Volume 26| January 2024 ISSN: 2795-7640

Enhancing Polymer Performance: A Comprehensive Review of Polyamide-Epoxy Combinations
.

Ihab S. Hasan(1) 1,College of Engineering University of Kerbala, Karbala, Iraq.; ihab.sh@s.uokerbala.edu.iq

Emad Q. Hussein (2) 2,College of Engineering University of Kerbala, Karbala, Iraq.; emad.dujaily@uokerbala.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

This comprehensive review explores the intricate amalgamation of Polyamide (PA) and Epoxy (EP), two commonly employed polymers with distinct properties. Delving into the chemical reactions between PA and EP, we unearth mechanisms that foster covalent crosslinking, offering avenues for enhanced adhesion. The toughening mechanism of the combined system varies depending on the PA's integration method, either as a pre-dissolved solution or a discrete phase. Further insights reveal the potential for PA to toughen EP-based composites, invoking principles observed in particle-fortified epoxies. Critical takeaways encompass the optimal balance between PA-induced ductility and system strength and the leverage of blend compositions, configurations, and processing parameters for targeted property enhancement. Whether aiming for moisture resistance, energy absorption, or enhanced adhesion, the PA-EP system provides a versatile platform, showcasing the innovative possibilities within polymer science.

Keywords:

1 Overview and History: Epoxy/Polyamide Systems

Epoxies are robust polymers widely used in various sectors such as adhesive manufacturing, protective coatings, and composite materials. They originate from pre-polymers with epoxide terminals (refer to table 1). These terminals, owing to the oxygen molecule's inherent strain and polarity, exhibit a high level of instability[1]. The polymers produced by crosslinking these pre-polymers, although robust, tend to be brittle. This brittleness can undermine essential properties like impact absorption, fracture resilience, and damping. This limitation sparks the interest in enhancing epoxies' toughness by blending them with a secondary component, either through homogeneous mixing or as a separate phase.

Surprisingly, despite polyamide (PA) having promising toughening properties for epoxies, the blending of the two hasn't been thoroughly explored. Yet, the vast research on epoxy toughening using other materials might hint at PA-blended behaviors. For instance, rubber is a predominant material used to enhance epoxy toughness, often mixed in its raw form as particles. These rubber elements act as pliable units that consume impact and impede the progression of cracks[2]–[5]. In an explorative study, Garg and Mai[6] have elucidated the toughening dynamics in rubber-blended epoxies. They argue that rubber particles initiate cavitation while concurrently instigating the growth of shear bands in the epoxy. These bands develop under tension and are halted by other rubber particles, suggesting rubber particle bridging as an alternate mechanism for energy absorption. Though these findings root from rubber-based epoxies, similar mechanisms might exist in epoxies toughened with different particle types. Nonetheless, these identified toughening techniques by Garg and Mai might not apply to highly crosslinked systems due to their non-deformable nature.

Another study by Bagheri et al[7] highlights a threshold rubber concentration after which matrix shear deformation remains constant or even reduces. Interestingly, while larger particles have the potential to bridge cracks, particle size doesn't play a significant role in matrix toughness. However, these particles need to be adequately sized to interact with the crack's initiation.

Another avenue explored for epoxy toughening is the use of thermoplastics, chosen for their potential compatibility with epoxies[8]–[14]. These thermoplastics can absorb energy both through deformation of their crystalline structures and the amorphous sections' plastic deformation. Hodgkin et al[8] provided insights into what constitutes an ideal thermoplastic for epoxy toughening. Typically, a suitable thermoplastic will possess reactive terminals, a heat-resistant backbone, significant molecular weight, and a morphology that integrates seamlessly with the epoxy.

Frigione et al[11] theorized that soft or rubbery particles can effectively toughen lightly-crosslinked thermosets. In contrast, highly crosslinked resins need a robust bond with the toughening agent for optimal results. In these highly crosslinked systems, glassy additions that share similar moduli with the resin are usually the best candidates for effective toughening since the stress at their interfaces remains minimal, preventing debonding.

For successful integration of thermoplastics into these epoxies, the bond between the two phases must be strong. Research has identified core adhesion theories[15]–[24], which are:

1. Mechanical Interlocking: Adhesive filling in the solid substrate's rough areas.
2. Chemical Bonding: Reactive terminals forming covalent, ionic, or hydrogen bonds across interfaces.
3. Diffusion Theory: Polymer chain mingling due to interfacial diffusion.
4. Physical Adsorption: Describes interactions due to van der Waals forces.
5. Electrostatic Theory: Points to charge differences forming an electrostatic layer at interfaces.
6. Weak Boundary Layer Theory: Surface contaminants forming a cohesively weak boundary.

These factors, depending on the material in use, contribute to adhesion at varying levels. The adhesion quality can be optimized by carefully selecting systems that leverage these principles.

A few notable thermoplastics for epoxy toughening include polysulfones, polyetherimide, poly(phthalazone ether ketone), and polyimide, among others.

PA stands out as an exciting thermoplastic toughening agent, primarily because of its ability to form strong chemical bonds with epoxies. Both PA and epoxy being polar molecules improves their blendability, promoting both mechanical and chemical crosslinking[1]. PAs are essentially polymers with monomer linkage through amide bonds. They are typically categorized based on the carbon atom count in the monomers, as shown in Table 2.1. A lesser number of carbon atoms between amide groups means higher polarity and reactivity due to the proximity of the reactive amide groups.

