

DEVELOPMENT AND CHARACTERIZATION OF BIODEGRADABLE
BLENDS OF LOW DENSITY POLYETHYLENE (LDPE)
INCORPERATED WITH THERMOPLASTIC SAGO STARCH

SHAHARUDDIN BIN KORMIN

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Master of Chemical Engineering

Faculty of Chemical and Natural Resources Engineering
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

JULY 2012

Created with



download the free trial online at nitropdf.com/professional

ABSTRACT

Starch-based polymeric materials offer a renewable, economical alternative to existing petroleum based, non-renewable or costly polymeric materials. The aim of this study is to develop degradable starch-low density polyethylene (LDPE) composites with enhanced mechanical properties. This research studies the effect of different filler loading, effect of compatibilizer and different kind of plasticizer. The compounding of the LDPE with sago starch was performed via a twin screw extruder followed by injection molding. Studies on their physical, mechanical properties and thermal properties of each formulation were carried out by density, melt flow index (MFI), tensile, flexural, impact, Thermogravimetry analyzer (TGA-DTA) and differential scanning calorimetry (DSC). The presence of high starch contents had an adverse effect on the mechanical properties of LDPE/starch blends. However, the addition of compatibilizer or plasticizer improved the interfacial adhesion between the two materials, hence, improved the tensile properties of the blends. Meanwhile, study of degradation of LDPE/SS blend was carried by hydrolysis, fungi exposure, natural weathering and soil burial exposure analysis. The biodegradability of sago starch-filled LDPE blend composites was studied by monitoring its weight loss. Incorporating sago starch with LDPE improved the weight loss. Tensile tests, TGA and SEM imaging were also carried out on the samples before and after degradation. Imaging showed that the increase in starch content from 5% to 20% in the formulations additive increases the biodegradability of the samples. The scanning electron micrographs (SEM) support the findings of biodegradation properties of LDPE/SS blend, compatibilized LDPE/SS and plasticized LDPE/SS blend. In order to increase the compatibility between LDPE and starch, maleic anhydride was used to graft onto the LDPE molecules (compatibilized LDPE/SS). After using the proper composition and processing condition, mechanical properties of compatibilized LDPE/SS blend are significantly higher than those of the LDPE/SS blend with the same starch contents. The second part of the study investigated the effects of different types of plasticizer (sucrose, urea, glycerol and sorbitol) and its content on the structure and properties of the LDPE/SS blend. Plasticized LDPE/SS have higher mechanical properties than unplasticized LDPE/SS blend.

ABSTRACT

Starch-based polymeric materials offer a renewable, economical alternative to existing petroleum based, non-renewable or costly polymeric materials. The aim of this study is to develop degradable starch-low density polyethylene (LDPE) blend with enhanced mechanical properties. This research studies the effect of different filler loading, effect of compatibilizer and different kind of plasticizer. The compounding of the LDPE with sago starch was prepared via a twin screw extruder followed by injection molding. Studies on their physical, mechanical properties and thermal properties of each formulation were carried out by density, melt flow index (MFI), tensile, flexural, impact, thermogravimetry analyzer (TGA-DTA) and differential scanning calorimetry (DSC). The presence of high starch contents had an adverse effect on the mechanical properties of LDPE/starch blends. However, the addition of compatibilizer or plasticizer improved the interfacial adhesion between the two materials, hence, improved the tensile properties of the blends. Meanwhile, study of degradation of sago starch filled-LDPE (LDPE/SS) blend was carried by hydrolysis, fungi exposure, natural weathering and soil burial exposure analysis. The biodegradability of sago starch-filled LDPE blend was studied by monitoring its weight loss. Incorporating sago starch with LDPE improved the weight loss. Tensile tests, TGA and SEM imaging were also carried out on the samples before and after degradation. Imaging showed that the increase in starch content from 5% to 20% in the formulations increases the biodegradability of the samples. The scanning electron micrographs (SEM) support the findings of biodegradation properties of LDPE/SS blend, compatibilized LDPE/SS and plasticized LDPE/SS blend. In order to increase the compatibility between LDPE and starch, malaeic anhydride was used to graft onto the LDPE molecules (compatibilized LDPE/SS). After using the proper composition and processing condition, mechanical properties of compatibilized LDPE/SS blend were found significantly higher than those of the LDPE/SS blend with the same starch contents. The second part of the study investigated the effects of different types of plasticizer (sucrose, urea, glycerol and sorbitol) and its content on the structure and properties of the LDPE/SS blend. Mechanical properties of plasticized LDPE/SS were found higher than unplasticized LDPE/SS blend.

