

**CHARACTERISATION AND PROPERTIES OF
BIOCOMPOSITES FABRICATED FROM
CYPERUS ODORATUS AND LINEAR LOW
DENSITY POLYETHYLENE**

NIK AHMAD FARIS BIN NIK ABDULLAH

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS

2018



**CHARACTERISATION AND PROPERTIES OF
BIOCOMPOSITES FABRICATED FROM
CYPERUS ODORATUS AND LINEAR LOW
DENSITY POLYETHYLENE**

By

**NIK AHMAD FARIS BIN NIK ABDULLAH
1340411112**

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

**School of Material Engineering
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS**

2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Allah SWT, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful, with Whose blessings, this study has been successfully completed.

My most sincere thanks goes to my supervisor, PM. Ts. Dr. Nik Noriman Bin Zulkepli, not only for his patience and guidance, but also for his capable supervision, continuous encouragement, and full support throughout my research. I would also like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Sam Sung Ting, my project co-supervisor, for all the valuable and timely advice, encouragement, and useful input throughout this research.

My sincere appreciation also goes to all staff in the UniMAP Lab, Plastic Engineering Workshop, POLIMAS, ILP, and Malaysia Nuclear Agency for their assistance in the use of equipment and machines for the research activities. I would like to extend my gratitude to all members of the CEGeoGTech group in UniMAP, for their hospitality, encouragement, and advice. I would also like to offer my regards and blessings to all who have supported me, in any respect, during this study.

I would like to thank the Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, for the scholarship provided, which made this study possible. Last but most importantly, special thanks to my family members, especially my parents, my beloved wife, and my daughter for their tireless encouragement, support, and continuous prayers throughout this study. They are the most important people in my life and I would like to dedicate this PhD thesis to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvii
ABSTRAK	xviii
ABSTRACT	xix
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENTS	4
1.3 OBJECTIVES	6
1.4 THESIS ORGANISATION	6
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Municipal Solid Waste	8
2.2 Polymer Biocomposites	9
2.3 Polymer Degradation	11
2.3.1 Biodegradation	13
2.3.2 Thermal Degradation	14
2.4 Biofibres	14
2.4.1 Classification of Biofibre	18
2.5 Linear Low Density Polyethylene	19
2.6 Degradation Testing	21
2.6.1 Natural Weathering	21
2.6.2 Natural Soil Burial	23
2.7 Alkali Treatment	24
2.8 Electron beam irradiation (EBI)	25
2.9 Initiators/Irradiation Crosslink Promoters	27
2.10 Pro-oxidant in Plastic	30

2.11	Fabrication of Composite	31
2.11.1	Extrusion	32
2.11.2	Injection Moulding	33
CHAPTER 3 : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		37
3.1	Materials	37
3.1.1	Linear Low-Density Polyethylene	37
3.1.2	Cyperus Odoratus (CY)	37
3.1.3	Sodium Hydroxide	39
3.1.4	Cobalt Stearate	39
3.1.5	TMPTA and TPGDA	39
3.2	CY Chemical Composition	40
3.3	Equipment	40
3.4	Preparation Method of CY Filler	41
3.5	Formulations of LLDPE/CY Biocomposites	42
3.6	Preparation Method of Biocomposite	43
3.7	Preparation of Dumbbell Specimens	46
3.8	Degradation Test	47
3.8.1	Soil Burial Test	47
3.8.2	Weathering Test	48
3.9	Characterisation Techniques	50
3.9.1	Tensile Test	50
3.9.2	Morphological Features	51
3.9.3	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR)	51
3.9.4	Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA)	51
3.9.5	Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC)	52
3.10	Weight Loss	53
3.11	Electron Beam Irradiation (EBI)	53
3.12	Gel Content Analysis	54
CHAPTER 4 : RESULTS & DISCUSSION		55
4.1	Effect of Particle Loading and Size on Properties of LLDPE/CY Biocomposite	55