2 Cure Dynamics of PA-EP Blends

The curing reaction between polyamide (PA) and epoxy (EP) has been well-documented due to PA's prevalent use as a curing agent, resulting in EP-PA networks commonly found in adhesives and coatings[25]–[27]. The primary mechanism underlying this reaction involves the PA's nitrogen atoms attacking the EP ring, as illustrated below[28].

Figure 2.1: Central PA-EP Reaction - Assault on the oxirane ring by the nitrogen atom of PA. Adapted from Zhong et al[28].

Research by Wang and Chen[29] on PA-EP blends outlined three distinct phases in such mixtures:

1. A semicrystalline pure PA phase.
2. An amorphous PA-EP combined phase.
3. An amorphous singular EP phase.

Interestingly, the blend's tensile strength peaked at 5% EP content due to stress-induced crystallization in the PA-centric phase. The maximum shear stress was observed at 30% EP content, indicating that increased crosslinking, as EP content rises, reinforces the shear strength.

Zhong and Guo[30] further probed the cure kinetics of PA-EP blends across diverse compositions. Their research corroborated the primary reaction as shown in Figure 2.1 but also identified a secondary reaction mechanism with a considerably higher activation energy.

Figure 2.2: Secondary Reaction in PA-EP system. Adapted from Zhong et al[28].

This latter reaction takes precedence when EP is in excessive stoichiometry, notably above 63wt% for the studied system. The secondary reaction can only occur after the completion of the primary reaction, and its dominance emerges primarily when the number of primary reactive sites dwindles.

In contrast to Wang's findings, all compositions tested by Zhong resulted in a single amorphous phase post-curing, though PA to EP ratios of 80:20 and 90:10 could still crystallize after curing[28]. One significant difference between the two studies was Zhong's exclusion of an EP curing agent in the system, implying the EP pre-polymer was restricted to reacting solely with PA chains. This choice might have influenced the post-cure morphology[30], potentially explaining the variations observed in Zhong's and Wang's results.

De Schoenmaker[31] et al. examined how PA nanofibers influence EP cure behavior, observing a catalytic effect from the PA fibers on the cure reaction. However, this might have resulted from water release from the PA fibers. Van der Heijden et al[32] subsequently delved deeper into this water content effect. They ascertained that dry PA fibers slightly catalyze the EP resin, an effect amplified by water presence.

Kim et al[33] delved into the reaction kinetics of a homogenous PA6-EP matrix surrounding carbon fiber fabric. They pinpointed a 40:60 PA:EP composition as the most optimal, recording maximum interfacial and interlaminar shear strength. Such findings bolster Zhong's theory regarding a secondary reaction mechanism being dominant for EP content beyond approximately 63%.

In summary, the cure kinetics of the PA-EP reaction provides valuable insights into the broader interplay between PA and EP. The potential for covalent crosslink formation augments the interaction between these materials, mitigating debonding risks, which in turn boosts the mechanical attributes of the blend.

3 Solution-Processed PA-EP Mixtures

Creating uniform blends of PA and EP by dissolving PA in solution has gained traction in material science. Vyas and Iroh's investigations[33] into PA6-EP mixtures highlighted that due to hydrogen bond formations among parts of the PA chain, PA can still crystallize even when EP pre-polymer is present. Concurrently, the amorphous regions of PA form covalent bonds with the EP pre-polymer, resulting in a crosslinked framework. These findings are in line with Wang's postulations[28] about the multiphasic nature of cured EP-PA combinations.

Gorton's work[34] reveals that introducing a minor quantity (15wt%) of EP to PA resin notably enhances the joint strength of PA by curbing the polymer's yield and non-linear stress/strain behavior, driving it toward a brittle fracture behavior. Interestingly, the introduction of an amide curing agent amplified the crosslinking intensity between the PA and EP. This possibly suggests that the curing agent aids EP in weaving into PA chains, bolstering mechanical entanglement. This implies that in such systems, the primary toughening mechanism facilitated by the PA is mechanical interlocking.

Bakar and team[35] took an innovative approach by dissolving diverse concentrations of PA6 into EP resin. The outcomes were encouraging with noticeable boosts in impact strength, flexural strength, and crack resistance compared to pure EP. Especially, the 5wt% PA6-EP blend showcased the most significant uplift in impact strength and energy factors related to fracture. However, with rising PA concentrations, the mechanical benefits started to diminish. This behavior underscores the existence of an optimal thermoplastic concentration for ideal EP enhancement. But the decrease in properties with PA content intensification reflects the emergence of an offsetting mechanism, possibly due to a heightened EP/PA interfacial domain.

Given PA's affinity for water, understanding its water absorption behavior is crucial. Delollis and Montoya's study[36] provided insights on how long-term exposure to liquid and vapor water influences the shear strength of PA-EP adhesives. Their findings (refer to Figure 2.4) suggest that while PA-EP adhesives can withstand humid settings (with some strength reduction), they falter in continuous liquid water environments.

Subsequent research by Butt and Cotter[37] confirmed the adverse impact of humidity on EP-PA adhesive strengths. Although drying restored some properties, the adhesive strength didn't fully recover, possibly due to water-triggered adhesive bond degradation.

Ishisaka and Kawagoe's work[38] further established that both EP and PA6's equilibrium water content is closely tied to ambient humidity. PA6's water diffusion was found to be more sensitive to relative humidity compared to EP's. This implies that while EP will stabilize its water content relatively quickly, the time for PA to equilibrate depends on the environment. Moreover, PA6's equilibrium water content was double that of EP across various conditions. Recognizing this behavior is crucial when assessing a material's steady-state properties or anticipating changes under prolonged humidity exposure.

