

---

**Final Refereeing Decision IJMMP\_166813**

---

Inderscience Online <noreply@indersciencemail.com>

20 April 2017 pukul  
12.26

Balas Ke: Inderscience Online <noreply@indersciencemail.com>, Submissions Manager  
<submissions@inderscience.com>

Kepada: rdweiri@yahoo.com, dedikarni@eng.uir.ac.id, drjaafarsahari@gmail.com, Editor  
<janez.grum@fs.uni-lj.si>

Dear Radwan Dweiri, Dedikarni Panuh, Jaafar Sahari,

Ref: Submission "Effect of processing parameters on electrical properties of polypropylene/graphite composite plates"

Congratulations, your above mentioned submitted article has been refereed and accepted for publication in the International Journal of Microstructure and Materials Properties. The acceptance of your article for publication in the journal reflects the high status of your work by your fellow professionals in the field.

You need now to login at <http://www.inderscience.com/login.php> and go to <http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/admin/author/articlelist.php> to find your submission and complete the following tasks:

1. Save the "Editor's post-review version" on your local disk so you can edit it. If the file is in PDF format and you cannot edit it, use instead your last MS Word revised version, making sure to include there all the review recommendations made during the review process. Rename the new file to "authorFinalVersion."
2. Open the "authorFinalVersion" file and remove your reply or any response to reviewers that you might have in the front of your article.
3. Restore the author's identification, such as names, email addresses, mailing addresses and biographical statements in the first page of your local file "authorFinalVersion."
4. IMPORTANT: The paper is accepted providing that you, the author, check, edit and correct the English language in the paper. Please proofread all the text and make sure to correct any grammar and spelling mistakes.
5. Save your changes in the file "authorFinalVersion" and use the "Browse..." and "Upload" buttons to upload the file on our online system.
6. Click on "Update Metadata" to correct the title, abstract and keywords according the recommendations received from the Editor. You must make sure that the title, abstract and keywords are totally free of English Spelling and Grammar errors. Do not forget to click the "Update" button to save your changes.
7. Once you have updated the metadata, check the box "Yes."
8. Upload a zipped file with the Copyright Agreement forms signed by each author. We need a signed author agreement form for every author and every co-author. Please insert the full names of all authors, reflecting the name order given in the article.
9. To see a sample of real articles that have been published in the International Journal of Microstructure and Materials Properties

visit <http://www.inderscience.com/info/ingeneral/sample.php?icode=ijmmp>.

Finally click on the "Notify Editor" button to let the editor know that you have completed the six tasks.

Your continuing help and cooperation is most appreciated.

Best regards,

Prof. Janez Grum  
Editor of International Journal of Microstructure and Materials Properties  
Inderscience Publishers Ltd.  
[submissions@inderscience.com](mailto:submissions@inderscience.com)

**From:** Inderscience Online <[noreply@indersciencemail.com](mailto:noreply@indersciencemail.com)>

**To:** Prof. Janez Grum <[janez.grum@fs.uni-lj.si](mailto:janez.grum@fs.uni-lj.si)>; Dr. Radwan Dweiri <[rdweiri@yahoo.com](mailto:rdweiri@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2017, 11:08:13 PM GMT+3

**Subject:** Refereeing Process: Author comments IJMMP-166813

Response to reviewers

Dear Prof. Janez Grum

Int. J. of Microstructure and Materials Properties (IJMMP)

The manuscript has been completely modified according to reviewers comments and a lot of care has been given to it.

Here the authors response to reviewers comments point by point appear in Bold:

Reviewer A Comments:

=====

Changes which must be made before publication:

Abstract

1- Abstract should contain maximally 150 words.

It is now containing 139 words

2- It is necessary to add research goals.

The research goals have been added at the beginning of the abstract (This paper aims at optimizing the processing parameters for the production of electrically conductive polypropylene/graphite composite plates.)

3- Abbreviations should be omitted in the abstract or written in full.

The abbreviations have been omitted.

4- Keywords should be ranked according to their importance.

The keywords have been ranked as follows: "in-plane electrical conductivity; processing parameters; PP/SG composite plates; melt mixing; compression moulding; design of experiments.

Introduction

1- Each reference should be written separately.

The references have been written according to author's constructions of the IJMMP

2- For each reference it is necessary to state way of research and findings.

It is done

3- If several references are stated together only the most important one should be given.

All references are important.

4- Old references should be replaced by more recent ones.

Old and recent references are included in the introduction

Experimental

1- In item 'Experimental method' it is necessary to add designations according to various standards.

Designation for electrical conductivity measurements was added "This test met specifications of ASTM F 84-99 Standard".

2- Experimental system should be added in the block scheme with input-output data as well as suitable detailed description.

The paper has been modified carefully with the suitable input–output data and suitable detailed description

3- It is necessary to add how synthetic flaky graphite particles should be added.

It is added as follows “The SG particles were mixed manually with PP at weight ratios (PP/SG) of (40/60), (25/75), and (10/90). The mixtures were then melt compounded using a Thermo Haake mixer Roller type Rotors R600 with a 50 ml intensive batch mixer at a temperature of 175 °C”.