ABSTRAK

Bahan polimer berasaskan kanji menawarkan alternatif yang boleh diperbaharui, menjimatkan petroleum yang sedia ada berasaskan bahan polimer yang tidak boleh diperbaharui atau mahal. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk membangunkan degradasi adunan kanji polietilena ketumpatan rendah (LDPE) dengan sifat-sifat mekanikal yang dipertingkatkan. Kajian ini mengkaji kesan pengisian yang berbeza, kesan bahan tambah kompatibilizer dan jenis plastiksizer yang berbeza. Pengadunan LDPE dengan kanji sagu telah disediakan melalui mesin pemutar skru berkembar dan diikuti oleh acuan suntikan untuk menghasilkan spesimen. Kajian ke atas fizikal mereka, sifat mekanik dan sifat haba setiap formulasi telah dijalankan dengan mengkaji ketumpatan, indeks aliran lebur (MFI), tegangan, lenturan, kekuatan hentakan, penganalisis thermogravimetri (TGA) dan pembezaan imbasan kalorimetri (DSC). Kehadiran kandungan kanji yang tinggi mempunyai kesan yang buruk kepada sifat-sifat mekanikal adunan kanji/LDPE. Walau bagaimanapun, penambahan kompatibilizer atau beberapa jenis plastiksizer meningkatkan lekatan antara kedua-dua bahan, secara tidak langsung, meningkatkan sifat-sifat tegangan adunan. Sementara itu, kajian degradasi adunan kanji sagu diisi-LDPE (LDPE/SS) telah diuji dengan ujian hidrolisis, pendedahan pada kulat, pendedahan pada cuaca semula jadi dan penanaman sampel di dalam tanah. Penguraian kanji sagu-diisi LDPE adunan komposit telah dikaji dengan memantau penurunan berat sampel. Adunan kanji sagu dengan LDPE bertambah baik dengan kehilangan berat sampel. Ujian tegangan, analisis TGA dan pengimejan imbasan mikroskop (SEM) juga telah dijalankan ke atas sampel sebelum dan selepas degradasi. Pengimejan menunjukkan peningkatan dalam kandungan kanji daripada 5% kepada 20% dalam formulasi meningkatkan penguraian sampel. Imbasan elektron mikroskop (SEM) menyokong penguraian adunan LDPE/SS, LDPE/SS dengan kompatibilizer dan adunan LDPE/SS dengan pemplastik. Bagi meningkatkan keserasian antara LDPE dan kanji, maleik anhidrida digunakan ke atas molekul LDPE (LDPE/SS dengan kompatibilizer). Selepas menggunakan komposisi dan keadaan pemprosesan yang sesuai, sifat mekanik adunan LDPE/SS didapati jauh lebih tinggi daripada adunan LDPE/SS dengan kandungan kanji yang sama. Bahagian kedua kajian menyiasat kesan jenis plastiksizer (sukrosa, urea, gliserol dan sorbitol) dan kandungan pada struktur dan sifat-sifat adunan LDPE/SS. Sifat mekanikal adunan LDPE/SS dengan pemplastik didapati lebih tinggi daripada adunan LDPE/SS tanpa bahan tambah plastiksizer.

TABLES OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE PAGE	i
STATEMENT OF AWARD	ii
SUPERVISOR’S DECLARATION	iii
STUDENT’S DECLARATION	iv
DEDICATIONS	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
ABSTRAK	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xxiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxiv

CHAPTER 1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background	1
1.2	Biodegradable plastic	2
1.3	Problem statement	5
1.4	Significant of research	7
1.5	Objectives of research	8
1.6	Scopes of research	8
1.7	Contribution of research	10
1.8	Thesis outline	10

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Plastic and environment	12
	2.1.1 Plastic waste	12
	2.1.2 Waste disposal	15

2.2	Biodegradable polymer	17
2.2.1	Degradation	23
2.2.2	Mechanism of polymer degradation	27
2.2.3	Life cycle of biodegradable polymer	29
2.2.4	Factor that effect the biodegradability of polymers	30
2.2.5	Enhancement of biodegradation polymer	32
2.3	Starch based biodegradable polymers	33
2.3.1	Thermoplastic starch materials	34
2.3.2	Nature of thermoplastic starch	37
2.3.3	Thermoplastic (TPS) production	38
2.4	Polymeric materials	41
2.4.1	Polyethylene (PE)	41
2.4.2	Low density polyethylene (LDPE)	43
2.4.3	Biodegradability of polyethylene (PE)	45
2.5	Additives	46
2.5.1	Role of compatibilizer	46
2.5.2	Role of plasticizer	47
2.6	Starch	48
2.6.1	Starch structure	49
2.6.2	Sago palm	52
2.6.2.1	Sago starch properties	54
2.6.2.2	Sago starch production	55
2.6.2.3	Utilization of sago starch	57
2.6.2.4	Related studies involving starch	58