4.1.1	Tensile Properties	55
4.1.2	SEM Morphology	60
4.1.3	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectra	62
4.1.4	Thermogravimetric Analysis	63
4.1.5	Differential Scanning Calorimetry	65
4.2	Effect of NaOH Treatment on the Properties of LLDPE/CY Biocomposites	67
4.2.1	Tensile Properties	68
4.2.2	SEM Morphology	73
4.2.3	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectra	74
4.2.4	Thermogravimetric Analysis	76
4.2.5	Differential Scanning Calorimetry	78
4.3	Effect of Electron Beam Irradiation (EBI) on the Properties of LLDPE/CY Biocomposites	81
4.3.1	Tensile Properties	81
4.3.2	SEM Morphology	84
4.3.3	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectra	86
4.3.4	Thermogravimetric Analysis	87
4.3.5	Differential Scanning Calorimetry	89
4.3.6	Gel Content Analysis	93
4.4	Effect of Electron Beam Irradiation (EBI) and Initiators on the Properties of LLDPE/CY Biocomposites	94
4.4.1	Tensile Properties	95
4.4.2	SEM Morphology	98
4.4.3	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectra	100
4.4.4	Thermogravimetric Analysis	102
4.4.5	Differential Scanning Calorimetry	104
4.4.6	Gel Content Analysis	108
4.5	Effect of Natural Soil Burial	109
4.5.1	Effect of Natural Soil Burial on LLDPE/CY Biocomposite	110
4.5.2	Effect of Natural Soil Burial on the LLDPE/CY Biocomposite Irradiated with EBI/TMPTA	121

4.5.3	Effect of Natural Soil Burial on LLDPE/CY Biocomposite with CS	134
4.6	Effect of Natural Weathering	148
4.6.1	Effect of Natural Weathering on LLDPE/CY Biocomposite	149
4.6.2	Effect of Natural Weathering on LLDPE/CY Biocomposites treated with EBI/TMPTA	161
4.6.3	Effect of Natural Weathering on LLDPE/CY Biocomposite with CS	173
CHAPTER 5 : CONCLUSIONS		188
5.1	Conclusions	188
5.2	Recommendations for Future Study	190
REFERENCES		192
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS		211

©This item is protected by original copyright

LIST OF FIGURES

NO.		PAGE
Figure 2.1:	Classification of biofibres.	19
Figure 2.2:	Schematic illustration of the radiation-induced crosslinking modification process (Janigová et al., 2001).	27
Figure 2.3:	Chemical structure of TMPTA multifunctional monomer.	28
Figure 2.4:	Chemical structure of TPGDA.	28
Figure 2.5:	Schematic diagram of an extruder	33
Figure 2.6:	Single screw injection moulding machine	34
Figure 2.7:	Injection mould used in this study including the delivery system and moulded parts.	35
Figure 3.1:	<i>Cyperus Odoratus</i>	38
Figure 3.2:	Preparation method of CY filler	42
Figure 3.3:	Flow chart of processing and characterisation of LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	45
Figure 3.4:	Details of the dumbbell dimension	47
Figure 3.5:	Maximum and minimum temperature from January 2014 to December 2014 (Chuping Meteorological Station, Perlis, Malaysia 2014)	49
Figure 3.6:	Relative humidity and average rainfall from January 2014 until December 2014 (Chuping Meteorological Station, Perlis, Malaysia 2014)	49
Figure 4.1:	Tensile strength of LLDPE/CY biocomposite with different CY particle loadings and sizes.	56
Figure 4.2:	The SEM micrographs of CY filler.	58
Figure 4.3:	Elongation at break (Eb) of LLDPE/CY biocomposite with different CY particle loadings and sizes.	59
Figure 4.4:	Young's modulus of LLDPE/CY composite with different CY particle loadings and sizes.	60
Figure 4.5:	Figure 4.5 : SEM micrographs (500×) of tensile fracture surfaces of (a) pure LLDPE, (b) 5% CY/63 μm, (c) 5% CY/250 μm, (d) 20% CY/63 μm, and (e) 20% CY/250 μm.	62
Figure 4.7:	FTIR spectra of pure LLDPE and LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	63

