



Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

**SELECTION AND OPTIMIZATION OF KENAF/ EPOXY
COMPOSITE AS AN ALTERNATIVE FRICTION MATERIAL**

Ashafi'e bin Mustafa

Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering

2017

**DESIGN OPTIMIZATION OF KENAF/ EPOXY COMPOSITE AS AN
ALTERNATIVE FRICTION MATERIAL**

ASHAFI'E BIN MUSTAFA

**A thesis submitted
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science
in Mechanical Engineering**

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA

2017

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis entitled “Selection and Optimization of Kenaf/ Epoxy Composite as an Alternative Friction Material” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in the candidature of any other degree.

Signature :

Name :

Date :

APPROVAL

I hereby declare that I have read this thesis and in my opinion this thesis is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering.

Signature :

Supervisor Name :

Date :

DEDICATION

To my beloved father, brothers, sisters, lecturers, friends and Allah S.W.T

ABSTRACT

This research consists of the selection and optimization of the alternate materials which represent asbestos, using the Cambridge Engineering Selector (CES). The design and selection of potential materials are according to the friction material's suggested specifications and performances. Comparative and verification studies were performed using the Pugh and Weighted Decision Matrix (WDM) methods in order to select the best material to represent asbestos from among all potential materials such as jute, ramie and kenaf. As for the result, kenaf (*Hibiscus Cannabinus*) was chosen as the best material that meets the criteria and design constrains. The tribological performances of the kenaf epoxy (KE) composite were conducted according to the L_{18} arrays design. A 10 mm diameter cylindrical pin of KE composite was fabricated using a hot-cold compression machine and tested on a pin-on-disk tribometer according to ASTM G99. The signal to noise (S/ N), analysis of variance (ANOVA) and correlation between factors were employed in order to determine the optimal combination between controlled factors and levels. The optimal combination parameters of the KE composite were verified upon the confirmation test, and then compared with conventional friction material. The confirmation test verified that an optimized KE composite result falls within confidence intervals of 95%; which sounds promising to be included in friction material formulations which also exhibit friction coefficient (0.4 - 0.44) within the range suggested. The predominant wear mechanisms from worn surfaces are studied using Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) images revealed signs of predominant wear mechanisms such as abrasive, adhesive and fatigue mechanisms and a profilometer to measure the surface roughness.

ABSTRAK

Kajian dijalankan merangkumi pemilihan dan pengoptimumkan bahan alternatif bagi menggantikan asbestos menggunakan "Cambridge Engineering Selector" (CES). Pemilihan bahan-bahan yang berpotensi adalah dengan mengikuti standard spesifikasi bahan geseran ("brake pads"). Untuk memilih alternatif terbaik, kajian perbandingan diantara bahan-bahan berpotensi seperti jute, ramie dan kenaf bersandarkan asbestos dilakukan melalui kaedah Pugh dan Matrik Keputusan Wajaran (WDM). Setelah dipertimbangkan secara terperinci, Kenaf dipilih sebagai alternatif terbaik serta memenuhi kriteria-kriteria yang digariskan. Kajian tribologi untuk kenaf/epoksi (KE) komposit dilakukan mengikut susunan L18 yang telah ditetapkan. KE komposit pin berdiameter 10mm dibentuk menggunakan mesin pemampat bersuhu sebelum diuji pada tribometer mengikut ASTM G99a. Kaedah – kaedah seperti Isyarat Gangguan (S/N), analisis terhadap variasi (ANOVA) dan hubungkait diantara faktor-faktor, digunakan bersama untuk menentukan kombinasi optimum. Melalui kombinasi optimum parameter KE komposit serta bahan geseran konvensional akan dibandingkan melalui ujian pengesahan. Keputusan dari ujian pengesahan menunjukkan kombinasi optimum parameter KE komposit berada didalam 95% selang keyakinan dan berpotensi jika digunapakai didalam formulasi bahan geseran. Permukaan yang haus akibat geseran dikaji menggunakan imbasan imej- imej daripada mikroskop imbasan elektron (SEM) bagi mengenalpasti mekanisma - mekanisma haus yang mendominasi sepanjang geseran dan profilometer digunakan untuk mengukur kekasaran permukaan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise is due to Allah, the Beneficent the Merciful. We bear witness that there is no god except Allah, and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Mohd Fadzli Bin Abdollah and Co-supervisor En. Hilmi Bin Amiruddin from faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia, Melaka (UTeM) for their guidance, support and constant encouragement towards completing this research.