In conclusion, blending EP and PA through solution-based techniques provides a treasure trove of insights relevant to other EP-PA combination methodologies. The mutual solubility of PA in EP is promising, hinting at potential covalent bonding between the two and improved mechanical performance over EP alone. However, water absorption in PA systems remains a challenge, necessitating further explorations to mitigate its impact.

4 PA Particle Integration into EP Systems

An innovative method for blending PA with EP is to incorporate distinct phases separately. A frequently employed technique involves integrating fine PA particles into uncured EP, a process that sidesteps the need for solvents or high temperatures, thus rendering the approach more cost-effective and eco-friendly. The EP curing phase raises temperatures, enhancing PA chain mobility, which then facilitates interactions with EP pre-polymers.

Lu et al's research[39] delved into toughening mechanisms in EP systems modified with particles. For highly crosslinked resins, debonding of the modifier particles resulted in decreased fracture toughness. However, lightly crosslinked resins exhibited enhanced fracture toughness through shear deformation, as depicted in Figure 2.5.

Cardwell and Yee's experiments[40] with PA12 particles aimed to enhance the robustness of a highly crosslinked EP resin. Their findings were affirmative for low strain rates, confirming that the bond between PA12 and EP is sturdy enough for toughening highly-crosslinked epoxies. The benefits of this bond arise as the PA bridges cracks, enhancing the material's fracture toughness, and undergoes plastic deformation without damaging the surrounding matrix.

Cardwell[40] outlined specific attributes of effective thermoplastic matrix toughening agents, which include robust matrix-toughener adhesion and a high work-to-fracture ratio in the thermoplastic. However, a delicate balance between these properties is essential. Excessive matrix-thermoplastic adhesion can hinder the plastic deformation of the thermoplastic preceding failure.

In their exploration, Kim et al[41] probed the influence of mixing temperatures on the structure and fracture energy of EP strengthened with 5wt% PA6 particles. Their findings, illustrated in Figure 2.7, highlight the significance of optimizing processing temperature to harness full fracture toughness benefits.

Kim and Robertson's research[42] employed crystalline PA6 particles to enhance an EP matrix. The results depicted in Figure 2.8 show substantial improvements in fracture toughness with escalating PA concentration and reductions in particle size, without significantly altering other material properties.

Girodet et al[43] integrated PA6 and PA12 particles below melting points, maintaining their original structures upon EP mixing. Their results, captured in Figure 2.9, indicate a bond strength disparity between PA6 and EP compared to PA12 and EP. This difference underscores the influential role of the bond strength in determining the toughening mechanism and overall material properties.

In essence, recent studies underscore the viability of incorporating PA into EP below the PA melting point, even without a solvent. During EP curing, PA chain mobility proves ample for interaction with EP pre-polymers. When integrated as particles, PAs offer distinct toughening mechanisms in comparison to when they are blended continuously with EP. Such varied energy absorption dynamics imply that optimizing PA-EP adhesion is pivotal for achieving desired material properties.

5 Composite Advancements Using EP Matrix with Fibers and PA

The spotlight on composites has intensified owing to their stellar specific strength, leading them to supersede traditional heavy metals in sectors like aerospace and automotive. However, the intrinsic brittleness of commonly utilized EP-fiber composites necessitates modifications for roles demanding impact resistance or damping[44]–[47]. By incorporating PA, these systems get toughened without compromising on mechanical prowess. PAs are generally integrated as distinct phases since producing a uniform matrix augments resin viscosity, thereby complicating fiber impregnation.

Jang et al's study[49] employed various thermoplastic and reinforcement fiber weaves amalgamated with EP resin to analyze impact behavior. The results indicate that while thermoplastic deformation is pivotal for energy absorption, the EP-PA system under scrutiny significantly limited PA's deformation-to-failure. This highlights potential benefits if PA-EP adhesion was toned down, thus allowing enhanced PA deformation for impact-rich applications.

Beier et al's experiments[49], [50] centered on leveraging low-melting temperature PA yarns to bind non-crimp carbon fiber fabrics, visualized in Figure 2.10. While the yarns amplified GIC and tensile strength, they adversely affected post-impact compression strength. Beier et al postulated that employing different grades of PA yarn might mitigate the observed reductions in mechanical properties.

Hogg's investigation[51] targeted the robustness imparted by intertwining thermoplastic fibers, inclusive of PA, with plain weave carbon fiber fabrics that underwent overmolding with EP resin. The results, depicted in Figure 2.11, emphasize the PA fibers' proficiency in elevating impact resistance and both Mode-I and Mode-II fracture toughness. However, the overwhelming size of PA threads vis-à-vis carbon fibers resulted in a dwindling carbon fiber volume fraction, showcased in Figure 2.12. Such low carbon content implies a significant drop in strength compared to conventional carbon fiber EP composites.

Thanomsilp and Hogg's subsequent work[53] confirmed that infusing PA fibers into a woven reinforcement fabric could elevate GIC. However, contrasting effects on GIIC were observed depending on the choice of fiber—carbon or glass. The reason for such a discrepancy remains ambiguous.

Another intriguing approach, as explored by Varelidis et al[54], is to pre-coat individual fibers or fabric with thermoplastic prior to EP impregnation. They deduced that carbon fibers coated with high-molecular weight PA6,6 via a solution dip coating method exhibited better adhesion to the EP matrix. In contrast, fibers coated through interfacial polymerization displayed inferior adhesion, attributable to the lower molecular weight of the PA chains.

