

# Moisture transport and equilibrium in organic coatings

Gerben K. van der Wel

Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, Eindhoven University of Technology,  
P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, the Netherlands

Olaf C.G. Adan

TNO Building and Construction Research, P.O. Box 49, 2600 AA Delft, the Netherlands

Improving coating performance in regard of protection of substrates and structures against moisture-related degradation requires detailed knowledge of underlying transport mechanisms. In this paper a review is given on transport and equilibrium sorption of moisture in polymer films and organic coatings.

Polymeric material forms the continuous phase of a coating and is therefore important for transport properties. Besides polymer, coatings consist of pigments (colouring agents) and fillers (cheap minerals) and various additives, each of them affecting moisture transport. Firstly, in this paper typical transport and equilibrium characteristics of pure polymer films are covered, and secondly those of coatings, assimilating the impact of pigments, fillers and additives.

Discrimination between Fickian and non-Fickian effects is usually made based on the appearance of kinetic absorption curves. Several types of curve are dealt with, and models that describe these curves are discussed. These include "two-stage" sorption, "sigmoidal" sorption and "Case II" sorption.

The common practice of fitting Fick's law to kinetic data by means of relaxation parameters is criticised. Transport kinetics is modelled on the basis of kinetic plots, thereby introducing relaxation parameters in Fick's diffusion law. Although these models describe moisture transport in polymers reasonably, these models imply a lot of "curve-fitting", without a clear mechanistic foundation.

Equilibrium sorption of moisture in polymeric systems is reflected by their sorption isotherms. Type II and III isotherms of the BET classification are commonly encountered, together with linear isotherms according to Henry's law. The suitability of porous media adsorption models for polymeric systems is discussed. These models are treated in relation to interactions of water in polymers, since localised binding of water to specific groups may justify the use of these models.

Finally, the – substantial – effects of pigments and fillers, as well as coating additives on moisture transport and solubility in coatings are dealt with. Pigments may lower moisture permeation, but non-ideality of pigmentation reduces this effect. Coating additives increase moisture solubility, but only little is known in detail.

*Key words:* Polymer films; Organic coatings; Transport; Equilibrium sorption; Moisture

## 1 Introduction

The present review paper deals with transport and equilibrium properties of moisture in organic coatings. This field of research is of continuous interest when protection of substrates and structures to moisture-related degradation is concerned. In the 1970s, it became clear that concrete was not as durable as originally expected, mainly due to corrosion of the reinforcement (Perkins 1997). In order to increase the lifespan of structures, barrier coatings nowadays are frequently used. While the desirable characteristics of such coating will vary according to its use, Perkins (1997) concluded that performance criteria for coatings applied externally to reinforced concrete should be based on: 1. the ability to reduce water penetration; 2. the possession of a high degree of vapour transmission; 3. very good bond with the substrate; 4. good elasticity properties to prevent over-stress due to building movement. Design of barrier coatings with these desired properties requires detailed knowledge of moisture transport mechanisms. This need is even increased by the trend towards water-borne coating systems, which have shown to be more sensitive towards moisture related degradation. In addition, biodegradation of organic coating systems, e.g. by fungal growth, is often closely related to the moisture balance of these systems, frequently in interaction with the underlying porous substrate (Van der Wel et al. 1998, 1999).

As far as we know, the papers of Blahník (1983) and Huldén and Hansen (1985) were the latest reviews dealing with the subject of moisture transport in coatings. In the present paper, the subject is reassessed starting from the point of view that overall kinetic data are not of primary interest, but rather the processes they result from. Our concern with the moisture balance of a combined system of coating and porous substrate also draws attention to differences and similarities in moisture transport mechanisms in these materials. In the past decade, modeling of moisture transport in inert, rigid porous media – e.g. gypsum plaster (Adan 1994) – has made a lot of progress as a consequence of improved and highly sophisticated measuring techniques.

Organic coatings normally consist of polymeric material, pigments, fillers and various additives (rheology modifiers, dispersion agents, etc.). The polymer functions as the binder material, and provides a matrix in which all other constituents are dissolved or dispersed. Pigments are generally dense inorganic particles added mainly for colouring purposes, fillers are cheap minerals added to lower the paint price, and additives are used to improve workability and stability of the coating. In research of transport properties, polymer films are frequently used as the starting point to which effects of other constituents are subsequently related. In the past years, diffusion phenomena in polymers have been reviewed by Vieth (1991) and, more recently, by Neogi (1996). However, despite the fact that most studies concern polymeric materials that are not normally used in coatings, many of the concepts may still be valid assuming that transport mechanisms basically remain the same.