I also would like to thanks Mrs Nurhidayah binti Ismail, Mrs Sushela Edayu Binti Mat Kamal, and Mrs. Noryani binti Muhammad from the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia (UTeM), as my grant (RAGS/2013/FKM/TK01/03/B00042) supervisors for financial support and their advices during this research activity.

I would like take this opportunity to thank En. Azrol Syafiq bin Mazlan from the Tribology laboratory of Universiti Teknikal Malaysia (UTeM), for his suggestions and advices regarding the apparatus, procedures and facility provided for this study.

Finally, the deepest and special thanks to my father, Mustafa bin Salul, my dear siblings and my fellow friends for their continuous prayers and moral have brought me here.

TABLE OF CONTENT

	PAGE
DECLARATION	
APPROVAL	
DEDICATION	
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem statement	2
1.3 Objectives	3
1.4 Scopes of research	3
1.6 Thesis structure	4
CHAPTER 2	6
LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Friction materials	6
2.2 Alternative eco-aware lightweight material	9
2.3 Design and material selection	9
2.3.1 Requirement of the materials in automotive	11
2.3.2 Material selection steps	12
2.4 Tribological performances of friction material	13
2.4.1 Semi-Metallic friction material	15
2.4.2 Metallic friction material	15
2.4.3 Non-Asbestos Organic friction material	19
2.5 Wear mechanism of friction material	41

CHAPTER 3	54
METHODOLOGY	54
3.1	Design selection of friction material 54
3.1.1	Cambridge Engineering Selector 56
3.1.2	Pugh method 58
3.1.3	Weighted Decision Matrix 59
3.2	Design of experiments 62
3.2.1	Signal to Noise ratio 64
3.2.2	Analysis of variance 65
3.2.3	Confirmation Test 66
3.3	Sample preparations 67
3.4	Physical and mechanical characterizations 68
3.4.1	Density 68
3.4.2	Hardness 68
3.4.3	Porosity 68
3.4.4	Water absorption 69
3.4.5	Surface roughness 70
3.5	Tribological testing 70
3.6	Surface morphology observation 72
CHAPTER 4	73
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	73
4.1	Selection of eco-lightweight friction material using Cambridge Engineering Selector 73
4.2	Justification and verification of kenaf fibre as an alternative friction material using Pugh and Weighted Decision Matrix methods 76
4.3	Effect of fibre percentage, types and treatment of physical and mechanical properties 82
4.3.1	Density 82
4.3.2	Water absorption 83
4.3.3	Porosity 85
4.3.4	Surface roughness 86
4.3.5	Hardness 88
4.4	Optimization of the friction coefficient and wear rate of kenaf epoxy composites 91
4.4.1	Correlation between design factors and friction coefficient 97

4.4.2	Correlation between design factors and specific wear rate	98
4.4.3	Confirmation test	100
4.5	Correlation between physical and mechanical properties with tribological properties	103
4.5.1	Correlation between surface roughness with μ and W_s	103
4.5.2	Correlation between porosity with μ and W_s	103
4.5.3	Correlation between hardness with μ and W_s	104
4.6	Predominant wear mechanisms of optimized kenaf epoxy composites	105
CHAPTER 5		108
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		108
5.1	Conclusions	108
5.2	Recommendations for future studies	109
REFERENCES		110
APPENDICES		121

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Classification of brake pads (Blau, 2001)	6
2.2	Characteristic required for friction materials (Chan and Stachpwiak, 2004)	8
2.3	Compositions of FMs and its functions (Eriksson, 2002)	8
2.4	Summary properties eco-aware lightweight materials	9
2.5	Criterion and requirements for automotive industry (Ghassemieh, 2011)	11
2.6	Mechanical properties of the composites (Behera and Murali, 2015)	30
2.7	Tribological properties of RS and RH composite (Mutlu, 2009)	34
2.8	ANOVA for wear with fibre (F) and without fibre (WF) (Kumar et al., 2015)	38
3.1	Function and criteria desired for the eco-aware lightweight friction material	55
3.2	L18 orthogonal array by Taguchi	64
4.1	Summary results for all design stages using CES	75
4.2	Summary properties between asbestos and several natural organic	77
4.3	Summary objective and function by Pugh	78
4.4	Weighted Decision Matrix for eco-aware lightweight automotive friction materials	81
4.5	Physical and mechanical properties of kenaf powder	90
4.6	Physical and mechanical properties of kenaf fibers	90
4.7	Response of average μ and Ws , S/ N ratio of KE composites	93
4.8	Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for μ of KE composites	96
4.9	Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Ws of KE composites	96
4.10	Confirmation testing at 95 % CI for μ and Ws	101