Figure 4.8:	Thermogravimetric analysis of pure LLDPE and LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	64
Figure 4.9:	DSC heating thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	66
Figure 4.10:	DSC cooling thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	67
Figure 4.11:	Tensile strength of untreated and treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with NaOH.	68
Figure 4.12:	Elongation at break (Eb) of untreated and treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with NaOH.	71
Figure 4.13:	Young's modulus of untreated and treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with NaOH.	72
Figure 4.14:	FTIR spectra of untreated and treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with NaOH.	76
Figure 4.15:	Thermogravimetric analysis of untreated and treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with NaOH.	77
Figure 4.16:	DSC heating thermograms of untreated and 5% NaOH-treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	79
Figure 4.17:	DSC cooling thermograms of untreated and 5% NaOH-treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	80
Figure 4.18:	Tensile strength of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites at different EBI doses.	82
Figure 4.19:	Eb of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites at different EBI doses.	83
Figure 4.20:	Young's modulus of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites at different EBI doses.	84
Figure 4.21:	SEM micrographs (500×) of tensile fracture surface of LLDPE/CY biocomposites after 100 kGy EBI with CY content of (a) 5 wt% and (b) 20 wt%; and LLDPE/CY biocomposites after 150 kGy EBI with CY content of (c) 5 wt% and (d) 20 wt%.	85
Figure 4.22:	FTIR spectra of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with difference EBI doses.	87
Figure 4.23:	Thermogravimetric analysis of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with different EBI doses.	88
Figure 4.24:	DSC heating thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with different EBI doses.	90
Figure 4.25:	DSC cooling thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with different EBI doses.	91
Figure 4.26:	The effect of CY powder loading and EBI dose on gel content of LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	94

Figure 4.27:	The effects of different initiators and EBI doses on the tensile strength of LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	95
Figure 4.28:	The effects of different initiators and EBI doses on the Eb of LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	97
Figure 4.29:	The effects of different initiators and EBI doses on the Young's modulus of LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	98
Figure 4.30:	SEM micrographs (500×) of tensile fracture surface of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with the presence of TMPTA as initiators before EBI with CY content of (a) 5 wt% and (b) 20 wt%; and LLDPE/CY biocomposites after 100 kGy of EBI with CY content of (c) 5 wt% and (d) 20 wt%.	99
Figure 4.31:	SEM micrographs (500×) for tensile fracture surface of LLDPE/5%CY biocomposites with the presence of TPGDA as an initiators at (a) 0 kGy and (b) 100 kGy of EBI.	100
Figure 4.32:	FTIR spectra of LLDPE/CY biocomposites at 0, 50, and 100 kGy irradiation with different initiators.	101
Figure 4.33:	Thermogravimetric analysis of irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites at 100 kGy with different initiators.	103
Figure 4.34:	DSC heating thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites irradiated at 100 kGy with different initiators.	105
Figure 4.35:	DSC cooling thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites irradiated at 100 kGy with different initiators.	105
Figure 4.36:	The effect of different initiators on gel content of LLDPE/CY biocomposites irradiated at 100 kGy.	109
Figure 4.37:	Tensile strength and retention of LLDE/CY biocomposites after 12-month natural soil burial.	111
Figure 4.38:	Eb and retention of LLDE/CY biocomposites after 12-month natural soil burial.	112
Figure 4.39:	Young's modulus and retention of LLDE/CY biocomposite after 12-month natural soil burial.	113
Figure 4.40:	SEM micrographs (250×) of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CY content of (a) 0 wt%, (b) 5 wt%, and (c) 20 wt% after 6 months of soil burial	115
Figure 4.41:	SEM micrographs (250×) of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CY content of (a) 0 wt%, (b) 5 wt%, and (c) 20 wt% after 12 months of soil burial	116
Figure 4.42:	FTIR spectra of LLDPE/CY biocomposites before and after soil burial.	117
Figure 4.43:	DSC heating thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites after 12 months of soil burial.	119