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1	Research design	60
3.2	Materials selection	62
3.2.1	Polymer matrix	62
3.2.1.1	Thermoplastic-Low density polyethylene (LDPE)	62
3.2.2	Sago starch as Filler	63
3.2.3	Additives	64
3.2.3.1	Compatibilizer	64
3.2.3.2	Plasticizer	64
3.3	Sample preparation	65
3.3.1	Physical treatment	65
3.3.2	Formation of sample composites	65
3.3.3	Mixing and blend	66
3.3.3.1	Compound formulation	66

3.3.3.2 Compounding/Extrusion process	68
3.3.3.3 Palletizer	69
3.3.3.4 Injection molding	69
3.4 Characterization and performance testing	71
3.4.1 Density	72
3.4.2 Melt flow index (MFI) determination	72
3.4.3 Water absorption test	73
3.4.4 Mechanical testing	73
3.4.4.1 Tensile test	73
3.4.4.2 Three point bending/Flexural test	74
3.4.4.3 Impact test	75
3.4.5 Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR)	76
3.4.6 Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)	76
3.4.7 Thermogravimetric analyzer (TGA-DTG)	77
3.5 Biodegradation	78
3.5.1 Simple hydrolysis	78
3.5.2 Alkaline hydrolysis	78
3.5.3 Natural weathering test	78
3.5.4 Expose to fungi environment	79
3.5.5 Expose to soil environment	80
3.5.6 Weight loss percentage (WLP)	82
3.5.7 Morphology	82
3.6 Statistical analysis	82

CHAPTER 4 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Preliminary studies: Effect of different sources of starch: Sago starch (SS), corn starch (CS), tapioca starch (TS), potato starch (PS), wheat starch (WS) on physical, mechanical, thermal and morphological properties of low density polyethylene (LDPE)	83
4.1.1 Physical properties - Density and Melt flow index (MFI)	83
4.1.2 Water absorption test	86
4.1.3 Mechanical test	87
4.1.3.1 Tensile properties	87
4.1.3.2 Flexural properties	91
4.1.3.3 Impact properties	92
4.1.4 Fourier transforms infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR) analysis	93
4.1.5 Thermogravimetric (TGA-DTG) analysis	96
4.1.6 Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) analysis	98
4.1.7 Visual assessment and hand feeling	99
4.1.8 Scanning electron microscope (SEM)	101

4.2	Effect of sago starch on mechanical, thermal, morphological and biodegradation studies of low density polyethylene (LDPE)	103
4.2.1	Physical properties - Density and Melt Flow Index (MFI)	103
4.2.2	Water absorption test	104
4.2.3	Mechanical test	105
4.2.3.1	Tensile properties	105
4.2.3.2	Flexural properties	108
4.2.3.3	Impact properties	110
4.2.4	Fourier transforms infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR) analysis	112
4.2.5	Thermogravimetric (TGA-DTG) analysis	114
4.2.6	Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) analysis	116
4.2.7	Scanning electron microscope (SEM)	118
4.2.8	Biodegradation test	120
4.2.8.1	Hydrolysis (Simple and Alkaline)	120
4.2.8.1.1	Weight loss percentage (WLP)	120
4.2.8.1.2	Scanning electron microscope (SEM)	122
4.2.8.2	Fungi exposure	123
4.2.8.2.1	Weight loss percentage (WLP)	123
4.2.8.2.2	Visual assessment of <i>Aspergillus niger sp</i>	125
4.2.8.3	Natural weathering exposure	127
4.2.8.3.1	Weight loss percentage (WLP)	127
4.2.8.3.2	Tensile properties	128
4.2.8.3.3	Thermogravimetric (TGA-DTG) analysis	130
4.2.8.3.4	Scanning electron microscope (SEM)	131
4.2.8.4	Soil burial exposure	133
4.2.8.4.1	Weight loss percentage (WLP)	133
4.2.8.4.2	Tensile properties	134
4.2.8.4.3	Thermogravimetric (TGA-DTG) analysis	136
4.2.8.4.3	Scanning electron microscope (SEM)	137
4.3	Effect of compatibilizer (maleic anhydride) on physical, mechanical, thermal and morphological properties of LDPE/Sago starch blend	139
4.3.1	Physical properties - Density and Melt flow index (MFI)	139
4.3.2	Water absorption test	141
4.3.3	Mechanical test	146
4.3.3.1	Tensile properties	142
4.3.3.2	Flexural properties	146
4.3.3.3	Impact properties	148
4.3.4	Fourier transforms infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR) analysis	150
4.3.5	Thermogravimetric (TGA-DTG) analysis	153
4.3.6	Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) analysis	155
4.3.7	Visual assessment and hand feeling	157

