point onwards the LDH-stearate referred to is the form that has subhedral platelets, unless stated otherwise.

![Figure 4.8](image)

**Figure 4.8.** Viscosity curves as a function of temperature of: (a) 30 wt.% LDH-St (E) and (b) 30 wt.% LDH-St (S) (The heating run is shown in red and the cooling run in blue)
Figure 4.9 shows the X-ray diffractograms for stearic acid (99%), LDH-CO$_3$, and LDH-St prepared with Tween 60 as surfactant at an intercalation temperature of 80 °C. It also shows a diffractogram for the gelled Jojoba oil dispersion containing 30 wt.% LDH-St. The reflection at 0.76 nm ($2\theta = 13.49^\circ$) for LDH-CO$_3$ is present in the LDH-St and its Jojoba oil dispersion, confirming that the former is present as an impurity. The reflections at 4.98 nm ($2\theta = 2.06^\circ$), 2.51 nm ($2\theta = 4.08^\circ$) and 1.68 nm ($2\theta = 6.12^\circ$) are consistent with bilayer intercalated LDH-St. The d-spacing of the LDH-stearate decreased slightly to 4.65 nm in the 30 wt.% in the Jojoba oil dispersion.

4.6.2 Jojoba oil/LDH-derivative formulation

4.6.2.1 Viscosity of stearic acid suspensions

Figure 4.10 shows the effect of temperature on the apparent viscosity of selected stearic acid suspensions in Jojoba oil. The DSC traces are shown in Figures 4.11 and 4.12 show optical micrographs of the 20 wt.% stearic acid suspension, which is roughly the same amount contained in the LDH-stearate/Jojoba oil formulation. The observations with regard to Figures 4.10 to 4.12 can be summarised as follows. Figure 4.10 shows that the low-
temperature viscosity of the suspensions increases dramatically with stearic acid content (also shown in Appendix D). However, when the samples are heated, a rapid drop is observed to values comparable to or lower than the viscosity observed for the Jojoba oil at higher temperatures.

![Viscosity-temperature curves](image1)

**Figure 4.10.** Viscosity-temperature curves of Jojoba oil/stearic acid suspensions heated at 5 °C/min from 10 to 90°C and cooled at the same rate back to 10 °C (The heating runs are shown in red and the cooling run in blue)

![DSC traces](image2)

**Figure 4.11.** DSC traces for neat Jojoba oil and stearic acid as well as a 60:40 blend of the oil with the acid; samples were heated at 5 °C/min from -40 to 200 °C and cooled at the same rate back to -40 °C
Figures 4.11 and 4.12 confirm that this step change in the viscosity can be associated with the melting of the stearic acid. Figure 4.11 also shows that Jojoba oil and stearic acid are fully molten above 15 and 60 °C respectively. In the presence of Jojoba oil, the stearic acid melts at a lower temperature, but the converse does not hold.

![Image of hot-stage optical microscopy](image)

**Figure 4.12.** Hot-stage optical microscopy of Jojoba oil suspension containing 20 wt.% stearic acid (magnification bar: 40µm)

The heats of melting and of crystallisation, for the suspended stearic acid, are nearly in proportion to the amount of acid present. This implies that the stearic acid is partially soluble in Jojoba oil at low temperatures. This is corroborated by the fact that even a 10 wt.% suspension increases the viscosity of the oil by two orders of magnitude. This observation can be explained by the formation of a space-filling network of fat crystal (Thareja et al., 2010) (see also Figure 4.11). The network crystal interaction provides firmness or gel-like character. Note also that the crystallisation of both the stearic acid and the Jojoba oil is more sluggish in the blend. This implies that the presence of stearic acid in the Jojoba oil matrix retards the crystallisation of Jojoba oil chains.

From the above data it is clear that colligative properties exist between stearic acid and Jojoba oil. Figure 4.13 illustrates a phase diagram of a generalised temperature versus composition for the Jojoba oil-stearic acid formulations. The left side of the curve intersects the ordinate at the melting point of pure Jojoba oil; on the right it intersects the ordinate at the melting point of pure stearic acid. The minimum is the eutectic and a horizontal line is drawn along the eutectic temperature. The left side can be considered as the ‘freezing-point-depression’ curve for stearic acid dissolved in Jojoba oil, and the curve to the right Jojoba oil dissolved in stearic acid. This is typical of binary systems in which the liquids are completely
miscible and the solids completely insoluble in each other (clearly demonstrated in Figures 4.11 and 4.12).

![Liquid solution
(Jojoba oil + stearic acid)]

**Figure 4.13.** General illustration of a Jojoba oil-stearic acid phase diagram

### 4.6.2.2 Effect of concentration on viscosity of the Jojoba oil formulation

Figure 4.14 shows the relationship that exists between viscosity and increase in the LDH-stearate content in the Jojoba oil matrix. All samples continue to exhibit shear-thinning behaviour, which is an indication of the internal structure within the matrix. As the shear rate increases, the LDH particles will tend to align themselves to the direction of flow. Viscosity continues to increase with the increase in the amount of LDH-stearate used in the formulation. This is due to ‘jamming up’ of the suspension giving rise to a continuous three-dimensional contact throughout the system, thus making flow restricted (Barnes *et al.*, 1986). Since the material under consideration also contained derivatives of magnesium and aluminium stearates, it was decided to study the effect that adding them would have on the viscosity of the Jojoba oil suspensions. Figure 4.15 shows the effect of Al-stearate, Mg-
stearate and LDH-stearate on the viscosity of Jojoba oil as the shear rate changes. The viscosity of Mg-stearate is much higher than that of both Al-stearate and LDH-stearate. Interestingly, the LDH-stearate depicts a viscosity that is in between that of Al-stearate and Mg-stearate.