Figure 4.44:	DSC cooling thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites after 12 months of soil burial.	119
Figure 4.45:	Tensile strength and retention versus CY loading of irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12-months of soil burial.	123
Figure 4.46:	Comparison of tensile strength versus CY loading of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12-months of soil burial.	124
Figure 4.47:	Eb and retention versus CY loading of irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12-months of soil burial.	125
Figure 4.48:	Comparison of Eb versus CY loading of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of soil burial.	126
Figure 4.49:	Young's modulus and retention versus CY loading of irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of soil burial.	127
Figure 4.50:	Comparison of Young's modulus versus CY loading of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of soil burial.	128
Figure 4.51:	SEM Micrographs (250×) of irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA and CY content of (a) 5 wt% and (b) 20 wt% after 12-months of soil burial.	129
Figure 4.52:	SEM Micrographs (250x) of nonirradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA and CY content of (a) 5 wt% and (b) 20 wt% after 12-months of soil burial.	130
Figure 4.53:	FTIR spectra of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA before and after 6 and 12 months of soil burial.	131
Figure 4.54:	DSC heating thermograms of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of soil burial.	132
Figure 4.55:	DSC cooling thermograms of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of soil burial.	132
Figure 4.56:	Tensile strength and retention versus CY loading with CS after 12 months of soil burial.	136
Figure 4.57:	Comparison of tensile strength versus CY loading with and without CS after 12 months of soil burial.	137
Figure 4.58:	Eb and retention versus CY loading with CS after 12 months of soil burial.	138

Figure 4.59:	Comparison of Eb versus CY loading with and without CS after 12 months of soil burial	139
Figure 4.60:	Young's modulus and retention versus CY loading with CS after 12 months of soil burial.	140
Figure 4.61:	Comparison of Young's modulus versus CY loading with and without CS after 12 months of soil burial.	141
Figure 4.62:	The SEM micrographs (250×) of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CS and CY content of (a) 0 wt%, (b) 5 wt%, and (c) 20 wt% after 6 months of soil burial.	142
Figure 4.63:	The SEM micrographs (250×) of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CS and a CY content of; (a) 0 wt%, (b) 5 wt% and (c) 20 wt% after 12 months of soil burial	144
Figure 4.64:	FTIR spectra of of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with and without cobalt stearate before and after 6 and 12 months of soil burial.	145
Figure 4.65:	DSC heating thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CS after 12 months of soil burial.	146
Figure 4.66:	DSC cooling thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CS after 12 months of soil burial.	147
Figure 4.67:	Tensile strength and retention of LLDE/CY biocomposite after 12 months of natural weathering.	150
Figure 4.68:	Eb and retention of LLDE/CY biocomposites after 12 months of natural weathering.	152
Figure 4.69:	Young's modulus and retention of LLDE/CY biocomposites after 12 months of natural weathering.	153
Figure 4.70:	The SEM micrographs (250×) of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CY content of (a) 0 wt%, (b) 5 wt%, and (c) 20 wt% after 6 months of weathering.	154
Figure 4.71:	The SEM Micrographs (250×) of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CY content of (a) 0 wt%, (b) 5 wt%, and (c) 20 wt% after 12 months of weathering.	156
Figure 4.72:	FTIR spectra of LLDPE/CY biocomposites before and after 6 and 12 months of weathering.	157
Figure 4.73:	DSC heating thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites after 12 months of weathering.	158
Figure 4.74:	DSC cooling thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites after 12 months of weathering.	159
Figure 4.75:	Tensile strength and retention versus CY loading of irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of natural weathering.	162

Figure 4.76:	Comparison of tensile strength versus CY loading of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of weathering	163
Figure 4.77:	Eb and retention versus CY loading of irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of natural weathering.	164
Figure 4.78:	Comparison of Eb versus CY loading of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of weathering.	165
Figure 4.79:	Young's modulus and retention versus CY loading of irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of natural weathering.	166
Figure 4.80:	Comparison of Young's modulus versus CY loading of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of weathering.	167
Figure 4.81:	The SEM micrographs (250×) of EBI/TMPTA irradiated biocomposites and CY content of (a) 5 wt% and (b) 20 wt% after 6 months of weathering.	168
Figure 4.82:	The SEM micrographs (250×) of EBI/TMPTA irradiated biocomposites and a CY content of (a) 5 wt% and (b) 20 wt% after 12 months of weathering.	168
Figure 4.83:	FTIR spectra of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA before and after 6 and 12 months of weathering.	170
Figure 4.84:	DSC heating thermograms of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of weathering.	171
Figure 4.85:	DSC cooling thermograms of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of weathering.	171
Figure 4.86:	Tensile strength and retention versus CY loading with CS after 12 months of natural weathering.	175
Figure 4.87:	Comparison of tensile strength versus CY loading with and without CS after 12 months of weathering.	176
Figure 4.88:	Eb and retention versus CY loading with CS after 12 months of natural weathering.	177
Figure 4.89:	Comparison of Eb versus CY loading with and without CS after 12 months of weathering.	178
Figure 4.90:	Young's modulus and retention versus CY loading with CS after 12 months of natural weathering.	179