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Thesis flow structure	5
2.1	Relationship between materials selection and design (Ashby and Cebon, 2007)	10
2.2	Material selection strategy (Ashby and Cebon, 2007)	11
2.3	Microstructure of brake pad sample X (Chan and Stachowiak, 2004)	14
2.4	Microstructure of brake pad sample Y (Chan and Stachowiak, 2004)	14
2.5	Friction increase during a run-in at 10 bar brake line pressure of NAO friction material (Börjesson et al., 1993)	14
2.6	Result of brake dynamometer wear test (Kukutschová et al., 2010)	17
2.7	Sensitivity of μ towards speed; (a) steel series;(b) brass series; and (c) copper series (Kumar and Bijwe, 2010)	18
2.8	Sensitivity of μ towards load: (a) steel series; (b) brass series;and (c) copper series (Kumar and Bijwe, 2010)	18
2.9	Cumulative wear of the selected composites (Kumar and Bijwe, 2013)	19
2.10	Articles published on related works in tribology (Nirmal et al., 2015)	20
2.11	First phase friction traces of the organic pad under a constant load for: (a) All materials at 0.52 m/ s; (b) A357 MMC and cast iron at 1.44 m/ s; (c) A357 MMC and cast iron at 3.16 m/ s (Howell, 1995)	21
2.12	Relation between steady state of μ and sliding velocity tested against (a) organic pad, (b) semi-metallic pad A (Howell, 1995)	22
2.13	Specific W_s against sliding velocity of (a) organic pad, (b) semi-metallic	23

	pad A (Howell, 1995)	
2.14	μ performance of JG-X; (a) initial baseline; (b) first fade and recovery; (c) second fade and recovery and; (d) final baseline (Matějka et al., 2013)	24
2.15	μ performance of JH-X; (a) initial baseline; (b) first fade and recovery; (c) second fade and recovery and; (d) final baseline (Matějka et al., 2013)	24
2.16	Specific W_s of JG-X and JH-X (Matějka et al., 2013)	25
2.17	Fibre orientations with respect to the sliding direction (Yousif, 2008)	26
2.18	Plots between weight loss and sliding distance for untreated and treated composites (Goriparthi et al., 2012)	27
2.19	Friction coefficient against load for; (a) neat PP; (b) jute/ PP (Yallew et al., 2014)	28
2.20	Variation of specific wear rate against load for; (a) neat PP; (b) jute/ PP (Yallew et al., 2014)	29
2.21	(a) Wear losses and (b) friction coefficient versus normal load for constant velocity for Al_2O_3 (Ahmed et al., 2012)	30
2.22	(a) Wear losses and (b) friction coefficient versus normal load for constant velocity for SiC (Ahmed et al., 2012)	30
2.23	(a) Friction coefficient; (b) wear rate (Yousif, 2013)	31
2.24	Effect of sisal fibre content on; (a) friction coefficient; (b) weight losses of the fibre composites (Wei et al., 2015)	32
2.25	Effects of SFCM contents against wear rate (Lv et al., 2015)	33
2.26	Result of (a) friction coefficient; (b) weight losses against distance for CFP composite at 10 N (Yousif, 2009)	33
2.27	Wear rate at different applied loads for; (a) polyester composite (OPRP) and; (b) neat polyester (Yousif and El-Tayeb, 2007)	35

2.28	Average friction coefficient of; (a) oil palm fibre polyester composite (OPRP) and; (b) neat polyester (Yousif and El-Tayeb, 2007)	35
2.29	(a) Variation of coefficient different epoxy composites; (b) Reduction in friction coefficient at the steady state of different epoxy composites (Shalwan and Yousif, 2014)	36
2.30	(a) Fibre length recommended via neural network; (b) S/ N ratios from tribological responses (Mahapatra and Chaturvedi, 2009)	37
2.31	Effect of control factors with/ without E-glass fibre on (a) μ and (b) W_s (Kumar et al., 2015)	39
2.32	S/ N ratio responses for erosion rate (Kranthi et al., 2010)	40
2.33	Contact plateaus forming the surface landscape on an organic brake pad (Börjesson et al., 1993)	42
2.34	Brake pad contact plateaus and areas of real contact (Börjesson et al., 1993)	42
2.35	Contact plateau on an organic brake pad of (a) enhanced topographical contrast; (b) enhanced compositional contrast (Eriksson and Jacobson, 2000)	43
2.36	SEM images of contact plateaus on a standard pad of Volvo 850 after braking at; (a) low brake pressure and temperature and (b) high pressure and temperature (Eriksson et al., 2000)	44
2.37	PLM of; (a) SMFM surface before friction test; (b) after test; (c) area showing plastically deformed steel chip (Kukutschová et al., 2009)	45
2.38	EDX spectrum showing elements present in the friction layer (Kukutschová et al., 2009)	46
2.39	SEM of the worn surfaces composites for; (a) CPC ₁₀ ; (b) M ₀ ; (c) SWC ₁₀ ; (d) SWC ₂₀ ; (e) BFC ₁₀ ; (f) CPC ₂₀ and; (g) BFC ₂₀ (Kumar and Bijwe, 2010)	47

