



**ME533 – Applicability of the Composite  
Rule-of-Mixtures for the Description of  
the Mechanical Properties of PBT  
Polymeric Matrix-Short Glass Fiber  
System**

Alan Wu  
Jan Quijalvo  
Ryan Lam

4B Mechanical Engineering

Prepared for  
ME 533 - Composite Materials with Non-metallic and  
Metallic Matrices  
Robert A. Varin

April 3, 2017

## **Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Experimental Procedure</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>15</b>

## List of Figures

1	PBT11 Longitudinal Fiber Counting . . . . .	5
2	PBT11 Transverse Fiber Counting . . . . .	5
3	PBT11 Volume Fraction Count . . . . .	6
4	PBT12 Volume Fraction Count . . . . .	6
5	PBT9 Tensile Test . . . . .	9
6	PBT9 Test to Failure . . . . .	9
7	PBT11 Tensile Test . . . . .	10
8	PBT11 Test to Failure . . . . .	10
9	PBT12 Tensile Test . . . . .	11
10	PBT12 Test to Failure . . . . .	11
11	PBT14 Tensile Test . . . . .	12
12	PBT14 Test to Failure . . . . .	12
13	Fracture Stress, Experimental vs. Analytical . . . . .	13
14	Young's Modulus, Experimental vs. Analytical . . . . .	14

## List of Tables

1	PBT9, PBT11, PBT12, and PBT14 Values . . . . .	7
2	Material Data for E-Glass Fiber and PBT Polymer . . . . .	7
3	PBT9, PBT11, PBT12, and PBT14 Modulus and Fracture Stress . . . . .	8
4	Tensile Test Data . . . . .	13

## 1 Introduction

This lab is meant to blah blah

## 2 Experimental Procedure

This is how we do.

## 3 Results

From conducting the experiment and examining the microstructures of each of the composites (PBT12, PBT11, and PBT14), the following microstructural properties can be found. Since PBT14 had no fibers, these values are not applicable for it.

- Average volume fraction of reinforcing fibers
- Average length of the fibers
- Average diameter of the fibers
- Average aspect ratio
- Volume fraction of matrix
- Volume fraction of voids (qualitative)

These values were determined by counting and measuring fiber lengths and diameters seen under the microscope and averaging the greatest 20 results. Figures 1 and 2 show how this was done. In both cases, the fibers were counted and measured in various places around the sample area. For the longitudinal fibers, only fully revealed fibers were counted (rectangular ends).

The volume fractions for the samples of PBT11 and PBT12 were calculated by determining the ratio of the cross-sectional area of the transverse fibers in the field of view of the microscope to the field of view of the microscope. Figures 3 and 4 show the process determining those ratios for PBT11 and PBT12.




Figure 1: PBT11 Longitudinal Fiber Counting




Figure 2: PBT11 Transverse Fiber Counting




Figure 3: PBT11 Volume Fraction Count




Figure 4: PBT12 Volume Fraction Count

The following table lists the respective values for PBT9, PBT11, PBT12, and PBT14. For PBT9 it was assumed that the fibers used in the composite would be the same as PBT11 and PBT12. The fiber lengths and diameters were simply calculated as the respective average of the same values for PBT11 and PBT12. Since PBT14 had no fibers in the polymer, these values were ignored, or set to zero.

Table 1: PBT9, PBT11, PBT12, and PBT14 Values

Sample	PBT9	PBT11	PBT12	PBT14
$V_f$	0.224	0.179	0.135	0
$\ell(\mu m)$	294.14	299.33	288.94	N/A
$d(\mu m)$	14.61	14.60	14.61	N/A
$\ell/d$	20.14	20.50	19.77	N/A
$V_m$	0.78	0.82	0.86	1
$V_v$	Less	Less	Many	Many

Table 2: Material Data for E-Glass Fiber and PBT Polymer

Material	Young's Modulus (MPa)	$\sigma^*$ Fracture Strength (MPa)	Shear Modulus
$E - Glass$	70000	1750	881.6
$PBT$	2558	32.467	N/A