Figure 4.91:	Comparison of Young's modulus versus CY loading with and without CS after 12 months of weathering.	180
Figure 4.92:	The SEM micrographs (250×) of LLDPE/CY biocomposite with CS and CY content of (a) 0 wt%, (b) 5 wt%, and (c) 20 wt% after 6 months of weathering.	181
Figure 4.93:	The SEM micrographs (250×) of LLDPE/CY biocomposite with CS and CY content of (a) 0 wt%, (b) 5 wt%, and (c) 20 wt% after 12 months of weathering.	182
Figure 4.94:	FTIR spectra of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with and without CS before and after 6 and 12 months of weathering.	184
Figure 4.95:	DSC heating thermograms of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with and without CS after 12 months of weathering.	185
Figure 4.96:	DSC cooling thermograms of LLDPE/CY powder composites with and without CS after 12 months of weathering.	186

©This item is protected by original copyright

LIST OF TABLES

NO.		PAGE
Table 3.1:	Chemical composition of CY determined by XRF	40
Table 3.2:	Equipment used in the research	41
Table 3.3:	Formulation of CY powder content on LLDPE/CY Composites	43
Table 3.4:	Injection moulding conditions	46
Table 3.5:	Analysis of natural soil content	48
Table 3.7:	Checklist of characterisation techniques conducted in this study	50
Table 4.1:	TGA data for pure LLPE and LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	65
Table 4.2:	Thermal properties of LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	67
Table 4.3:	TGA data for untreated and treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with NaOH.	78
Table 4.4:	DSC results of untreated and NaOH-treated LLDPE/CY biocomposites.	80
Table 4.5:	TGA data for nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with different EBI doses.	89
Table 4.6:	DSC results of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with different EBI doses.	92
Table 4.7:	TGA data for nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites in the presence of TMPTA and TPGDA as initiators.	104
Table 4.8:	DSC results of the nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with different initiators	107
Table 4.9:	Retention of tensile properties for LLDPE/CY biocomposites after 12-month soil burial.	114
Table 4.10:	DSC results of LLDPE/CY biocomposites after different periods of soil burial.	120
Table 4.11:	Weight loss of LLDPE/CY biocomposite after 6 and 12 months of soil burial	121
Table 4.12:	Retention of tensile properties for of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of soil burial.	128

Table 4.13: DSC results of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after different periods of soil burial.	133
Table 4.14: Weight loss of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 6 and 12 months of soil burial.	134
Table 4.15: Retention of tensile properties for LLDPE/CY composite after 12 months of soil burial.	141
Table 4.16: DSC results of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with CS after different periods of soil burial.	147
Table 4.17: Weight loss of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with and without CS after 6 and 12 months of soil burial.	148
Table 4.18: Retention of tensile properties for LLDPE/CY biocomposite after 12 months of weathering.	153
Table 4.19: DSC results of LLDPE/CY biocomposites after different periods of weathering.	159
Table 4.20: Weight loss of LLDPE/CY biocomposite after 6 and 12 months of weathering.	160
Table 4.21: Retention of tensile properties for nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after 12 months of weathering.	167
Table 4.22: DSC results of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA after different periods of weathering.	172
Table 4.23: Weight loss of nonirradiated and irradiated LLDPE/CY biocomposites with EBI/TMPTA LLDPE/CY after 6 and 12 months of weathering.	173
Table 4.24: Retention of tensile properties for LLDPE/CY biocomposite after 12 months of weathering.	180
Table 4.25: DSC results of LLDPE/CY biocomposites with and without CS after different periods of weathering.	186
Table 4.26: Weight loss of LLDPE/CY biocomposite with and without CS after 6 and 12 months of weathering.	187

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
CS	Cobalt Stearate
CY	Cyperus Odoratus
DSC	Differential Scanning Calorimetry
EB	Electron Beam
Eb	Elongation at Break
FTIR	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectrometer
LLDPE	Linear Low Density Polyethylene
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscope
TGA	Thermogravimetric Analysis
TMPTA	Trimethylolpropane Triacrylate
TPGDA	Tripolyene Glycol Diacrylate