![Figure 4.14](image1.png)

**Figure 4.14.** The effect of shear rate and LDH-St content on the viscosity of Jojoba oil suspensions (the temperature was kept constant at 30 °C)

![Figure 4.15](image2.png)

**Figure 4.15.** Comparison of the Jojoba oil thickening efficiency of 30 wt.% Mg-stearate, Al-stearate and LDH-St (the temperature was 30 °C)
It is usual to add small organic/polar molecules that act as activators in organoclay suspensions. The effect of addition of 5 wt.% of alcohol on the LDH-St/Jojoba oil formulation is shown in Figure 4.16. The apparent viscosity of the dispersion seemed to decrease with increase in chain length. This is an indication that the presence of alcohol helps in the dispersion of the organo-LDH in the Jojoba oil matrix. The LDH-St is partially covered with the stearate chains, meaning that there are areas with exposed OH groups that are able to interact with the alcohol hydroxyl groups. This enhances the wettability and dispersion of the LDH-St particles in the Jojoba oil. As the chain length increases, there is better compatibility of the alcohol hydrophobic tail with the matrix (which is typically composed of liquid wax esters of C\textsubscript{16–C\textsubscript{22}}). Better dispersion or solvation of fatty acid chains by the alcohol leads to lower apparent viscosity.

![Figure 4.16. Effect of the presence of small amounts of alcohols (5 wt.%) to 25 wt.% LDH-St suspension in Jojoba oil on the suspension viscosity](image)

4.6.2.3 Effect of temperature on viscosity of the Jojoba oil formulation

Generally, viscosity tends to decrease with increasing temperature. Surprisingly, when a 30 wt.% suspension of LDH-St in Jojoba oil was heated, it showed an increase in viscosity in a certain temperature region (Figure 4.17). When heated, the viscosity initially decreases with temperature, but then increases in the temperature range of 25 to 35°C before decreasing again. This is an indication of changes in flow behaviour, as well as of probable
microstructures forming during the rheological study at the given temperature ranges. An increase in temperature results in an increase in the molecular or particle movement.

Figure 4.17. The effect of temperature on the viscosity of Jojoba oil and a 30 wt.% LDH-St suspensions subjected to a heating-cooling cycle (The shear rate was 30 s$^{-1}$; the temperature was scanned at 5 °C/min from 10 to 90 °C and back. The heating run is shown in red and the cooling run in blue)

As demonstrated in previous sections, free stearic acid molecules are exuded into the Jojoba oil matrix as the temperature increases. Depending on the concentration of stearic acid in the Jojoba matrix, the acid begins to melt at as low as 20 °C (see Appendix D). This means that the matrix is composed three components, i.e. LDH-St particles, Jojoba oil chains and the expelled stearic acid. As molecular/particle mobility increases as a function of temperature, so do the chances of particle-particle, particle-molecule and molecule-molecule interactions taking place. Figure 4.18 shows the viscosity-temperature curve of 30 wt.% of the LDH-St/Jojoba formulation. The heating run that is divided into three sections according to the different flow behaviour. The stages have been assigned the following events:
Figure 4.18. Viscosity-temperature heating run subdivided into three stages

I – This stage is not unusual; the inverse relationship of decrease in viscosity as a function of temperature increases is strongly exhibited. As temperature increases, the Jojoba oil becomes less viscous and flows readily. Particles introduced into a liquid at rest usually assume a state of thermodynamic equilibrium forming aggregated microstructures (Barnes et al., 1989). The microstructures breakdown from edge-to-face (house of cards) aggregation due to shear and align themselves to the direction of flow as shown in the Figure 4.18 and Table 4.3.

II – This stage exhibits an increase in viscosity as temperature increases. This begins at about 20 °C; at this temperature bilayer intercalated LDH begins to exude excess stearic acid into the Jojoba oil matrix. Addition of stearic acid into the Jojoba oil matrix would naturally increase the viscosity. The presence of ‘dangling bonds’ on the subhedral LDH-St particles previously mentioned can result in an inductive effect on the neighbouring acid group, as shown in Table 4.3. These associations could substantially increase the size of the LDH-St particle. This in turn will cause viscosity drag, resulting in a higher resistance to flow. On the other hand, the external hydroxyl groups of the LDH-St can also form hydrogen bonds. However, because of the presence of shear, the neighbouring platelets are envisaged to have edge-to-edge interaction, as shown in Table 4.3. These flocculated platelets also contribute to resistance to flow. Flocculated structures give rise to greater resistance to flow by enclosing and immobilising some of the continuous phase (Jojoba oil) hence increasing the apparent phase volume.

III – As temperature increases, the continuous phase (Jojoba oil) flows readily and the newly associated particles move as one mass and align to the direction of shear. Hence a steady
decrease in viscosity as a function of temperature is observed. Another plausible explanation is shearing of flocculated suspensions could possibly deform or even break them down at elevated temperatures.

**Table 4.3.** Illustration of the different stages associated with the heating run in the viscosity-temperature curve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="House of cards, Deaggregation, Orientation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of cards structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Clay–fatty acid interaction/association" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clay–fatty acid interaction/association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Clay–clay platelet interaction/association" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clay–clay platelet interaction/association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Associated particle" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associated particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Alignment to the direction of flow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment to the direction of flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When cooled, the apparent viscosity decreases slightly (Stage I) (see Figure 4.19), and then starts to increase at 54 °C. This marks the beginning of Stage II when the free stearic acid in the matrix begins to crystallise out. The viscosity continues to increase as the stearic acid crystallises, forming a fatty acid crystal network. In stage III the viscosity decreases; this could be explained by the fact that the fatty acid crystal network has been broken down due to continued shear action. Thareja et al. (2011) also cite the breakdown of some of the fatty acid crystal network due to applied strain. Stage IV shows another increase in the viscosity. The temperature in this region is low, the mobility of the matrix is greatly reduced and resistance to flow increases. The excess stearic acid molecules that continue to crystallise out and form networks also add to the viscosity increase in this stage.

