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Interfacial tension and coalescence in polymer blends

C. Tufano, G.W.M. Peters and H.E.H. Meijer
Eindhoven University of Technology, Department of Mechanical Engineering

Introduction
The final properties of polymer blends are, to a great extend, determined by the morphology. It’s well known that interfacial tension is a key parameter in the evolution of morphology during blending. The goal of this work is to study the evolution of interfacial tension with time and temperature and the influence of such variations on drop coalescence.

Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blend</th>
<th>Drop/Matrix</th>
<th>$\Delta R_{th} [\mu m]$</th>
<th>$R_0 [mm]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>PB635/PDMS62700</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>PBD8000/PDMS62700</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Blends; $\Delta R_{th}$ drop size change in matrix after 4h at 23°C.

A2 is a very diffusive system, B4 is not (see $\Delta R_{th}$ Table 1).

Results

Interfacial tension

![Figure 1. Interfacial tension for the two blends as function of temperature and time measured with a sessile drop apparatus.](image)

Drop radius

Experiments for the same viscosity ratio and same temperature have been performed using SALS. The theory of Debye-Bueche gives the radius of the droplets.

$$I(q) = K \xi^3 F(q\xi); \quad F(x) = 1/(1 + x^2)^2$$

K: a function of the scattering contrast, q: scatter vector magnitude, $\xi$: structure correlation distance and $R^2 = 10\xi^2$, see Fig.2 and Fig.3. For system A2 the trend of the radius follows the variation of interfacial tension (see Fig.4, left). Repeating the A2 experiment after 48h: no diffusion effects left, so the trend of radii is different (see Fig.4, right).

![Figure 2. Drop size evolution with time at constant temperature.](image)

Mathematical Models

Drop radii from a drainage model. Three cases: immobile, partially mobile and fully mobile interfaces.

$$R_{Imm.} = \left(\frac{8}{9}\right)^{1/4} \frac{1}{h_{cr}^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\eta_c \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\gamma}\right)^{-1/2}$$

$$R_{P.M.} = \left(4/\sqrt{3} \cdot \dot{\gamma}\right)^{2/5} \left(\frac{p}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{5} \left(\frac{\eta_c \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\gamma}\right)^{3/5} \right)$$

$$R_{F.M.} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{R_{F.M.}}{h_{cr}}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right) \left(\frac{\eta_c \cdot \dot{\gamma}}{\gamma}\right)^{-1}$$

$\eta_c$: viscosity continuous phase, $\dot{\gamma}$: shear rate, $\gamma$: interfacial tension, $h_{cr}$: critical film thickness, $p$: viscosity ratio. For system A2 the initial, minimum and "plateau" value of $\gamma$ have been used. For system B4 only one value of $\gamma$ is used. Table 2 shows the results: none of these cases is able to predict the radii values found experimentally.

![Figure 3. Drop size evolution with time at constant viscosity ratio, $\lambda = 1$.](image)

![Figure 4. Left: Time evolution of interfacial tension (from[1]) and drop radius for a fresh system. Right: Drop radius evolution for an old (48h) system.](image)

![Figure 5.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$A2_{\sigma_{th}}$</th>
<th>$A2_{\sigma_{min}}$</th>
<th>$A2_{\sigma_{plate}}$</th>
<th>B4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$ [N/m]</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>1.70E-03</td>
<td>2.10E-03</td>
<td>4.10E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{Imm.} [\mu m]$</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{P.M.} [\mu m]$</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>54.87</td>
<td>52.07</td>
<td>46.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{F.M.} [\mu m]$</td>
<td>105.51</td>
<td>78.18</td>
<td>93.98</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{Exp.} [\mu m]$</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2 - 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Calculated drop radii.

Conclusions
- Diffuse interface strongly affects the morphology of the blends.
- Existing mathematical models do not apply.
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