MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AND SOLID MECHANICS SERIES



Heat Transfer in Polymer Composite Materials

Forming Processes

Edited by Nicolas Boyard





Heat Transfer in Polymer Composite Materials

Series Editor Noël Challamel

Heat Transfer in Polymer Composite Materials

Forming Processes

Edited by

Nicolas Boyard





First published 2016 in Great Britain and the United States by ISTE Ltd and John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licenses issued by the CLA. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside these terms should be sent to the publishers at the undermentioned address:

ISTE Ltd 27-37 St George's Road London SW19 4EU UK

www.iste.co.uk

John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 111 River Street Hoboken, NJ 07030 USA

www.wiley.com

© ISTE Ltd 2016

The rights of Nicolas Boyard to be identified as the author of this work have been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016931428

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library ISBN 978-1-84821-761-4

Contents

	XV
Chapter 1. Introduction to Heat Transfer During the Forming of Organic Matrix Composites	1
1.1. Introduction.	1
1.2. Examples of injection of short fiber reinforced composites	2
1.2.1. Heat transfer during the filling phase	2
1.2.2. Heat transfer during part consolidation	18
1.3. Injection on continuous fiber reinforcements	22
1.4. Conclusion: toward a controlled processing	24
1.5. Bibliography	25
Chapter 2. Experimental Determination and Modeling of Thermophysical Properties	29
2.1. Measurement of specific volume and shrinkage	29
2.1.1. Thermoplastic PvT diagram	30
2.1.2. Specific volume of thermosetting polymers	36
2.2. Determination of specific heat capacity of resin and composites	40
2.3. Thermal conductivity: a tricky task	43
2.3.1. A first assessment of experimental data	44
2.3.2. Overview of the main characterization techniques	
to measure the thermal conductivity of polymers	
and associated composites	46
*	

2.4. Conclusions.	69 70
Chapter 3. Experimental Determination and Modeling of Transformation Kinetics	77
3.1. Introduction	78
analyze a reaction rate?	79
3.2.1. Conventional methods	79
3.2.2. Original methods	86
characterization methods	86
3.3. Modeling of the cure kinetics of thermosetting resins	88
3.3.1. Mechanistic models: complexity versus accuracy	89
models: the engineer approach	91
3.3.3. Modeling of the diffusion induced by vitrification	97
3.4. Overall crystallization kinetics of	
semi-crystalline thermoplastics	98
3.4.1. Most popular crystallization kinetics	100
models for process simulations.	100
3.4.2. Systems of differential equations	102
and associated parameters.	104
3.4.4. Models for specific crystallization	107
phenomena and geometries	10/
3.5. Concluding remarks.	109
3.6. Bibliography	111
Chapter 4. Phase Change Kinetics within Process Conditions and Coupling with Heat Transfer	121
 4.1. Introduction. 4.2. Flow-induced crystallization: experimental observations. 4.2.1. Relevant experimental techniques 4.2.2. Effect of flow on crystallization kinetics 4.2.3. Flow effect on crystalline morphology 4.2.4. Flow effect on crystalline growth rate. 	121 124 124 125 131 134

4.2.5. Effect of flow on rheological properties	134
4.2.6. Summary of experimental observations	
and guidelines for modeling	136
4.3. Flow-induced crystallization: modeling	138
4.3.1. Overall kinetics modeling	138
4.3.2. Explicit nucleation and growth modeling.	139
4.3.3. Role of viscoelasticity	140
4.4. Effect of the composite components	143
4.4.1. Effect of nucleating agents	143
4.4.2. Effect of fibers	144
4.5. Concluding remarks.	147
4.6. Bibliography	149
not bionography	117
Chapter 5, From the Characterization and Modeling	
of Cure-Dependent Properties of Composite Materials	
to the Simulation of Residual Stresses	157
Yasir NAWAB and Frédéric JACQUEMIN	
5.1. Introduction	157
5.2. Origin of residual stress	157
5.2.1. Mechanical levels of residual stress	158
5.2.2. Parameters contributing to the formation	
of residual stress	159
5.2.3. Problems generated by residual stress.	161
5.3. Determination of composite properties	161
5.3.1. Modeling the mechanical properties of composites	162
5.3.2. Experimental determination of	
thermomechanical properties of composite	164
5.4. Modeling of residual stress	167
5.4.1. Linear approach or classical theory of laminates	168
5.4.2. Nonlinear approach.	168
5.4.3. Minimization of energy approach	169
5.4.4. Application	170
5.5. Conclusion	171
5.6. Bibliography	172
Chapter 6. Heat Transfer in Composite Materials	
and Porous Media: Multiple-Scale Aspects and	
Effective Properties.	175
Michel QUINTARD	
(1 Interduction	175
$0.1. \text{ Introduction}. \dots \dots$	1/3
6.2. Effective inermal conductivity	1//
6.2.1. Background on upscaling methods	178

6.2.2. A simple example: continuous thermal conductivity 6.2.3. Effective thermal conductivity: properties	179
and bounds.	181
6.3. Local-equilibrium model and thermal dispersion.	184
6.4. Local equilibrium versus local non-equilibrium models	187
6.4.1. The two-equation model.	187
6.4.2. Further discussion	189
6.5. Various extensions	192
6.5.1. Effect of homogeneous and heterogeneous	
thermal sources	193
6.5.2. Interfacial thermal resistance	194
6.6. Conclusions.	195
6.7. Bibliography	196
Chapter 7. Thermal Optimization	
of Forming Processes	203
Vincent SOBOTKA	
7.1 Context of ontimization	203
7.2. Heat transfer: ontimization lever	203
7.2. Definition of the optimization criterion	204
7.4. Broblem modeling	200
7.4.1 Spatial scale	207
7.4.1. Spatial scale	207
7.4.2. Time scale: process steps	207
7.4.3. Multi-physical aspects	207
	208
7.5.1. The adjoint problem	210
7.5.2. Practical setting of the method	211
7.6. Example of process optimization:	
determination of optimal heat flux setpoint.	211
7.6.1. Experimental setup and constraint	212
7.6.2. Instrumentation of the mold and the preform	214
7.6.3. Thermal modeling	215
7.6.4. Experimental data from a composite part molding	218
7.6.5. Estimation of the thermal contact resistances	219
7.6.6. Determination of the optimal setpoint.	220
7.7. Optimal design of molds	222
7.7.1. OSOTO project	222
7.7.2. The considered thermoplastic part	222
7.7.3. General methodology	223
7.7.4. Conformal cooling approach	223

7.7.5. Heat transfer model in the process.	224
7.7.6. Objective function	226
7.7.7. Minimization of the functional J	227
7.7.8. Cooling channel design	228
7.8. Conclusions and outlook	231
7.9. Bibliography	232
Chapter 8. Modeling of Thermoplastic Welding	235
8.1. Introduction	235
8.1.1. Polymer welding processes	235
8.1.2. Healing mechanisms of polymer interfaces	237
8.2. Physics of thermoplastic welding	237
8.2.1. Intimate contact at interface.	237
8.2.2. Macromolecular diffusion	241
8.3. Linear viscoelasticity to quantify the	
macromolecular diffusion	246
8.4 Application to continuous welding of composite tape	248
8.4.1 Process description	248
8.4.2 Influence of processing conditions on interfacial strength	249
8 4 3 Modeling of macromolecular diffusion	249
8 4 4 Modeling of thermal aging	251
8 4 5 Thermal modeling of the process	253
8.4.6 Weldability prediction	254
8.5 Application to ultrasonic welding	255
8.5.1 Process description and time scale separation	255
8.5.2 Process modeling: necessity of a time	200
homogenization framework	256
8 5 3 Numerical multi-physical model	250
8.5.4 Illtrasonic welding with energy directors:	231
process analysis and optimization	250
8.6 Conclusion	259
8.0. Conclusion	262
8. /. Acknowledgments	203
	205
Chapter 9 Multiphysics for Simulation	
of Forming Processes	269
Luisa SILVA, Patrice LAURE, Thierry COUPEZ and Hugues DIGONNET	-07
	0.00
9.1. Introduction	269
9.2. Multiscale, multiphysics and multidomain modeling	270
9.2.1. Flow equations	271

