

Jarod M. Younker, PhD

# POLYMER PROPERTIES AND MOLECULAR MODELING

# **MODELING SCALES**



# TALK OVERVIEW

Flex Modulus/Solubility Parameters of Nylon Plasticizers



#### **Thermal Interface Materials**



Carbon Fiber from Polyethylene



Current applications of 1,3-propanediol (Bio-PDO):





The Story of Sorona®



Sorona® is made, in part, with annually renewable plant-based ingredients



DuPont Tate & Lyle Susterra® Propanediol DuPont Tate & Lyle Zemea® renewably sourced propanediol

- Nylon market projected to grow by 5% annually driven by automotive industry.
- Proposed application of Bio-PDO: environmentally friendly nylon plasticizer
- Incumbent plasticizer: *n*-butylbenzenesulfonamide (NBBS)
  - Environmental contaminant
  - Probable neurotoxin



n-butylbenzenesulfonamide



polyethylene glycol



poly(1,3-propanediol)



poly(1,4-butanediol)



Hypothesis: Rigidity of polymer is a function of intermolecular hydrogen bonding.

- Workflows automated using Materials Studio Perl script
- Data stored within MySQL database



1) Screen x amorphous cells

S BIOVIA



2) Geometry optimization Molecular dynamics

NP

Density

Total

Non-bond

Potential

NVT

150



S BIOVIA

High-throughput virtual approach has been used to screen plasticizers.

Bio-PDO-based poly(1,3-propanediol) is effective at reducing the flex modulus of nylon6, but it not as effective as NBBS in nylon12.

Large difference in polar electrostatics between nylon12 and poly(1,3propanediol) limits compatibility.

 Condensation to the benzoate ester increases compatibility, but at the expense of reduced flex modulus.



Objective: Screen for and engineer thin films that have high thermal conductivity.



#### Bulk thermal conductivity





**Bulk Silicon** 

Forcefield verification: Second Nearest Neighbor Modified Embedded Atom Potential (2NN-MEAM)



Younker,

THz

 $E = \sum_{i} \left[ F_i(\overline{\rho}_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j(\neq i)} S_{ij} \phi_{ij}(R_{ij}) \right]$ 

*Phys. Rev. B* **1994**, *50*, 2221-2226 *Calphad* **2007**, *31*, 95-104

**Bulk Silicon** 

Forcefield verification: Second Nearest Neighbor Modified Embedded Atom Potential (2NN-MEAM)



**Bulk Copper** 

Forcefield verification: Second Nearest Neighbor Modified Embedded Atom Potential (2NN-MEAM)



 $E = \sum_{i} \left[ F_i(\overline{\rho}_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j(\neq i)} S_{ij} \phi_{ij}(R_{ij}) \right]$ 

JETP Letters **2010**, 92, 238-243 Phys. Rev. B **2003**, 68, 144112

Younker, J. M. in preparation

**Bulk Copper** 

Forcefield verification: Second Nearest Neighbor Modified Embedded Atom Potential (2NN-MEAM)



Bulk amorphous and crystalline polyethylene

Forcefield verification: Consistent Valence Force Field (CVFF)



Younker, J. M. in preparation

Bulk amorphous polyethylene

Forcefield verification: Consistent Valence Force Field (CVFF)



Younker, J. M. in preparation

Nucl. Instrum. Meth. Phys. Res. A 2005, 538, 686-691 Pro. Struct. Func. Gen. 1988, 4, 1-47

- \* Bulk crystalline polyethylene
- \* Forcefield verification: Consistent Valence Force Field (CVFF)





 $V(r) = 4\chi\epsilon [(\sigma/r)^{12} - (\sigma/r)^{6}]$ 

 $\varepsilon_{ij} = \mathbf{sqrt}(\varepsilon_{ii}\varepsilon_{jj})$ 

 $\sigma_{ii} = (\sigma_{ii} + \sigma_{ii})/2$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} \epsilon_{\rm CL} = 409 \mbox{ meV} \\ \sigma_{\rm CL} = 2.34 \mbox{ Angstroms} \\ \epsilon_{\rm C} = 1.7 \mbox{ meV} \\ \sigma_{\rm C} = 3.88 \mbox{ Angstroms} \\ \epsilon_{\rm H} = 1.6 \mbox{ meV} \\ \sigma_{\rm H} = 2.45 \mbox{ Angstroms} \end{array}$ 

 $\Omega_{\rm K} \,({\rm mK/W}) = \Delta {\sf T}_{\rm interface} \, [(\kappa_{\rm Cu} \nabla {\sf T}_{\rm Cu}^{\rm L})^{-1} + 2(\kappa_{\rm PE} \nabla {\sf T}_{\rm PE})^{-1} + (\kappa_{\rm Cu} \nabla {\sf T}_{\rm Cu}^{\rm R})^{-1}$ 