The polymer content of a dry coating film is highly variable. In many manufactured decorative coatings, the amount of polymeric material is only just enough to bind the pigments and fillers in the paint film. Most common inorganic pigments and extenders are impermeable and, consequently, moisture transport primarily takes place in the binder material. On the other hand, pigments may have substantial influence on moisture transport in paint films since they decrease the volume fraction of binder. Besides, additives contribute to moisture transport properties, especially for water-borne coatings, since many of these additives are applied in paint formulations to

achieve compatibility between polar phases (inorganic pigments and, in case of aqueous paints, water) and the more hydrophobic polymer phase. Therefore, many additives are inherently moisture sensitive.

To avoid ambiguities, a number of used terms are defined here. Throughout this paper, we will adopt the following definitions:

- *Sorption*: Usually, a synonym for absorption. Sorption may also be used referring to equilibrium uptake.
- *Absorption*: Uptake of liquids or vapours by a material.
- *Desorption*: Loss of liquids or vapours from a material.
- *Adsorption*: Physical binding of molecules, or clusters of molecules, at surfaces or specific binding sites.
- *Permeation*: Transport of liquids or vapours through a material.
- *Penetrant*: Any liquid and/or vapour that is present in a polymer, coating or porous material as a result of absorption.
- *Moisture*: Water in liquid and/or vapour phase.
- *Substrate*: The base material to which the coating is adhered.
- *Hiding power*: The extent to which a coating is able to hide the colour of the substrate.

The paper is outlined as follows: In chapter 2, general aspects of coatings are dealt with. In chapter 3, transport and equilibrium sorption in polymer films are covered, being general concepts valid for many penetrant-polymer systems. In section 3.5, the specific role of water as the penetrant is highlighted in relation to polymer structure. In chapter 4, the role of other constituents of organic coatings on the moisture balance are considered, starting with pigments and fillers in section 4.1, and additives in section 4.2. A general discussion of moisture in organic coatings in chapter 5 concludes the present paper.

## 2 General aspects of coatings

### 2.1 Solvent-borne and water-borne paints

Solvent-borne paints are generally crosslinking coating systems. In the wet state, the binder is usually present as low molecular weight polymer. Upon curing crosslinking takes place, resulting in a polymer network. Consequently, the dry film is not soluble anymore. Polyesters, alkyds, and epoxies are typical binders. For interior applications (especially wood) alkyds are frequently used, since they are cheap and cure easily with oxygen from the air at room temperature. A problem with alkyds is their low durability, and, for white paints, their tendency to turn yellow. For barrier systems epoxies, polyurethanes and silicones or silanes are used (Perkins 1997).

The current expansion of water-borne dispersion (latex) paints is a result of the pressure to reduce volatile organic compounds and the industrial trend towards friendlier products with low toxicity to the product formulation. Typical binder polymers are acrylics and vinyl acetate copolymers. The first step in the process of film formation is evaporation of water from the film. Secondly, coalescence (particle deformation) starts to take place when the polymer particles come into contact, resulting in a polyhydric structure once the water has evaporated from the film. Deformation

mechanisms have been reviewed by Visschers et al. (1997). The final stage is interfacial diffusion of polymeric chains that should result in a continuous and homogeneous film (Gauthier et al. 1996). However, doubt is cast whether the formation of a completely homogeneous film actually takes place. Dried latex films should be considered cellular (Richard 1996), which is clearly shown in electron micrographs of Zosel (1995). Richard (1995) concluded on the basis of experiments that water vapour is mainly transported via the interfaces of the latex particles, without entering the more hydrophobic core of the particle.

## 2.2 *Pigments and fillers (Hare 1997)*

Pigments are insoluble substances, which are suspended into the coating formulation mainly for colouring, but also with other objectives, such as corrosion inhibition. They are usually dense inorganic compounds, but also insoluble organic compounds may be used. Common pigments are titanium dioxide, iron oxide, and aluminium flakes.

Most fillers are cheap natural minerals, and typically include talc, clay, chalk and quartz. Their major role is lowering the paint price, but they also contribute to the hiding power, and affect coating properties such as hardness.

The amount of pigments and fillers, relative to the amount of binder is usually expressed as the pigment volume concentration (*PVC*). The *PVC* is the volume fraction of pigment in the dry coating film (normally expressed as a percentage). When the amount of binder is such that the total pigment volume is just completely wetted, the *PVC* equals the so-called critical *PVC* (*CPVC*). The *CPVC* is considered a transition point, playing a pivotal role in many coating properties.