9.2.2. Thermal-rheological-kinetical coupling	273
9.2.3. Orientation and structure development during processing	275
9.3. Advanced numerical techniques and	
macroscale simulations.	278
9.3.1. Implicit boundaries	280
9.3.2. Immersed subdomains and regularization	281
9.3.3. Multiphase flow and thermokinetical	
numerical resolution	282
9.3.4. Composite forming simulation illustrations	283
9.3.5. Parallel mesh adaptation and high-	
performance computing	286
9.4. Determination of equivalent properties	
and microscale simulations	289
9.4.1. Generation of representative numerical samples	289
9.4.2. Permeability of a composite	291
9.4.3. Stiffness tensor determination	294
9.5. Conclusions	294
9.6. Bibliography	296
Matrix Composite Materials Second Secon	301
10.1 Introduction	301
10.2 Methods based on contact measurement	302
10.2.1 Temperature sensors and fluxmeters	302
10.2.2. Heat flux estimation	304
10.2.3. Thermal probes for thermophysical property	
measurement in static conditions	308
10.3. Contactless heating	311
10.3.1. Photothermal methods with monosensors	
(under microscale characterization)	312
10.3.2. Thermal non-destructive evaluation: cracks	
or delamination detection in composite samples	313
10.3.3. Screening of chemical processes and	
microfluidic experiments	317
10.3.4. Principles for the factory global monitoring,	
example of conveyor belt parameter estimation	
	323
10.3.5. In a near future: the Big Data related to	323

10.4. Conclusion	326 326
Chapter 11. Sensors for Heat Flux Measurement	333
11.1. Motivations: heat flux sensor	333
11.2. Principle of heat flux sensors.	335
11.2.1. Gradient heat flux sensor.	335
11.2.2. Inertial heat flux sensor	338
11.2.3. Inverse heat flux sensor	338
11.3. Main characteristics of HFS	340
11.3.1. Invasiveness	340
11.3.2. Time constant	340
11.3.3. Calibration	343
11.4. Type, positioning and use of heat flux sensors	344
11.4.1. Commercial sensors	345
11.4.2. Positioning of heat flux sensors	347
11.4.3 Price	348
11.5 Advantages and limitations of HFS compared	510
to other <i>in situ</i> monitoring techniques	349
11.5.1 Advantages	349
11.5.2 Limitation and care in using HFS	349
11.6 Examples	349
11.6.1 Compression molding	350
11.6.2 Resin transfer molding flow front detection	352
11.6.2. Resin transfer molding: influence	552
of mold temperature	353
11.6.4 Internal temperature prediction	555
during infusion	354
11.6.5 Glass mat transfer internal	554
temperature monitoring	355
11.7 Conclusions	355
11.7. Conclusions	356
11.0. Bibliography	350
	557
Chapter 12 Thermal Radiative Properties of	
Polymers and Associated Composites	359
Benoit ROUSSEAU	227
12.1 Introduction	350
12.1. Introduction.	359
12.2.1 Spectral range of thermal radiation	361
	501

12.2.2. Radiant energy, radiant flux, radiative	
flux density and radiative intensity	363
12.2.3. Blackbody spectral emissive power	366
12.2.4. Radiative properties at interfaces	368
12.2.5. Radiative properties of semi-transparent slabs	372
12.3. Prediction of the radiative properties of	
homogeneous semi-transparent slabs: case of the	
isotactic polypropylene.	373
12.3.1. Intrinsic optical properties for a homogeneous,	
isotropic and non-magnetic medium	374
12.3.2. Prediction of the radiative properties	
of polypropylene slabs at 20°C.	376
12.4. Radiative properties of polymer composites	
with fiber structures.	378
12.4.1. Normal spectral absorptance of	
Roving TWINTEX [®]	378
12.4.2. Normal spectral absorptance of sheet of	
PEEK with carbon fibers	380
12.5. Conclusion	381
12.6. Bibliography	381
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to	
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes	385
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes	385
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes	385 386
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes	385 386 386
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes	385 386 386
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing.	385 386 386 386
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes	385 386 386 386 388
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes	385 386 386 386 388 388
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization	385 386 386 386 388 389 393
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements	385 386 386 388 388 389 393 397
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements 13.3. Modeling of infrared radiation	385 386 386 388 389 393 397 403
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements 13.3. Modeling of infrared radiation 13.1. Opaque medium: surface to surface methods	385 386 386 388 388 393 393 397 403 403
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements 13.3. Modeling of infrared radiation 13.3.1. Opaque medium: surface to surface methods 13.3.2. Semi-transparent medium	385 386 386 388 389 393 397 403 403 403
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements 13.3.1. Opaque medium: surface to surface methods 13.3.2. Semi-transparent medium 13.3.3. Ray tracing method	385 386 386 388 389 393 397 403 403 403 405 407
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics. 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements 13.3.1. Opaque medium: surface to surface methods. 13.3.2. Semi-transparent medium 13.3.3. Ray tracing method 13.4. Polymer processing applications.	385 386 386 388 389 393 397 403 403 405 407 409
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements 13.3. Modeling of infrared radiation 13.3.1. Opaque medium: surface to surface methods 13.3.2. Semi-transparent medium 13.3.3. Ray tracing method 13.4.1. Optimization of preform temperature	385 386 386 388 389 393 397 403 403 405 407 409
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements 13.3. Modeling of infrared radiation 13.3.1. Opaque medium: surface to surface methods 13.3.2. Semi-transparent medium 13.3.3. Ray tracing method 13.4.1. Optimization of preform temperature for the ISBM process	 385 386 386 388 389 393 397 403 405 407 409 409
Chapter 13. Infrared Radiation Applied to Polymer Processes Yannick LE MAOULT and Fabrice SCHMIDT 13.1. Introduction 13.1.1. Why use infrared heating for polymers? 13.1.2. Application of radiative transfers in polymer processing. 13.2. Infrared radiation characteristics. 13.2.1. Radiative properties (basis and main definitions) 13.2.2. Infrared emitters: characterization 13.2.3. Infrared camera measurements 13.4.1. Opaque medium: surface to surface methods. 13.3.3. Ray tracing method 13.4.1. Optimization of preform temperature for the ISBM process 13.4.2. Optimal infrared composite curing.	385 386 386 388 389 393 397 403 403 405 407 409 409 415

Contents xiii

13.6. Acknowledgements 13.7. Bibliography	420 420
List of Authors	425
Index	427

Preface

This book is a recapitulation of the CNRS Summer School organized in June 2013 dedicated to heat transfer in organic matrix composite materials and their forming processes. The industry of composites has grown steadily in recent years due to the numerous advantages of these materials, such as their lightness and interesting mechanical properties, compared to aluminum and other metal-based alloys. To remain competitive, especially in a very strong international economic context, the quality of the produced parts must be fully controlled. This control requires an accurate knowledge of physical phenomena occurring during the various steps of their manufacturing process and in a context where the strong activity and the needs led to the emergence of new processes and increasingly fast production rates. The forming of composite materials has thus become a major topic of research in terms of experimentation, modeling and simulation, where several scientific disciplines must come together in order to achieve the control of manufactured parts and properties. We can notice that heat transfer is one of the main levers to control the forming processes and induced properties of the composite part. They have to be carefully analyzed during the manufacturing of these materials that also require a multidisciplinary approach. Thus, thermal sciences have to be coupled to other scientific fields such as mechanics and physical chemistry.

The first goal of this summer school was to bring together academic and industrial researchers from different disciplines within thermal sciences with transverse themes common to their activities. A second aim was also to provide the basis on heat transfer during polymer and composite processing as well as the latest methods and techniques from experimental, numerical and modeling points of view, useful to help in the solving of many issues. Therefore, the book takes this and gives theoretical and practical information to understand, measure and describe, in a relevant way, heat transfer during forming processes (in the tool as well as in the composite part) and introducing the required couplings. For this purpose, we relied on the experience of recognized French researchers. This book is written in a comprehensive way for an audience that is already aware of the world of composites and associated processes: graduate students, researchers and people involved in R&D activities in industrial sectors. Our aim is to provide a tool, useful for the readers to start a study on composite processing where heat transfers are involved. Each chapter describes the concepts, techniques and/or models related to the developed topic and several examples are given for illustration purposes. A list of selected references is also given at the end of each chapter for a deeper complement of its content, which is necessary for more complex analyses and developments. Unfortunately, all topics and issues related to heat transfer in composite parts and processes cannot be addressed in a single book and a selection was made to cover a broad range of subjects and associated issues.

