Effect of Particle Size and Aggregation on Thermal Conductivity of Metal–Polymer Nanocomposite

Metal nanoparticle has been a promising option for fillers in thermal interface materials due to its low cost and ease of fabrication. However, nanoparticle aggregation effect is not well understood because of its complexity. Theoretical models, like effective medium approximation model, barely cover aggregation effect. In this work, we have fabricated nickel–epoxy nanocomposites and observed higher thermal conductivity than effective medium theory predicts. Smaller particles are also found to show higher thermal conductivity, contrary to classical models indicate. A two-level effective medium approximation (EMA) model is developed to account for aggregation effect and to explain the size-dependent enhancement of thermal conductivity by introducing local concentration in aggregation structures. [DOI: 10.1115/1.4034757]

Introduction

Including metal nanoparticles in polymers, such as epoxy, helps to enhance thermal conductivity and to maintain electrical insulation below percolation threshold. Because of the low cost of fabrication, metal–epoxy composite has been a great option for thermal interfacial material in many applications [1]. Aggregation effect is often observed in nanocomposites and attributed as a dominant factor in thermal conductivity enhancement [2–10]. However, its complex morphology posts a great challenge for nanocomposite design and theoretical modeling.

To estimate overall thermal conductivity with fillers, many effective medium approximation models are proposed and reviewed [11–13]. The Maxwell model assumes isolated and spherical particles in matrix material, neglecting any interactions between particles [14,15]. Several modifications, such as the Hamilton model [16] and modified effective medium approximation [17], include a geometry factor of fillers, interfacial resistance and size effect both in filler and matrix material. Utilizing Green’s function, Nan has developed a model that treats filler aspect ratio, orientation, and interfacial resistance [18]. However, these models only consider isolated particles, while aggregation effect remains neglected. The series and parallel models [19] consider the most simplified geometry of multilayer stacked together. The Bruggeman model [20] was developed for powder compact, and it neglects the effect of continuous phase of the matrix material. Therefore, the Bruggeman model provides a much lower thermal conductivity when interfacial resistance is considered. The percolation model [21] for thermal conductivity does include interactions between particles and distinguish particles and matrix, with percolation threshold and percolation exponent as two fitting parameters. Compared with electrical properties in metal–polymer composites, thermal transport does not show an increase in conductivity as dramatic as electrical conductivity [21–23]. Thus, fitting parameters can be sensitive to experimental data. Some methods for nanofluid utilize hierarchical EMA models to include the aggregation effect [24] by using fractal dimensions, which can be difficult to determine [22,25,26] especially for nanocomposite. The backbone method is another three-level homogenization model developed by Prasher et al. [27,28]. It relies on two pre-determined fractal dimensions. However, it still fails to fit against our experimental data of nanocomposites. Other modeling methods, such as Monte Carlo, Boltzmann transport equation (BTE), or molecular dynamics (MD), are limited to simple periodic geometries due to their high-computing cost [29].

In our work, we have fabricated nickel nanoparticle–epoxy nanocomposites and observed that they show higher thermal conductivity than effective medium theory predicts even at low concentrations below the percolation threshold. Furthermore, larger enhancement in thermal conductivity is obtained with smaller nanoparticles at the same concentration, contrary to what classical EMA models predict. Thermal conductivity characterization is done by $3\omega$ method, and microscopy analysis by transmission electron microscopy (TEM) indicates thermal conductivity enhancement and size-dependency are caused by the aggregation effect. A two-level effective medium approximation model is developed to consider inhomogeneous dispersion of nanoparticles, by distinguishing local and global concentrations. A rough estimation of the local concentration can be also gained with TEM figures, matching reasonably well with modeling results. Overall, the new two-level EMA model helps explain aggregation effect in nanocomposite and the size-dependent thermal conductivity enhancement, which other EMA models fail to explain.