![Figure 4.19. Viscosity-temperature cooling run subdivided into four stages](image)

Figure 4.20 shows the viscosity-temperature behaviour of Mg-stearate, Al-stearate and LDH-stearate. The complex behaviour observed in the LDH-stearate is absent in both Al-stearate and Mg-stearate.
Figure 4.20. Comparison of the Jojoba oil thickening efficiency of Mg-St, Al-St and LDH-St, all at a loading of 30 wt.%. (The shear rate was 5 s\(^{-1}\); temperature was scanned at 5 °C/min from 10 to 90 °C and back. The heating runs are shown in red and the cooling runs in blue coloured symbols)

4.6.2.4 State of LDH-St in Jojoba oil matrix

Figure 4.21 shows the diffractograms of stearic acid, LDH-St and the LDH-St/Jojoba oil formulation. The d-spacing of the LDH-St used is 4.98 nm. Next to the primary basal reflection is a shoulder which could be an indication of unreacted stearic acid. The typical characteristics of stearate-intercalated LDH have been previously discussed in other sections. After the heating and cooling run on the rheometer of the 30 wt.% formulation, XRD analysis was carried out on the sample and showed a slight decrease in the d-spacing (4.86 nm). This reduction could be a result of the exudation of the excess stearic acid. The peaks appear broader, especially the primary peak, which indicates the presence of numerous phases, as well as poor ordering. Such observations point to the possibility of delamination occurring to a certain extent.

The temperature scan XRD showed very little change within the anomalous region of 30–45 °C (see Appendix D). The d-spacing remained effectively the same. However, the element of shear was absent in the test and hence the results cannot be accurately correlated.
Figure 4.21. X-ray diffractograms of stearic acid, LDH-St and the LDH-St/Jojoba oil formulation

Figure 4.22 shows the FTIR spectra of the LDH-St/Jojoba oil formulation as temperature is increased. The spectra remained very similar to those of the bilayer intercalated LDH-St, which has previously been characterised to contain both un-ionised and ionised fatty acid species. A major change in the spectra was observed at 80 °C where the 1541 cm$^{-1}$ peak, shoulder at 1643 cm$^{-1}$, disappears. Borja & Dutta (1992) assigned these peaks to unassociated carboxylic acid.
Figure 4.22. FTIR spectra of 30 wt.% LDH-St/Jojoba oil formulation obtained as temperature is increased
4.7 CONCLUSION

The viscosity of the 30 wt.% LDH-St formulation shows complex temperature behaviour at a constant shear of 30 s⁻¹. It was initially thought that the increase and decrease in the apparent viscosity on heating and cooling respectively, in the low-temperature range 20 to 35 °C, is caused by reversible delamination and reassembly to a partially intercalated form. However, experiments such as temperature-scanned IR, DSC and XRD conducted on the LDH-St Jojoba oil formulation did not correlate well with the proposed hypothesis. The XRD analysis of the gel exposed to a cycle of heating and cooling shows a reduction in the d-spacing which could be explained by the exudation of the excess stearic acid. On the other hand, the reduction in the d-spacing could also be explained by delamination. This is further supported by the lack of ordering shown by peak broadening and symmetry changes. However, there is no concrete evidence of restacking. A more plausible explanation is the formation of a fat crystal network formed from the anchoring of exuded stearic acid molecules to the subhedral LDH particles. The observed anomalous response appears to be strongly related to the crystal structure of the platelets used. Association between platelets and platelet-free fatty acid molecules results in flocculated structures and substantially larger particles respectively. These are envisaged to cause ‘viscosity drag’, hence increasing the apparent viscosity of the matrix.
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Chapter 5

Conclusion and Recommendations

The chapter presents the general conclusions and makes recommendations regarding the findings of the research. The more specific conclusions are found at the end of each chapter.
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The work described in the thesis is a further contribution to the Hydrotalcite Project at the Institute of Applied Materials, University of Pretoria. The one-pot fatty acid intercalation technique was developed by Landman et al., 2005.\textsuperscript{1} Different types of starting material were used, i.e. LDH-CO$_3$ and LDO. Nhlapo et al. (2008)\textsuperscript{2} undertook a follow-up study using sodium dodecyl sulphate as a surfactant, and it was found that excess stearates were intercalated as their sodium salt. In this current study Tween 60 was employed, yielding sodium-free fatty acid-intercalated LDH. The carbonate form of layered double hydroxide (LDH-CO$_3$) was successfully intercalated with fatty acids (C$_{14}$–C$_{22}$) in a direct one-pot synthesis. The method yielded a product with minimal carbonate contamination. The highlights of this work with regard to the intercalation chemistry are:

- The different sizes and shapes of platelets formed during the modification process indicate that the intercalation entails dissolution and recrystallisation of the LDH-lattice.
- Intercalation can yield a mixed product, either aluminium-rich and/or magnesium-rich platelets or LDH platelets with the correct magnesium and aluminium ratio. Researchers have hardly probed the composition of the individual platelets, but from this study it would appear to be a worthwhile practice.
- High levels of intercalation are envisaged to be driven by the insertion of both ionised and un-ionised fatty acids.
- Changes occur in the interlayer structure as temperature is increased and the excess fatty acids are eventually exuded at elevated temperatures.

Polymer composites containing 5 and 10 wt.% LDH-St or LDH-CO$_3$ were prepared via melt-compounding. No marked difference in characteristics was observed and hence the 10 wt.% formulation formed the basis of the current study. The polymer matrices employed were EVA, LLDPE and EVAL. The LDH fillers appear to act as nucleating agents for EVA and LLDPE as the DSC crystallisation temperatures increased. However, in the EVAL


composites nucleation appeared to be retarded. A marked improvement in the Charpy notched impact strength was noted for the EVAL/LDH-St composite. The difference in the performance of the EVAL/LDH composites, compared with the less-polar polymers, is tentatively attributed to strong hydrogen bonding interaction between the -OH groups on the polymer backbone and those on the clay sheets. The melt-compounding process involved the removal of excess interlayer stearate anions, resulting in a monolayer arrangement. The exuded stearate ions were found to have lubricating and plasticising effects on the matrices. Although various improvements were obtained, it would be more beneficial to make composites from low-melting polymer matrices. In this instance the true nature of the organo-LDH is conserved.

In order to make a more detailed interpretation of the changes in mechanical properties presented earlier, an in-depth study of other factors, such as processing, thermomechanical history and structure development, is essential. Changes in molecular weight, orientation of polymer chains and filler, as well as crystallinity, all play a major role in the properties observed.