The introductive chapter presents heat transfer analyses and issues in polymer and composite processing through illustrative examples mostly from injection molding. Preconceived ideas, difficulties and simplified approaches are well highlighted. One key to success in heat transfer modeling is the accurate knowledge of thermophysical properties, phase change kinetics and their associated models for both thermosets and thermoplastics. Conventional as well as new methods to experimentally determine these properties and reaction rate parameters as a function of temperature are detailed in Chapters 2 and 3. Scientific and technical issues are also included. A comprehensive review of the effects of thermoplastics process conditions (shear and/or elongation induced by the flow) and the addition of other components (nucleating agents, fibers, etc.) on the transformation kinetics of the polymers, their rheological behaviors and final microstructures is detailed.

From all these data, the simulation of residual stresses developed during the matrix transformation and the cooling is discussed. For this purpose, thermokinetic and mechanical couplings are introduced and the prediction of cure-dependent mechanical properties is presented. In Chapter 6, modeling of heat transfer in multi-scale porous media, which can be encountered during the filling step of Resin Transfer Molding (RTM) mold, is discussed following a homogenization approach. The relationship between the physics at local-scale and the macroscale description is explained, also including the determination of effective properties.

The improvement of the quality of parts can be achieved by optimizing process parameters. Among them, the thermal control of the part is of strong importance and depends on the thermal control of the mold. Thus, optimization approach has to consider heat transfer in the tool and couplings to include contact conditions and transformation kinetics. Context, definition and methods of optimization are covered in this book and are illustrated with two detailed examples. Process modeling is introduced in Chapters 8 and 9. First, we discuss the peculiar case of thermoplastic welding, where no adding materials is required for assembling. The importance of intimate contact and macromolecular diffusion is emphasized from theoretical and

practical points of view, including the strong temperature dependence. A simulation of forming processes is also addressed in a more general way. Several examples are proposed to present multiscale, multiphysics and multidomain modeling, which are representative of the complexity of forming processes.

Another important part in heat transfer analysis concerns the instrumentation for the thermal characterization and the control of manufacturing processes. From these data, it is possible to obtain information about the process, thermophysical properties and/or the matrix transformation (for example, using inverse method algorithms). An overview of the existing instrumentation (contact and contactless methods) is given in this book. A specific chapter has been specifically dedicated to heat flux sensors, since they provide relevant information to quantify heat transfer between the part and the tool. It is thus an important complement to temperature measurement. Available heat flux sensor technologies and their main characteristics are also mentioned and are completed with practical examples.

Toward the final part of this book, radiative heat transfer in polymer and composite forming are detailed. The processes using infrared heating are in development and the complexity of heat transfer analysis leads to several scientific issues. After a presentation of the basics to define thermal radiative properties, measurements are presented for classical semi-crystalline polymers and associated composites. Finally, after a description of infrared emitters and the temperature measurement using infrared camera, modeling of radiative heat transfer is introduced and polymer processing applications are included.

I would like to thank all my French colleagues who have done me the honor of participating to the CNRS Summer School in 2013 and then of accepting to contribute to this book project with their high-quality work. Special recognition goes to Didier Delaunay, CNRS senior researcher, for his scientific involvement and significant contribution to research in heat transfer in composites and forming processes. I hope that all readers, working in the broad field of polymer and composite processing, may find this book an interesting and valuable resource.

Nicolas BOYARD January 2016

Introduction to Heat Transfer During the Forming of Organic Matrix Composites

In this chapter, we present some very illustrative examples of advances obtained in the analysis of the heat transfer in the forming processes of composites. These examples highlight at the same time the difficulties and scientific issues, as well as some simplified approaches to obtain, in an accessible way, a rapid estimation of the times of cooling or heating of a composite part. We also point out some preconceived ideas, in particular on the nature of transfers during the filling of molds in injection process, and for this we propose a new criterion to determine the transition between the thermal shock regime and the one of established convection, which is validated by experimental results. The selected processes are the injection of composites with short fibers (thermoplastic and thermosets), and the injection on a fabric. The examples are illustrated by results issued of more than 25 years of analysis of heat transfer in the processes, during thesis led within the framework of partnership programs with companies of the plastics processing industry. Finally, some directions for new developments are proposed.

1.1. Introduction

The mastery of composite forming processes raises a number of challenges on heat transfer and how to take them into account adequately. Indeed, the nature of these materials itself induces peculiarities. First, they have at least two components, which poses the problem of determining their effective properties according to those constituents. Composites are also multi-scale materials: the fibers are gathered into tows, which are woven to make a fabric. Reinforcements, but sometimes also the matrices, are anisotropic. The coupled phenomena introduce complex physics difficult to interpret without thorough knowledge of them and their interactions. Furthermore, the operating conditions in the process can be often considered as extreme. High cooling rates are frequently encountered, such as for the contact

Chapter written by Didier DELAUNAY.

between a cold mold and a hot composite. Shear rates can be very large at the wall of an injection mold, or in the micro channels between fibers (even if the flow rates are low). To compensate the shrinkages due to the cooling or the transformations, pressures are sometimes very high in the molding cavity (up to 200 MPa for injection). Low-conductive polymers and composites are in some cases subjected to overheating as a result of heat source release induced by transformation. An additional issue is the fact that the temperature measurement is very difficult because it is intrusive. It is not yet well known how to experimentally determine the temperature fields within a molded part or inside of the plies in a reinforcement stack. The size of thermocouples, which should be at least as small as the fibers, makes them very fragile, especially in a viscous fluid flow. To date, the precise determination of the inlet temperature in the injection channel of a mold is an open problem. Another particularly characteristic example is the location of the filling fronts and the saturation distribution in a composite made by liquid composite molding (LCM) since it is coupled to heat transfer. In addition, solving a heat transfer problem requires the accurate knowledge of the boundary conditions, which may be difficult. We can also give the example of the determination of the thermal contact resistance (TCR) to the wall of a molding cavity or between plies during the consolidation of a composite.

Temperatures are important to know, but the dynamics of a thermal system may be assessed only by measuring the heat flux. How to make a heat flux sensor nonintrusive and accurate in the environment of forming processes? The main question is ultimately whether a fine thermal knowledge is essential to achieve quality parts.

In this chapter, we will show, from a few illustrative examples, that the couplings involved at all levels must be adequately taken into account from the point of view of heat transfer, since they induce consequences on the quality of the final product appearance, size, shape and properties. The thermal scientific problem appears as inevitable, especially since productivity requires short cycles in mass production: there is indeed cycles of about 1 min for automotive parts. Everyone can easily understand that the heating and cooling of a part by varying its temperature sometimes several hundred degrees in very short times, with the objective to control the temperature fields and to obtain uniform final properties for complex shapes, requires a non-trivial strategy.

1.2. Examples of injection of short fiber reinforced composites

1.2.1. Heat transfer during the filling phase

1.2.1.1. Case of semi-crystalline polymer matrices

We will first discuss the injection of a polymer reinforced with glass fibers, taking the example of a widely distributed poly-aramid, whose trade name is IXEF [PIN 09]. The scope of this study is a collaborative program ("FISH" program) involving LTN, IMP (Lyon), PIMM (ENSAM Paris) laboratories and Moldflow, Legrand, and Solvay companies.

An injection cycle is typically divided into four phases: the filling step (few seconds) is short compared to the total cycle time, during which high shear rates may occur. The packing phase consists of applying a pressure on the polymer/composite to compensate the thermal and crystallization shrinkages. The third step is the isochoric cooling under pressure after the gel of the injection gate, preventing the entry or exit of polymer from the molding cavity and finally the cooling at atmospheric pressure after the possible unsticking of the part. At the end of the cooling, the solid polymer part is ejected and the new cycle can begin.