2.40	SEM worn surfaces of; (a) JG-0; (b) JG-23.6; (c) JH-0 and; (d) JH-23.6 (Matějka, et al., 2013)	48
2.41	Details surface of JH-23.6 (Matějka, et al., 2013)	49
2.42	SEM of the worn surface on; (a) normal orientation; (b) parallel oriental (Dwivedi and Chand, 2009)	50
2.43	Literatures gap and thesis research	53
3.1	Eco-aware lightweight friction material"s design specifications	55
3.2	Objective tree	61
3.3	Objective trees with determined weight factors	62
3.4	Dimension of the sample	67
3.5	(a) Schematic diagram of a pin-on-disc tribometer and; (b) an illustration of the specimen placement	71
3.6	Actual setup of a pin-on-disc test	71
4.1	Plotted graphical materials for Young Modulus (Pa) against density (kg/ m ³)	74
4.2	Plotted graphical materials for Yield Strength (Pa) against density (kg/ m ³)	75
4.3	Eco-audit results between materials for; (a) energy and; (b) CO ₂ footprint	76
4.4	Density of KE composites and conventional friction material	83
4.5	Water absorption behaviour of KE composite, (a) 30 %.wt; (b) 45 %.wt; (c) 60 %.wt	84
4.6	Porosity of KE composite	86
4.7	Surface roughness of KE composites before and after tests	87
4.8	Samples hardness of KE composites before and after sliding	89
4.9	Residual plots of data obtained for μ (a) normal probability plot and (b) versus fits	91

4.10	Residual plots of data obtained for W_s (a) normal probability plot and (b) versus fits	92
4.11	Main effect plot of S/ N ratio for (a) μ and (b) W_s	95
4.12	Contour plots of μ against kenaf concentration, load, speed and temperature	98
4.13	Contour plots of W_s against kenaf concentration, load, speed and temperature	99
4.14	Confirmation test results for μ of KE composites and conventional friction material using optimal design parameters	101
4.15	Confirmation test results for specific wear rate, W_s (mm^3/Nm) of KE composites and conventional friction material using optimal design parameters	101
4.16	Roughness, R_a (μm) for (a) samples; (b) disk before and after confirmation tests	102
4.17	Contour plots of μ against surface roughness, R_a (μm) and W_s	103
4.18	Contour plots of μ against porosity and W_s	104
4.19	Contour plots of μ against hardness and W_s	104
4.20	SEM for conventional friction materials and optimized KE composite	106

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDICES	TITLE	PAGE
A	Standard Test Method for Wear Testing with a Pin-on-Disk Apparatus	121
B	Standard Test Method for Water Absorption of Plastics	122
C	Standard Test Method for Rubber Property- Durometer Hardness	123
D	Results of CoF Vs times	124
E	List of Publications	125

LIST OF SYMBOLS

μ	Coefficient of friction
ρ	Density (g/ m ³)
W_s	Specific wear rate (mm ³ / Nm)
L	Distances (m)
M_{loss}	Mass loss (mg)
V_{loss}	Volume loss (mm ³)
F_n	Force (N)
F_f	Frictional force (N)
%wt	Weight concentration (g)
E	Young's Modulus (N/ m ²)
σ	Yield Strength (N/ m ²)
M	Performance indices slope
S/N	Signal to Noise
SS_T	Total sums of squared deviations
SS_d	Sums of squared deviations
F_{value}	Fisher's ratio
R_a	Surface roughness
L	Distance

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AISI	American Iron and Steel Institute
Al ₂ O ₃	Aluminium Oxide
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ASTM	American Standard Testing Method
B	Bleached
BFC	Brass Fibre
CES	Cambridge Engineering Selector
CFP	Coir Fibre Polyester
CI	Confident Interval
CPC	Copper Powder
DOE	Design of Experiments
DOF	Degree of Freedom
EDX	Energy Dispersive X-ray
EPA	Environment Protection Agency
FMs	Friction Materials
HRC	Rockwell Hardness C Scale
JH	Jute Hazelnut Shells
JPP	Jute/ Polypropylene
KE	Kenaf Epoxy
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
M	Metallic