Although LDH-based composites appear to be attractive, their utilisation is hampered by their small aspect ratio (an aspect ratio of less than 80). Within a specific area ($A_{sp} < 100 \, m^2/g$), the platelets are thin (about 0.5 to 0.8 nm) and fragile (as seen by the platelet size reduction after melt processing). These properties can be manipulated in the use of LDHs as rheological modifiers in cosmetic or personal care product formulation. This section of the Hydrotalcite Project demonstrated the effectiveness of LDH-St as a rheological modifier by increasing the viscosity of the Jojoba oil. When viscosities of organo-LDH/Jojoba oil formulations were studied as a function of temperature, gelling was observed. This has been attributed to the formation of a fatty acid crystal network from the exuded excess acid. However, the gels were observed to form preferentially from subhedral-shaped LDH particles. Further study is essential to ascertain the effect of platelet shape on the anomalous viscosity observation. Particles with a uniform size distribution should be employed in the study. Modified LDHs could also be used for emulsion stabilisation.
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Appendix B: Fatty acid-intercalated layered double hydroxides

Figure B-1. Fatty/carboxylic acids used in the study

Figure B-1 shows the fatty acids used in the intercalation reaction. Oleic acid was also intercalated to demonstrate the close packing phenomenon. Due to the presence of the \textit{cis}-double bond, the molecules pack with difficulty as this bond limits chain flexibility and decreases adhesion to adjacent chains. The limiting area of oleic acid is about 32 Å², which is much greater than that of saturated fatty acid chains, which is \(\approx 21\ \text{Å}^2\).
The basic method was adapted from Nhlapo et al. (2008) for the one-pot synthesis. The LDH-carbonate precursor was obtained from Chamotte Holdings and used as is.

Table B-1. Summary of intercalation experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample LD</th>
<th>AEC (Acid)</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>pH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate C</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-laurate/jojoba oil</td>
<td>2 lauric + 1 jojoba oil</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate/jojoba oil (1AEC)</td>
<td>1 stearic + 2 jojoba oil</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate/jojoba oil (2AEC)</td>
<td>2 stearic + 1 jojoba oil</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate/jojoba oil (2AEC)</td>
<td>2 stearic + 1 jojoba oil</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDHSt 1 AEC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDHSt 2AEC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- palmitate 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- palmitate 3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- palmitate 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate/stearate</td>
<td>2 palmitic + 2 stearic</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-behenate 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-behenate 2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>~9-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X-Ray Diffraction

Figure B-2. XRD diffractograms for LDH-myristate
Table B-2. Observed 2θ reflections of XRD of neat myristic acid and LDH-myristate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Reflections</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2θ(°)</td>
<td>d003</td>
<td>2θ(°)</td>
<td>d006</td>
<td>2θ(°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myristic acid</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 1</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 2</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 3</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 4</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B-3. XRD diffractograms for LDH-palmitate
Table B-3. Observed 20 reflections of XRD of neat palmitic acid and LDH-palmitate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$2\theta$ ($^\circ$)</th>
<th>$d_{003}$ (nm)</th>
<th>$2\theta$ ($^\circ$)</th>
<th>$d_{006}$ (nm)</th>
<th>$2\theta$ ($^\circ$)</th>
<th>$d_{009}$ (nm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmitic acid</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 1</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 2</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 3</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 4</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average d-spacing observed for LDH-palmitate samples was 4.538 nm. However, it is clear that there are palmitic acid impurities in the case of LDH-palmitate 4. This further substantiates the observations by Kuehn and Poelmann (2010) that a second layer of undissociated acid will lead in greater d-spacings.

Figure B-4. XRD diffractograms for LDH-behenate
Table B-4. Observed 2θ reflections of XRD of neat behenic acid and LDH-behenate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>2θ(°)</th>
<th>d_{003}(nm)</th>
<th>2θ(°)</th>
<th>d_{006}(nm)</th>
<th>2θ(°)</th>
<th>d_{009}(nm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behenic acid</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-behenate 1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-behenate 2</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average d-spacing observed for LDH-behenate samples was 6.097 nm.

Co-intercalation Trials

Two different fatty acids were used in the intercalation reaction, i.e. palmitic acid and stearic acid. The resultant intercalation product had a d-spacing of 4.56 nm (Figure B-5). This is substantially higher than what is normally obtained for bilayer LDH-palmitate (4.46 nm), yet it is lower than that of bilayer LDH-St (4.88 nm). This is an indication that the fatty acids will orient themselves in such a manner that they can accommodate each other, despite the difference in chain length.

In other scenarios, an attempt was made to co-intercalate Jojoba oil and stearic acid into LDH in a ratio of 2:1 and 1:2 respectively. However, co-intercalation was only observed in the later ratio of Jojoba oil to stearic acid (Figure B-5).

Figure B-5. XRD diffractogram of co-intercalated organo-LDH
Co-intercalation of stearate anion and Jojoba oil yielded a mixed-order product with crystallites with d-spacings of 5.06 and 4.46 nm. The latter is assumed to be a constituent of Jojoba oil; its phases are marked by means of asterisks in Figure B-5. This points to the possible exchange/incorporation of the Jojoba oil constituents with the LDH interlayer anions. The narrow symmetric peaks observed are indicative of a highly crystalline and well-ordered material. This is primarily explained by the fact that Jojoba oil wax esters have a chain length of C\textsubscript{34}–C\textsubscript{50} with an alcohol/acid combination of C\textsubscript{16}–C\textsubscript{26}, and hence allow interaction with the interlayer anions. The fatty acid and alcohol component of the ester is usually unsaturated, both possessing a cis-ethylenic bond between the 9th and the 10th carbon, counting from either of the terminal methyl groups (Miwa, 1984\textsuperscript{3}). The cis-geometry has bends at the position of the double bond. The ill-defined secondary peak is due to co-intercalation of a Jojoba oil constituent. However, as mentioned earlier, the fact that the Jojoba oil esters possess a double bond imposes some steric challenges. Hence, minimal intercalation is observed as well as poor ordering/absorption within the interlayer.

Table B-5 shows the elemental composition as determined by ICP-EOS.

**Table B-5.** Compositional data and formulae of co-intercalated organo-LDHs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercalated Anion</th>
<th>Aluminium mol ratio to</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pal/St</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St/Jojoba oil</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morphology

Figure B-6 shows the typical platelet morphology of the co-intercalated LDHs described above.