Figure 1.1. Heat flux to the wall of a molding cavity in injection process

The thermal behavior of the mold is periodic: the heat flux exchanged between the part and the mold is very large at the beginning of the cycle, decreases and finally is negative at the ejection, as shown in Figure 1.1. This particularity has to be taken into account since an established periodic state is required for constant quality parts. The typical example of heat flux at the wall of a molding cavity displayed in Figure 1.1 highlights a dramatic and very quick decrease. How can we interpret this behavior? Let us consider the flow in the channel formed by the molding cavity. If we assume legitimately that the forced convection is in the steady state, it is possible under these conditions to evaluate a local Nusselt number at the distance x from the entry of the molding cavity using a conventional correlation for a prescribed wall temperature [PIN 09], for a shear thinning fluid with a rheological power law type:

$$Nu(x) = 1.16((3n + 1)/4n)^{1/3} (PeD_h/x)^{1/3}$$
[1.1]

The Peclet number is defined as $Pe = VD_h/a$; D_h is the hydraulic diameter of the channel, here twice its thickness, *a* is the diffusivity of melt, *n* is the index of the power law viscosity. For the considered instrumented molding cavity [LEG 06] (incomplete part is shown in Figure 1.2 and instrumented cavity in Figure 1.10), we obtain the position of the sensor near the gate *a* value of 20 for the Nusselt number, which corresponds to a constant heat flux during the filling phase close to 1.10^5 W/m². The heat flux obtained as such (see detailed calculations in section 1.2.1.2 applied for bulk molding compound (BMC) processing) is the good order of magnitude (see Figure 1.1) but the experimental one decreases very quickly and we do not observe a constant value even during a short time. The analysis is thus invalidated: the evolution of the heat flux does not correspond to a regime of established convective exchange between the polymer and the wall of the molding cavity. Here is a preconceived idea, which constitutes an approach nevertheless classic but erroneous.

Let us test then the hypothesis that the heat flux decrease is due to the coupling with the conduction in the mold. There is an analytical solution [CAR 59] to the problem of a flowing fluid, which is suddenly put into contact with a wall. In this solution, exchanges by convection are based on a constant convective heat transfer coefficient h. This latter, calculated from the equations [1.1] and [1.11], is in this case approximately equal to 660 W/m²/K (we take the value n = 0.308). The heat flux density is given by $\Phi(t) = h F(t/\tau) (T_m - T_i)$. T_m is the average temperature of the melt, and T_i is the initial temperature of the mold. F is a decreasing function of time [CAR 59]. τ is given by $\tau = \lambda^2/h^2 a$, where λ is the mold thermal conductivity and *a* is the melt diffusivity. For the molding cavity studied, we find $\tau = 35586$ s, which corresponds to about 10 h. The rapid decrease in the observed heat flux is completely incompatible with this law since for $t = \tau$ the value of the function F is approximately 0.4. The result of this analysis using *a reductio ad absurdum* that convective heat transfer during the filling phase is not the key to analyze the heat transfer with the mold.

Let us consider the incomplete part shown in Figure 1.2. The energy equation for the filling of the molding cavity may under certain simplifying assumptions (constant thermophysical properties in particular) be written as:

$$\rho C_{\rm p} DT/Dt = \beta TDP/Dt + \eta \dot{\gamma}^2 + \lambda \Delta T + Q \qquad [1.2]$$



Figure 1.2. Incomplete part obtained with the SWIM mold [LEG 06]

In this equation, D/Dt is the operator $(\partial/\partial t + V.grad)$. The left term represents the thermal inertia. The first term on the right is due to the compressibility. The analysis of its order of magnitude shows that in first approach, it can be neglected. The second term is due to the viscous dissipation. Although it is not always negligible, it is also an order of magnitude lower than the other terms, especially early in the filling phase. The third term is the thermal diffusion, which occurs mainly in the z direction. Q is the possible source due to the phase change of the polymer (in the case of semi-crystalline thermoplastics, for example). A commonly accepted hypothesis is that transfers are one-dimensional (1D) along z, so that we can neglect viscous dissipation and the effect of the compressibility. Equation [1.2] can be thus simplified:

$$\rho C_{\rm p} (\partial T / \partial t + v_{\rm x} \, \partial T / \partial {\rm x}) = \lambda \, \partial^2 T / \partial z^2$$
[1.3]

The second term of the left side equation [1.3] is, at the beginning of the filling phase, of several orders of magnitude, lower than the first one. Indeed, the term $\partial T/\partial t$ is very large and takes precedence over the other. We can then neglect this one and the equation is reduced to the classical 1D Fourier equation:

$$\rho C_{p} \partial T / \partial t = \lambda \, \partial^{2} T / \partial z^{2}$$
[1.4]

The part is then subjected to a heat shock: for a short time (fast filling), it can be assumed that during this stage only the surface layers of the part and the mold in the vicinity of the wall of the molding cavity are involved in heat exchanges. The temperature field is thus the one observed in two semi-infinite media suddenly put into contact. At this time, the temperature in the polymer can be assumed to be uniform and equal to the injection temperature T_{inj} . The temperature in the vicinity of the molding cavity wall is quasi-uniform and equal to the temperature of the mold surface at the time of the beginning of the filling phase. We denote it by T_{mi} . The solution of the contact problem is well known. In the case of an amorphous polymer, if we neglect the contact resistance between the mold and the polymer, the mold surface temperature T_c at the contact time is given by equation [1.5]

$$T_c = (T_{inj}b_p + T_{mi}b_m)/b_p + b_m)$$
 [1.5]

In this equation, b_p and b_m denote, respectively, the effusivity of the polymer and the mold, given by the square root of the product thermal conductivity λ , volumic mass ρ and specific heat C_p : $b = (\lambda \rho C_p)^{0.5}$. Let us apply this result on the example presented in Figure 1.3, where the time evolution of the mold surface temperature is plotted for the injection of an ABS in a steel mold. The thermal properties of this steel are $\lambda = 36$ W.m⁻¹.K⁻¹, $\rho = 7850$ kg.m⁻³, $C_p = 460$ J.kg⁻¹.K⁻¹.



Figure 1.3. Surface temperature of a mold during injection of an amorphous polymer (ABS)

The injection temperature of the molten polymer is 240°C. In a periodic regime, we can see that the experimental temperature of the injection mold, which is the

minimum value of the curve, is about 64.7°C. The effusivity of the mold steel is 11,474 J.K⁻¹.m⁻².s^{-1/2}. The ABS used for this test had the following properties: thermal conductivity $\lambda = 0.2$ W.m⁻¹.K⁻¹, density $\rho = 961$ kg.m⁻³, specific heat $C_p = 2,300 \text{ J.kg}^{-1}.\text{K}^{-1}$. Its effusivity is, therefore, 665 J.K⁻¹.m⁻².s^{-1/2}. From equation [1.5], the contact temperature is equal to $T_c = 74.3$ °C. This value is obviously very close to the recorded maximum temperature reached by the molding cavity surface, which corresponds to the time of contact of the mold with the hot polymer. This first result is in line with the validation of the heat shock phenomenon governed by the conduction in the part thickness. We note a temperature range of 10 K for the increase in the wall temperature. This result is classic. Soon after, the temperature decreases, because the condition of semi-infinite medium is only valid in the first times of the cycle for a dimensionless characteristic time $\tau = at/e^2 <$ 0.05 (empirical result). In the expression of τ , a is the thermal diffusivity of the polymer and e is the half-thickness of the part. In our case, $e = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ m and the diffusivity of the ABS is 9.10⁻⁸m².s⁻¹. The corresponding time below which the assumption of infinite medium is valid is 1.25 s. From the end of the filling that lasts 1 s, the core temperature of the part decreases and, as a result, the surface temperature.