4- Abbreviations GME should be written in full.

GME is a company name in Malaysia has a name as “GME Carbon Sdn. Bhd.” and no full name is available at the company website.

5- In table 1 it is necessary to add other compositions.

60, 75, and 90wt.% was shown in Table 1 as input data for DOE.

6- Results of different processing conditions should be added.

Table 2 was added for the results of DOE of all compositions and processing parameters.

7- Pressure unit should be changed into the right unit.

It is changed to bar.

8- It is necessary to add experimental system for measuring electrical conductivity of composites.

It was added.

9- It is necessary to give more precise data about mixing time, mixing speed, processing time and processing value.

Figure 1 was added and figure 2 was modified.

Conclusion

1- Conclusions are too general.

It is modified.

2- It is necessary to state concrete findings in to given research.

It is done.

3- It is necessary to compare results obtained with results from references.

It is compared as follows: “Comparing the results obtained in this study with the previous studies, (Lawrance, 1980) reported a value of in-plane conductivity about 119 S/cm for Poly(vinylidene fluoride)/80wt.% graphite. (Wilson and Busick, 2001) reported a value of 61 S/cm for vinyl ester/68wt.% graphite and (Dweiri and Sahari, 2007) reported a value of less than 10 S/cm for PP/80wt.% SG composites”.

Reviewer B Comments:

=====

Suggestions which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication:

Good paper : results are clear and well presented

Changes which must be made before publication:

Nothing to declare

no comments

Best Regards

Dr. Radwan Dweiri

[rdweiri@yahoo.com](mailto:rdweiri@yahoo.com)

for: Int. J. of Microstructure and Materials Properties (IJMMP)

From: **Online Submissions** <[noreply@indersciencemail.com](mailto:noreply@indersciencemail.com)>

Date: 2017-01-11 16:07 GMT+08:00

Subject: IJMMP\_166813 Submission Acknowledgement

To: "Dr. Dedikarni Panuh" <[dedikarni@eng.uir.ac.id](mailto:dedikarni@eng.uir.ac.id)>

Dear Dr. Dedikarni Panuh,

Thank you for submitting your article entitled "Effect of processing parameters on electrical properties of polypropylene/graphite composite plates" (Submission code: IJMMP-166813) for the International Journal of Microstructure and Materials Properties (IJMMP).

Your article has been processed to be refereed.

You can track the progress of your article by logging in at the following Web page:

URL: <http://www.inderscience.com/ospeers/login.php>

Username: panuh

Temporary Password: dedikarni

This is a temporary password that you are requested to change at your earliest convenience. You must change your password before you can receive review reports from our review committee.

How long will take to review your article?

This depends on the journal. You should directly contact the editor of the journal if you haven't received any communication from the editor after six months of submission. If you do not receive a satisfactory reply from the journal editor, please contact [submissions@inderscience.com](mailto:submissions@inderscience.com)

Thank you for your interest in our journal.

Best regards,

pp. IJMMP Editor

Inderscience Publishers Ltd.

[news submissions@inderscience.com](mailto:news submissions@inderscience.com)

---

## **Effect of processing parameters on electrical properties of polypropylene/graphite composite plates**

---

**Dedikarni Panuh**

Department of Mechanical Engineering,  
Universitas Islam Riau,  
Pekanbaru, Riau 28284, Indonesia

and

Fuel Cell Institute,  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia,  
43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia  
Email: dedikarni@eng.uir.ac.id

AQ1: Please clarify which affiliation has to be included for the first and second authors.

**Radwan Dweiri\***

Department of Materials Engineering,  
Al Balqa Applied University,  
Al Salt 19117, Jordan

and

Fuel Cell Institute,  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia,  
43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia  
Email: rdweiri@yahoo.com  
Email: dr.dweiri@bau.edu.jo

\*Corresponding author

AQ2: Please supply detailed affiliation for the last author.

**Jaafar Sahari**

Email: drjaafarsahari@gmail.com

**Abstract:** This paper aims at optimising the processing parameters for the production of electrically conductive polypropylene/graphite composite plates. The composites were prepared by melt compounding using internal mixer and the plates were produced by compression moulding. The effect of processing parameters on conductivity at different graphite contents were optimised using design of experiments based on a cross-mixed method. The results showed a significant dependence of the conductivity values on the processing parameters. The highest value of in-plane conductivity resulted from simulations was

86.83 S/cm and it was achieved at a mixing time of 57.95 min, a mixing speed of 105.8 rpm, a compression moulding time of 157.89 s, and a pressure of 48.24 bar. Slightly higher value of about 91 S/cm was experimentally obtained. The distribution of graphite particles and the porosity on the surfaces of plates were also examined.

**Keywords:** in-plane electrical conductivity; processing parameters; PP/SG composite plates; melt mixing; compression moulding; design of experiments.

**Reference** to this paper should be made as follows: Panuh, D., Dweiri, R. and Sahari, J. (xxxx) 'Effect of processing parameters on electrical properties of polypropylene/graphite composite plates', *Int. J. Microstructure and Materials Properties*, Vol. x, No. x, pp.xxx-xxx.