Sample Fabrication

Nickel particles of multiple sizes 10 nm (9.9 ± 0.2 nm), 40 nm (37.1 ± 2.2 nm), 70 nm (67.5 ± 2.5 nm), and 1 μm (0.86 ± 0.09 μm) are used to make nanocomposites. 10 nm nickel particles are purchased through mkNano Inc., Mississauga,
Canada, and other nickel particles are from Skyspring Nanomaterials, Houston, TX. Matrix materials consist of epon 862, epikure W, both purchased from Miller-Stephenson, Morton Grove, IL, and curing accelerator epikure 3253 for preventing particle precipitation provided by Matteson-Ridolfi, Inc., Riverview, MI. Nickel particles, epoxy resin, curing agent, and accelerator are mixed together in THINKY mixer ARE-310 for 10 min. The mixture is degassed for 1 h, then poured into aluminum mold. Releasing agents are sprayed ahead of time to ensure an easier removal of samples. The curing procedure occurs in an oven, with 30 min temperature ramp from room temperature to 121 °C with 2 h hold, followed by a 30 min ramp from 121 °C to 177 °C and 2 h hold, and then a slow cooldown to room temperature [30].

The samples produced are pellets of 2.5 mm thickness and 1.5 cm in diameter. The top and bottom surfaces are polished to avoid contamination from releasing agent and to make the surfaces smooth for 3ω measurements. The density is measured before and after polishing to ensure that the volume concentration of nickel is consistent.

**Thermal Conductivity Characterization**

Thermal conductivity is measured by the 3ω method [31,32]. It requires a thin metal line on the surface of the sample, functioning both as a heater and detector. A metal line of 4 mm long and 40 μm wide is deposited on the surface of the sample with shadow mask, consisting of 20 nm Cr and 150 nm Au. Because of the microscale size of the metal line, radiation loss even at high temperature is insignificant. There have been different variations of this method to measure thin films, fluid, multilayer films, anisotropic thermal conductivity materials, etc. [33,34]. During the measurement, an AC current of frequency ω is applied to the metal line, heating up the surface of the sample with a temperature oscillation amplitude ΔT. A voltage of 3ω frequency is also present across the metal line. Detailed deductions about ΔT can be found in previous literatures [31,32] as

\[ ΔT = \frac{2v_{1ω}}{v_{1ω}C_{m}} = \frac{p}{2kC_{m}} \sin^2(2θ) (\frac{b}{b + 2τ/d}) \frac{d}{(2τ/d)} \]  

(1)

By measuring \( v_{1ω}, v_{3ω}, \) and temperature coefficient of resistance \( C_{m} \) of the metal line, thermal conductivity of nanocomposites can be obtained by fitting real and imaginary part of theoretical \( ΔT/\rho \) to experimental in-phase and out-of-phase signal, respectively. A typical fitting procedure on one of our Ni-epoxy nanocomposites samples is shown in Fig. 1, with thermal conductivity obtained as 0.28 W/m K. The thermal penetration depth is around 25 μm at 5 Hz, 5 μm at 100 Hz, and 1.3 μm at 2000 Hz, while the largest size scale of the inhomogeneity due to aggregations is 1–3 μm as seen in Fig. 2(b) (Fig. 2(a) shows smaller inhomogeneity scale). Besides, the inhomogeneity is also averaged across the metal line (4 mm x 40 μm), which is large enough to obtain an effective thermal conductivity of the sample.

The thermal conductivities of nanocomposites with different nickel particle sizes and volume concentrations are shown in Fig. 3, where the Maxwell model curve is also plotted. Without the inclusion of interfacial resistance, the thermal conductivity from the Maxwell model is independent on particle sizes. All of the thermal conductivities are higher than the Maxwell model predicts. Surprisingly, it is also observed that smaller fillers provide higher thermal conductivity at the same concentration, contrary to the trend of classical EMA models, where thermal conductivity decreases with smaller particles due to interfacial resistance. Motivated by these observations, we slice our composites’ samples into 100 nm thickness and characterize the microscopy structure with transmission electron microscopy (TEM). According to Fig. 2, nickel particles (dark dots) are not isolated or located evenly. Instead, they aggregate to form some clusters with high-local concentration. Interactions between particles help form a continuous path to conduct heat better within nickel phase, thus increase the overall thermal conductivity more effectively than isolated dispersion. On the other hand, these clusters are mostly isolated from each other. It is also important to note that 40 nm nanoparticles form a more spread-out cluster structure than 70 nm, which is likely the reason for size-dependent thermal conductivity. In this case, using a single-level EMA model like the Maxwell model would ignore the aggregation effect. On the other hand, although the percolation model considers the aggregation effect, it does not treat the nonuniform particle distribution. In this work, a two-level EMA is developed to account for the aggregation effect.

