

Identification and Validation of Analytical Chemistry Methods for Detecting Composite Surface Contamination and Moisture

Xiangyang Zhou University of Miami Dwayne McDaniel, Rakesh Guduru, Tomas Pribanic and Richard Burton Florida International University





Introduction

- Motivation and Key Issues
 - Adhesive bonding is now used in manufacture and repair and is beginning to predominate over mechanical fastening.
 - Adherend surface preparation is a critical issue to the structural integrity and durability of bonded structures.
- Objectives
 - benchmark knowledge of surface preparation quality assurance methods
 - identify and validate definitive analytical chemistry methods to provide sufficient in-field quality assurance.
- Approach
 - Literature review and analysis (complete)
 - Surface chemistry analysis
 - Electrochemical sensor study



Tasks Overview

- Accomplished tasks:
 - Electrochemical Sensor Study
 - Humidity Sensor Study
 - Atomic Force Microscopy Study (AFM)

- Current tasks:
 - Advancement of Electrochemical Sensor
 - Chemical Force Microscopy



AFM Principles



Schematic representation of an atomic force microscopy (AFM) showing the force sensing cantilever.



CFM Principles



CHEMICAL FORCE MICROSCOPY 411

Figure 16 Force microscopy images of a photopatterned SAM sample. The $10 \times 10 \ \mu m$ square region terminates in COOH, and the surrounding region terminates in CH₃. The images are of (A) topography, (B) friction force using a tip modified with a COOH-terminated SAM, and (C) friction force using a tip modified with a CH₃-terminated SAM. Light regions in (B) and (C) indicate high friction, dark regions indicate low friction (produced from Reference 33).

CFM Principles

Force microscopy images of a photopatterned SAM sample. The $10 \times 10 \ \mu m$ square region terminates in COOH, and the surrounding region terminates in CH3.

(A) Topography,

(B) f riction f orce using a tip modied with a COOHterminated SAM,

(C) friction force using a tip modied with a CH3-terminated SAM.

NOTE: Light regions in (B) and (C) indicate high friction; dark regions indicate low friction.

Why Epoxy Probe?

- CFM with epoxy functional group modified probe will mimic the interactions between composite surfaces and epoxy resin adhesive.
- Interactions between composites and epoxy resin are important for bonding strength.
- The epoxy functional group has the ability to interact with a wide range of nucleophiles which make it an ideal probe in detecting contaminants on surfaces.
- No prior use of an epoxy modified probe has been recorded according to our literature review. Epoxy modified probes are not available commercially - this study is the first research effort that seeks to synthesize these modified probes.

Methodology

- Modify AFM probe with epoxy functional group.
- Testing of probe on pre-defined gold surface.
- Contaminating the composite with known contaminants and developing signature peaks for various contaminants.
- Building a database of adhesive forces for the various contaminants.
- Testing the probe efficiency.
- Epoxy probe testing on various laminates with and without peel ply for surface contaminants.

Mapping the Laminate Surface Using the Epoxy Probe (Force Spectroscopy)

Record force vs. distance traces between samples and functionalized tip

Record the histograms of adhesion forces between tip and sample.

Results - Phase Imaging

Mixed surface having hydrophobic and hydrophilic domains

Unmodified surface - unmodified probe

Modified surface - unmodified probe

Modified surface - Modified probe

Epoxy modified probes are more sensitive in detecting the chemically distinct domains.

Results – Force Spectroscopy

Histogram for the epoxy tip and the unmodified surface.

Histogram for the epoxy tip and the COOH surface.

Histogram for the epoxy tip and the CH3 surface.

Histogram for the epoxy tip and the epoxy surface.

Results – Force Spectroscopy

Table 1. Force Spectroscopy Results for Various Substrates

| Type of Tip | Unmodified Surface (Average adhesion force in nN) | CH ₃ Surface (Average adhesion force in DN) | COOH Surface (Average adhesion force in nN) | Epoxy Surface (Average adhesion force in nN) | |
|-------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Ероху | 39 | 8 | 21 | 84 | |
| Hydroxyl | + | 6 | 0 | 5 | |

Force spectroscopy on four different surfaces i.e, unmodified surface, -CH3 surface, -COOH surface, epoxy surface using epoxy modified and hydroxyl modified (commercially available). Results indicate that epoxy modified functional groups have higher adhesion forces when compared to the hydroxyl modified functional groups.

SEM Results

Polyester peel-ply sample showing fiber remnants

SEM Results

7

The diameter of the fiber imprint on the epoxy matrix is $\sim 15 \mu m$

 \sim ~7.5µm the depth

Imprint of polyester fibers on the epoxy matrix

Λ

Note: The dimensions are approximately the same with nylon peel-ply samples

Dimensional Analysis

SEM-AFM TIP

Area of contact for probe and composite surface

- AFM Z-range parameter will limit the topography range of operation
- Currently investigating other tips that will optimize scanning range

AFM Composite Images

Polyester prepared peel-ply composite samples

Dista type Height 300 mm Dista type Plase 60.00 °

3D Height Image

 $2\ \mu\text{m}$ Height & Phase Image

AFM – Environmental Effects

| | - Humidity | Temperature (C) | Tip No. | Mean of 50 adhesion force | S.D |
|-------|------------|--------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|
| | 52.2 | 22.5 | 1 | 10.997 | 1.7966 |
| | 50.4 | 23.4 | 2 | 32.803 | 0.97307 |
| Day 1 | 50.3 | 23.5 | 3 | 19.967 | 1.3857 |
| | 49.6 | 23.7 | 4 | 13.714 | 2.2984 |
| | 49.0 | 23.8 | 5 | 18.056 | 6.0413 |

| | -'' Humidity | Temperature (C) | Tip No. | Mean of 50 adhesion force | S.D |
|-------|--------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------------|---------|
| Day 2 | 56.7 | 22.2 | 1 | 17.036 | 1.1987 |
| | 55.2 | 22.5 | 2 | 7.7828 | 0.71156 |
| | 55.6 | 22.6 | 3 | 9.7174 | 1.1738 |
| | 54.7 | 22.6 | 4 | 6.0493 | 0.61482 |
| | 54.2 | 22.8 | 5 | 7.7124 | 0.8806 |

Trials were conducted with unmodified tips on a freshly cleaved mica wafer

Quantum Chemistry Simulation of Force Spectroscopy

Interaction energy and force spectra for a Si tip on an epoxy sample. For the non-functionalized tip, the maximum adhesion force is approximately 20 nN which is within the range of experimental results.

Quantum chemistry model of the interaction between Si tip (top) and epoxy sample (below). The relative positions and orientations of the Si tip of the AFM and the epoxy sample are defined in the model as shown.

Future Work

- Developing signature peaks for various known contaminants (from XPS analysis).
- Establishing correlation between the electrochemical cyclic voltammetry and chemical essence of contaminants.
- Building a database of these signature peaks.
- Testing epoxy probe wear and tear.
- Testing epoxy probe on composite laminates with and without peel ply for surface contaminants.
- Theoretical analysis of the force spectroscopy.

Thank you!