**Biographical notes:** Dedikarni Panuh is a Senior Lecturer of Mechanical Engineering at the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Universitas Islam Riau (UIR), Indonesia. He received his PhD at the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, in 2013 from Mechanical and Materials Engineering Department. His research of interest focuses on fuel cell technology, e.g., proton electrolyte membrane fuel cells (PEMFCs), direct methanol fuel cells (DMFCs), solid oxide fuel cells (SOFCs), ceramic metal composites for SOFCs and materials for bipolar plate PEMFCs.

Radwan Dweiri is employed at Department of Materials Engineering in Al Balqa Applied University, Jordan, since September 2009. He is an Associate Professor and the Chairman of the Department. He finished his PhD in Mechanical and Materials Engineering from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, UKM, 2008. He was a Visiting Lecturer at Fuel Cell Institute in UKM for the period of 1 June until 31 August 2013. His research focuses on composite materials mainly electrically conductive polymer composites.

Jaafar Sahari was a Professor at Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering in Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. He finished his PhD in Mechanical Engineering from University of Leeds, United Kingdom, 1984. He was the Deputy Director of Fuel Cell Institute in UKM and He was a project Leader of a group of "Development and Long Term Performance Testing of Bipolar Plates". He has many publications in highly cited journals in areas of mechanical and machine design, materials engineering and metallurgy.

This paper is a revised and expanded version of a paper entitled [title] presented at [name, location and date of conference].

AQ3: If a previous version of your paper has originally been presented at a conference please complete the statement to this effect or delete if not applicable.

---

## 1 Introduction

The use of conductive polymer composites (CPCs) is very promising in engineering applications (Sabu et al., 2014). Their processing methods and properties of their products are an active research field. One important application where the CPCs have been intensively used is the bipolar plate in polymer electrolyte membrane (PEM) fuel cells (Allen et al., 2005). Bipolar plates have used as an alternative for metallic and traditional graphite plates in PEM fuel cells (Davies et al., 2000). The bipolar plate is

used to separate each cell in the PEM stack, collect current, carry water out from each cell and humidify gas. The materials suggested for manufacturing bipolar plates must achieve high chemical and corrosive resistance, low cost and easy manufacturing processes, good electrical and thermal conductance, gas impermeabilities and good strength-to-weight performance. For bipolar plates, the in-plane electrical conductivity was restricted by the US Department of Energy to a minimum value of 100 S/cm (Xiao et al., 2005).

Generally, carbon-based CPCs have occupied a great interest in several engineering applications (Wei et al., 2007) and more specifically, in the application of bipolar plate in PEM fuel cells (Ehsan et al., 2013; Dweiri, 2015; Grundler et al., 2010; Ghosh and Verma, 2014; Xiqiang et al., 2006; Adjima and Jantrawan, 2008). Many issues have been investigated by researchers in the literature regarding to the use of carbon-based CPCs for bipolar plate. Using single and multi-conductive fillers such as graphite (G), carbon black (CB), carbon fibres (CF) were found as an effective way to improve processibility and performance of CBCs (Dweiri and Sahari, 2007; Suherman et al., 2014). Influence of graphite particle size and its shape on the performance of carbon composite bipolar plates has also been investigated (Zhang et al., 2005; Dweiri, 2012). Intensive studies on the conventional methods such as compression and injection moulding showed that these methods are cost effective and produce net-shaped bipolar plates (Mighri et al., 2004; Müller et al., 2006; Devaraj, 2009; Cunningham and Baird, 2006; Dhakate et al., 2007).

The preparation of composites prior to compression and injection moulding and the effect of processing parameters on the mechanical and conductive properties of CPCs have attracted the attention of many researchers (Suherman et al., 2015; Carneiro et al., 2012; Raghavan et al., 2016; Dweiri and Sahari, 2010). Researchers have used melt or solution mixing techniques for preparation of CPCs. The solution mixing is environmentally harmful because of the use of solvents while the melt mixing is not and economically viable. Melt mixing was usually carried out by the use of internal mixers and many issues regarding to this technique had been highlighted by the researchers such as homogenisation of the composites and understanding the effect of processing parameters such as mixing time, rotating speed and mixing temperature on composite properties. Similar to melt mixing, compression moulding processing parameters involving compression moulding duration, pressure value and temperature are also play a main role in determining the final properties of the product. It is worth to mention that to improve the conduction properties of composites, the conductive fillers are to be dispersed uniformly throughout the polymer matrix. This can be achieved by sufficiently mixing the composites that means severe and long-time mixing parameters (Wei et al., 2007). Most studies focused on a short-time mixing within the range of 10–30 min and no studies are found for longer melt mixing duration.

This work aims at optimising the processing parameters of melt mixing and compression moulding for the production of electrically conductive PP/SG composite plates. Design of experiments based on a cross-mixed method was utilised for the purpose of optimisation. Mixing for long time of 50–120 min was carried out while there were no investigations on temperature effect. The high filling load of 60–90 wt.% SG was implemented in an attempt to meet the target of US Department of Energy of 100 S/cm in-plane electrical conductivity for bipolar plate in PEM fuel cells.