![SEM micrographs of co-intercalated LDHs](image)

**Figure B-6.** SEM micrographs of co-intercalated LDHs
EDS Analysis of Clay Platelets

During the study some samples showed unusually high AEC levels or elevated levels of organic incorporation. For this reason the composition of the clay platelets was investigated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight %</th>
<th>Atom ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-CO$_3$ pt1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight % Error (+/- 1 Sigma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Al</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH-CO$_3$ pt1</td>
<td>+/-0.6</td>
<td>+/-0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B-7.** LDH-CO$_3$ SEM micrograph, X-ray and composition of platelets
**Figure B-8.** LDH-myristate SEM micrograph, X-ray and composition of platelets
Figure B-9. LDH-palmitate SEM micrograph, X-ray and composition of platelets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight %</th>
<th>Atom ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate pt1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight % Error (+/- 1 Sigma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate pt1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B-10. LDH-St SEM micrograph, X-ray and composition of platelets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight %</th>
<th>Atom ratio</th>
<th>Mg/Al ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Al</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate pt1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate pt2</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight % Error (+/- 1 Sigma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Al</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate pt1</td>
<td>+/-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate pt2</td>
<td>+/-1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B-11. LDH-behenate SEM micrograph, X-ray and composition of platelets
Thermogravimetric Analysis

The formulae used in the calculation of the clay content on a dry basis; actual clay and percentage organic content are:

Clay content on a dry basis  =  \frac{\% \text{ Residue at } 900 \, ^\circ\text{C}}{\% \text{ Residue at } 150 \, ^\circ\text{C}}

Actual clay content is obtained by multiplying the ratio of the clay content on a dry basis to that of 100% clay of the LDH precursor. For example, using LDH-CO$_3$,

Clay content on a dry basis  =  \frac{57.33}{98.51}
= 58.19\%

Ratio of clay on a dry basis to 100%  =  \frac{100}{58.19}
= 1.718

% Organic content = 100 – Actual % clay

Table B-6. Summary of thermogravimetric data and estimates for the degree of intercalation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample identity</th>
<th>Residual mass loss (wt.%) at</th>
<th>Carboxylate/Al mol ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 °C</td>
<td>900 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-CO$_3$</td>
<td>98.10</td>
<td>57.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 1</td>
<td>92.90</td>
<td>23.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 2</td>
<td>96.88</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 3</td>
<td>97.77</td>
<td>48.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate 4</td>
<td>96.83</td>
<td>13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 1</td>
<td>95.99</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 2</td>
<td>96.23</td>
<td>20.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 3</td>
<td>95.50</td>
<td>26.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate 4</td>
<td>95.73</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate</td>
<td>95.40</td>
<td>13.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-behenate 1</td>
<td>96.45</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-behenate 2</td>
<td>96.04</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B-12. LDH-palmitate and myristate TG profile
Table B-7. Summary of thermogravimetric data, estimates for the degree of intercalation and d-spacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample identity</th>
<th>Residual mass loss (wt.%) at 150 °C</th>
<th>Carboxylate/Al mol ratio</th>
<th>d-spacing (nm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH- CO₃</td>
<td>98.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 1</td>
<td>95.15</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 2</td>
<td>95.10</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 3</td>
<td>94.29</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 4</td>
<td>94.75</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 5</td>
<td>95.40</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 6</td>
<td>95.28</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 7</td>
<td>95.18</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 8</td>
<td>95.44</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 9</td>
<td>95.57</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 10</td>
<td>94.71</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 11</td>
<td>94.94</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 12</td>
<td>94.99</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 13</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>95.04</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample identity</th>
<th>Residual mass loss (wt.%) at 900 °C</th>
<th>Carboxylate/Al mol ratio</th>
<th>d-spacing (nm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 14</td>
<td>95.27</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 15</td>
<td>95.27</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH- stearate 16</td>
<td>95.52</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>95.35</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The division indicates samples prepared by two different individuals. The bottom three exhibit exceptionally high carboxylate/Al mol ratios. Discrepancies could have arisen from the pH regulation during synthesis, as well as the washing procedure used for the sample.
Appendix C: LDH-based polymer composites

Injection Moulding Comments

Table C-1. Injection moulding comments on EVA and derivative composites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mould:</th>
<th>ASTM T.S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temperatures:</strong></td>
<td>Set point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 1</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 2</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 3</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melt</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection time</td>
<td>12 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection speed</td>
<td>8 mm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection pressure</td>
<td>180 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold on pressure</td>
<td>85 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back pressure</td>
<td>10 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw speed</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling time</td>
<td>25 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>22 mm(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clamping force</td>
<td>350 kN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
- Fed with difficulty
- Moulded with ease
- Mouldings very rubbery
- Moulded all samples under the same moulding conditions
- Short cycle times
### Table C-2: Injection moulding comments on EVAL and derivative composites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mould:</th>
<th>ASTM T.S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temperatures:</strong></td>
<td>Set point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 1</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 2</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 3</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melt</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection time</td>
<td>15 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection speed</td>
<td>15 mm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection pressure</td>
<td>180 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold on pressure</td>
<td>85 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back pressure</td>
<td>10 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw speed</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling time</td>
<td>25 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>22 mm(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clamping force</td>
<td>350 kN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
- Fed with ease
- Moulded with ease but stuck to the stationary half of the mould
- Mouldings very hard
- Moulded all samples under the same moulding conditions
- Mouldings hammered out after each shot; long cycle time
Table C-3. Injection moulding comments on LLDPE and derivative composites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mould:</th>
<th>ASTM T.S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperatures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set point</td>
<td>Indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(°C)</td>
<td>(°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 1</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 2</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel 3</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melt</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection time</td>
<td>10 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection speed</td>
<td>10 mm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection pressure</td>
<td>180 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold on pressure</td>
<td>75 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back pressure</td>
<td>10 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw speed</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling Time</td>
<td>25 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>22 mm(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clamping force</td>
<td>350 kN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
- Fed with ease
- Moulded with ease
- Mouldings tended to shrink
- Moulded all samples under the same moulding conditions
## Polymer resin product sheets