 $\epsilon_{QJ/C} = 26.3 \text{ meV}$ 

 $\epsilon_{\text{QJ/H}} = 26.0 \text{ meV}$ 

 $\sigma_{\Omega_{u/C}}$ =3.11 Angstroms

 $\sigma_{\Omega_{1}/H} = 2.39$  Angstroms







Hypothesis: The overlap of the acoustic modes (< 20 THz) is directly correlated with thermal conductance



Younker, J. M. in preparation

Replace "most" steel components of automobiles with carbon fiber

- 10X stronger than steel with 1/4 the weight
- Reduce vehicle weight by 40% and improve fuel efficiency by 30%



| Dia | agram from H        | arper Inter  | national    |                     |                |                             |                              | and and and  |        |
|-----|---------------------|--|-------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--------|
|     | 1-trenter 7         | the re   |             |                     |                |                             | Ti an D                      |  |        |
|     | Spooling &          | Surface  | Carbonizati | ion/                | Stabilization  |                             |                              | Precursors   |        |
|     | Packaging           | ackaging ITreatment Graphitization<br>\$0.61 \$0.37 \$2.32 |             | ion I               | & Oxidation    |                             |                              |  |        |
|     | \$0.61              |  |             | 2                   | \$1.54 Ba      |                             | aseline Today - \$9.88 \$5.0 |  | \$5.04 |
|     | \$0.41              | \$0.33   | \$1.48      | 3                   | \$0            | .99 ŀ                       | ligh Volum                   | e - \$7.85   | \$4.64 |
| ſ   | Precursor<br>type   | Yield (%)  |             | \$/Ib (as-<br>spun) | Melt-<br>spinn | Best achieved<br>properties |                              | Problem  |        |
|     |                     | Theore<br>tical  | Practical   |                     | able           | Strength<br>(KSI)           | Modulus<br>(MSI)             |  |        |
|     | Conventional<br>PAN | 68   | 45-50       | >4                  | No             | 500-900                     | 30-65                        | High cost  | t I    |
|     | Textile PAN*        | ~ 68   | 45-50       | 1-3                 | No             | 300-400+                    | 30                           | High variation in<br>properties                              |        |
|     | Lignin*             | 62-67  | 40-50       | 0.40 - 0.70         | Yes            | 160                         | 15                           | Fiber handling, low<br>strength & slow<br>stabilization step |        |
|     | Polyolefin**        | 86   | 65-80       | 0.35 - 0.5          | Yes            | 380                         | 30                           | Slow stabilization<br>(sulfonation) step                     |        |

"Ford--Dow Partnership Linked to Carbon Fiber Research at ORNL," *Innovations in Manufacturing*, DOE, 2012. "Green Car Congress," October 12, 2012.

> Diagram courtesy of Harper International, Lancaster, NY. Table courtesy of Amit Naskar, ORNL.





$$\kappa(t) = \kappa(T) \frac{k_{\rm B}T}{h} \frac{Q_{\rm TS}(T)}{Q_{\rm A}(T)} e^{-\Delta E/RT}$$

 $\Delta E$ : zero-point corrected activation barrier Q: partition functions  $\kappa$ : Wigner tunneling correction

Anharmonic effects incorporated for low frequency modes up to 110 cm<sup>-1</sup> (Python scripted)

Second-order rate constants calculated assuming thermodynamic control:  $k_i' = k_i K_{eq}$ 

59.4 В Α OH 34.1 49.5 SO<sub>2</sub> 28. 27.6 27.5 26.1 cis 21.1 H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> concerted pathways 20.7 H<sub>2</sub>O 17.4 trans SO<sub>2</sub> HOSO<sub>2</sub> cis 14.9 13.9 11.9 10.6 intermediate H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> 9.4 6.7 H<sub>2</sub>O [B] [C] [A] 3.4 0.4 0.8 SO<sub>2</sub> 0.0 0.0 \+H<sub>2</sub>O -0.5 -0.4 -2.5 radical pathways -3}5 22 ×H20 -3.1 +HOSO. -10.9 -9.1 -16.8 ----- radical intermediate intermediate -19.3 ·······HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition -21.5  $H_2O$  $- \cdot - \cdot H_2O$ -catalyzed HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition  $-H_2SO_3$  decomposition  $-H_2O$ -catalyzed  $H_2SO_3$  decomposition -32.6 Pre TS Post Pre TS Ρ Post R R Ρ