4.3.8	Scanning electron microscope (SEM)	158
4.4	Effect of plasticizer (urea, sucrose, glycerol and sorbitol) on physical, mechanical, thermal and morphological properties of LDPE/Sago starch blend	161
4.4.1	Physical properties - Density and Melt flow index (MFI)	161
4.4.2	Water absorption test	162
4.4.3	Mechanical test	164
4.4.3.1	Tensile properties	164
4.4.3.2	Flexural properties	167
4.4.3.3	Impact properties	169
4.4.4	Fourier transforms infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR) analysis	171
4.4.5	Thermogravimetric (TGA-DTG) analysis	174
4.4.6	Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) analysis	176
4.4.7	Visual assessment and hand feeling	178
4.4.8	Scanning electron microscope (SEM)	179
CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1	General conclusions	182
5.2	Recommendations	184
LIST OF CONFERENCES		186
REFERENCES		187
APPENDICES		200
A	SPSS analysis on the effect of different sources of starch on LDPE	200
B	SPSS analysis on the effect of sago starch on LDPE	210
C	The effect of sago starch on biodegradation studies of LDPE	214
D	SPSS analysis on the effect of compatibilizer on the LDPE/SS blend	216
E	SPSS analysis on the effect of plasticizer on the LDPE/SS blend	220
F	Photograph of starch filled-LDPE blend after degradation	230

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Titles	Page
2.1	Common synthetic biodegradable and its description	20
2.2	Summarizes of various biodegradable polymers, along with generic advantages, disadvantages and potential applications	21
2.3	Degaradation process for polymer and elastomer	26
2.4	Properties of polyethylene (PE)	42
2.5	Properties of LDPE according to their resistance and fabrication	44
2.6	Characteristic of the starch granule from various sources	55
2.7	Utilization of sago starch	58
3.1	Properties of Petlin polyethylene homopolymer low density polyethylene	62
3.2	Sago starch and different source of starch selected for study and their component	63
3.3	Physical properties of maleic anhydrides (MA) - Commercial name: Polybond 3200	64
3.4	Plasticizer selected for study and their properties	64
3.5	Compound formulation	67
3.6	Temperature setting of LDPE and starch-filled LDPE at separate zone	69
3.7	Microbial growth rating on specimen	80
4.1	Density and melt flow index values of native LDPE and different sources of starch filled-LDPE	84
4.2	FTIR assignment and remarks of native LDPE and starch filled-LDPE blend	94
4.3	Effect of native LDPE and different sources of starch filled-LDPE on the onset of degradation temperature and percentage of weight loss	98
4.4	Thermal parameter from DSC analysis of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends	99
4.5	The appearance and hand feeling of different sources of starch	100

	filled-LDPE blend	
4.6	Density and melt flow index of native LDPE and LDPE/SS blend	103
4.7	FTIR spectrum of native LDPE and LDPE/SS blend	112
4.8	Effect of sago starch content on the onset of degradation temperature percentage of weight loss for LDPE blend	116
4.9	Thermal parameter DSC analysis of native LDPE and LDPE/SS blend	117
4.10	Weight loss of LDPE/SS blend after a month fungi exposure	124
4.11	Visual assessment of fungi growth for each formulation of LDPE/SS blend	126
4.12	Effect of natural weathering exposure on the onset of degradation temperature and percentage of weight loss for LDPE/SS blend	131
4.13	Effect of soil burial exposure on the onset of degradation temperature and percentage of weight loss for LDPE/SS blend	137
4.14	Density and melt flow index values of native LDPE and compatibilized LDPE/SS blend with MA	140
4.15	FTIR assignment and remarks of native LDPE, compatibilized LDPE/SS and uncompatibilized LDPE/SS blend	152
4.16	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on the onset of degradation temperature and percentage of weight loss for LDPE/SS blend	155
4.17	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on thermal parameter by DSC analysis of LDPE/SS blend	156
4.18	The appearance and hand feeling of different ratio of LDPE/SS with compatibilizer	158
4.19	Density and melt flow index values of native LDPE, LDPE/SS and plasticized LDPE/SS blend with different amount of plasticizer	162
4.20	FTIR assignment and remarks of native LDPE, plasticized LDPE/SS blend with different plasticizer	173
4.21	Effect of different plasticizer on the onset of degradation temperature and percentage of weight loss for LDPE/SS blend	176
4.22	Effect of different plasticizer on thermal parameter DSC analysis of LDPE/SS blend	177