## 2 Experimental


### 2.1 Materials

Synthetic flaky graphite particles (SG) with a density of  $1.74 \text{ g/cm}^3$  and an electrical resistivity of  $1200 \times 10^{-6} \Omega \text{ cm}$  had been used in this study. It had a particle size distribution ranging between 10 and  $200 \mu\text{m}$  and it was supplied by GME Carbon Sdn. Bhd., Malaysia. Polypropylene (PP) grade Titan (600) had a density of  $910 \text{ kg/m}^3$ , melt flow index of  $10 \text{ g/10 min}$ , a melting point of  $160^\circ\text{C}$  and it was supplied by Polypropylene Malaysia Sdn. Bhd.

### 2.2 Fabrication of the composite plates

Melt compounding of PP and SG are carried out at different compositions and processing parameters. The SG particles were mixed manually with PP at weight ratios (PP/SG) of (40/60), (25/75) and (10/90). The mixtures were then melt compounded using a Thermo Haake mixer Roller type Rotors R600 with a 50 ml intensive batch mixer at a temperature of  $175^\circ\text{C}$ . Different values of rotational speed and mixing time were applied. The melt compounded composites were crushed and placed into a mould which had been preheated in a hot press machine for 10 min without pressure. The composite plates were then hot pressed into disk samples of 100 mm diameter and 2 mm thickness at a temperature of  $200^\circ\text{C}$  and different values of pressure and compression moulding time. Figure 1 shows a photo of the compounded PP/60 wt.%SG composite at the end of mixing process after opening the die. The change of torque and actual temperature during mixing time at a rotating speed of 50 rpm is also shown in Figure 1. At the beginning of mixing, the torque rapidly increases and falls down before it starts gradually decreasing. The actual temperature in mixing chamber raises up to  $182^\circ\text{C}$ .

**Figure 1** The photo of compounding PP/60 wt.%SG composite and the change of torque and actual temperature with mixing time during mixing process (see online version for colours)





### 2.3 Design of experiment

The composite material composition and processing parameters for the compression-moulded plates were optimised by design of experiment (DOE) based on cross-mixed method using computer software namely 'Design Expert® 6' (Stat-Ease). Table 1 indicates the input data for performing the simulation and it represents the factors that influencing the electrical conductivity of the composites, their symbols and the values range being selected. The DoEs based on cross-mixed method is involving components with several variables and applying an equation in the form of centroid simplex model (equation (1)) combined with  $2^n$  factorial model (equation (2)) to produce the optimum response (equation (3)) (Montgomery, 2001; Cornell, 2002).

$$y(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{i<j}^q \beta_{ij} x_i x_j + \dots + \beta_{12\dots q} x_1 x_2 \dots x_q + \varepsilon, \quad (1)$$

where  $x_i$  is the component mixture with  $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$ ;  $\beta$  is the mixing coefficient and  $\varepsilon$  is the standard error.

$$y(z) = \alpha_0 + \sum_{l=1}^n \alpha_l z_l + \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{l<m}^n \alpha_{lm} z_l z_m + \dots + \alpha_{12\dots n} z_1 z_2 \dots z_n + \varepsilon, \quad (2)$$

where  $z_l$  is the variable process with  $l = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ;  $\alpha$  is the factorial denominator coefficient; and  $\varepsilon$  is the standard error.

$$\begin{aligned} y(x, z) = & \sum_{i=1}^q \left[ \gamma_i^0 + \sum_{l=1}^n \gamma_i^l z_l + \dots + \gamma_i^{12\dots n} z_1 z_2 \dots z_n \right] x_i \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{i<j}^q \left[ \gamma_{ij}^0 + \sum_{l=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^l z_l + \dots + \gamma_{ij}^{12\dots n} z_1 z_2 \dots z_n \right] x_i x_j \\ & + \dots + \left[ \gamma_{12\dots q}^0 + \sum_{l=1}^n \gamma_{12\dots q}^l z_l + \dots + \gamma_{12\dots q}^{12\dots n} z_1 z_2 \dots z_n \right] x_1 x_2 \dots x_q + \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the combination denominator coefficient.  $q$  and  $n$  were adjusted to  $q = 2$  and  $n = 2$  in this study.

**Table 1** Factors affecting the in-plane electrical conductivity of the composites and their selected values which was used for DOE

|                      |                           | Symbol | Unit | Selected values |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--------|------|-----------------|
| Composite components | Graphite                  | SG     | wt.% | 60, 75, 90      |
|                      | Polypropylene             | PP     | wt.% | 40, 25, 10      |
| Processing variables | Mixing time               | MT     | min  | 50, 120         |
|                      | Mixing speed              | MS     | rpm  | 50, 110         |
|                      | Compression moulding time | PT     | sec  | 155, 220        |
|                      | Pressure value            | PV     | bar  | 30, 50          |
| Response             | Conductivity              | CON    | S/cm | –               |