Pigments are generally obtained from the manufacturer with particle sizes much larger than the size of the pigment crystal. The process of breaking up these so-called "agglomerates" is called pigment "dispersion". Firstly, a pigment dispersion concentrate is prepared by grinding pigment in a mill, together with a minimum of solvent and resin. Additives like dispersion agents facilitate this process. The performance of the paint depends clearly on the quality of the pigment dispersion concentrate. Furthermore, stabilization of the pigment dispersion may be critical, since flocculation, i.e. pigment agglomeration in the paint due to insufficient stabilization of the pigment particles may take place.

## 2.3 *Additives (Calbo 1987)*

Additives are generally applied to coatings to improve their performance. Some of them are essential, such as stabilizers. Many of them contain hydrophilic parts, therefore also contributing to the moisture affinity of the film. The most important additives usually are pigment dispersants, rheology modifiers, leveling additives, and antifoams. Pigment dispersants facilitate agglomerates of pigment particles to break up in the dispersion process; rheology modifiers or thickeners are used to obtain the right paint viscosity. They are usually hydrophilic polymers, but also hydrophobe-modified forms (associative thickeners) are used. Leveling agents, such as higher boiling alcohols, facilitate spreading of the paint over the substrate surface and homogeneous film formation. Antifoams prevent foam formation and typically are oils, silica and surfactants.

## 2.4 Homogeneity of a coating

Although coatings are clearly heterogeneous in a microscopic sense, they are usually considered homogeneous from a macroscopic point of view. Bear and Bachmat (1990) introduced the so-called Representative Elementary Volume (REV) to assess whether macroscopic homogeneity can be supposed. The REV is defined as the minimum volume for which statistically meaningful averages can be obtained. Although the concept was developed for porous media, it should also be suitable to other micro-heterogeneous systems such as polymeric coatings. Besides defects that are difficult to prevent, such as capillaries resulting from coating application, the size of coating constituents determine the REV of the coating. Pigment particles are usually the most sizeable coating constituents, having typical dimensions of 0.1–0.4  $\mu\text{m}$ . For a 60  $\mu\text{m}$  dry coating thickness, the film thickness is about 150–600 times larger than the typical size of pigment crystals, and consequently, well-dispersed coatings without defects are clearly homogeneous in a macroscopic sense.

## 3 Polymer films

### 3.1 Fickian and non-Fickian kinetics

Uni-directional Fickian transport in polymer films is described by:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( D(C) \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} \right) \quad (1)$$

This equation is known as the general diffusion law or Fick's second law of diffusion (Fick's law, for short).  $C$  [ $\text{kg m}^{-3}$ ] is the penetrant concentration,  $t$  [s] is time,  $x$  [m] is the position in the film in the direction of diffusion, and  $D$  [ $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ ] is the diffusion coefficient or diffusivity of the penetrant in the polymer.  $D$  is the pivotal parameter determining the rate of transport. It may depend strongly on concentration, but this is not necessarily the case in polymers. It is noted that concentration dependency implies dependency both on penetrant content [ $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ ] and on temperature. According to Hopfenberg and Frisch (1969), isothermal diffusion of organic penetrants in polymers is concentration independent at very low activities over a wide temperature range. With increasing penetrant activities, however, they claim that diffusion is only concentration independent in the case of very low temperatures.

Fickian diffusion in polymers is an ideal case of penetrant transport, corresponding to free diffusion of penetrant without interference of polymer chain rearrangement – i.e. structural relaxation –. Whether deviations from ideal Fickian behaviour occur, depends on the rate of relaxation compared to that of diffusion. If polymer relaxation is much faster than penetrant diffusion, diffusion is accompanied by instantaneous response of the system, resulting in Fickian behaviour. Instantaneous response of the system requires large flexibility of the polymer chains in the system. This is generally accepted to be the case for polymers above their glass transition temperature ( $T_g$ ) [ $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ], which are 'rubbery' (systems below  $T_g$  are 'glassy'). Two things should be mentioned about this transition of state. Firstly, the  $T_g$  is not a real thermodynamic transition, since its value depends on the speed of heating or cooling of the system (Challa, 1993). Secondly, the  $T_g$  is characteristic for the total system including possible penetrant. Since penetrant absorption may also induce a transition from glassy to rubbery state and vice versa, such transition under isothermal conditions should be considered in terms of a glass transition concentration ( $C_g$ ) rather than in terms of a glass transition

temperature. The effect of the glass transition on the diffusion behaviour of several water-polymer systems has been investigated, and summarized by Barrie (1968). Although the isothermal diffusion coefficients appeared to be clearly dependent on temperature, no discontinuities were found upon traversing the  $T_g$ . Instead,  $D$  increased smoothly with increasing temperature.