### Ethylene-Vinyl Acetate Copolymer Resin

**Polymer-E 百利滿-E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Test Method (ASTM)</th>
<th>EV101</th>
<th>EV102</th>
<th>EV103</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polymer-E 百利滿-E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foaming &amp; Casting Grades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV101</td>
<td>EV102</td>
<td>EV103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Physical Properties**
  - **Density** (g/cm³)
  - **Hardness** (Shore D)
  - **Heat Deflection Temp. (65 psi)** (°C)
  - **Heat Distortion Temperature** (°C)
  - **Heat Distortion Temperature** (°C)
  - **Heat Distortion Temperature** (°C)

- **Mechanical Properties**
  - **Ultimate Modulus** (Mpa)
  - **Ultimate Tensile Strength** (Mpa)
  - **Elongation** (%)

- **Chemical Resistance**
  - **Chemical Resistance**

### Notes:
1. For general purpose and thin gauge film applications, film properties are based on thickness of 0.10 mil (2.5 microns) extruded on a blown film line at 150°F (65°C) and 1.1 BAR.  For Heavy Duty Films, properties are based on thickness of 0.06 mil (1.5 microns) blown at 150°F (65°C) and 1.1 BAR.
2. The data reported are typical properties for reference only and are not to be construed as specifications.

### Manufacturing:
- **Preparation**
  - [Preparation Process]
  - [Preparation Equipment]

### Quality Control:
- **Testing Methods**
  - [Testing Method 1]
  - [Testing Method 2]

### Contact Information:
- **Contact Person**
  - [Contact Name]
- **Contact Address**
  - [Address]

### Additional Information:
- [Additional Notes]
  - [Note 1]
  - [Note 2]
Rotational moulding/injection moulding

**Melt index:** 3.5  **Density:** 0.939

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Additives</th>
<th>Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High rigidity</td>
<td>Antioxidant</td>
<td>Large mouldings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent impact strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thick walled containers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent chemical resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Articles for indoor use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good ESCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough and abrasion resistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colourable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexene copolymer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance properties - HR 411**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Test method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFI (190°C/2.16kg)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>g/10min</td>
<td>ASTM D1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal density</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>g/cm³</td>
<td>ASTM D1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile strength at yield</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>MPa</td>
<td>ASTM D638 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile strength at break</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>MPa</td>
<td>ASTM D638 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elongation at break</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>ASTM D638 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexural modulus</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>MPa</td>
<td>ASTM D790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCR F 50</td>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td>hr</td>
<td>ASTM D1693 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact energy at -40°C</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>J/m²</td>
<td>ASTM D3029 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicat softening temperature</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>ASTM D1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore D hardness</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Shore D</td>
<td>ASTM D2240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Crosshead speed 50mm/min
2) 100% Igepal CD630
3) Tested on rotomoulded product
LLDPE - Product Data Sheet

Processing (Rotomoulding)

An air temperature of 210°C to 300°C is recommended for processing of HR 411. Temperatures above 300°C should be avoided as this would narrow the processing window considerably and could result in poor physical properties.

Processing (Injection moulding)

HR 411 has a medium melt viscosity making it unsuitable for moulds with long flow paths. Typical melt temperatures would be 200°C - 230°C. Parts can be demoulded at relatively high temperatures due to the material's high melting point and rigidity.

Combustibility

Polyethylene resins will burn when supplied with adequate heat and oxygen. They should be handled and stored away from contact with direct flames and/or other ignition sources. In burning, polyethylene resins contribute high heat and may generate a dense black smoke. Fires can be extinguished by conventional means, with water and water mist preferred. In enclosed areas, fire fighters should be provided with self-contained breathing apparatus.

Pigmentation (Rotomoulding)

For colouring purposes inorganic pigments should be added at the lowest possible concentration and mixed in using a high speed mixer or a tumbler blender, prior to moulding. Pigment preparations should contain only minimal amounts of dispersants.

Food Packaging

This material complies with FDA regulation 177.1520 when used unmodified and according to good manufacturing practices for food contact applications. Accordingly, this material may be used in all food contact applications (except holding food during cooking).

Conveying

Conveying equipment should be designed to prevent accumulation of fines and dust particles that are contained in all polyethylene resins. These fines and dust particles can, under certain conditions, pose an explosion hazard. We recommend the conveying system used:

1. be equipped with adequate filters;
2. is operated and maintained in such a manner to ensure no leaks develop;
3. that adequate grounding exists at all times.

We further recommend good housekeeping be practiced throughout the facility.

Storage

As ultraviolet light may cause a change in the material, all resins should be protected from direct sunlight during storage.

Presentation

Supplied in pellet form packed in 25kg bags. Grinding of pellets is required to make it suitable for rotomoulding.

Handling

Workers should be protected from the possibility of skin or eye contact with molten polymer. Safety glasses are suggested as a minimal precaution to prevent possible mechanical or thermal injury to the eyes. Fabrication areas should be ventilated to carry away fumes or vapours.

This information is based on our current knowledge and experience. In view of many factors that may affect processing and application, this data does not relieve processors from the responsibility of carrying out their own tests and experiments, neither does it imply any legally binding assurance of certain properties or of suitability for a specific purpose. It is the responsibility of those to whom we supply our products to ensure that any proprietary rights and existing laws and legislation are observed.
Datasheet: Typical Properties of EVAL™ Resin

**EVAL™ T101B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test method</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethylene Content</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kuraray Method</strong></td>
<td><strong>mol %</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14965-2 annex E</td>
<td>20°C 0%RH</td>
<td>cm² 20μm²/m²·day·atm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14965-2 annex E</td>
<td>20°C 50%RH</td>
<td>cm² 20μm²/m²·day·atm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14965-2 annex E</td>
<td>20°C 75%RH</td>
<td>cm² 20μm²/m²·day·atm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14965-2 annex E</td>
<td>20°C 95%RH</td>
<td>cm² 20μm²/m²·day·atm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Vapour Transmission Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASTM E96-E</strong></td>
<td>g 30μg/m²·day·atm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Density**