#### 2.4 Characterisation of composite plates

In-plane electrical conductivity of the plates was measured by means of a Jandel Multi-Height Four-Point Probe combined with RM3 Test Unit which had a constant current source and a digital voltmeter designed especially for the four-point probe measurement. This technique measured sheet resistance in the range from 1 m $\Omega$ /sq up to 5  $\times 10^8$   $\Omega$ /sq and volume resistivity ranges from 10<sup>-3</sup> to 10<sup>6</sup>  $\Omega$  cm. The system accuracy was within 0.3%. No electrodes used for DC measurements. The electrical resistivity,  $\rho$ , of the samples can be calculated according to the formula:

$$\rho = 2\pi s \left( \frac{V}{I} \right) F, \quad (4)$$

where  $s = 1$  mm is the probe spacing,  $I$  is the input current through the outer two tips,  $V$  is the voltage drop across the inner two probes and  $F$  is the correction factor based on the ratio of sample thickness to probe spacing. This test met specifications of ASTM F 84-99 Standard.

The morphology of the surfaces of the plates and the distribution of SG particles on surfaces was examined using Leo 1450 Scanning Electron Microscopy Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy (SEM-EDX) instrument (High-Tech Company). The porosity measurements were performed using a Thermo Finnigan Pascal 140 series mercury porosimeter. The surfaces of the plates were polished with a fine emery paper to remove the slip layer of the binder prior tests.

### 3 Results and discussion

#### 3.1 Results of design of experiments

Initial DOE analysis using the input data shown in Table 1 was carried out and 41 different samples at different processing parameters and their resulting in-plane conductivities are shown in Table 2. The data shown in Figure 2 were explored from Table 2 to further clarify the effect of each processing parameter on the electrical conductivity of the composites. The effect of mixing time and rotating speed, compression moulding time and pressure were examined. The reference samples of 60, 75 and 90 wt.% SG were produced at MT = 120 min, MS = 110 rpm, PT = 220 s and PV = 50 bar. The results are represented in Figure 2 as the relationship of in-plane electrical conductivity vs. SG content. In general, the values of conductivity increase with the increase in filler loading regardless of the processing parameters. Figure 2(a) shows that the increase in mixing time results in a decrease in conductivity values for all types of composites. Researchers (Kalyon and Birinci, 2002) reported that the increase of mixing time increases the specific energy input generated during the mixing process which causes better coating of the binder to the SG particles, thus the formation of conductive network is hindered and electrical conductivity decreases. This effect is less pronounced as SG content increases in the composites due to the decrease of the binder amount coated the graphite particles. A reduction in the values of conductivity of the composite plates was also noticed by increasing the compression moulding time from 155

to 220 s (Figure 2(b)) and by increasing the compression pressure value from 30 to 50 bar (Figure 2(c)). It is known from the previous studies that the electrical conductivity increases as a result of the increase in compactness of filler particles in the polymer matrix with increase in moulding pressure (Das, 2002). In the pressure range selected here, opposite trend was observed and the increase of compression moulding time and pressure may elevate specific energy of a mixture and pushing the binder to the sample surface, and hence reducing conductivity. Figure 2(d) shows that the increase in rotating speed has less effective impact on electrical conductivity and literature reported that, with increasing rotating speed, the SG particles and agglomerates are subjected to more shearing action leading to appreciable breakdown of the conductive network, and hence the conductivity of the composite decreases. Furthermore, increase of rotating speed causes a temperature rise of the matrix, so that its viscosity decreases and as a result the shearing force decreases. Finally, it was noticed from DOE that composites containing 75 wt.% SG were less affected with processing parameters compared to those having 60 and 90 wt.%.

**Figure 2** Effect of: (a) mixing time; (b) compression moulding time; (c) pressure value and (d) mixing speed on the conductivity of composite plates at different SG contents obtained from DOE results