The heat flux exchanged between the part and the mold associated with equation [1.5] is decreasing and is given by:

$$\Phi(t) = \lambda \left(T_{inj} - T_c \right) / \sqrt{\pi a t}$$
[1.6]

This expression of the heat flux, inversely proportional to the square root of the time, is consistent with the experimental observation. It was compared with the experimental data recorded during the injection of an isotactic polypropylene [LEB 98]. Figure 1.4 illustrates the good description of the experimental heat flux by this law during the filling phase, within the first second after contact, when the polypropylene is in the molten (and thus amorphous) state. Then, the beginning of the crystallization is observed, since it induces an increase in the heat flux. At this time, the model deviates from the experiment since it cannot take into account the effect of the phase change. This result completes the demonstration that in the early time of the injection cycle, conductive thermal shock allows us to interpret perfectly the heat exchanges between the part and the mold. Is it possible to transpose this result to a charged polymer, additionally for a semicrystalline one?

The first approach is to consider the neat matrix. Figure 1.5 displays a typical example of the wall temperature of the molding cavity for the injection of a semicrystalline polymer [SOB 13].



Figure 1.4. Comparison between the heat flux given by equation [1.6] (dotted line) and the measurement (solid line) in thermal shock regime during the injection of an isotactic polypropylene [LEB 98]



Figure 1.5. Wall temperature in the molding cavity during the injection of isotactic polypropylene [SOB 13]

Unlike amorphous polymers, we observe that the temperature curve shows a net plateau during the first seconds before the decreasing due to cooling. This is due to the latent heat of crystallization. The solution of a thermal shock problem with phase change (Stefan problem [SOB 13]) induces a change (in comparison with the classical case) of the contact temperature equation [LOU 97]:

$$T_{c} = \frac{b_{s}T_{F} + b_{m}erf(\xi/\nu)T_{mi}}{b_{s} + b_{m}erf(\xi/\nu)}$$
[1.7]

In this relation, $v = \sqrt{a_s/a_l}$ where a_s and a_l are the solid and liquid (i.e. molten) phases diffusivity, respectively. ξ is the solution of the transcendental equation

$$Ste_{s}v\frac{e^{-\xi^{2}/v^{2}}}{erf\left(\xi/v\right)} - \frac{Ste_{l}e^{-\xi^{2}}}{erfc\left(\xi\right)} = \sqrt{\pi}\xi \quad ; \quad t > 0$$

$$[1.8]$$

where $Ste_l = Cp_l (T_{inj} - T_F)/L$, $Ste_s = Cp_s (T_F - T_c)/L$ are, respectively, the liquid and solid Stefan numbers. T_F is defined as the temperature of the crystallization quasiplateau that appears in the core of the polymer upon cooling [SOB 13]. This is a new thermophysical characteristic, which depends on the pressure conditions. It can be determined experimentally or by simulation taking into account the kinetics of crystallization and its changes under pressure. The iterative solution of equations [1.7] and [1.8] allows calculating ξ and T_c . The quasi-plateau observed in the core of the part is related to the heat released during the crystallization, maintaining T_F until the complete solidification. Therefore, the constant half-thickness temperature is imposed, which has the effect to extend the semi-infinite character of the phenomenon, hiding what happens "behind" the isotherm T_F . This plateau, therefore, lasts until complete solidification of the part. What happens if we add short fibers to the semi-crystalline polymer?

Figure 1.6 shows a typical example of the evolution of the mold surface temperature during the injection of a poly-aramide reinforced with short glass fibers. A temperature plateau is clearly observed and its time is even longer than the reinforcement ratio is low. This is related to the solidification time since the latent heat decreases when the reinforcing ratio increases. The plateau temperature is also even higher than the reinforcing ratio increases. It can be explained by the increase in the contact temperature induced by both the increase in ξ , when latent heat decreases (the solidification is faster) and the increase in the effusivity of the composite when the glass fiber weight ratio is higher. The accurate calculation of T_c confirms these effects and the experimental results. 1D heat transfer in the composite through the thickness of the part has been demonstrated in several studies

[DEL 11, LEG 10, LEG 11], the fibers being oriented in the part in a core-skin structure.



Figure 1.6. Molding cavity wall temperature during the injection of poly-aramide composites [LEG 06]: no fiber (IXEF 6002), 30 wt% fiber (IXEF 1002), 50 wt% (IXEF 1022)

This characteristic behavior has the advantage of applying the method described in [SOB 13] to easily estimate the cooling time of the composite part and thus to choose the optimum molding parameters. Indeed, observing Figure 1.6, we note that the molding cavity surface temperature may be less than 1 K with accuracy schematically described by successively a plateau (ordinate T_c) and the negative slope line connecting the point corresponding to the solidification time with ordinate T_c (120.5°C for IXEF 6002) to the point corresponding to the part ejection (39 s, 116.5°C for IXEF 6002). The solidification time may be calculated analytically [SOB 13]. It is then possible to analytically calculate the temperature changes in the part and therefore the time for which an ejection criterion is reached. Needless to say that such a simplified approach is not a substitute for professional software that continuously become more accurate, as Moldflow[©] for example, but it provides the expert with a relatively precise and very quick estimate. This reduced model is also an advantage for optimization software that uses intensively direct problems for solving.

1.2.1.2. Bulk molding compound injection molding

This section is dedicated to research work done as part of a program with the ultimate goal of controlling surface aspect of parts made of BMC, involving several laboratories: CRMD of Orleans, the Department of Polymers and Composites Technology of the School of Mines of Douai, LTN laboratory and Menzolit company (now known as IDI Composites), material supplier. Our specific goal in this study that covered several cooperative programs between 1997 and 2003 was to better control heat transfer in the injection of these composites constituted of unsaturated polyester resin, thermoplastic additive (to compensate the shrinkage induced by the crosslinking), mineral fillers and short glass fibers. The results are detailed in [MIL 01]. An experimental mold equipped with pressure and heat flux sensors was designed, as shown in Figure 1.7.



Figure 1.7. Picture of the instrumented mold for the heat transfer study of the injection of a BMC plate

This mold was mounted onto a vertical press (200 tons clamping force). The injection unit is horizontal. It is equipped with heating elements to heat the material up to 40°C in order to reduce its viscosity, which facilitates its injection. A water-cooled nozzle avoids the warming induced by the hot mold. Material gelation in the nozzle is then avoided. The injected part had a size enough large to be representative of the process: $0.4 \text{ m} \times 0.15 \text{ m} \times 3 \text{ mm}$. The heating channels of the mold are such that the thermal gradient along the walls of the molding cavity is as small as possible. An oil regulator unit is used to heat the mold up to 180° C. Two pressure sensors and four thermal ones (heat flux and temperatures) have been placed into the mold according to the positions indicated in Figure 1.8. The pressure sensors are Kistler type. Data acquisition is done by a Tektronix recorder (200 measures/s). The heat flux sensors conception and their manufacturing have been done in our

laboratory [QUI 98] and are composed of three small thermocouples (25 µm diameter). Each sensor is made with the same steel (Z40CDV3) as the mold so that it is fully non-intrusive from a thermal point of view. A numerical treatment of the data (using the 1D sequential inverse method of Beck [SOM 12]) gives the temperature and the flux density at the sensor surface. Practically speaking, the thermocouple placed far (4.9 mm in our case) from the surface defines the boundary condition; the two others are used for the criterion calculation. This criterion is defined as the quadratic difference between the calculated temperatures (for the position of each thermocouple) and the measured ones. The minimization of the criterion gives the surface heat flux density and the temperature evolution with time. Theoretically, two thermocouples are sufficient for calculation. However, the analysis with three thermocouples gives a better confidence in the results. The thermophysical properties of the steel have been carefully measured due to classical methodologies. Note that short fibers are all oriented in the plane of the part, so that heat transfer arises mainly in the direction of the thickness of the sample. The heat flux sensors have a time constant lower than 5 ms. Indeed, the thermocouples are semi-intrinsic with separated junctions. The metal of the sensor itself ensures the electric continuity. The sensor thermocouples are K type (the thermoelectric power of about 40 μ V/°C). This low voltage generates acquisition difficulties and amplification of the signal is necessary.