**Two-Level EMA Modeling**

Our two-level EMA model adopts a different EMA model at each level, shown in Fig. 4. The first level is a cluster where nanoparticles are packed closely, and the second level is the whole composite where each cluster is treated as an isolated new particle. A local concentration, \( ϕ_c \), is defined as the volume concentration of particles inside clusters. The cluster concentration, \( ϕ_c \), is defined as volume concentration of clusters inside the matrix material. Thus, the overall concentration of nanoparticles will be preserved as \( ϕ = ϕ_c × ϕ_i \). For the first level EMA, where particles are packed together, the Hashin and Shtrikman model [35] is used as

\[ k_{c,i} = k_p \frac{2ϕ_i}{3 - ϕ_i} \]  

(2)

where \( k_p \) is nickel particle thermal conductivity, \( ϕ_i \) is the local volume concentration, and \( k_{c,i} \) is the thermal conductivity of clusters neglecting interface resistance. Several attempts in literature have shown that with sufficient particle interactions at high concentration, thermal conductivity enhancement can be comparable to the higher bound of the Hashin and Shtrikman model [5–9,36]. Thermal interface resistance between epoxy and nickel particles can also be included as [37]

\[ \frac{1}{k_i} = \frac{1}{k_{c,i}} + \frac{2R_i}{d} \]  

(3)

where \( k_i \) is the thermal conductivity of clusters considering interfacial resistance, \( R_i \) is the thermal interfacial resistance, and \( d \) is the diameter of nickel particles. The interfacial resistance is added in the same manner that it is included for isolated spheres [18]. However, aggregation and sintering effects shown in Fig. 5...
decrease the surface area significantly and change the shape of clusters [36], resulting in a diminished effect of thermal interfacial resistance on overall thermal conductivity. Thus, simply applying $R_i$ and the diameter of individual particles as \( d \) will overestimate the effect of interfacial resistance. Due to its complexity, another model is needed to quantify the exact effect of interfacial resistance due to the agglomerations. On the second level, even though the aggregation structures appear as cylinders, rods, and some irregular shapes in TEM images, the true geometry factor remains uncertain. The TEM figures only show a slice of 100 nm thickness, thus those agglomerations that seem to be connected together might be relatively distant away, and some small agglomerations might be only part of larger ones. Because of spherical particles and isolated clusters, we assume spherical agglomerations based on the Maxwell model as

\[
k_e = k_m \frac{k_e + 2k_m + 2\phi_c(k_e - k_m)}{k_e + 2k_m - \phi_c(k_e - k_m)}
\]

where \( k_e \) is the thermal conductivity of clusters, \( k_i \) is the effective thermal conductivity of nanocomposites, \( k_m \) is the matrix thermal conductivity, and \( \phi_c \) is the volume concentration of clusters in epoxy. In this work, thermal interface resistance is set to be \( 5 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ K/W} \) [38]. We applied a constant interfacial resistance between nickel and epoxy, although it is reported that interfacial resistance may vary depending on particle sizes [38]. The thermal conductivity of nickel particles is estimated based on the mean free path of phonons and the electron cooling length [39], shown in Table 1. If the aspect ratio is to be measured or fitted in the model, Nan’s model can be an alternative model to include the geometry factor.

The local concentration \( \phi_l \) of each sample is an exact fit with experimental thermal conductivity data based on the two-level EMA model in Fig. 6, where the curve \( \phi_l = \phi \) is also included for comparison. All local concentrations are above the curve \( \phi_l = \phi \), indicating higher local concentrations in clusters. For smaller particles as 10 nm, 40 nm, and 70 nm at low concentrations, the local concentration increases faster than overall concentration does. In other words, particles tend to aggregate more closely with higher particle loadings. After certain concentration, the local concentration increasing speed becomes similar to that of overall concentration. It is interesting to note that with a lower local concentration, the overall thermal conductivity tends to be higher at the same overall concentration. A comparison is made between 40 nm sample at 5.74% and 70 nm sample at 5.52% in Table 2. Even though 70 nm nanocomposite has a higher local concentration, thus a
higher cluster thermal conductivity, its lower cluster concentration limits its overall thermal conductivity. Referring to Fig. 2 at similar concentrations and the same magnification, the aggregation structure of 40 nm nanoparticles is more beneficial for heat transfer, since clusters are more spread-out, which translates into larger $\phi_c$ or smaller $\phi_l$. Thus, the aggregation effect enhances thermal conductivity compared with isolated particle dispersion, and an extensive aggregation structure or low-local concentration is preferred for higher thermal conductivity. The local concentration of the composites with 1 $\mu$m nickel particles is less dependent on overall concentration mainly because of its much larger size compared with other nanoparticles, thus smaller number of particles and longer distance between them.