Using the values in Table 1 the elastic modulus of the samples for short fiber reinforced composites ( $E_{\downarrow\downarrow}^{short}$ ) using both the Halpin approach (Equation 1) and simple equation (Equation 4).

$$\frac{E_{\downarrow\downarrow}^{short}}{E_m} = \frac{1 + \xi\eta V_f}{1 - \eta V_f} \quad (1)$$

To calculate  $E_{\downarrow\downarrow}^{short}$  using the Halpin method, two variables are required,  $\eta$  and  $\xi$ , which are calculated using the following:

$$\eta = \frac{E_f/E_m - 1}{E_f/E_m + \xi} \quad (2)$$

$$\xi = 2\frac{l}{d} + 40V_f^{10} \quad (3)$$

The simple method of calculating  $E_{\downarrow\downarrow}^{short}$  is shown in the following equation.

$$E_{\downarrow\downarrow}^{short} = \eta_l E_f V_f + E_m(1 - V_f) \quad (4)$$

This method requires the calculation of a *length correction factor*,  $\eta_l$ , found using the following equation.

$$\eta_l = 1 - \left[ \frac{\tanh 0.5\beta l}{0.5\beta l} \right] \quad (5)$$

$$\beta = \left[ \frac{2G_m}{E_f r^2 \ln(\frac{R}{r})} \right]^{1/2} \quad (6)$$

The fracture stress of the composites were also calculated using Equation 7.

$$\sigma_{\downarrow\downarrow}^* = \left( \frac{l}{2l_c} \right) \sigma_f^* V_f + \sigma_m^* V_m \quad (7)$$

This requires the *critical fiber length*,  $\ell_c$ , calculated using the following.



$$\ell_c = \frac{\sigma_f^* r}{\tau_i^*} \quad (8)$$

The results of these calculations are shown in the following table.

Table 3: PBT9, PBT11, PBT12, and PBT14 Modulus and Fracture Stress

Sample	PBT9	PBT11	PBT12	PBT14
$E_{\downarrow\downarrow}^{short}$ Halpin (MPa)	12658.3	10508.06	8376.91	2558
$E_{\downarrow\downarrow}^{short}$ Simple (MPa)	12256.6	10366.57	8338.3	2558
$\sigma_{\downarrow\downarrow}^*$ (MPa)	98.42	86.12	71.37	32.47
$\ell_c(\mu m)$	787.31	787.65	787.65	N/A

The following figures show tensile tests performed for samples of PBT9, PBT11, PBT12, and PBT14 in the elastic regions and up to fracture.







Figure 8: PBT11 Test to Failure







Figure 10: PBT12 Test to Failure



Comparing the results of these tensile tests to the analytical data in Table 3, it is clear that there is some degree of error between the experimental and analytical results for PBT11 and PBT12. The experimental data for PBT12 has errors.

Table 4: Tensile Test Data

Sample	Young's Modulus (MPa)			Fracture Stress (MPa)			$V_f$
	Test	Calculated	% Error	Test	Calculated	% Error	
PBT9	13448	12658.33	6.24	107.01	98.42	8.73	0.224
PBT11	10180.33	10508.06	3.12	111.94	86.12	29.97	0.179
PBT12	11957	8376.91	42.74	65.31	71.36	8.09	0.135
PBT14	2558	2558	0	32.47	32.47	0	0

Plotting the measured and calculated values of the Young's Modulus and the Fracture Stress helps to exemplify the differences between the experimental and analytical results, as shown in Figures 13 and 14.




Figure 13: Fracture Stress, Experimental vs. Analytical




Figure 14: Young's Modulus, Experimental vs. Analytical

## **4 Discussion**

Looks like our samples are lif af fam.

## **5 Conclusion**

We did some stuff using some PBT samples for the sake of testing some stuff. From testing and analysis we learned that something about the PBT or composites and we got these results. From this we can say that blah blah blah or something.

## References

- [1] Ryan Lam, Jan Quijalvo, Robert Weeks and Alan Wu. Design Project Proposal. Unpublished manuscript, University of Waterloo, 2016.
- [2] Engineering Control Guidelines for Hot Mix Asphalt Pavers. (2014). Retrieved July 26, 2016, from <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/97-105/>