4.23	The appearance and hand feeling of LDPE/SS blends with different plasticizer	179
------	--	-----

LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Titles	Page
2.1	The world production of thermoplastics resins from 1950 to 2004	13
2.2	Polymer life cycle	14
2.3	Polymer waste management options	16
2.4	Plastic biodegradable process	18
2.5	Schematic representation of bio-based polymers based on their origin and method of production	19
2.6	Microbiological deterioration and degradation of synthetic polymeric materials	24
2.7	Summarizes the various modes of environmental polymer degradation	25
2.8	Mechanism of polymer degradation cycle	28
2.9	Life cycle representation of biodegradable polymer	30
2.10	Pathways for polymer biodegradation	32
2.11	Processing steps of starch-based production	40
2.12	Synthetic polymer (a) The repeating unit of poly(ethylene) (b) Molecular architecture of various polyethylenes	41
2.13	Chemical structure of starch: Repeated Glucose Units	49
2.14	Structure of starch (A) linear amylose (poly- α -1,4-D-glucopyranoside) and (B) branched amylopectin (poly- α -1,4-D-glucopyranoside and α -1,6-D-glucopyranoside)	50
2.15	Schematic (a) (b) (c) and photography (d) view of the structure of a starch granule, with alternating amorphous and semi-crystalline zones constituting the growth rings	51
2.16	Sago palm	52
2.17	Application of sago palm	53
2.18	Production of sago starch	56
3.1	Flowchart of experimental procedure	61

3.2	SEM micrograph of sago starch (300× and 1.20k ×) magnification	64
3.3	Flow chart of physical treatments for the preparation of sago starch filler	65
3.4	Flow chart of process preparation composite sample	66
3.5	Schematic diagram of the extruder with three zones	68
3.6	Schematic diagram of the extruder with the five separate heating zones	69
3.7	Schematic diagram of the injection molding	70
3.8	Photograph of injection mold for impact, tensile and flexural test	71
3.9	Schematic diagram of the injection mold used in experiments including the delivery system and molded parts.	71
3.10	Simple and alkaline hydrolysis test	78
3.11	Natural weathering exposure at UMP, Kuantan	79
3.12	Schematic diagram of the soil burial test	81
3.13	Photograph of specimen expose to soil burial test	81
4.1	Effect of starch content on water absorption of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blend at 10wt% loading.	86
4.2	Effect of starch content on tensile strength of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends with standard deviation	89
4.3	Effect of starch content on elongation at break of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends with standard deviation	90
4.4	Effect of starch content on elastic modulus of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends with standard deviation	90
4.5	Effect of starch content on flexural strength of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends with standard deviation	91
4.6	Effect of starch content on flexural modulus of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends with standard deviation	92
4.7	Effect of starch content on impact properties of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends with standard deviation	93
4.8	FTIR spectrum of (a) LDPE/CS:90/10; (b) LDPE/SS:90/10; (c) LDPE/TS:90/10; (d) LDPE/PS:90/10; (e) native LDPE; (f) LDPE/WS:90/10	95

4.9	TGA-DTG thermogram of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends: (a) TGA curves; (b) DTG curves	97
4.10	DSC thermogram of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends	99
4.11	Photograph of different sources of starch filled-LDPE blends: (a) LDPE/SS:90/10; (b) LDPE/CS:90/10; (c) LDPE/PS:90/10; (d) LDPE/SS:90/10; (e) LDPE/SS:90/10; (f) native LDPE	100
4.12	SEM micrograph fracture part of LDPE/Starch blends at (50× and 100×) magnification	101
4.13	Effect of sago starch content on water absorption of LDPE blend	105
4.14	Effect of sago starch content on tensile strength of LDPE with standard deviation	107
4.15	Effect of sago starch content on elongation at break of LDPE with standard deviation	107
4.16	Effect of sago starch content on elastic modulus of LDPE with standard deviation	108
4.17	Effect of sago starch content on flexural strength of LDPE with standard deviation	109
4.18	Effect of sago starch content on flexural modulus of LDPE with standard deviation	109
4.19	Effect of sago starch content on impact strength of LDPE with standard deviation	111
4.20	Effect of sago starch content on the FTIR spectra; (a) LDPE/SS:95/5; (b) LDPE/SS:90/10; (c) native LDPE	113
4.21	Effect of sago starch content on the TGA-DTG thermograms of LDPE blend; (a) TGA curves; (b) DTG curves	115
4.22	Effect of sago starch content on the DSC thermogram of LDPE blend	117
4.23	SEM micrograph surface part of LDPE/Sago starch blend at (100×, 300× and 1.2k×) magnification	119
4.24	Percentage weight loss versus degradation time on LDPE/SS blend (5wt% to 30wt%) with standard deviation: Simple hydrolysis	120
4.25	Percentage weight loss versus degradation time on LDPE/SS blend (5wt% to 30wt%) with standard deviation: Alkaline hydrolysis	121
4.26	Percentage weight loss versus degradation time on LDPE/SS blend	121