MMC	Metal Matrix Composite
NAO	Non-Asbestos Organic
NaOH	Sodium Hydroxide
NP	Neat Polyester
NT	Non Treat
OPRP	Oil Palm Fibre Reinforced Polyester
PF	Phenol Formaldehyde
PLM	Polarized Light Microscope
PP	Polypropylene
PV	Pressure Velocity
RH	Rice Husk
RS	Rice Straw
SN	Signal to Noise Ratio
SAE	Society of Automotive Engineers
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscope
SiC	Silicon Carbide
SMFM	Semi-Metallic Friction Materials
SOPRP	Seed Oil Palm Reinforced Polyester
STDeV	Standard Deviations
SWC	Steel Wool
T	Treated
WDM	Weighted Decision Matrix
WGRP	Woven Glass Reinforced Polyester

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Journals

1. **A. Mustafa**, M.F.B. Abdollah, , H. Amiruddin, Shuhimi, F.F., and N. Ismail, 2016. Optimization Of Friction Properties of Kenaf Polymer Composite as an Alternative Friction Material. *Industrial Lubrication and Tribology*, Volume 69, Issue: 2, pp. 259-266, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ILT-05-2016-0118>. (ISI Q4).
2. **A. Mustafa**, M.F.B. Abdollah, N. Ismail, H. Amiruddin, and N. Umehara, 2015. Selection and Verification of Kenaf Fibres as an Alternative Friction Material Using Weighted Decision Matrix Method, *Materials and Design*, Volume 67, pp. 577-582. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2014.10.091> (ISI Q1).
3. **A. Mustafa**, M.F.B. Abdollah, N. Ismail, H. Amiruddin, and N. Umehara, 2014. Materials Selection for Eco-Aware Lightweight Friction Material, *Mechanics and Industry*, Volume 15 (4), pp. 279-285. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/meca/2014039>. (ISI Q4).

Conferences attended

1. **A. Mustafa**, M.F.B. Abdollah, H. Amiruddin, F.F. Shuhimi, N.A.M. Tahir, N. Muhammad, S.E. Mat Kamal, and N. Ismail. *Optimization of Friction Coefficient of Kenaf/Epoxy Composites as an Alternative Friction Material Using Taguchi Method*. Proceedings of Mechanical Engineering Research Day 2016 (MERD'16), Melaka, 31 March 2016.

2. **A. Mustafa**, M.F.B. Abdollah, and H. Amiruddin. *Tribological Performances of Kenaf Polymer Composite as Potential Friction Material using ANOVA*, 1stMYTRIBOS Colloquium 2016 (MTC2016), School of Mechanical Engineering, Engineering Campus Universiti Sains Malaysia, 26 January 2016.
3. **A. Mustafa**, M.F.B. Abdollah, and H. Amiruddin. *Effect of Friction Coefficient and Wear on Different Types and Treatments of Kenaf/Epoxy Composites*. Postgraduate Research Symposium In Mechanical Engineering 2016 (PRISME), Melaka, 5-6 January 2016.
4. **A. Mustafa**, M.F.B. Abdollah, N. Ismail, and H. Amiruddin, *Pre-Materials Selection for Eco-Aware Lightweight Friction Material*, Proceedings of 9th International Materials Technology Conference and Exhibition (IMTCE2014), Kuala Lumpur, 13-16 May 2014.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Friction materials (FMs) in automotive brake systems are known as complex composites that contain numerous ingredients or materials. The FMs are divided into 4 main important categories which are binders, fibres, fillers and friction modifiers. Asbestos fibre has been used as a traditional fibrous ingredient which is reinforced within the friction materials to provide essential mechanical strength, preventing the damaging of the friction material composite when operating.

However, due to its non-biodegradability, difficulty in processing, high cost, high density and potential risk of causing lung cancer when produced, asbestos FMs were banned by the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) (Rammazini, 1992). Thus, the search for safer and cheaper alternative sources is increasing. The alternative materials which can represent asbestos will be identified using the material engineering design approach according to the desired performances and characteristics using the systematics approach. A comparative study will be performed in order to justify and verify the new alternative materials found and compare them to other potential materials using a statistically comparative Pugh and Weighted Decision Matrix (WDM) method.

In order to evaluate and identify the tribological performance of the alternate FMs, the materials will be compressed into pin shaped polymer composites using a hot-cold compression machine. The samples being pin shaped is necessary to fit into a pin-on-disk tribometer sample holder mounting apparatus. The samples also have to perform several