Furthermore, Varelidis et al[55] extended their coating methods to Kevlar fabrics. Despite the enhancement of certain properties, the PA coatings also introduced some drawbacks, particularly in terms of water absorption due to PA's hydrophilic nature, corroborating Delollis[46] and Butt[47] findings.

Skourlis et al[56] took a slightly different route, adopting an in-situ polyamidization coating technique to cloak individual carbon fibers with a slender PA layer before crafting unidirectional composites in an EP matrix. Preliminary findings indicated that such thin PA coatings accentuated the tensile and impact characteristics, emphasizing the nuanced interplay between coating thickness, fiber properties, and the surrounding matrix.

Fibrous Interlaminar Strategy 5.1

3-point bending tests have accentuated the intricate stress dynamics in the composite systems, as seen with the flexural anomalies when PA was integrated into EP-fiber composites. Complex stress fields, particularly in these bending tests, can introduce uncertainties in performance evaluations.

One of the breakthroughs in composite engineering was the introduction of interleaved layers, specifically designed to boost the fracture properties of an EP-matrix composite. Interleaves, typically composed of ductile material, are sandwiched between the composite layers, reinforcing the bond between plies and assisting energy absorption. Favre's investigations[57] using PA6 as an interlayer showcased an interesting trade-off—while the Charpy impact energy of EP-carbon fiber composites increased with the number of PA interleaves, there was a decline in their interlaminar shear strength (illustrated in Figure 2.13). Notably, these composites primarily displayed cohesive failure (refer to Figure 2.14), with ambiguity surrounding the nature of adhesion between PA and EP.

Master's explorations[58] centered around interleaved composites and their enhanced impact resistance and delamination resistance. The idea of using electrospun thermoplastics as interleaves, proposed by Dzenis and Reneker[59], emerged as a promising method. Electrospinning, depicted in Figure 2.15, crafts a mat of nanoscale fibers, which, due to its increased surface area to volume ratio, offers superior adhesion over traditional interleaving methods.

5.2 Importance of PA Molecular Weight and Bonding

The studies on PA-coated fibers underscore the critical role of PA's molecular weight in composite systems. Low molecular weight seems to hinder optimal toughening, while high molecular weight enables superior mechanical interlocking between PA and EP, a vital factor for improved mechanical properties.

Daelamans et al’s[61], [62] multi-scale investigations underline various toughening mechanisms at play, ranging from the matrix to laminate resin levels. In their observations, electrospun nanofibers performed a pivotal role, from deflecting and absorbing energy from growing crack fronts at the matrix level, to offering large-scale toughening benefits at the laminate level. Notably, this behavior hinged on the temperature during processing, with temperatures below the PA's glass transition hampering mobility and preventing optimal bonding.

5.3 Application and Evaluation in Composite Systems

Akangah et al[60] incorporated electrospun PA6,6 interlayers in unidirectional carbon fiber-EP composites. The results were promising, with notable enhancements in the threshold impact force and reduced damage rates. Palazzetti's research[63], [65] on carbon fiber/EP composites reinforced with electrospun PA6,6 interlayers exhibited improvements in Mode-I and Mode-II fracture toughness and energy absorption.

On the other hand, Tstotsis' work[64] elucidated the potential of thin PA veils as interleaves in carbon fiber/EP composites. They ascertained that PA interlayers with higher melting temperatures were superior in performance.

In summary, while integrating PA into EP-matrix composites presents a realm of potential benefits, it's essential to understand the fine balance between molecular weight, adhesion, and processing conditions to harness the full spectrum of advantages. Future research should focus on optimizing these parameters for various applications, from aerospace to automotive sectors.

5.4 Selective Toughening and the Role of Carbon Fibers

Daelemans et al[66]'s study demonstrated that PA interleaves could significantly affect the crack propagation dynamics in composite materials. As observed, when a composite has room for carbon fibers to bridge across a crack, PA interleaves can act as a deterrent to crack growth, a phenomenon depicted in Figure 2.16. This observation is critical as it suggests a nuanced approach to composite design—by creating areas within the composite that are receptive to crack bridging and employing PA to control and manage crack progression. The idea of selectively toughened composites is intriguing and could find applications in areas that require materials to have an intelligent response to mechanical stresses.

5.5 Electrospun vs. Traditional Interlayers

A prominent advantage of electrospun interleaves over traditional ones is the decreased PA volume fraction, leading to optimized mechanical characteristics while still conferring the benefits of PA-enhanced toughness. However, irrespective of the fabrication method, one consistent observation is the strong bonding between PA and EP. The robustness of this adhesion ensures that the system doesn't succumb to adhesive failures.

5.6 Balancing Act: Toughness vs. Strength

The role of PA as a toughening agent has been consistently emphasized across different studies. However, as these researches also highlight, it's crucial to find a balance. An increased volume of PA can improve impact toughness but might compromise the composite's inherent strength. Therefore, while PA offers a promising avenue for improving the mechanical properties of EP-based composites, judicious application is essential. One must ensure that the benefits accrued in terms of improved toughness aren't offset by significant reductions in other vital mechanical properties, such as strength and stiffness.

Conclusion:

In the evolving landscape of composite materials, polyamide (PA) has emerged as a potent agent for enhancing toughness, especially in epoxide (EP) matrix composites. However, as the science dives deeper into this domain, the complexities become evident. The integration of PA needs a precise understanding, not only of the mechanics at play but also of the various processing techniques that can be employed. When done right, PA can indeed be a game-changer, taking the capabilities of EP-based composites to new heights. Future endeavors in this domain should be centered around refining the processing techniques, understanding the micro-mechanics in greater detail, and applying these materials to real-world applications that can leverage their unique properties.