Figure 1.8. View of the BMC part indicating the locations of the sensors

A characteristic result of heat flux and pressures during the filling phase is shown in Figure 1.9 and we intend to use it to illustrate the power of relevant thermal analysis. The mold temperature before the injection is set to 140°C, whereas the BMC is maintained at 40°C in the injection unit. During the injection, when the material arrives in front of the heat flux sensors F1 and F2, the heat flux decreases sharply, nevertheless increasing in absolute value. We note that between 0.40 and 0.45 s, the sensors facing each other (one on top of the mold and the other on the lower part) have different responses. This is due to a particularity of the BMC injection, which is also observed in some cases of fiber-reinforced thermoplastics: the existence of a "non-sticking front" ahead of the front. BMC is a yield stress fluid, implying that it has a "piston-type" flow until the velocity and duration of shear is not high enough (with respect to the yield stress). It does not adhere to the wall of the molding cavity. Therefore, there is no contact on the sensor F2 that does not see the front, while there is a poor contact on the sensor of the lower mold part (i.e. F1). Both curves of heat flux F1 and F2 converge after 0.05 s to a maximum absolute value before rising up to an injection time equal to 0.6 s. This initial change is characteristic of a heat shock regime with imperfect contact between the "cold" BMC and the hot mold. From t = 0.6 s, the heat flux given by the sensors F1 and F2 stabilizes at almost the same value. The mold is relatively long and, unlike the case of thermoplastics, there is time to reach an established convective regime.



Figure 1.9. Characteristic record of the heat flux and pressure during the filling of the mold

The same behavior is observed on the F3 sensor at the bottom of the molding cavity, the maximum magnitude of the heat flux being the same as on the sensors

near the injection gate. The composite was not heated significantly during its flow in the mold. This hypothesis is confirmed by the observation of the given pressure P1 by the sensor: the linear evolution during the filling is correlated to the increase in the pressure drop between the sensor position and the BMC front, the filling taking place with a constant flow rate. The fact that the slope is constant reflects that the variation of the viscosity, and therefore the composite average temperature, are almost negligible.

Therefore, heat flux sensors are excellent detectors of events and these data may be used to initially test the rheology of the composite. Indeed, while with the pressure sensors it is difficult to detect the passage front of the material (particularly with P2 sensor), we can estimate the filling velocity by identifying, for example, the minimum flux on the sensors F2 and F3. The distance between these sensors is 0.273 m, and the peaks are separated by 0.55 s. The result is an average velocity $\overline{V} =$ 0.496 m.s⁻¹.

Rheological measurements [MIL 01] demonstrate that the rheological behavior can be modeled with an Oswald–de Waelde-type shear thinning model $\eta = K(T) \dot{\gamma}^{m-1}$ with m = 0.43 and $K(T) = 7600.4 \exp(-0.025T)$. This is consistent with what is proposed in [LE 07]. Let us consider the filling of the molding cavity between the sensor locations, defining a channel of width W considered as infinite, with a length L = 0.273 m, and a height $h = 3.10^{-3}$ m. The flow is therefore in this two-dimensional (2D) channel. The volume flow rate is expressed by:

$$Q = \overline{V}hW$$
 [1.9]

Given the rheological law of the BMC, the volumetric flow rate is classically given by:

$$\frac{m}{2(2m+1)} \left(\frac{1}{2K} \frac{\Delta P}{L}\right)^{1/m} h^{\frac{1+2m}{m}} W = Q$$
[1.10]

From equations [1.9]–[1.10], taking into account values of m and h, \overline{V} can be inferred from the value of ΔP and the apparent value of the consistency index K(T): the mold can be viewed as a sort of rheometer. As shown in Figure 1.9, the pressure increases from 5 to 40 bars between 0.5 and 1.05 s, i.e. a pressure variation equal to 3.5 10⁶ Pa. We thus determine at the average temperature the fluid composite consistency index: K(T_{inj}) = 8.54 10² Pa.s. Using the classical expression of the apparent shear rate $\dot{\gamma}_a = 6Q/Wh^2$, we obtain a value $\dot{\gamma}_a = 1,000 \text{ s}^{-1}$. Using the expression of the viscosity given above, the apparent viscosity of the uncured composite would be $\eta_a = 16.65$ Pa.s. The laminar 2D flow in the mold is an advantage to characterize *in situ* the composite and to compare the results with laboratory techniques, which are unfortunately not always appropriate. The aging of the polymer can thus be identified by changes in viscosity.

Let us go further into the analysis and try to quantify the heat flux at the molding cavity wall, in the steady convective regime (in the plateau between 0.6 and 1.2 s). For this purpose, we use the classical correlation given in equation [1.1]. The Peclet number value is $Pe = \overline{V}D_h/a$ where *a* is the thermal diffusivity. We noted the fiber orientation is in the flow plane (in this plane, they exhibit an orientation distribution in x and y directions indicated in Figure 1.8). The transverse thermal conductivity, measured in guarded hot plate, was found independent of temperature and equal to $\lambda = 0.6 \text{ W.m}^{-1}.\text{K}^{-1}$ whereas the density is 2,000 kg.m⁻³ and the specific heat is 1,200 J.Kg⁻¹.K⁻¹. BMC diffusivity is then 2.5.10⁻⁷ m²s⁻¹. The hydraulic diameter D_h being equal to 2 h, so we deduce Pe = 1.2. 10⁴. The F1 and F2 sensors are located 67 mm from the injection gate. This singularity is thus the origin of the thermal boundary layer. We obtain by applying the formula given in equation [1.1], taking the origin of x at the injection gate, the value of the Nusselt number to the position of the sensor Nu(x = 67.10⁻³m) = 12.77. Then, we can deduce the heat transfer coefficient by equation [1.11]:

$$h(x = 67.10^{-3}m) = Nu \lambda / D_h$$
 [1.11]

We obtain the value $h = 1277 \text{ W.m}^{-2} \text{.K}^{-1}$. The heat flux density is then given by:

$$\Phi = h \left(T_p - T_{ini} \right)$$
[1.12]

where T_p represents the average temperature of the molding cavity wall during the filling step; $T_p = 132^{\circ}$ C between 0.5 and 1.2 s at 132°C for the sensor F2 and $T_p = 130^{\circ}$ C for the sensor F1. The corresponding heat flux is in absolute value $1.18.10^5 \text{ W.m}^2\text{.K}^{-1}$ for sensor F2 and $1.15 \text{ W.m}^2\text{.K}^{-1}$ for sensor F1. Experimentally, the sensors record the entering heat flux in the mold as negative because the hot mold transfers the heat to the cold composite ($T_{inj} = 40^{\circ}$ C). Experimental absolute values given in Figure 1.9 are very close to the values estimated by equations [1.1], [1.11]–[1.12] (better than 10% accuracy for the predicted heating). Calculations also indicate that the heat flux given by F2 is greater than F1 in absolute value. The heat flux estimation is of great interest because conversely, it allows calculating the average temperature in the part thickness from a heat balance during the residence time in the mold. As such, we can build simplified models for heat transfer.

Nevertheless, a question arises on the transition into the mold between the heat shock regime and the convective flow regime. An attempt to estimate this time can be to find the time for which the conductive heat flux due to thermal shock decreasing in $1/\sqrt{t}$ (equation [1.6]) becomes equal to the steady regime of convective heat flux given by equations [1.1], [1.11–1.12].

Conductive heat flux during a thermal shock is given by equation [1.6]. Equations [1.11]–[1.12] combined with the expression of the Nusselt number in a plane channel (equation [1.1]) are used to calculate the convective flux. By identifying these two expressions, and by dividing both sides of the equality by λ (T_{inj} – T_c), we obtain equation [1.13] where x is the distance between the gate and the position of the sensor:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi at}} = \frac{1.276}{D_h} \left(\frac{3m+1}{4m}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{PeD_h}{x}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$$
[1.13]

For the BMC, the index of the power law being m = 0.43, this previous expression becomes:

$$\frac{at}{D_h^2} = 0.1955 \left(\frac{x}{Pe.D_h}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$$
[1.14]

Knowing that D_h is equal to 2 h, by defining a Fourier number Fo = at / h^2 , we obtain the time t for which both heat fluxes are equal. This is the time t such that:

Fo =
$$0.78(\frac{x}{Pe.D_h})^{\frac{2}{3}}$$
 [1.15]

Let us apply this relationship to the results displayed in Figure 1.9. We remind that the Peclet number is Pe = 1.2. 10^4 , $D_h = 2h = 6.10^{-3}m$, and the sensor F1 is at x = 67 mm from the gate. The diffusivity is $a = 2.5.10^{-7} \text{ m}^2.\text{s}^{-1}$. This gives a time t = 0.27 s. If it is added to the time of passage in front of the sensors, we obtain the end of the shock regime between 0.65 and 0.7 s. It is seen in Figure 1.9 that this time corresponds remarkably well with the beginning of the plateau.