**Table 2** Initial DOE running results and the input data are shown in Table 1

| <i>Sample</i> | <i>Components</i>   |                     | <i>Processing parameters</i> |                    |                  |                    | <i>Response</i>       |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|               | <i>SG</i><br>(wt.%) | <i>PP</i><br>(wt.%) | <i>MT</i><br>(Min)           | <i>MS</i><br>(rpm) | <i>PT</i><br>(s) | <i>PV</i><br>(bar) | <i>CON</i><br>(S/cm)  |
| 1             | 90                  | 10                  | 120                          | 50                 | 155              | 50                 | 27.47                 |
| 2             | 75                  | 25                  | 50                           | 50                 | 220              | 30                 | 1.5                   |
| 3             | 75                  | 25                  | 50                           | 110                | 220              | 30                 | 1.07                  |
| 4             | 75                  | 25                  | 50                           | 110                | 155              | 30                 | 1.481                 |
| 5             | 90                  | 10                  | 50                           | 50                 | 220              | 50                 | 41.1                  |
| 6             | 60                  | 40                  | 120                          | 50                 | 220              | 50                 | $3.07 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| 7             | 75                  | 25                  | 120                          | 110                | 220              | 50                 | 1.55                  |
| 8             | 75                  | 25                  | 120                          | 110                | 155              | 30                 | 0.94                  |
| 9             | 90                  | 10                  | 50                           | 110                | 220              | 30                 | 19.67                 |
| 10            | 90                  | 10                  | 120                          | 50                 | 155              | 30                 | 32.4                  |
| 11            | 90                  | 10                  | 120                          | 110                | 220              | 50                 | 18.05                 |
| 12            | 90                  | 10                  | 120                          | 110                | 220              | 30                 | 47.69                 |
| 13            | 90                  | 10                  | 50                           | 110                | 220              | 30                 | 35.1                  |
| 14            | 90                  | 10                  | 50                           | 110                | 155              | 30                 | 22.07                 |
| 15            | 75                  | 25                  | 120                          | 50                 | 220              | 50                 | 0.753                 |
| 16            | 75                  | 25                  | 50                           | 50                 | 220              | 50                 | 1.52                  |
| 17            | 90                  | 10                  | 50                           | 50                 | 220              | 50                 | 41.1                  |
| 18            | 60                  | 40                  | 50                           | 50                 | 155              | 50                 | $5.80 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| 19            | 60                  | 40                  | 50                           | 110                | 220              | 50                 | 0.06                  |
| 20            | 90                  | 10                  | 50                           | 50                 | 220              | 30                 | 48.14                 |
| 21            | 90                  | 10                  | 120                          | 50                 | 220              | 50                 | 31.99                 |
| 22            | 90                  | 10                  | 50                           | 110                | 220              | 50                 | 61.65                 |
| 23            | 75                  | 25                  | 50                           | 50                 | 155              | 50                 | 2.53                  |
| 24            | 60                  | 40                  | 50                           | 50                 | 220              | 30                 | 0.143                 |
| 25            | 60                  | 40                  | 120                          | 110                | 155              | 50                 | 0.39                  |
| 26            | 90                  | 10                  | 120                          | 110                | 155              | 30                 | 72.22                 |
| 27            | 75                  | 25                  | 120                          | 50                 | 220              | 30                 | 0.86                  |
| 28            | 60                  | 40                  | 120                          | 110                | 220              | 30                 | $2.61 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| 29            | 75                  | 25                  | 120                          | 50                 | 155              | 30                 | 0.481                 |
| 30            | 75                  | 25                  | 120                          | 110                | 155              | 50                 | 2.34                  |
| 31            | 90                  | 10                  | 50                           | 50                 | 155              | 50                 | 44.74                 |
| 32            | 60                  | 40                  | 120                          | 110                | 220              | 50                 | $3.60 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| 33            | 75                  | 25                  | 50                           | 110                | 155              | 50                 | 2.61                  |
| 34            | 60                  | 40                  | 120                          | 50                 | 155              | 30                 | $7.02 \times 10^{-6}$ |

**Table 2** Initial DOE running results and the input data are shown in Table 1 (continued)

| Sample | Components   |              | Processing parameters |             |           |             | Response      |
|--------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
|        | SG<br>(wt.%) | PP<br>(wt.%) | MT<br>(Min)           | MS<br>(rpm) | PT<br>(s) | PV<br>(bar) | CON<br>(S/cm) |
| 35     | 75           | 25           | 120                   | 110         | 220       | 30          | 1.88          |
| 36     | 75           | 25           | 120                   | 110         | 220       | 30          | 1.68          |
| 37     | 75           | 25           | 50                    | 50          | 155       | 30          | 1.48          |
| 38     | 90           | 10           | 50                    | 50          | 155       | 30          | 20.38         |
| 39     | 75           | 25           | 50                    | 110         | 220       | 50          | 2.77          |
| 40     | 75           | 25           | 120                   | 50          | 155       | 50          | 0.75          |
| 41     | 90           | 10           | 120                   | 110         | 155       | 50          | 50.55         |

The previous simulations showed that a maximum in-plane electrical conductivity value of 72.22 S/cm was reported for PP/90 wt.%SG composites and this value was obtained at MT = 120 min, MS = 110 rpm, PT = 155 s and PV = 30 bar. For further optimising the electrical conductivity, a second running of the DOE was carried out for PP/90 wt.%SG and the mixing time, MT, was left to change from 50 min to 120 min, MS from 50 min to 120 rpm, PT ranging between 155 s and 220 s and PV from 30 bar to 50 bar. The results of simulations are shown in Table 3. It is noticed from Table 3 that the highest value of in-plane conductivity was 86.83 S/cm and it was achieved at MT = 57.95 min, MS = 105.8 rpm, PT = 157.89 s and PV = 48.24 bar. Therefore, at a high rotating speed the two conflict effects, which mentioned earlier, may counterbalance each other (Das, 2002). By noting the change of the processing parameters all together, the judgement on increasing and decreasing of conductivity is quite different, e.g., the low mixing time, high rotating speed, low compression time and high pressure value results in high electrical conductivity value. Finally, the a composite plate of PP/90 wt.%SG was experimentally produced at the optimised parameters and its in-plane electrical conductivity value was found to be 91.27 S/cm. This value was slightly higher than that obtained using DOE but it could be concluded that there is a good agreement between the predicted and experimental value. Comparing the results obtained in this study with the previous studies (Lawrance, 1980) reported a value of in-plane conductivity about 119 S/cm for poly(vinylidene fluoride)/80 wt.% graphite. Wilson and Busick (2001) reported a value of 61 S/cm for vinyl ester/68 wt.% graphite and Dweiri and Sahari (2007) reported a value of less than 10 S/cm for PP/80 wt.% SG composites.