6 PA Particle Interlayers: A Fusion of Techniques

The incorporation of PA12 particles as interlayers in EP-matrix composites, as studied by Groleau et al[67], heralds a merging of the toughening principles seen in particle-toughened EP systems and those with interleaved composites. It's noteworthy how the performance shifts with the crosslinking degree of the EP. Highly crosslinked EP composites, which are inherently more brittle, benefit from the added ductility and energy absorption capability of the PA12 particles, as they aid in deformation and bridging during load applications. The processing temperature being above the PA melting point aids in the fusion and interlinking of the particles with the matrix, enhancing the interface's robustness.

7 Effects on Shear Properties

Caprino et al[68]'s experiments on the shear properties of unidirectional EP-CF composites, toughened using a layer of PA particles in the EP resin, are significant. While the in-plane shear properties maintained their integrity, the through-thickness shear modulus was seen to be compromised due to the presence of the PA in the interlayers. The reasons behind this unexpected drop in modulus need a more detailed exploration.

8 Delamination Resistance in Particle-Interleaved Composites

Hojo et al[69]'s work offers an enlightening perspective on Mode-I delamination fatigue properties. In PA particle-toughened composites, the crack first encounters the toughened interlayer. Here, the resistance to crack growth is significantly enhanced compared to composites devoid of PA particles. The crack's transition from this toughened region to the untoughened region, even when not directly interacting with the particles, still offers higher resistance than in reference materials. This behavior highlights the nuanced effects of PA particle integration and the resultant crack deflection mechanics in such systems.

9 Conclusion: The Promising Horizon of Hybrid Composites

The use of PA particles as interlayers in EP-matrix composites presents a fascinating combination of toughening mechanisms derived from both particle-embedded EP systems and those with interleaved designs. This amalgamation approach to material design offers tailored properties by blending distinct mechanisms of mechanical and chemical interactions. In essence, such hybrid materials could pave the way for creating composites with customized strength, ductility, and resistance attributes suitable for diverse application demands. As researchers continue to experiment and innovate, there is immense potential for further breakthroughs in the realm of PA-toughened EP composites.

10 Overview of PA and EP Interactions

The investigation presented provides a comprehensive understanding of the EP and PA amalgamation. Through chemical reactions, PA and EP chains can crosslink, with an additional reaction pathway further fortifying this linkage at elevated temperatures and particular EP compositions. The mechanism of toughening, when introducing PA to EP, varies depending on the integration method—either as a pre-dissolved solution or as a distinct phase. For composite enhancements, the principles harken back to those observed in particle-fortified epoxies, with the major distinction being the configuration or size of the PA inclusions. Regardless of system design, the balance between PA-induced ductility and system strength is pivotal. The properties can be fine-tuned to achieve desired outcomes in the final product.

11 Generalizing the Findings

Many insights from this exploration of PA and EP can be extended to other disparate polymer combinations. Aspects like reaction kinetics can inform the choice of polymers with synergistic reactive groups, elevating the possibility of covalent crosslinking which, in turn, augments adhesion. Even if polymers exhibit partial immiscibility, successful combination is attainable under diverse conditions. Furthermore, this examination offers strategies on leveraging blend compositions, configurations, and processing parameters to optimize particular properties without compromising others. Key takeaways include:

1. Optimizing Strength: Maximizing strength involves reducing the size of the weaker component. This facilitates better stress transfer to the stronger constituent, mitigating .premature failure
2. Consideration of Moisture Absorption: Polymers with hydrophilic tendencies will imbibe water, potentially altering material properties. This plasticizing influence necessitates considerations during design and .often a pre-manufacture drying phase
3. Particle Suspensions and Energy Absorption: Small ductile particles in a

brittle backdrop can deviate crack growth and display plastic deformation, amplifying energy absorption.

4. Thermoplastic Phase Processing: A processing temperature just beneath the thermoplastic’s melting point encourages chain entanglement and adhesive enhancement.
5. Polymer Chain Length: Extended polymer chains can bolster the mechanical entwining between distinct polymers.
6. Interleaved Composites: Whether using electrospinning or not, incorporating ductile polymers as interlayers in brittle-matrix composites augments energy absorption capabilities.

12 Concluding Thoughts

The EP and PA integration investigation shines a spotlight on the multifaceted interplay of chemistries and mechanisms at work. The derived insights and methodologies offer a blueprint for engineers and researchers to strategically combine polymers, achieving superior materials with targeted properties for various applications. The amalgamation of these polymers exemplifies the exciting possibilities in polymer science when innovative methods intersect with deepened understandings.