If we perform the same exercise on the SWIM mold of section 1.2.1, we also obtain very interesting results. Figure 1.10 presents the position of the sensors on the wall of the SWIM molding cavity. The closest one is at x = 17 mm to the gate. Figure 1.11 (extracted from [LEB 98]) depicts the heat flux measured during the injection of a polypropylene in the SWIM mold. We note again that the amplitudes of the heat flux close to the gate and the cavity bottom are almost identical. The filling velocity is estimated from the maximum values of the flux to 0.1 m.s⁻¹. If we assume an Oswald–de Waelde-type rheological behavior for the PP, the power law index is close to 0.3 (0.308 for the studied PP). The diffusivity is 8.7.10⁻⁸ m².s⁻¹. The Peclet number is thus equal to 6,900. We apply the same approach as for the BMC, noting that the expression $\left(\frac{3m+1}{4m}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ now has the value 1.16. A value close to the one obtained for the BMC, which differs only by 5%. This parameter has little importance on the transition between the two regimes. The calculation gives

a time t = 0.454s for equality between the two terms of the heat flux, and therefore the transition between regimes. We see in Figure 1.11 that the filling is finished at this time. We conclude that the whole filling occurs during the heat shock regime.



Figure 1.10. Position of the sensors on the mold SWIM



Figure 1.11. Heat flux density during the passage of the molten PP in front of the sensors

Finally, considering a domain of variation of the power law index including most of the injected polymers, we are able to propose a criterion determining the transition between the regimes. If a Fourier number Fo, built on the thickness of the piece and estimated at a distance x from the molding cavity gate, satisfies:

Fo < 0.6
$$\left(\frac{x}{Pe.D_h}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$$
 [1.16]

Then, it can be considered that the regime of heat shock prevails at this location. This equation takes into account the range of variation of the power law index of the polymer-based pastes.

1.2.2. Heat transfer during part consolidation

1.2.2.1. Consolidation of the thermoplastic parts

During the consolidation phase, new phenomena must be taken into account. A very strong coupling exists between the heat transfer and the phase change in the case of semi-crystalline. The coupling is initially induced by a strong dependence of thermophysical properties on temperature, pressure and the physical state, i.e. liquid or solid (including the crystalline fraction). These properties are the specific volume, the specific heat and the thermal conductivity. We will discuss this in Chapter 2, but it can be said that these data are accessible with suitable apparatuses. The term of compressibility may be non-negligible, especially when the pressure varies very quickly at the commutation time in injection molding (temperature rise of few degrees). Viscous dissipation is generally negligible because of the low flow velocities in these phases. The source term must be of course taken into account adequately for semi-crystalline polymers. It is related to the kinetics of crystallization and its release participates in the coupling between the phase change and heat transfer. Provided that the homogenization is possible in the composite, the source is weighted by the weight fraction of the matrix. This question of homogenization is not trivial and research works remain to be undertaken to indicate in which circumstances it is possible. The coupling between the heat transfer and crystallization is controlled by the ratio of two characteristic times called thermal Deborah number De. This is the ratio between the characteristic time of heat transfer $\tau = e^2/a$, where e is a characteristic length of the part and a is the thermal diffusivity (typically 1.10^{-7} m².s⁻¹) and the characteristic time of the transformation t_t at the temperature where it occurs in the core of the part. We can choose the transformation half-time t_c, which is accessible experimentally. Let us take the example of a PP part with a half-thickness equal to 2 mm. Crystallization occurs at 100°C, the crystallization half-time is 1 s, which is small compared to $\tau = 40$ s.

Depending on the value of *De*, one can fall in one of the three situations illustrated in Figure 1.12.



Figure 1.12. Coupling between the temperature and phase change fields. The temperature field is in black and the transformation field is in red. For a color version of the figure, see www.iste.co.uk/boyard/heat.zip

Of course, solid and liquid Stefan numbers defined in section 1.2.1.1 play a role in the coupling. If these numbers are large, the heat source is negligible and heat transfers are the same as those in a part made with anamorphous thermoplastic. If Stefan numbers are small, the thermal behavior will depend on the characteristics time ratio. If De is very large, the polymer behaves like two phases with a localized (sharp) interface, and the change of state occurs at T_c (case 3, in Figure 1.12). A plateau is observed at T_c on the temperature evolution in the centre of the part. This is almost true for the solidification example given above for a PP, for which De = 40. If $De \approx 1$, there is a quasi-plateau of phase change in the core of the part and the transformation zone has limited thickness compared to the part one (case 2, Figure 1.12). A good approximation of solidification and cooling times is possible with simplified models already mentioned in section 1.2.1.1 (see [SOB 13]). In the case where the phase change time is large compared to the thermal time constant (case 1 in Figure 1.12), De is small and the thermal history imposes locally the phase change. Heat transfer and phase change can be uncoupled. We are then in a case similar to the forming of an amorphous polymer, for which the cooling is easy to model, noting that the time evolution of molding cavity surface temperature shown in Figure 1.3 may be represented by a triangle. The average temperature of the

molding cavity surface during the cycle \overline{T}_s can then easily be determined and used in a conventional analytical solution to calculate the cooling time.

Kinetic laws, which provide the relationship between the rate of transformation $d\alpha/dt$ to the temperature and the transformed fraction α (see Chapter 3), are used to make the coupling between the energy conservation equation and the equation which describes the evolution of the transformed fraction. Indeed, the source in the energy equation, related to the phase change, is:

$$Q = \rho (P, T, \alpha) \Delta H \partial \alpha / \partial t$$
[1.17]

In this expression, ρ is the density and ΔH is the phase change enthalpy.



Figure 1.13. Measured and calculated temperature during the solidification of a reinforced poly-aramide (IXEF 1002)

The kinetics is piezo-dependent: the increase in pressure moves the crystallization toward higher temperatures. The heat source is thus released at temperatures, which depend on the pressure and this has a strong impact on the temperature fields. Many formulations are available for the source and the readers will find a detailed presentation later in this book (Chapter 3). Nevertheless, it is observed that the temperature difference called supercooling: $\Delta T = T_m^0 - T$ appears in the expression of the crystallization kinetics. The temperature T_m^0 refers to the thermodynamic melting temperature. The effect of pressure on the kinetics is related to the increase in the thermodynamic melting temperature when the pressure P increases, which has to be taken into account in the expression for the kinetics [LEG 10, FUL 01]. Figure 1.13 shows the excellent agreement between simulated

and measured temperatures in the core of the part [LEG 11]. The modeling of heat transfer includes crystallization heat source, including the pressure effect. Similar results are obtained for a composite polyamide/UD glass fiber [FAR 15]. The cooling rate decreases (quasi-plateau) during the crystallization. It should also be noted that this level of accuracy requires a good modeling of the thermal properties, in particular depending on the phase change, which will be discussed in Chapter 2.

1.2.2.2. Part consolidation with a thermosetting matrix

The problem is identical to the previous one for the thermosetting matrix composites. It can be estimated that the calculation of the temperature fields coupled to the source of polymerization (cross-linking) is now performed correctly, subject to a number of precautions, especially related to a good estimate of the thermal properties and their changes according to the degree of conversion [DEL 14a, DEL 14b]. An example of the level of accuracy in the prediction of coupled fields is shown in Figure 1.14 [BAI 98].