- ISO 1183 kg/m³ 1.17

**Yield Stress**

- ISO 527 MPa

**Stress at Break**

- ISO 527 MPa

**Yield Strain**

- ISO 527 %

**Stain at Break**

- ISO 527 %

**Young's Modulus**

- ISO 527 MPa

**Flexural Modulus**

- ISO 178 MPa

** Izod Impact Strength**

- ISO 180 kJ/m²

** Izod at -40°C**

- ISO 180

**Charpy Impact Strength**

- ISO 193-1 kJ/m²

**Charpy at -40°C**

- ISO 193-1 kJ/m²

**Rockwell Hardness**

- ISO 2059-2 M

**Melting Temperature**

- ISO 11367 °C 183

**Crystallisation Temperature**

- ISO 11367 °C 161

**Glass Transition Point**

- ISO 11367 °C 69

**Visco Softening Point**

- ISO 306 °C

**Melt Mass-Flow Rate**

- ISO 1133 190°C g/10min 1.7
- ISO 1133 210°C g/10min 4.3
- ISO 1133 230°C g/10min
- ISO 1133 250°C g/10min

**Contact**

EVAL Europe nv
Haven 1053 - Nieuwe Weg 1, Box 10
2070 Zwijndrecht (Antwerp), Belgium
Tel +32 3 250-9733
Fax +32 3 250-9745

**Data updated on:**

18-Nov-04

**Layout updated on:**

11-Dec-06

*Note: The information and data contained in this document are believed to be current and are given in good faith. However, no liability, warranty or guarantee of final product performance is created by this document. No freedom from any patent is granted or to be inferred. This document does not constitute a sales specification and the EVAL Europe nv Sales Contract General Terms and Conditions continue to apply.*
FT-IR of Composites

Figure C-1 shows the FTIR results of the LDH-stearate and each of the 10 wt% composites prepared. The LDH-CO$_3$ exhibits a broad band at 3455 cm$^{-1}$, which is characteristic of the hydroxyl stretching vibration of free hydrogen, hydrogen bonded to the octahedral layer and water molecules. The LDH-CO$_3$ has a peak at 1360 cm$^{-1}$, which is attributed to carbonate anions. For the LDH-St there is minimal carbonate contamination as the peak within the specified area is weak or in some cases absent. The OH stretching vibrations are also observed, as well as a shoulder between 3247 and 3225 cm$^{-1}$, which is attributed to the water molecules bonded to the interlayer anion by hydrogen bonding. The peaks between 2940 and 2847 cm$^{-1}$ are assigned to -CH$_2$ asymmetric and symmetric vibrations of aliphatic groups, while the peaks at 1630 and 1462 cm$^{-1}$ are due to O-H deformation of entrapped water molecules and CH$_2$ deformation respectively. The CH$_2$ wagging modes are also observed in the 1300–1250 cm$^{-1}$ range. The 1534 cm$^{-1}$ peak is due to the symmetric stretching mode of the ionised –C-O group. The M-O in-plane stretching and deformation of the LDH metal lattice is observed between 1000 and 719 cm$^{-1}$. Generally, all these peaks are preserved in the composite materials. However, a few peaks from the polymer overlap with those in the LDH stearate, e.g. the OH band overlaps with that of the LDH-St and EVAL due to the existence of OH groups in the polymer itself. However, the –OH band in the EVAL/LDH-St composite broadens and its intensity is reduced. This could be attributed to the interaction of the –OH groups of the metal hydroxide with that of the polymer. This band is retained in the EVA and LLDPE composites, pointing to no interaction of the aforementioned functional groups. The peaks at 1735 and 1235 cm$^{-1}$ in the EVA samples are a result of O-C=O carbonyl stretching vibrations of the ester and asymmetric vibration of the C-O-C bond respectively.
Figure C-1. FTIR of the neat and composite derivatives
Low magnification

High magnification

Figure C-2. TEM micrographs of the 5 wt.% LDH-carbonate polymer composites
Figure C-3. TEM micrographs of the 5 wt.% LDH-stearate polymer composites
Figure C-4. Dynamic mechanical properties of 5% filler formulations
Mechanical Properties

Figure C-5. Tensile strength and tensile impact test summary of neat EVAL and derivative composites
Figure C-6. Tensile strength and tensile impact test summary of neat EVA and derivative composites
Figure C-7. Tensile strength and tensile impact test summary of neat LLDPE and derivative composites
Figure C-8. Tensile test results
Fracture Behaviour

Figure C-9. SEM micrographs of fractured surfaces from the Charpy impact test and corresponding data (composites of 10 wt.% LDH)

Figure C-9 shows SEM micrographs of the Charpy impact specimens of the LDH/polymer composite samples. As mentioned earlier, breaks were observed in the EVAL and LLDPE samples. The two matrix systems show two different types of break, i.e. a brittle and a ductile break for the EVAL and LLDPE composites respectively. The EVAL specimens show a classic brittle break, with a mirror region extending radially outward from the initial flaw, forming a hackled region. Normally, fracture is perpendicular to polymer fibres, but angular cracks and breaks are observed in the composite samples. A closer look at the inserts of EVAL composites shows a granular fracture, implying that the addition of the LDH induces strong association within the polymer matrix. It is clear that the adhesion between the EVAL and the LDH is good as there is no clear distinction between the platelets and the polymer. The polymer continued to cover the LDH particles at the time of fracture.
DSC Data

Figure C-10. DSC scans of EVA and derivative composites

Figure C-11. DSC scans of EVAL and derivative composites
The figures below are DSC scans of the 5% LDH loading. A slight change is observed in the melting and crystallisation temperatures of each of the filled systems.