References

[1] J. E. McMurry, Organic Chemistry: Chem 10172 & Chem 20273, 8th ed. Cengage Learning, 2012.
[2] A. C. Garg and Y.-W. Mai, “Failure Mechanisms in Toughened Epoxy Resins-A Review,” Compos. Sci. Technol., vol. 31, pp. 179–223, 1988.
[3] F. J. McGarry, “Building Design with Fibre Reinforced Materials,” P. R. Soc. A, vol. 319, p. 59, 1970.
[4] W. D. Bascom, R. L. Cottington, R. L. Jones, and P. Peyser, “The Fracture of Epoxy- and Elastomer-Modified Epoxy Polymers in Bulk and as Adhesives,” J. Appl. Polym. Sci, vol. 19, pp. 2545–2562, 1975.
[5] J. N. Sultan and F. J. McGarry, “Effect of Rubber Particle Size on Deformation Mechanisms in Glassy Epoxy,” Polym. Eng. Sci., vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 29–34, 1973. [6] A. C. Garg and Y.-W. Mai, “Failure Mechanisms in Toughened Epoxy Resins—A Review,” Compos. Sci. Technol., vol. 31, pp. 179–223, 1988.
[7] R. Bagheri, B. T. Marouf, and R. A. Pearson, “Rubber-Toughened Epoxies: A Critical Review,” J. Macromol. Sci C., vol. 49, pp. 201–225, 2009.
[8] J. H. Hodgkin, G. P. Simon, and R. J. Varley, “Thermoplastic Toughening of Epoxy Resins: a Critical Review,” Polym. Advan. Technol, vol. 9, pp. 3–10, 1998. [9] R. Mülhaupt, “Flexibility or Toughness?—The Design of Thermoset Toughening Agents,” Chimia, vol. 44, pp. 43–52, 1990.
[10] P. Vijayan, P. ; Puglia, D. ; Al-Maadeed, M. A. S. A. ; Kenny, J. M. ; Thomas, and S., “Elastomer/Thermoplastic Modified Epoxy Nanocomposites: The Hybrid Effect of `Micro’ and `Nano’ Scale,” Mat Sci. Eng R, vol. 116, pp. 1–29, 2017.
[11] M. E. Frigione, L. Mascia, and D. Acierno, “Oligomeric and Polymeric Modifiers for Toughening of Epoxy Resins,” Eur. Polym. J, vol. 31, no. 11, pp. 1021–1029, 1995. [12] R. Mezzenga, L. Boogh, and J.-A. E. Månson, “A Review of Dendritic Hyperbranched Polymer as Modifiers in Epoxy Composites,” Compos. Sci. Technol., vol. 61, pp. 787– 795, 2001.
[13] Y. Huang, D. L. Hunston, A. J. Kinloch, and C. K. Riew, “Mechanisms of Toughening Thermoset Resins,” Toughened Plastics I, pp. 1–35, 1993.
[14] D. Ratna, “Modification of Epoxy Resins for Improvement of Adhesion: A Critical Review,” J. Adhes. Sci. Technol, vol. 17, no. 12, pp. 1655–1668, 2003.
[15] K. W. Allen, “Some Reflections on Contemporary Views of Theories of Adhesion,” Int. J. Adhes. Adhes., vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 67–72, 1993.
[16] K. W. A. Allen, “Review of Contemporary Views of Theories of Adhesion,” J. Adhesion, vol. 21, pp. 216–277, 1987.
[17] M. Kryszewski, A. Galeski, and E. Martuscelli, “Polymer Blends: Processing Morphology, and Properties,” Springer Science+Business Media: New York, vol. 2, 1984.

[18] J. Comyn, Adhesion Science. RSC Publishing, 1997.
[19] W. C. Wake, "Theories of Adhesion and Uses of Adhesives: A Review," Polymer, vol. 19, pp. 291–308, 1978.
[20] A. J. Kinloch, Adhesion and Adhesives: Science and Technology. London: Chapman & Hall, 1987.
[21] G. Fourche, "An Overview of the Basic Aspects of Polymer Adhesion Part I: Fundamentals," Polym. Eng. Sci., vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 957–967, 1995.
[22] H. W. Kammer and J. Piglowshi, "Adhesion between Polymers," Polymer Blends, pp. 19–34, 1984.
[23] G. Fourche, "An Overview of the Basic Aspects of Polymer Adhesion. Part II: Application to Surface Treatments," Polym. Eng. Sci., vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 968–975, 1995. [24] R. Awaja, M. Gilbert, G. Kelly, B. Fox, and P. J. Pigram, "Adhesion of Polymers," Progress of Polymer Science, vol. 34, pp. 948–968, 2009.
[25] J. L. Hedrick, I. Yilgor, M. Jurek, J. C. Hedrick, G. L. Wilkes, and J. E. McGrath, "Chemical Modification of Matrix Resin Networks with Engineering Thermoplastics: 1 Synthesis, Morphology, Physical Behaviour and Toughening Mechanisms of Poly(arylene ether sulphone) Modified Epoxy Networks," Polymer, vol. 32, no. 11, pp. 2020–2032, 1991.
[26] C. B. Bucknall and I. K. Partridge, "Phase Separation in Epoxy Resins Containing Polyethersulphone," Polymer, vol. 24, pp. 639–644, 1983.
[27] R. S. Raghava, "Role of Matrix-Particle Interface Adhesion on Fracture Toughness of Dual Phase Epoxy-Polyethersulfone Blend," J. Polym. Sci. Pol. Phys, vol. 25, pp. 1017– 1031, 1987.
[28] R. S. Raghava, "Development and Characterization of Thermosetting-Thermoplastic Polymer Blends for Applications in Damage-Tolerant Composites," J. Polym. Sci. Pol. Phys, vol. 26, pp. 65–81, 1988.
[29] J. L. Hedrick, M. J. Jurek, I. Yilgor, and J. E. McGrath, "Chemical Modification of Matrix Resin Networks with Engineering Thermoplastics. III. Synthesis and Properties of Epoxy Networks Modified with Amine Terminated Poly(Aryl Ether Sulfone) Oligomers," Polym. Prepr, vol. 26, pp. 293–295, 1985.
[30] Y. Fu Z. & Sun, "Epoxy Toughened by Thermoplastics," Polym. Prepr., vol. 29, pp. 177–178, 1988.
[31] A. J. MacKinnon, S. D. Jenkins, P. T. McGrail, and R. A. Pethrick, "A Dielectric and Mechanical, Rheological and Electron Microscopy Study of Cure and Properties of a Thermoplastic-Modified Epoxy Resin," Macromolecules, vol. 25, pp. 3492–3499, 1992.
[32] A. J. MacKinnon, S. D. Jenkins, P. T. McGrail, and R. A. Pethrick, "Cure and Physical Properties of Thermoplastic Modified Epoxy Resins Based on Polyethersulfone," J. Appl. Polym. Sci, vol. 58, pp. 2345–2355, 1995.
[33] B.-G. Min, J. H. Hodgkin, and Z. H. Stachurski, "Reaction Mechanisms, Microstructure, and Fracture Properties of Thermoplastic Polysulfone-Modified Epoxy Resin," J. Appl. Polym. Sci, vol. 50, pp. 1065–1073, 1993.
[34] T. H. Yoon, S. C. Liptak, D. B. Priddy Jr., and J. E. McGrath, "Adhesive and Mechanical Properties of Reactive Polysulfone Modified Epoxy Resins," J. Adhesion, vol. 45, no. 1– 4, pp. 191–203, 1994.
[35] R. J. Varley and J. H. Hodgkin, "Effect of Reinforcing Fibres on the Morphology of a Toughened Epoxy/Amine System," Polymer, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 1005–1009, 1997. [36] I. Martinez, M. D. Martin, A. Eceiza, P. Oyanguren, and I. Mondragon, "Phase Separation in Polysulfone-Modified Epoxy Mixtures. Relationships between Curing Conditions, Morphology and Ultimate Behavior," Polymer, vol. 41, pp. 1027–1035, 2000.
[37] B.-G. Min, Z. H. Stachurski, and J. H. Hodgkin, "Microstructural Effects and the Toughening of Thermoplastic Modified Epoxy Resins," J. Polym. Sci, vol. 50, pp. 1511– 1518, 1993.
[38] P. Huang, S. Zheng, J. Huang, and Q. Guo, "Miscibility and Mechanical Properties of Epoxy Resin/Polysulfone Blends," Polymer, vol. 38, no. 22, pp. 5565–5571, 1997. [39] J. L. Hedrick, I. Yilgor, G. L. Wilkes, and J. E. McGrath, "Chemical Modification of Matrix Resin Networks with Engineering Thermoplastics 1. Phenolic Hydroxyl Terminated Poly(Aryl Ether Sulfone)-