### 3.2 Porosity measurements and morphological observations


Porosity is one of the factors that affecting the electrical conductivity of the composites. Figure 3(a)–(c) shows the results of porosity measurements of three different samples. The pore size distribution of all samples was approximately ranging from 5 to 100  $\mu\text{m}$ . The relative volume porosity for (40/60), (25/75) and (10/90)wt.% PP/SG was in the range of 0.15–0.75%, 0.05–0.65% and 0.0–0.65% and their total porosities were 1.037%, 1.282% and 1.77%, respectively. Figure 3(d) shows the average pore size which decreases by increasing SG content and values of 10.6, 6.01 and 5.48  $\mu\text{m}$  were estimated for (40/60), (25/75) and (10/90)wt.% PP/SG composites, respectively. The decrease of

the degree of porosity and the pore size causes lower distance between particles, and hence enhancing the electrical conductivity. Gautam and Kar (2015) stated that, at high nanocarbon black content in phenolic matrix, the carbon particles got agglomerated, which developed closed porosity in the composites and this causes an increase in the porosity.

**Table 3** In-plane conductivity readings and the predicted processing parameters for PP/90wt.%SG composite obtained from DOE (second running)

|   | Components   |              | Processing variables |             |           |             | Response      |         |
|---|--------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|---------|
|   | SG<br>(wt.%) | PP<br>(wt.%) | MT<br>(min)          | MS<br>(rpm) | PT<br>(s) | PV<br>(bar) | CON<br>(S/cm) |         |
| 1 | 90           | 10           | 60.33                | 99.57       | 159.32    | 49.2        | 81.78         |         |
| 2 | 90           | 10           | 57.95                | 105.8       | 157.89    | 48.24       | 86.83         | Maximum |
| 3 | 90           | 10           | 50                   | 84.81       | 182.29    | 50          | 66.09         |         |
| 4 | 90           | 10           | 120                  | 110         | 193.77    | 31.75       | 52.93         |         |
| 5 | 90           | 10           | 86.99                | 105.42      | 155       | 37.12       | 49.16         |         |
| 6 | 90           | 10           | 82.77                | 66.3        | 155       | 49.99       | 47.94         |         |
| 7 | 90           | 10           | 87.58                | 59.17       | 213.3     | 30          | 37.04         |         |
| 8 | 90           | 10           | 82.32                | 75.64       | 213.94    | 30.01       | 36.74         |         |


**Figure 3** The pore size distribution of PP/SG composite plates at: (a) 60wt.% SG; (b) 75wt.% SG; (c) 90wt.% SG and (d) the average pore size vs. SG content (see online version for colours)



The SEM micrographs of the surfaces of PP/SG composite plates consist of 60, 75 and 90 wt.% SG and their EDX mapping are illustrated in Figure 4 and the SG particle distribution is shown on the surface. In general, the SG particles are not uniformly

distributed within the polymer matrix and agglomeration of particles is found on the surfaces shown in Figure 4(a)–(c). The tendency of the SG agglomerates to form conductive paths on the polymer matrix is increased as SG content increases and these agglomerates are better distributed in PP having 90 wt.% SG. Moreover, less particle-to-particle contacts could be attributed to lower the electrical conductivity of the composite plates.

**Figure 4** SEM micrographs of the surfaces of the composite plates and SG particles distribution at: (a) 60wt.% SG; (b) 75wt.% SG and (c) 90wt.% SG (see online version for colours)



#### 4 Conclusions

A better understanding of the effect of processing parameters on the in-plane electrical conductivity of PP/SG composites was explored by using DOE and experimental investigations. The DOE results showed that the increase of mixing time and speed, compression time and pressure resulted in a decrease of the in-plane conductivity of the composites. Further DOE simulations for composites containing 90 wt.% SG showed that a combination of low mixing time and high mixing speed, and a low compression time and a high pressure produced the optimum value of conductivity, 86.83 S/cm. This value was in a good agreement with the experimental conductivity value of PP/90 wt.%SG composite which was found about 91 S/cm. Porosity of composite plates was found to increase with increasing SG content while the average pore size decreased. Morphology of the composite plates showed a tendency of the SG to agglomerate and at 90 wt.%, the

agglomerates tended to form a better conductive paths in PP matrix. These values of conductivities at high filler content are still not competitive for applications of bipolar plate in fuel PEM fuel cells due to their difficulty of manufacturing and the expected degradation in mechanical properties.