LIST OF SYMBOLS

ΔH_m	Melting enthalpy
ΔH_f^o	Heat of fusion
ΔH_f^*	Heat of fusion for semicrystalline
phr	Part per hundred resin
$T_{-5\%}$	Temperature at 5% degradation
$T_{-30\%}$	Temperature at 30% degradation
T_c	Crystalline temperature
T_m	Melting temperature
W_i	Weight before degradation
W_f	Weight after degradation
wt%	Percentage in weight
X_c	Degree crystallinity

©This item is protected by original copyright

Pencirian dan Sifat Biokomposit yang dihasilkan daripada *Cyperus Odoratus* dan Polietilena Ketumpatan Rendah Linear

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini dilakukan terhadap potensi *Cyperus Odoratus* (CY) sebagai pengisi. Serbuk CY dicampurkan dengan polietilena ketumpatan rendah linear (LLDPE), sebelum dimasukkan ke dalam penyemperit skru kembar dan seterusnya ke dalam mesin pengacuan suntikan untuk menghasilkan spesimen dumbel biokomposit LLDPE/CY. Biokomposit LLDPE/CY dengan nisbah komposisi 5% hingga 20% berat dikaji. Hasil ujikaji menunjukkan peningkatan pemuatan CY dan saiznya menyebabkan nilai modulus keanjalan bertambah, tetapi kekuatan tegangan dan pemanjangan pada takat putus (Eb) berkurang. Selain itu, pencirian morfologi permukaan patah tegangan bagi biokomposit ini yang ditentukan melalui SEM menunjukkan rekatan antara muka yang lemah antara pengisi CY dan matriks LLDPE termoplastik. Rawatan 5% NaOH terhadap CY meningkatkan kekuatan tegangan dan modulus Young bagi adunan LLDPE/CY dengan ketara, walaupun ini menyebabkan penurunan dalam Eb. Daripada segi penghabluran dan kestabilan haba, biokomposit yang dirawat adalah lebih baik berbanding biokomposit yang tidak dirawat. Sementara itu, penyinaran alur elektron (EBI) dikenakan pada komposit untuk tujuan rangkaian silang, menggunakan pemecut alur elektron 1.5 MeV, dalam julat dos 0–150 kGy. Berdasarkan keputusan kekuatan tegangan, penyinaran pada 100 kGy menghasilkan penyerapan optimum bagi biokomposit LLDPE/CY. Trimetilolpropana triakrilat (TMPTA) dan tripipilena glikol diakrilat (TPGDA) digunakan sebagai pemula dalam kajian ini dan hasil ujikaji menunjukkan komposit yang ditambah dengan TMPTA menunjukkan sifat tegangan, kestabilan terma, kandungan gel, dan penghabluran lebih tinggi, berbanding komposit yang ditambah dengan TPGDA. Hasil kajian juga menunjukkan penambahan TMPTA dan EBI pada 100 kGy meningkatkan semua sifat fizikal, dengan menyediakan bahan yang sesuai berasaskan polimer semula jadi biokomposit. Kehadiran TMPTA meningkatkan rangkaian silang LLDPE/CY semasa penyinaran, yang kemudiannya meningkatkan kestabilan haba komposit tersebut. Timbusan tanah semula jadi dan luluhawa dikenakan ke atas biokomposit LLDPE/CY selama 1 tahun dan sampel diambil selepas 3, 6, dan 12 bulan untuk ujian kebolehduraian, melalui ujian tegangan, kajian morfologi, dan ukuran kesusutan berat sampel. Dalam tempoh 1 tahun ujian penimbusan tanah dan luluhawa, kekuatan tegangan dan Eb bagi komposit menurun, manakala modulus Young meningkat. Kemerosotan dalam sifat-sifat berat komposit dikaji, dan didapati kehadiran pengisi CY dalam komposit mempercepat degradasi biokomposit LLDPE/CY dengan ketara. Kesan kobalt stearat (CS) terhadap penimbusan tanah dan luluhawa ke atas sifat-sifat biokomposit LLDPE/CY turut diselidiki, dan hasil ujikaji menunjukkan kekuatan tegangan dan Eb bagi komposit menurun, manakala nilai modulus Young meningkat dengan bertambahnya kandungan CY dan CS. Pencirian morfologi SEM membuktikan penambahan CS pada komposit mempercepat degradasi.