Epoxy Systems," Polym. Bulletin, vol. 13, pp. 201– 208, 1985.
[40] I. Blanco, G. Cicala, L. Faro, C. ; Recca, and A., "Improvement of Thermomechanical Properties of a DGEBS/DDS System Blended with a Novel Thermoplastic Copolymer by Realization of a Semi-IPN Network," J. Appl. Polym. Sci, vol. 88, pp. 3021–3025, 2003.
[41] G. di Pasquale, O. Motta, A. Recca, J. T. Carter, P. T. McGrail, and D. Acierno, "New High-Performance Thermoplastic Toughened Epoxy Thermosets," Polymer, vol. 38, no. 17, pp. 4345–4348, 1997.
[42] D. Dumont, D. Seveno, J. de Coninck, C. Bailly, J. Devaux, and D. Daoust, "Interdiffusion of Thermoplastics and Epoxy Resin Precursors: Investigations Using Experimental and Molecular Dynamics Methods," Polym. Int, vol. 61, pp. 1263–1271, 2012.
[43] A. J. Kinloch, M. L. Yuen, and S. D. Jenkins, "Thermoplastic-Toughened Epoxy Polymers," J. Mater. Sci, vol. 29, pp. 3781–3790, 1994.
[44] R. S. Brooker, A. J. Kinloch, and A. C. Taylor, "The Morphology and Fracture Properties of Thermoplastic-Toughened Epoxy Polymers," J. Adhesion, vol. 86, no. 7, pp. 726–741, 2010.
[45] C. B. Bucknall and I. K. Partridge, "Phase Separation in Crosslinked Resins Containing Polymeric Modifiers," Polym. Eng. Sci., vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 54–62, 1986.
[46] Y. Yu, M. Wang, W. Gan, Q. Tao, and S. Li, "Polymerization-Induced Viscoelastic Phase Separation in Polyethersulfone-Modified Epoxy Systems," J. Phys. Chem. B, vol. 108, pp. 6208–6215, 2004.
[47] E. van Overbeke, J. Devaux, R. Legras, J. T. Carter, P. T. McGrail, and V. Carlier, "Phase Separation in Epoxy-Copolyethersulfphone Blends: Morphologies and Local Characterisation by Micro-Raman Spectroscopy," Polymer, vol. 44, pp. 4899–4908, 2003.
[48] M. Naffakh, M. Dumon, and J. F. Gérard, "Study of a Reactive Epoxy-Amine Resin Enabling in situ Dissolution of Thermoplastic Films during Resin Transfer Moulding for Toughening Composites," Compos. Sci. Technol., vol. 66, pp. 1376–1384, 2006.
[49] C. B. Bucknall and A. H. Gilbert, "Toughening Tetrafunctional Epoxy Resins Using Polyetherimide," Polymer, vol. 30, pp. 213–217, 1989.
[50] D. J. Hourston, J. M. Lane, and N. A. MacBeath, "Toughening of Epoxy Resins with Thermoplastics. II. Tetrafunctional Epoxy Resin-Polyetherimide Blends," Polym. Int, vol. 26, pp. 17–21, 1991.
[51] D. J. Hourston and J. M. Lane, "The Toughening of Epoxy Resins with Thermoplastics: 1. Trifunctional Epoxy Resin-Polyetherimide Blends," Polymer, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 1379– 1383, 1992.
[52] J. B. Cho, J. W. Hwang, K. Cho, J. H. An, and C. E. Park, "Effects of Morphology on Toughening of Tetrafunctional Epoxy Resins with Poly(ether imide)," Polymer, vol. 34, no. 23, pp. 4832–4836, 1993.
[53] M. C. Chen, D. J. Hourston, F.-U. Shafer, and T. N. Huckerby, "Miscibility and Fracture Behaviour of Epoxy Resin-Nitrated Polyetherimide Blends," Polymer, vol. 36, no. 17, pp. 3287–3293, 1995.
[54] L. Bonnaud, A. Bonnet, J. P. Pascault, H. Sautereau, and C. C. Riccardi, "Different Parameters Controlling the Initial Solubility of Two Thermoplastics in Epoxy Reactive Solvents," J. Appl. Polym. Sci, vol. 83, pp. 1385–1396, 2002.
[55] H. Li, W. Gan, L. Zhao, and S. Li, "Studies on the Phase Separation of a Polyetherimide Modified Epoxy Resin VI. Effect of Surface Energy on Reaction-Induced Phase Separation of Epoxy Resin Modified with Polyetherimide," J. Macromol. Sci. A, vol. 40, no. 8, pp. 833–846, 2003.
[56] M. T. Heitzmann, M. Hou, M. Veidt, L.-J. Vandi, and R. Paton, "Morphology of an Interface between Polyetherimide and Epoxy Prepreg," Adv. Mat. Res, pp. 184–188, 295– 393, 2012.
[57] D. J. Hourston, J. M. Lane, and H. X. Zhang, "Toughening of Epoxy Resins with Thermoplastics: 3. An Investigation into the Effects of Composition on the Properties of Composition on the Properties of Epoxy Resin Blends," Polym. Int, vol. 42, pp. 349–355, 1997.

