Magnetorheological fluids redispersibility - a factorial design study of phosphate shell on carbonyl iron powder with dispersing additives

Antonio J. F. Bombard^{*}, Laís Santos Antunes, Pedro P. Balestrassi, Anderson P. Paiva

Federal University at Itajubá Av. BPS 1303, Itajubá/MG – 37.500-903, Brazil, phone: +55-35-3629-1222; fax: +55-35-3629-1140, ^{*} Corresponding author: bombard@unifei.edu.br

As shown in a previous paper [1], Magneto-Rheological Fluids (MRFs) prepared with phosphate coated or uncoated carbonyl iron powders (CIP) have different rheology, due to the interactions of between presence hydrophilic fumed silica and the phosphate, through hydrogen bonding. This especially happens without magnetic field.

Redispersibility is a challenge in MRF formulation [2,3] and it was measured through the work to vertically penetrate a steel blade at constant speed, into a test tube with 10 mL of each MRF formulation after centrifuging it @ 2000 'g' for 15 minutes, according to the test described by *Kieburg et al* [4].

The MRF formulations were made with a poly(alpha-olefine) oil, food grade. Besides the oil (balance); the dispersing additive (0.8% w/w) and the CIP (80% w/w); a modified montmorillonite clay (0.3% w/w) was used as thixotropic agent. A high shear homogenizer (Ika – Turrax T-18) was used to disperse the CIP in each MRF formulation. The MRF samples were prepared duplicate, and in the measurements were twice repeated.

In this paper, factorial design of experiments was applied to study the redispersibility of some MRF formulations of two carbonyl iron powders with different dispersing additives [5,6]. The response variable for the factorial design was the work (mJ) measured with the normal force cell built-in a rheometer (Anton Paar – Physica MCR-301).

Figure 1 shows the results and settings of a 2-level factorial design for the factors of (i) carbonyl iron powders A or B (uncoated or phosphate shell); (ii) additives with carboxyl or primary amine as polar group and (iii) n-octyl (C_8H_{17}) or n-dodecyl (C₁₂H₂₅) as alkyl hydrocarbon chain (R-). The presence of several interactions – what makes the DOE approach a very suitable methodology – can be seen in the Pareto chart. The main effect plot shows the individual effect of the variables on the mean work resulting in a natural choice for the minimum work for Powder of B, HC Chain of 8 and Polar Group of Acid. The second order interactions are also significant and represented by the unparallel lines in the interaction plot. The cube plot shows the experimental space for the considered factors revealing the Work mean.

Table I shows the generalized regression model considering two scenarios of experimentation. The first one was the obtained when statistical model included a specific outlier in the sample. In the second model the outlier was removed showing an excellent curve fitting for a nonlinear model. Both scenarios have indicated the optimization direction of minimum work to redisperse the MRF by adopting the above mentioned levels. The power of the DOE methodology was fundamental to understand the complex interactions between the factors CIP and the additives.



Fig. 1 Factorial plots for the experimental study.