	(10wt%) with standard deviation: comparison between simple and alkaline hydrolysis	
4.27	SEM micrograph fracture part of LDPE/SS blend with 10wt% loading at (50× and 100×) magnification: Alkaline hydrolysis	122
4.28	SEM micrograph fracture part of LDPE/SS blend with 10wt% loading at (50× and 100×) magnification: Simple hydrolysis	123
4.29	Percentage weight loss versus starch content of LDPE/sago starch (5wt% to 30wt%) with standard deviation on fungi environment after 1 month exposure	124
4.30	Visual of fungal growth (<i>Aspergillus niger sp</i>) on LDPE/SS mould after 30 days incubation; (a) native LDPE; (b) LDPE/SS:99/1; (c) LDPE/SS:97/3; (d) LDPE/SS:95/5;(e) LDPE/SS:90/10; (f) LDPE/SS:85/15; (g) LDPE/SS:80/20; (h) LDPE/SS:70/30	125
4.31	Percentage weight loss versus degradation time of LDPE/Sago starch (5wt% to 30wt%) with standard deviation on natural weathering test	128
4.32	Effect of natural weathering exposure on tensile strength of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	129
4.33	Effect of natural weathering exposure on elongation at break of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	129
4.34	TGA-DTG curves LDPE/SS blend with 10wt% starch loading after 6 month natural weathering exposure	130
4.35	SEM micrograph surface part of LDPE/SS blend at (50× and 100×) magnification before and after 6 month natural weathering exposure	133
4.36	Percentage weight loss versus starch content of LDPE/SS blend (5wt% to 30wt%) with standard deviation on soil burial after 6 month exposure	134
4.37	Effect of soil burial exposure on tensile strength of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	135
4.38	Effect of soil burial exposure on elongation at break of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	135
4.39	TGA-DTG curves LDPE/SS blend with 10wt% starch loading after 6 month soil burial exposure	136
4.40	SEM micrograph surface part of LDPE/SS blend at (50× and 100×) magnification before and after soil burial exposure	138
4.41	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on water absorption of LDPE/SS blend	141

4.42	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on water absorption of LDPE/SS blend: Comparison between compatibilized and uncompatibilized blend	142
4.43	Polyethylene (PE) and maleic anhydride (MA) grafting and condensation reaction	144
4.44	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on tensile strength of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	144
4.45	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on elongation at break of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	145
4.46	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on elastic modulus of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	145
4.47	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on flexural strength of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	147
4.48	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on flexural modulus of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	147
4.49	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on impact strength of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	149
4.50	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on the FTIR spectra; (a) native LDPE (b) uncompatibilized LDPE/SS:90/10; (c) LDPE/SS:95/5-1; (d) LDPE/SS:90/10-1	151
4.51	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on the FTIR spectra; (a) native LDPE (b) LDPE/SS:95/5-1; (c) LDPE/SS:90/10-1; (c) LDPE/SS:85/15-1; (d) LDPE/SS:80/20-1	151
4.52	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on the TGA-DTG thermogram of LDPE/SS blend: (a) TGA curves; (b) DTG curves	154
4.53	Effect of compatibilizer (MA) on the DSC thermogram of LDPE/SS blend	156
4.54	Photograph of different ratio of LDPE/SS blends with compatibilizer (MA); (a) LDPE/SS:95/5-1; (b) LDPE/SS:90/10-1; (c) LDPE/SS:95/15-1; (d) LDPE/SS:90/20-1; (e) LDPE/SS:95/25-1	157
4.55	SEM micrograph surface part of uncompatibilized and uncompatibilized LDPE/SS blend at (50× and 100×) magnification	160
4.56	Effect of different plasticizer with same ratio (88.5/8.5/3) on water absorption of LDPE/SS blend	163
4.57	Effect of different plasticizer with different ratio on tensile strength of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	166