Besides fitting to the thermal conductivities of experimental data, the local concentrations of nickel particles in clusters can also be roughly estimated from TEM images by evaluating cluster concentration in matrix $\phi_c$ first. The method is to assume the particle distribution to be uniform along with the 100 nm thickness of TEM slice. Then, the ratio of area occupied by closely packed particle to the total area is $\phi_c$. Using the overall concentration of particles $\phi$, the local concentration $\phi_c$ can be estimated. Figure 2 contains two TEM pictures of 40 nm nickel and 70 nm nickel at similar volume concentrations. The local concentration of these two samples are calculated to be 13.1% ± 0.2% and 23.9% ± 1.8%, respectively, comparing to the fitted local concentrations 23% and 35%. This is probably because that the assumption that the particle dispersion is uniform across 100 nm overestimates $\phi_l$, thus underestimates $\phi_c$. Nonetheless, the estimations based on the TEM images still follow the same trend with those fitted from our two-level EMA model.

The backbone method is another hierarchical EMA model, proposed by Prasher et al., estimating thermal conductivity of nanofluid including the aggregation effect [27,28]. Three parameters are needed as overall fractal dimension, backbone fractal dimension, and gyration radius. Overall fractal dimension is usually set as 1.7 for nanofluids and 2.0 for nanocomposites [25,26]. However, the model cannot achieve thermal conductivity as high as our experimental results, even by setting gyration radius as a parameter.

### Conclusion

In this work, we observe higher thermal conductivity of nickel–epoxy nanocomposites compared with other EMA models predict, due to aggregation effect. At the same concentration, smaller particle size shows higher thermal conductivities due to its wider-spread aggregation structures in epoxy, according to TEM figures. A two-level EMA model with the local concentration as a fitting parameter indicates a lower local concentration for smaller particles, thus a higher effective thermal conductivity. The local concentration for nanoparticles also shows an increasing trend with higher overall concentration and saturates later. An estimation of local concentration based on TEM figures follows the trend and agrees reasonably well with modeling results. Overall, the new two-level EMA model works well with nanocomposites and helps explain the aggregation effect and size-dependent thermal conductivity enhancement.
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### Nomenclature

- $b$ = half width of metal line
- $C_{rt}$ = coefficient between resistance and temperature
- $D$ = thermal diffusivity
- $k$ = thermal conductivity
- $k_c$ = cluster thermal conductivity

### Table 1 Thermal conductivity of nickel particles with size effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle size (nm)</th>
<th>10 nm</th>
<th>40 nm</th>
<th>70 nm</th>
<th>1 $\mu$m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity (W/m K)</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 Comparison between two nanocomposites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle size (nm)</th>
<th>$\phi_l$ (%)</th>
<th>$\phi_c$ (%)</th>
<th>$k_e$ (W/m K)</th>
<th>$k_c$ (W/m K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5 Sintering effect is observed in nanocomposite with 40 nm Ni at 5.74%. Lines are labeled where a continuous path is formed among nanoparticles. The scale bar is set as 200 nm.

Fig. 6 Local concentration of Ni particles in aggregations is plotted with different overall concentrations and nickel particle sizes.
\[ k_e = \text{overall thermal conductivity} \]
\[ k_m = \text{matrix thermal conductivity} \]
\[ k_p = \text{particle thermal conductivity} \]
\[ p = \text{power consumption of metal line in 3\sigma measurement} \]
\[ q^{-1} = \text{penetration depth} \]
\[ V_{1\sigma} = \text{voltage signal of } \sigma \text{ frequency} \]
\[ V_{3\sigma} = \text{voltage signal of } 3\sigma \text{ frequency} \]
\[ \Delta T = \text{temperature oscillation amplitude} \]
\[ \phi = \text{volume concentration} \]
\[ \phi_c = \text{cluster volume concentration in matrix} \]
\[ \phi_l = \text{local volume concentration in agglomeration} \]
\[ \omega = \text{frequency of current in } 3\sigma \text{ measurement} \]
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