Figure 1.14. Comparison between the measured and calculated conversion degree in an epoxy/UD glass fiber part in which partial and uniform polymerization was carried out through the thickness [BAI 98]

Indeed, the solved problem included an inverse method to compute the optimized temperature cycle to impose on the surfaces of a 10 mm thick plate of composite epoxy/glass fiber to obtain a uniform and partial conversion degree in the thickness of the plate. Of course, the accurate knowledge of the cross-linking kinetics is mandatory since it is necessary to avoid uncontrolled heating in the centre of the part, linked to the release of the heat due to the chemical reaction in such an insulating medium. The conversion degree was verified by cutting small strips in the thickness of the plate and then measuring the residual enthalpy by DSC. It is seen

that the control of the transformation with an optimized temperature cycle, which is very difficult to achieve, is efficient and a partial predetermined state of cure can be reached with a good accuracy.

1.3. Injection on continuous fiber reinforcements

This problem is particular. In this section, we are discussing about process of the type liquid composite molding (LCM), for which continuous reinforcement is placed in the mold, which is closed, and then the resin is injected to impregnate the preform. An alternative is to partially close the mold, such as in C-RTM, to impregnate the reinforcement with a transverse flow in the thickness. This is, first of all, multi-scale medium: the microscopic scale is associated with the fibers and meshes (10-100 µm), the mesoscopic scale is related to the ply (millimeter scale) and finally the macroscopic scale is associated with the part (meter is the order of magnitude). Chapter 6 will deal with homogenized transfer equations in such a medium. During the consolidation of parts, problems are identical to those presented in the previous section. A new generation of composite arises now, based on thermoplastics. This is of great interest, because of their ecological potential (recycling, bio-based polymers), the possible reduction of the forming cycle, the lack of post-curing, their potential welding and post-forming and their increased mechanical properties (impact resistance). The high viscosity of thermoplastic polymers raises the difficulty of impregnating continuous reinforcement with a viscous polymer. Two solutions are thus possible to overcome this difficulty, either coupling the RTM process and polymer chemistry by injecting a monomer onto the reinforcement, polymerization (to create macromolecules) and crystallization are then produced in the mold, or injecting low viscosity polymers which then crystallize in the mold. Both ways are developed by polymer suppliers, raising many scientific and technological obstacles. Indeed, the challenges are numerous for parts manufacturers: to achieve as fully as possible the polymerization in the case of reactive injection, to achieve an optimum crystallinity, to obtain a composite with controlled porosity (air/water), to control shrinkage induced by transformations, to get a good surface aspect, to ensure reasonable cycle times depending on the application (including automotive) and finally to develop an "industrial" process. Scientifically, the challenges are no less pithy: the first one is to understand and control the coupling between crystallization and polymerization: from a certain conversion, the polymer will crystallize, hindering the macromolecule growth. There is a competition between both mechanisms that have to be controlled by an accurate temperature control.

Obtaining a composite with controlled porosity supposes an understanding of how the double scale flow evolves, within and between the meshes of a fluid whose chemo-rheological properties vary with the time and the temperature changes due to heat transfer. The lack of knowledge on mechanisms provokes a bad impregnation and voids caused by air, reaction gas and/or water bubbles entrapment. The situation is generally observed and analyzed in [VIL 15, NOR 12, RUI 12] for example, and is also schematically shown in Figure 1.15.



Figure 1.15. Saturated and unsaturated flows into the fabric of a composite part during the impregnation of a continuous reinforcement (fluid is in yellow). For a color version of the figure, see www.iste.co.uk/boyard/heat.zip



Figure 1.16. *a)* Experimental bench and *b)* recorded and calculated heat flux at the sensor locations [VIL 15]. For a color version of the figure, see www.iste.co.uk/boyard/heat.zip

According to the respective velocity of impregnation between the meshes and in the meshes, air bubbles can be trapped in the composite, therefore degrading its quality. Modeling heat transfer in and through the structure during the impregnation has been addressed by the heat transfer community and is an important scientific challenge. It should be noted that the thermal conductivity has a high sensitivity to the saturation [VIL 15], but it varies in a differentiated manner depending on the intra-mesh or inter-mesh saturation. Nevertheless, it has been shown that the heat transfer modeling can be performed with a good accuracy. This is illustrated in Figure 1.16(b) that shows the comparison between the simulated and measured heat flux when a known heat flux is dissipated by a thin heater on the wall of a mold, in which of a fluid impregnates the reinforcement, as shown schematically in Figure 1.16(a).

When the flow front reaches the sensor position, the heat flux sharply increases and then decreases until it reaches a value corresponding to the established convective regime. We can see in this figure the very good agreement between the measured and calculated heat flux, the latter taking into account both the heat transported by the flow and that passing through the composite thickness during the saturation. Another phenomenon must be taken into account and is known as thermal dispersion. It appears when the temperature and flow rates at the microscopic scale are different from their mean values. Physically speaking, local convection phenomenon between meshes increases the effective thermal conductivity. It is then necessary to include the effect of tortuosity. During the tortuous flow between the meshes, in the presence of a transverse temperature gradient in particular, heat is transported in a complex way, resulting in an increased apparent thermal conductivity. Lecointe [LEC 99] shows that we must introduce a dispersive thermal conductivity λ_d , which depends on the Peclet number built on the hydraulic diameter of the inter-meshes channels. However, some problems remain open today in this field: the thermal homogenized conditions of entry and the modeling of a coupled heat transfer-unsaturated multi-scale flow. On the contrary, the consolidation phase is solved, it is identical to the case described in the previous section, provided that a correct coupling between the polymerization reactions (identical to the case of thermosets) and the crystallization exists, which can be influenced by the shear in the meshes and the confinement between the fibers (transcrytallinity).

1.4. Conclusion: toward a controlled processing

As can be seen in this chapter, many problems related to heat transfer during composite processing were solved during numerous studies dedicated to this topic. Heat transfers during the filling of short fiber composites are well described by the models, provided that the orientation tensor is, of course, correctly estimated. The consolidation is also described satisfactorily, the coupling with the transformation kinetics (polymerization or crystallization) allowing us to accurately estimate the overheating due to the source release during the transformations. Many challenges are still to be met. Without being exhaustive, these challenges include the problem of modeling the non-isothermal saturation of the reinforcing fabrics, taking into account the influence of shear on the crystallization at the various scales of these reinforcements, the influence of shear on the thermal conductivity (effects of anisotropy by the orientation of the macromolecules or the crystalline structures), the contact resistance between a part and a tool, or between plies, the adequate consideration of radioactive effects in semi-transparent medium (for example, composite PA/glass fibers). Finally, advances in thermal metrology in the composite processing to validate the models, especially to measure composite surface temperatures, temperatures inside the composite without intrusivity or also 2D heat flux fields. Once these many challenges are confronted, we can extend the works to thermomechanical coupling to optimize the processing parameters to meet criteria on the residual stresses and war pages.

1.5. Bibliography

- [BAI 98] BAILLEUL J.L., DELAUNAY D., JARNY Y., "Optimal thermal processing of composite materials, an inverse algorithm and its experimental validation", 11th International Heat Transfer Conference, pp. 87–92, 1998.
- [CAR 59] CARSLAW H.S., JEAGER J.C., Conduction of Heat in Solids, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, London, 1959.
- [DEL 11] DELAUNAY D., "Thermal conductivity of an injected polymer and short glass fibers composite part: measurement and model", *Keynote in 27th world Congress of the polymer Processing Society*, Marrakech, pp. KN–15–517, 2011.
- [DEL 14a] DELAUNAY D., SOBOTKA V., THOMAS S. et al., "Thermal properties", in THOMAS C., SINTUREL, THOMAS R. (eds), Micro and Nanostructured Epoxy/Rubber Blends, Wiley-VCH, 2014.
- [DEL 14b] DELAUNAY D., BOYARD N., "Pressure-volume-temperature (PVT) analysis", in THOMAS S., SINTUREL C., THOMAS R. (eds), *Micro and Nanostructured Epoxy/Rubber Blend*, Wiley-VCH, 2014.
- [FAR 15] FARAJ J., PIGNON B., BAILLEUL J.L. et al., "Heat transfer and crystallization modeling during compression molding of thermoplastic composite parts", Key Engineering Materials, vols. 651–653, pp. 1507–1512, 2015.