Calculating rate constants according to Transition State Theory



59.4 В Α OH 34.1 49.5 SO<sub>2</sub> 28. 27.6 27.5 26.1 cis 21.1 H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> concerted pathways 20.7 H<sub>2</sub>O 17.4 trans SO<sub>2</sub> HOSO<sub>2</sub> cis 14.9 13.9 11.9 10.6 intermediate H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> 9.4 6.7 H<sub>2</sub>O [B] [C] [A] 3.4 0.4SO<sub>2</sub> 0.8 0.0 0.0 **\**+H<sub>2</sub>O −0.5 -0.4 -2.5 radical pathways -3\5 22 \*1420 -3.1 +HOSO. -10.9 -9.1 -16.8 ----- radical intermediate intermediate -19.3 ·······HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition -21.5  $H_2O$  $- \cdot - \cdot H_2O$ -catalyzed HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition  $-H_2SO_3$  decomposition  $-H_2O$ -catalyzed  $H_2SO_3$  decomposition -32.6 Pre TS Post Pre TS Ρ Post R R Ρ

Calculating rate constants according to Transition State Theory





Calculating rate constants according to Transition State Theory



59.4 В Α OH 34.1 49.5 SO<sub>2</sub> 28. 27.6 27.5 26.1 cis 21.1 H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> concerted pathways 20.7 H<sub>2</sub>O 17.4 trans SO<sub>2</sub> HOSO<sub>2</sub> cis 14.9 13.9 11.9 10.6 intermediate H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> 9.4 6.7 H<sub>2</sub>O [B] [C] [A] 3.4 0.4 SO<sub>2</sub> 0.0 \+H<sub>2</sub>O -0.5 -0.4 -2.5 radical pathways -3}5 22 ×H20 -3.1 -10.9 losu -9.1 -16.8 ----- radical intermediate intermediate -19.3 ------ HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition -21.5  $H_2O$  $- \cdot - \cdot H_2O$ -catalyzed HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition  $-H_2SO_3$  decomposition  $-H_2O$ -catalyzed  $H_2SO_3$  decomposition Pre TS Post Pre TS Post R Ρ R Ρ

Calculating rate constants according to Transition State Theory



59.4 В Α OH 34.1 49.5 SO<sub>2</sub> 27.6 26.1 cis 21.1 H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> concerted pathways 20.7 H<sub>2</sub>O 17.4 trans SO<sub>2</sub> HOSO<sub>2</sub> cis 14.9 13.9 11.9 10.6 - intermediate H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> 6.7 9.4 H<sub>2</sub>O [B] [C] [A] 3.4 0.4 0.8 SO<sub>2</sub> 0.0 0.0 +H<sub>2</sub>O -0.5 -0.4 -2.5 radical pathways -3\5 22 -3.1 +HOSO -10.9 -9.1 -16.8 - radical intermediate intermediate -19.3 ------ HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition -21.5  $H_2O$  $- \cdot H_2O$ -catalyzed HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition  $-H_2SO_3$  decomposition  $-H_2O$ -catalyzed  $H_2SO_3$  decomposition -32.6 Pre TS Post Pre TS R R Post Ρ Ρ

Calculating rate constants according to Transition State Theory





Calculating rate constants according to Transition State Theory



59.4 В Α OH 34.1 49.5 SO<sub>2</sub> 28. 27.6 27.5 26.1 cis 21.1 H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> concerted pathways 20.7 H<sub>2</sub>O 17.4 trans SO<sub>2</sub> HOSO<sub>2</sub> cis 14.9 13.9 11.9 10.6 intermediate H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> 9.4 6.7 H<sub>2</sub>O [B] [C] [A] 3.4 0.4 SO<sub>2</sub> 0.8 0.0 0.0 \+H<sub>2</sub>O -0.5 -0.4 -2.5 radical pathways -3}5 22 \*1420 -3.1 -10.9 osu -9.1 -16.8 ----- radical intermediate intermediate ·······HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition -19.3 -21.5  $H_2O$  $- \cdot - \cdot H_2O$ -catalyzed HOSO<sub>2</sub> decomposition  $-H_2SO_3$  decomposition  $-H_2O$ -catalyzed  $H_2SO_3$  decomposition -32.6 Pre TS Post Pre TS Ρ Post R R Ρ

Calculating rate constants according to Transition State Theory



Integrate rate equations using kinetic Monte Carlo

- Thermodynamically, both the elimination and radical mechanisms result in an overall similar change in energy (~27 kcal/mol).
- Kinetically, the radical mechanism is the preferred pathway at lower temperatures.
- The presence of radicals is supported by experimentally observed alkane cleavage.



# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

#### DuPont

- Kerwin D. Dobbs
- Hari B. Sunkara
- Jeffrey Meth
- Keith Hutchinson
- Numerous Others

#### BioVia

- Nick Reynolds
- Jian-Jie Liang

- Oak Ridge National Laboratory
  - Ariana Beste
  - \* A. C. Buchanan III
  - Amit K. Naskar
  - Tomonori Saito
  - Edoardo Apra (Pacific Northwest National Laboratory)