Characterisation and Properties of Biocomposites Fabricated from *Cyperus Odoratus* and Linear Low Density Polyethylene

ABSTRACT

The potential of *Cyperus Odoratus* (CY) as a filler was studied. In powder form, CY was mixed with linear low density polyethylene (LLDPE), prior to being fed into a twin screw extruder and subsequently into an injection moulding machine to produce LLDPE/CY biocomposite dumbbell specimens. LLDPE/CY biocomposites with composition ratios of 5% to 20 wt% were studied. The results obtained showed that the increased of CY loading and size resulted in an increment of the Young's modulus, but slightly reduction in tensile strength and elongation at break (Eb). In addition, as determined through the SEM, the morphology characterisation of tensile fracture surface of these composites showed poor interfacial adhesion between the CY filler and thermoplastic LLDPE matrix. A 5% NaOH treatment on CY improved the tensile strength and Young's modulus of the LLDPE/CY biocomposites significantly, although it caused a decrement in Eb. The NaOH treatment enhanced both the tensile and thermal properties of the composites. In terms of crystallinity and thermal stability, the treated composites were superior compared with those of the untreated composites. Meanwhile, electron beam irradiation (EBI) was applied on the composites for crosslinking purposes, using a 1.5 MeV electron beam accelerator within the dosage range of 0–150 kGy. Based on the results of the tensile strength, the radiation at 100 kGy caused the optimum absorption by the LLDPE/CY biocomposites. Trimethylolpropane triacrylate (TMPTA) and tripropylene glycol diacrylate (TPGDA) were used as the crosslink promoters and the results indicated that the composites added with TMPTA showed higher tensile properties, thermal stability, gel content, and crystallinity, compared with those of the composites added with TPGDA. Also, the addition of TMPTA and EBI at 100 kGy improved all the physical properties, which provided suitable material based on natural polymer for biocomposites. The presence of TMPTA enhanced the crosslinking of LLDPE/CY during irradiation, which in turn enhanced the thermal stability of the composites. The natural soil burial and weathering of LLDPE/CY biocomposites were carried out for 1 year and the samples were collected and measured after 3, 6, and 12 months for degradability tests, by means of tensile tests, morphological study, and weight loss measurements. Within the 1-year exposure to soil burial and weathering test, the tensile strength and Eb of the composites decreased, while their Young's modulus increased. The deterioration in weight properties of the composites was investigated, where the presence of CY filler in the composites significantly accelerated the degradation of the LLDPE/CY biocomposites. The effects of cobalt stearate (CS) in natural soil burial and weathering on the properties of LLDPE/CY biocomposites were also examined, and the results indicate that the tensile strength and Eb of the composites decreased, while the Young's modulus increased with the increment in CY and CS contents. The morphology characterisation through SEM proved that the addition of CS to the composites accelerated their degradation.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The awareness of environmental conservation and the use of green products have been emphasised in related industries for the past few decades. In response to this, numerous studies have been conducted, particularly in the polymer processing industry, to substitute the petroleum-based conventional plastic with plastic materials containing natural fibre. Natural fibre is produced from plants and animals which is also known as biofibre. Today, biofibre is widely used to reinforce various polymer matrix materials. It is widely used in research and industries because it offers various advantages over inorganic fillers such as cost saving, abundantly available, low density, and good deformability. The usage of biofibre is less abrasive to equipment and machinery during its processing. Biofibre is being extensively used for the production of cost-effective ecofriendly composites (Abdulsada & Al-Mosawi, 2015).

Biofibre is used in the processing of biocomposite using various types of polymeric matrix materials. The emergence of polymer matrix improves the interaction between filler and matrix, and leads to the enhancement of new methods or approaches (Saba et al., 2014). Biocomposites are used in several applications such as building construction, aerospace, automotive, and packaging industries.