## References

- Adjima, R. and Jantrawan, P. (2008) 'xxxx', *Journal of Metals, Materials and Minerals*, Vol. 18, pp.121–124. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Allen, H., Tapas, C. and Priscil, S. (2005) 'xxxx', *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 30, pp.1297–1302. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Carneiro, O.S., Covas, J.A., Reis, R., Brulé, B. and Flat, J.J. (2012) 'xxxx', *Journal of Thermoplastic Composite Materials*, Vol. 25, pp.607–629. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Cornell, J.A. (2002) *Experiment with Mixtures: Designs, Models and the Analysis of Mixture Data*, 3rd ed., John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Cunningham, B. and Baird, D.G. (2006) 'xxxx', *Journal of Materials Chemistry*, Vol. 16, pp.4385–4388. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Das, N.C., Chaki, T.K. and Khastgir, D. (2002) 'xxxx', *Carbon*, Vol. 40, pp.807–816. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Davies, D.P., Adcock, P.L., Turpin, M. and Rowen, S.J. (2000) 'xxxx', *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry*, Vol. 30, pp.101–105. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Devaraj, V. (2009) Master Thesis, University of Texas, Austin. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY THESIS TITLE.**
- Dhakate, S.R., Mathur, R.B., Kakati, B.K. and Dhami, T.L. (2007) *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, Vol. 32, pp.4537–4543. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Dweiri, R. (2012) 'xxxx', *International Journal of Materials Research*, Vol. 7, pp.909–914. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Dweiri, R. (2015) 'xxxx', *Jordan Journal of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering*, Vol. 9, pp.1–8. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Dweiri, R. and Jaafar, S. (2007) 'xxxx', *Journal of Materials Science*, Vol. 42, pp.10098–10102. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE AND CITE THIS REFERENCE IN TEX.**
- Dweiri, R. and Sahari, J. (2007) 'xxxx', *Journal of Power Sources*, Vol. 171, pp.424–432. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Dweiri, R. and Sahari, J. (2010) 'xxxx', *AIP Conference Proceedings 2010*, Vol. 1217, pp.559–565. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Ehsan, Z., Morteza, S. and Arjomand M-Z. (2013) 'xxxx', *Iranica Journal of Energy and Environment*, Vol. 4, pp.357–360. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Gautam, R.K. and Kar, K.K. (2015) 'xxxx', *Journal of Multidisciplinary Engineering Science and Technology (JMEST)*, Vol. 2, pp.191–200. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Ghosh, A. and Verma, A. (2014) 'xxxx', *Fuel Cells*, Vol. 14, pp.259–26. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE AND CLARIFY THE PAGE RANGE.**
- Grundler, M., Derieth, T., Beckhaus, P. and Heinzl, A. (2010) 'xxxx', *Proceedings of the WHEC*, 16–21 May, Essen. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Kalyon, D.M. and Birinci, E. (2002) 'xxxx', *Polymer Engineering and Science*, Vol. 42, pp.1609–1617. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Lawrance, R.J. (1980) *Low Cost Bipolar Current Collector-Separator for Electrochemical Cells*, General Electric Company, USA, p.10. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**



- Mighri, F., Huneault, M.A. and Champagne, M.F. (2004) 'xxxx', *Polymer Engineering and Science*, Vol. 44, pp.1755–1765. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Montgomery, D.C. (2001) *Design and Analysis of Experiments*, 5th ed., John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Müller, A., Kauranen, P., Ganski, A.V. and Hell, B. (2006) 'xxxx', *Journal of Power Sources*, Vol. 154, pp.467–471. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Raghavan, C., Karthikeyan, S. and Naveen, H.R.A. (2016) 'xxxx', *International Journal of Advanced Research in Mechanical and Production Engineering and Development*, Vol. 2, pp.164–173. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Sabu, T., Robert, S. and Sarathchandran, C. (2014) 'xxxx', in Ufana, R. and Ashraf, S.M. (Eds.): *Nanostructured Polymer Blends: Conductive Polymer Composites and Blends: Recent Trends*, 1st ed., Elsevier Inc., USA, pp.509–538. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Suherman, H., Irmayani and Sahari, J. (2015) 'xxxx', *Advanced Materials Research*, Vol. 1119, pp.201–206. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE AND INITIAL FOR HIGHLIGHTED AUTHOR.**
- Suherman, H., Sahari, J., Sulong, A.B., Astuti, S. and Septe, E. (2014) 'xxxx', *Advanced Materials Research*, Vol. 911, pp.8–12. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Wei, Z., Abbas, A.D. and Richard, S.B. (2007) 'xxxx', *Journal of Materials Science*, Vol. 42, pp.3408–3418.
- Wilson, M.S. and Busick, D.N. (2001) *Composite Bipolar Plate for Electrochemical Cells*, US6248467 B1. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Xiao, Z.Y., Haijiang, W., Jiujuun, Z. and David, P.W. (2005) 'xxxx', *Journal of New Materials for Electrochemical Systems*, Vol. 8, pp.57–267.
- Xiqiang, Y., Ming, H., Haifeng, Z., Fenning, J., Pingwen, M. and Baolian, Y. (2006) 'xxxx', *Journal of Power Sources*, Vol. 160, pp.252–257. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**
- Zhang, J., Zou, Y-W. and He, J. (2005) 'xxxx', *Journal of Zhejiang University Science*, Vol. 6A, No. 10, pp.1080–1083. **AUTHOR PLEASE SUPPLY ARTICLE TITLE.**