4.58	Effect of different plasticizer with different ratio on elongation at break of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	166
4.59	Effect of different plasticizer with different ratio on elastic modulus of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	167
4.60	Effect of different plasticizer with different ratio on flexural strength of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	168
4.61	Effect of different plasticizer with different ratio on flexural modulus LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	168
4.62	Effect of different plasticizer with different ratio on impact strength of LDPE/SS blend with standard deviation	170
4.63	Effect different plasticizer with same ratio (LDPE/SS/Pzr:88.5/8.5/3) on the FTIR spectra before smoothing; (a) native LDPE; (b) sucrose; (c) UTPS; (d) GTPS; (e) STPS	172
4.64	Effect different plasticizer with same ratio (LDPE/SS/Pzr:88.5/8.5/3) on the FTIR spectra after smoothing; (a) native LDPE; (b) sucrose (c) UTPS; (d) GTPS; (c) STPS	172
4.65	Effect of different plasticizer with same ratio (88.5/8.5/3) on the TGA-DTG thermogram of LDPE/SS blend; (a) TGA curves; (b) DTG curves	175
4.66	Effect different plasticizer with same ratio (88.5/8.5/3) on the DSC thermogram of LDPE/SS blend	177
4.67	Photograph of LDPE/SS impact mould with different plasticizer; (a) LDPE/SS/Sucrose; (b) LDPE/SS/Urea; (c) LDPE/SS/Glycerol; (d) LDPE/SS/Sorbitol	178
4.68	SEM micrograph surface part of different plasticized LDPE/SS (88.5:8.5:3) blend at (100× to 1.00k×) magnification	181

LIST OF SYMBOLS

E_t	Tensile modulus of composite, MPa
E_f	Flexural modulus of composite, MPa
σ_t	Tensile strength of composites, MPa
σ_f	Flexural strength of composite, MPa
σ_i	Impact strength, J/m
ε_p	Elongation at break, %
W_f	Weight percentage, %
W_w	Weight of sample before immersed in water, g
W_c	Weight of sample after immersed in water, g
F_{max}	The maximum peak load, N
A	cross section area, m^2
L_o	Original measured length, m
L	Length of the specimen at its breaking point, m
B	The mean width of the specimen, m
D	The mean thickness of the specimen, m
ΔW	Increment in load, N
ΔS	Increment in deflection
E	Energy in kgf.cm
T	Thickness, mm
X_{com}	Crystallinity of composites, %
X_{LDPE}	Crystallinity of LDPE, %
T_g	Glass transition temperature, °C
T_m	Melting temperature, °C
T_d	Decomposition temperature, °C

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PE	Polyethylene
PP	Polypropylene
LDPE	Low density polyethylene
HDPE	High density polyethylene
LLDPE	Linear low density polyethylene
SS	Sago starch
PS	Potato starch
TS	Tapioca starch
WS	Wheat starch
CS	Corn starch
NaOH	Sodium hydroxide
MA	Malaeic anhydride
MAPE	Maleated anhyride grafted polyethylene
UTPS	Urea thermoplastic starch
STPS	Sorbitol thermoplastic starch
GTPS	Glycerol thermoplastic starch
TPS	Thermoplastics
MFI	Melt flow index
MFR	Melt flow rate
FTIR	Fourier Tranform Infrared Spectroscopy
SEM	Scanning electron Microscope
WLP	Weight loss percentage
DSC	Differential scanning calorimetry

DTA	Differential thermal analysis
DTG	Differential thermogravimetr
TGA	Thermogravimetric Analyzer
XRD	X-ray diffraction
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
CRAUN	Crop Research and Application Unit
LCDA	Land, Custody and Development Authority

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

A few decades ago, synthetic polymer was used in every field of all human activities. These artificial macromolecular substances are usually developed from petroleum. Synthetic polymers have become technologically significant since the 1940s, and packaging is one industry that has been transformed by oil-based polymers such as polyethylene (PE), polypropylene (PP), polystyrene (PS), polyethylene terephthalate (PET) and poly(vinyl chloride) (PVC). Each year nearly 78 million tonnes of petrochemicals used to make plastics and polyethylene represents 64% of the produced synthetic plastics. Almost half of that is thrown away within a short time, remaining in waste deposits and landfills for decades (more than 30 years) (Volke-Sepulveda et al., 1999). In recent years, there has been growing concern about the disposal of single-use plastics. There are many biodegradable resins now present on the market. However, most of them are very expensive to compete with the petroleum-based products. Plastics are everywhere in contemporary society. They are found in households and are extensively employed in such many industries.