[58] Y. Zu, S. Zhou, and J. Xigao, “Fracture Toughening of Epoxy Resins by Addition of a Novel Thermoplastic PPAEs,” Appl. Mech. Mater, vol. 161, pp. 153–156, 2012. [59] Y. Xu, S. Zhou, G. Liao, and X. Jian, “Curing Kinetics of DGEBA Epoxy Resin Modified by Poly(phthalazinone ether ketone) (PPEK),” Polym. Plast. Technol, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 128–133, 2012.

[60] R. Liu, J. Wang, Q. He, L. Zong, and X. Jian, “Interaction and Properties of Epoxy Amine System Modified with Poly (phthalazinonone ether nitrile ketone),” J. Appl. Polym. Sci, vol. 133, p. 42938, 2016.

[61] R. A. Pearson and A. F. Yee, “Toughening Mechanisms in Thermoplastic-Modified Epoxies: 1. Modification using Poly(Phenylene Oxide),” Polymer, vol. 34, no. 17, pp. 3658–3670, 1993.

[62] S. J. Wu, T. K. Lin, and S. S. Shyu, “Cure Behavior, Morphology, and Mechanical Properties of the Melt Blends of Epoxy with Polyphenylene Oxide,” Int. J. Appl. Polym. Sci, vol. 75, pp. 26–34, 2000.

[63] S. J. Wu, N. P. Tung, T. K. Lin, and S. S. Shyu, “Thermal and Mechanical Properties of PPO Filled Epoxy Resins Compatibilized by Triallylisocyanurate,” Polym. Int, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 1452–1457, 2000.

[64] R. A. Pearson and A. F. Yee, “The Preparation and Morphology of PPO-Epoxy Blends,” J. Appl. Polym. Sci, vol. 48, pp. 1051–1060, 1993.

[65] J. N. Hay, B. Woodfine, and M. Davies, “Toughening of Epoxy Resins by Polyimides Synthesized from Bisanilines,” High Perform. Polym, vol. 8, pp. 35–56, 1996. [66] N. Biolley, T. Pascal, and B. Sillion, “Polyimide-Modified Epoxy System: Time Temperature-Transformation Diagrams, Mechanical and Thermal Properties,” Polymer, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 558–564, 1994.

[67] K. Gaw, M. Kikei, M. Kakimoto, and Y. Imai, “Preparation of Polyamide-Epoxy Composites,” React. Func. Polym, vol. 30, pp. 85–91, 1996.

[68] K. O. Gaw and M. Kakimoto, “Polyimide-Epoxy Composites,” Adv. Polym. Sci, vol. 140, pp. 107–136, 1999.

[69] T. Agag and T. Takeichi, “Synthesis and Characterization of Epoxy Film Cured with Reactive Polyimide,” Polymer, vol. 40, pp. 6557–6563, 1999.

BIOGRAPHIES

Emad Q. Hussein was born in Karbala, in 1962. He received Ph.D. Degree in aircraft design from Mechanical Engineering Department, University of Technology, Iraq, in 2006. He is current with the College of Engineering, University of Kerbala. He is specialist in fluid structure interaction and CFD dynamic mesh. He has published more than 37 articles.

Ihab Sh. Hasan was born in Baghdad in 1995. He received a B.sc degree in General Mechanical Engineering from Karbala University in 2019., he works as an employee in Alezza Co. specializes in contract management In addition, he was a mechanical designer.