With Outlier						
Term	Effect	Coef	SE Coef	т	P	
Constant		10.484	2.096	5.00	0.001	
Powder Type	-13.399	-6.699	2.096	-3.20	0.013	
HC Chain	12.265	6.132	2.096	2.93	0.019	
Polar Group	-13.146	-6.573	2.096	-3.14	0.014	
Powder Type*HC Chain	-14.780	-7.390	2.096	-3.53	0.008	
Powder Type*Polar Group	14.699	7.349	2.096	3.51	0.008	
HC Chain*Polar Group	-15.627	-7.814	2.096	-3.73	0.006	
Powder Type*HC Chain*Polar Group	13.440	6.720	2.096	3.21	0.013	
S = 8.38537 PRESS = 2250.06						
R-Sq = 90.64% $R-Sq(pred) = 62.5%$	i7% R−Sq	(adj) =	82.45%			
Removing Outlier						
Removing Outlier						
Removing Outlier Term	Effect	Coef	SE Coef	Т	Р	
Removing Outlier Term Constant	Effect	Coef 8,498	SE Coef 0,2052	т 41,40	Р 0,000	
Removing Outlier Term Constant Powder Type	Effect -8,879	Coef 8,498 -4,439	SE Coef 0,2052 0,2052	т 41,40 -21,63	P 0,000 0,000	
Removing Outlier Term Constant Powder Type HC Chain	Effect -8,879 7,745	Coef 8,498 -4,439 3,872	SE Coef 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052	T 41,40 -21,63 18,87	P 0,000 0,000 0,000	
Removing Outlier Term Constant Powder Type HC Chain Polar Group	Effect -8,879 7,745 -8,351	Coef 8,498 -4,439 3,872 -4,176	SE Coef 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052	T 41,40 -21,63 18,87 -20,34	P 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	
Removing Outlier Term Constant Powder Type HC Chain Polar Group Powder Type*HC Chain	Effect -8,879 7,745 -8,351 -10,806	Coef 8,498 -4,439 3,872 -4,176 -5,403	SE Coef 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052	T 41,40 -21,63 18,87 -20,34 -26,33	P 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	
Removing Outlier Term Constant Powder Type HC Chain Polar Group Powder Type*HC Chain Powder Type*Polar Group	Effect -8,879 7,745 -8,351 -10,806 10,450	Coef 8,498 -4,439 3,872 -4,176 -5,403 5,225	SE Coef 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052	T 41,40 -21,63 18,87 -20,34 -26,33 25,46	P 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	
Removing Outlier Term Constant Powder Type HC Chain Polar Group Powder Type*HC Chain Powder Type*Polar Group HC Chain*Polar Group	Effect -8,879 7,745 -8,351 -10,806 10,450 -11,379	Coef 8,498 -4,439 3,872 -4,176 -5,403 5,225 -5,689	SE Coef 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052	T 41,40 -21,63 18,87 -20,34 -26,33 25,46 -27,72	P 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	
Removing Outlier Term Constant Powder Type HC Chain Polar Group Powder Type*HC Chain Powder Type*Polar Group HC Chain*Polar Group Powder Type*HC Chain*Polar Group	Effect -8,879 7,745 -8,351 -10,806 10,450 -11,379 8,645	Coef 8,498 -4,439 3,872 -4,176 -5,403 5,225 -5,689 4,322	SE Coef 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052	T 41,40 -21,63 18,87 -20,34 -26,33 25,46 -27,72 21,06	P 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	
Removing Outlier Term Constant Powder Type HC Chain Polar Group Powder Type*HC Chain Powder Type*Polar Group HC Chain*Polar Group Powder Type*HC Chain*Polar Group	Effect -8,879 7,745 -8,351 -10,806 10,450 -11,379 8,645	Coef 8,498 -4,439 3,872 -4,176 -5,403 5,225 -5,689 4,322	SE Coef 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052 0,2052	T 41,40 -21,63 18,87 -20,34 -26,33 25,46 -27,72 21,06	P 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000 0,000	

Table I - Regression model for two experimental scenarios

Acknowledgments

Bombard wishes to thank FAPEMIG for the Grant # CEX APQ-2676-5.02/07 as well as the financial support to attend this conference and CNPq (Brazilian Council for Research) by the post-doc fellowship.

References

- [1] Bombard, AJF *et al.*; "Phosphate coating on the surface of carbonyl iron powder and its effect in magnetorheological suspensions"; Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 21: 4858-4867; 2007.
- [2] Phule PP *et al*; J. Materials Research 14(7): 3037-3041; 1999.

- [3] Lopez-Lopez, MT *et al*; J. Rheology 50 (4): 543-560, 2006.
- [4] Kieburg C et al; "Proceedings of the 10th Int. Conf. on ER Fluids and MR Suspensions" - Lake Tahoe, USA; World Sci. Pub.; Singapore; 2007. pp. 101-107.
- [5] Böse, H; "Investigations on zeolite-based ER fluids supported by experimental design"; Int. J. Mod. Phys. B; 13: 1878-1885; 1999.
- [6] Box, Hunter & Hunter: "Statistics for Experimenters: Design, Innovation, and Discovery"; 2nd Edition. Wiley-Interscience; 2005.