The most common and significant use of synthetic organic polymers was stimulated by their thermal, mechanical, electrical and optical properties. They occupied and dominate the large and important industries which produce plastics, coatings, textiles, packaging materials, electronic devices, rubbers, adhesives and medical appliances. The justifications behind multiuse of plastics have potential to be manufactured to meet very specific functional needs for users.

Polyethylene is available in many varieties (linear low density, high density, high molecular weight). Low density polyethylene that is used extensively in the rigid packaging industry because of several favorable physical properties. Polyethylene represents 64% of the produced synthetic plastics. Polyethylene is so widely used because of their wide range of physical properties, suitability to most of the commercial thermoplastics fabrication process. In addition, it offer such desirable features as broad range of properties, very good moisture barrier properties, and good chemical resistance and food grades available. The most important properties found in PE resin is because of the cheaper price that can give them a competitive advantage compared to other materials (both polymeric and non polymeric) (Thakore et al., 1999).

1.2 Biodegradable plastic

The petroleum resources are limited, and the use of non-biodegradable polymers cause major environmental problems. In addition, the resistance to natural biodegradation has been becoming more and more problematic, especially where they are used only a short period of time (Vert et al., 2002). Even though there has been a lot of latest technology and approach in recycling and decreasing plastics waste, the amount of these materials is yet growing every year. Recycle of products also has obstacle such as high cost of operation, besides, the technologies of recycling are still under development.

Numerous packaging materials do not provide themselves to recycle because of contamination, and the cleaning indispensable prior to recycling can be very costly. One effective method to address this global inconvenience is the creation of biodegradable plastics, which presently exist in the market. Biodegradable plastics, as new materials, make demands to be environmentally friendly. Biodegradable plastics are plastics that can withstand a degradation process known as biodegradation. Biodegradable plastics refer to degradable polymers that are consumed by microorganisms via polymer chain disintegration and future utilization (Garth and Kowal, 2001). It is also defined as plastics with similar properties to conventional plastics, but it can be decayed after disposal to the environment by the activity of microorganisms to produce end products of CO₂ and H₂O (Tharanathan, 2003).

Naturally occurring biodegradable plastic/biopolymers are derived from four broad feedstock areas (Tharanathan 2003). Animal sources provide collagen and gelatine, while marine sources provide chitin which is processed into chitosan. However, the remaining two

feedstock areas are the ones receiving the most attention from scientists, and are the sources thought to be the most promising for future development and expansion. Microbial biopolymer feedstocks are able to produce polylactic acid (PLA) and polyhydroxy alkanooates (PHA). The final category of agricultural feedstocks is the biopolymer source. Starch is an agricultural feedstock hydrocolloid biopolymer found in a variety of plants including (but not limited to) sago, wheat, tapioca, cassava, yam, corn, rice, beans, and potatoes (Salmoral et al., 2000, Martin et al., 2001).

Starch has been used successfully as a polymer in the production of a loose-fill packaging. It has good mechanical properties, readily biodegrades in soil, and sells at competitive prices. Starch is a naturally occurring biodegradable polymer which is cheap, contain hydrosable groups, readily hydrosable, abundant, renewable, and it has been mixed into the thermoplastics/synthetic polymer to increase the biodegradability (as starch is biodegradable and ready be consumed by micoorganism) and reduce the cost of the material (Shah et al., 1994). Examples of synthetic biodegradable polymers are polycaprolactone, poly(lactic acid) and poly(vinyl alcohol). In the degradation of polymers, there are a lot of factors need to be considered. Sunlight, heat, oxygen, humidity, microorganisms are some of the agents that work synergistically towards the degradation of polymers. Native starch will swell when absorbed water with their free hydroxyl groups. As a result, it will become very brittle and it supports the growth of mold. Due to these reasons, native starch alone is not suitable to be used as a packaging material. The introduction of granular starch into plastics via melt-mixing has become the simplest and cheapest way for preparing starch-plastics composites (Danjaji et al., 2002).

Chemical and physical properties of starch have been widely investigated due to its suitability to be converted into a thermoplastic and then to be used in different application as a result of its known biodegradability, availability and economical feasibility (Danjaji et al., 2002). In this works, blending of low density polyethylene (LDPE) with a cheap natural biopolymer such as starch will enhance the biodegradability of this material. Incorporation of starch will accelerate the attack of microorganisms to LDPE. Unfortunately, native starch has poor mechanical properties and is predominantly water soluble and cannot be processed by melt-based routes without being degraded. The most significant problem with the starch-based loose-fill packaging material is that it collapses when it is in contact with water or in an atmosphere with high relative humidity. In order to compete with non-degradable plastics,