Research and development of these bio-based materials will directly support our ecosystem and contributes to social and economic improvements in rural and remote areas in developing countries. Since biofibres are harmless compared to synthetic fibres,

they could as well offer a resolution to the problem of environmental contamination with their new uses for waste materials. Cheap biofibres can be obtained in a plentiful amount in most developing countries, giving these countries a chance to use their own natural resources in their composite processing industry (Hassan et al., 2010). Biofibres was introduced as a filler in polymer blends as it is deemed beneficial to the environment, as far as the degradability and utilisation of renewable materials were concerned (Rout et al., 2001). Typical widely studied for their suitability as fillers in polymer blends include rice husks, flax fibres, and palm fibres.

In recent years, there has been a high consumption of polyethylene in the packaging and the agricultural sectors. Packaging waste has caused increasing environmental concerns (Vroman & Tighzert, 2009). The use of mulch films in agricultural sector, similarly, gives adverse environmental impacts with a high energy consumption required for the removal and disposal of their waste (Kyrikou & Briassoulis, 2007). This conventional plastic is a nondegradable plastic and its disposal in the natural environment can cause hazardous impact on the environment (Pavani & Rajeswari, 2014). Khabbaz and Albertsson (2001) reported that polyethylene has a very slow degradation rate of less than 0.5% in 100 years. The rate increases to 1%, if it is exposed to sunlight for 2 years.

The rapid development of biocomposites provides vast opportunities for people all over the world to improve their standard of living. Besides, it has been a great motivating factor for materials scientists to delve into the potentials provided by the composites. Since many of the renewable materials are based on agricultural products as

a source of raw materials, particularly to plastic industries, a non-food source of economic development for farming and rural areas in developing countries could be generated. For example, generation of jobs by agro-based materials can be provided by the use of rice husk, which constitutes more than 10% of world rice production. It was reported that the increasing use of renewable materials would create or secure employment in rural areas, especially in sectors such as forestry and agriculture (Satyanarayana et al., 2009).

To overcome these problems, biodegradable plastics are produced from various renewable materials, or blends of synthetic materials and biofillers. Also, biofibres are readily available, cheap, and biodegradable, making them advantageous to be used as plastics (Iovino, Zullo, Rao, Cassar, & Gianfreda, 2008). Biofibres have been increasingly used as reinforcing materials for polymer-based matrices, not only because of their environmentally friendly nature, but also because of their low cost and intrinsically interesting properties such as low density, good shape ratio, and superior mechanical behaviour. Due to the increased awareness of ecological safety and utilisation of renewable materials towards a greener society, the use of natural fibres in the industries as biofiller or reinforcement materials in composites also increases by leaps and bounds (Satyanarayana, Arizaga, & Wypych, 2009).

In general, various types of fillers were incorporated into LLDPE matrix due to its physical properties and cost-saving feature. Organic fillers such as biofibres or powders derived from renewable natural resources such as banana, sisal, hemp, jute, pineapple, bamboo, cotton, coconut, rice husk, and kenaf have been used recently, due

to their advantages in terms of high strength and stiffness, low cost, low density, low CO₂ emission, biodegradability and annually renewable (Ashori, A. 2008).

Biofibres displays comparatively poor fibre/matrix interactions, water resistance, and relatively lower durability. This consequently causes weaker interfacial or adhesion bonds between highly hydrophilic natural fibres and hydrophobic nonpolar organophilic polymer matrix, resulting in a significant impairment of the properties of the composites, thus depriving them of potential industrial use and output. To overcome this compatibility deficiency, a number of approaches have been established, such as the introduction of coupling agents and/or various surface modification techniques (Susheel Kalia, Kaith, & Kaur, 2009). Modification of the biofibres surface is achieved by the use of physical, mechanical, and/or chemical substance.

1.2 Problem Statements

Plastic waste is a hazardous environmental problem in Malaysia and polyethylene (PE) constitutes one of the greatest pieces of plastic waste. PE is currently in high demand for its use in various packaging applications. Although plastic recycling is a useful alternative to reduce plastic waste in the surroundings, its operations, sometimes, can be very costly, compared to the production of new plastic. Petroleum-based plastic is not biodegradable and it is inert to microorganisms, ultraviolet, heat, and water, thus causing disposal problems and jeopardising marine life. The most commonly employed method of municipal solid waste disposal is landfilling. Therefore, alternative materials, such as biodegradable plastic or biocomposite must be sought.