**Figure C-12.** DSC scans of LLDPE and derivative composites

**Figure C-13.** DSC scans of EVAL and derivative composites
Figure C-14. DSC scans of EVA and derivative composites

Figure C-15. DSC scans of LLDPE and derivative composites
Figure C-16. TG data of EVA and derivative composites

Figure C-17. TG data of EVA and derivative composites
Evolved Gas Analysis

Figure C-18. Evolved gas analysis of neat EVAL by TG-FTIR
Figure C-19. Evolved gas analysis of EVAL/5% LDH-St by TG-FTIR
Figure C-20. Evolved gas analysis of EVAL/10% LDH-St by TG-FTIR
Figure C-21. Evolved gas analysis of EVAL/5% LDH-CO$_3$ by TG-FTIR
Figure C-22. Evolved gas analysis of EVAL/10% LDH-CO$_3$ by TG-FTIR
Figure C-23. Evolved gas analysis of neat EVA by TG-FTIR
Figure C-24. Evolved gas analysis of EVA/5% LDH-St by TG-FTIR
Figure C-25. Evolved gas analysis of EVA/10% LDH-St by TG-FTIR
Figure C-26. Evolved gas analysis of EVA/5% LDH-CO$_3$ by TG-FTIR
Figure C-27. Evolved gas analysis of EVA/10% LDH-CO$_3$ by TG-FTIR
Appendix D: Organo-LDH / Jojoba oil suspension

Fatty Acid-Jojoba Oil Formulation

Table D-1. Stearic acid in Jojoba oil formulation (J stands for Jojoba oil and S for stearic acid and their respective compositions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID Formulation ratio</th>
<th>Weight of acid (g)</th>
<th>Weight of Jojoba oil (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J-S 95-5</td>
<td>0.5001</td>
<td>9.5028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-S 90-10</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>9.0151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-S 80-20</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>8.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-S 70-30</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>7.0023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-2. Palmitic acid in Jojoba oil formulation (J stands for Jojoba oil and P for palmitic acid and their respective compositions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID Formulation ratio</th>
<th>Weight of acid (g)</th>
<th>Weight of Jojoba oil (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J-P 95-5</td>
<td>0.5003</td>
<td>9.5011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P 90-10</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>9.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P 80-20</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>8.0166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P 70-30</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>7.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure D-1. Viscosity-temperature curve of different stearic acid compositions in Jojoba oil

Figure D-2. 20 wt.% of stearic acid in Jojoba oil heated and cooled to 24 °C (measurement bar is 40 µm)
Figure D-3. DSC curves of different stearic acid compositions in Jojoba oil
Figure D-4. Viscosity-temperature curve of different palmitic acid compositions in Jojoba oil

Figure D-5. 20 wt.% palmitic acid in Jojoba oil heated and cooled to 25 °C (measurement bar is 40 µm)

It is interesting to note that fatty acid crystallisation behaviour in Jojoba oil differs for stearic and palmitic acid. This could also explain the different gels obtained from the LDH-stearate and from the LDH-palmitate. Crystal shape, size and density were found to affect the physical properties of the final solid fat matrix (Rye et al., 2005)
FT-IR Spectra

Figure D-6. FTIR spectra of neat Jojoba oil, 30 wt.% LDH-stearate/Jojoba oil formulation and stearate

The Jojoba oil peaks are the same as those observed in Le Dreau et al., 2008.
Rheology of Fatty Acid-Intercalated LDH/Jojoba Oil Formulation

**Table D-3.** Visual observation of different 30 wt% of intercalated LDHs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Carbon chain number</th>
<th>Orientation of intercalated anion</th>
<th>Appearance: unheated treated formulation</th>
<th>Appearance: heated treated formulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDH-myristate</td>
<td>C₁₄</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>Runny</td>
<td>Thickens slightly on standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-palmitate</td>
<td>C₁₆</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>Slightly runny</td>
<td>Thickens slightly on standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-stearate</td>
<td>C₁₈</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>Dropping consistency</td>
<td>Thickens slightly on standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-oleate</td>
<td>C₁₈</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>Runny</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH-behenate</td>
<td>C₂₂</td>
<td>Bilayer</td>
<td>Soft dropping consistency</td>
<td>Thickens slightly on standing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure D-7.* The effect of shear rate and temperature on the viscosity of Jojoba oil suspensions (the LDH-stearate content was 30 wt.% and the shear rate was kept constant at 5 s⁻¹)
Figure D-8. Viscosity as a function of temperature of the neat Jojoba oil

Figure D-9. Summary of rhombohedral-shaped LDH-palmitate: A – SEM image of morphology of particles; B – XRD diffractograms with a d-spacing of 4.7 nm; C – TGA data indicating organic content; D – viscosity curve as a function of temperature of the derivative 30 wt.% formulation
Figure D-10. Summary of subhedral-shaped LDH-palmitate: A – SEM image of morphology of particles; B – XRD diffractograms with a d-spacing of 4.46 nm; C – TGA data indicating organic content; D – viscosity curve as a function of temperature of the derivative 30 wt.% formulation
Complex viscosity behaviour was observed for the C_{16–C_{22}} intercalated LDHs.

Other formulations were attempted with LDH-palmitate and behenate/Jojoba oil systems, and similar results were obtained. However, the products were found to have a higher viscosity that the LDH-stearate derivatives and became grease-like. This could be explained by the fatty acid-platelet association, which results in the release of a hydrogen ion (H^+). The hydrogen attacks the unsaturated bonds of the Jojoba oil. Hydrogenation of these bonds...
results in the change of properties from oil (liquid) to wax (solid-like). Hence, fatty acid-intercalated LDHs may potentially be used as rheological modifiers. As a result it is recommended that further analysis and experimentation be conducted to determine the effect that LDH-fatty acid has on the rheological behaviour of Jojoba oil.

The co-intercalated samples also showed this complex viscosity, i.e. for the palmitic and stearic acid co-intercalated LDH (LDH-Pal-St), and for the Jojoba oil and stearic acid-intercalated LDH (LDH-Jojoba/stearate).

Figure D-12. Summary of subhedral-shaped LDH-Pal-St: A – SEM image of morphology of particles; B – XRD diffractograms with a d-spacing of 4.56 nm; C – TGA data indicating organic content; D – viscosity curve as a function of temperature of the derivative 30 wt.% formulation
**Figure D-13.** Summary of subhedral-shaped LDH-(Jojoba/stearate): A – SEM image of morphology of particles; B – XRD diffractograms with d-spacings of 5.06 and 4.46 nm; C – TGA data indicating organic content; D – viscosity curve as a function of temperature of the derivative 30 wt.% formulation.