Vrentas et al. (1975, 1977, 1997) introduced a diffusion Deborah number  $(DEB)_D$  [-] to indicate the presence of non-Fickian effects during absorption experiments. This number is defined as:

$$(DEB)_D = \frac{\lambda_m}{\theta_D} \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\theta_D$  [s] is the characteristic time of penetrant diffusion and  $\lambda_m$  [s] can be considered as the characteristic time of polymer relaxation processes.  $\theta_D$  is proportional to the square of film thickness  $l$  [m] and, consequently,  $(DEB)_D$  is proportional to  $l^{-2}$ . Calculation of the diffusion Deborah number is described in Vrentas et al. (1977). Since 'glassy' to 'rubbery' state transitions depend – at least – on both the concentration  $C$  and temperature  $T$ ,  $(DEB)_D$  may be expressed as a function of  $C$  and  $T$ . Vrentas et al. (1975) suggested that three different zones in a  $C$ - $T$  diagram can be distinguished, separated by lines of constant Deborah number (See Figure 1).




Fig. 1 Schematic picture of the different zones of diffusion, separated by lines of constant diffusion Deborah number  $(DEB)_D$ , as related to penetrant concentration and temperature.  $T_E$  is the temperature below which pure polymer acts like an elastic solid,  $T_g$  is the glass transition temperature, and  $T_V$  is the temperature above which pure polymer acts like a viscous fluid. Reproduced from Vrentas et al. (1975).

They defined two threshold temperatures,  $T_V$  and  $T_E$  respectively, characterizing these lines.  $T_V$  [°C] is the temperature at zero penetrant concentration above which the polymer acts like a viscous

liquid, whereas  $T_E$  [°C] is the temperature at zero penetrant concentration below which the polymer acts like an elastic solid. They claim that Fickian behaviour is found both above  $T_V$  and below  $T_E$ . In the latter state, polymer segments move back to their original positions instantaneously after passage of a diffusing particle, resulting in a net unchanged matrix (Vrentas et al. 1975). To our opinion, rigid structures should not be excluded from this point of view. As shown in Figure 1, the (effective) glass transition temperature is in the area between these borderlines. Thus, in this respect Vrentas et al. (1975) disagree with the general opinion that the glass transition is the border between Fickian and non-Fickian diffusion characteristics.

### 3.2 Porosity and free volume

The kind of Fickian behaviour found for elastic solids may also result from a polymer film with a rigid structure containing free spaces which are able to accommodate penetrant molecules, therefore showing characteristics of porous materials. Philip and De Vries (1957) provided a theory, dealing with moisture transport in inert porous materials. In this model, moisture transport is described by a diffusion type equation, similar to that for Fickian diffusion (1). However, the – macroscopic – moisture diffusion coefficient  $D$  assimilates various moisture transport mechanisms in the pore system and appears to be highly dependent on the moisture content  $\phi$  [ $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ ] (Adan 1995). There is clear evidence that penetrant transport in polymers may be connected to free volume. Vrentas et al. (1988, 1989, 1990) suggested a model for describing the volumetric behaviour of glassy polymer-penetrant systems. This model has been reviewed by Duda and Zielinski (1996). According to this model, polymer volume is divided in three elements (See Figure 2): <1> Occupied volume. This is basically the “van der Waals” volume (Bondi 1968) and is the volume of the material without any free volume. This volume can be calculated from bond distances and non-bonded contact radii – the so-called “van der Waals” radii – and is a constant for all temperatures. <2> Interstitial free volume. This inaccessible free volume stems from the vibrational energy of polymer bonds, and increases slightly with temperature. <3> Hole free volume. This is the volume stemming from volume relaxation and plasticization upon heating and cooling of the polymer. This free volume is accessible for penetrant transport, and may be altered by absorption and desorption of penetrants. Changes in the total polymer volume are largely governed by changes in the hole free volume. Rubbery polymers attain equilibrium volume, since polymer relaxations are fast. Glassy polymers, however, are non-equilibrium liquids in which relaxations are slow. Consequently, glassy polymers may have larger volume than would be the case at equilibrium, since extra hole free volume is trapped in the polymer. Although polymers seem to be porous viewed in this way, Duda and Zielinski (1996) emphasize that volume trapped in a glassy polymer is continuously redistributed through the volume. However, the nature of free volume is still open for discussion, since commonly polymers are considered non-porous.




Fig. 2. Schematic picture of polymer volume as a function of temperature. Reproduced from Duda and Zielinski (1996).

For porous materials, the penetrant phase is clearly decisive for the transport mechanism, both at the surface and inside the material. However, for non-porous polymers, the penetrant phase within the polymer is not defined, and consequently, transport cannot be considered in terms of liquid and/or vapour.

### 3.3 Typical sorption and permeation kinetics

#### Typical sorption kinetics

In kinetic sorption experiments a quantity representing overall penetrant loss or gain is recorded as a function of time for a sample of polymer film or coating that is subjected to a certain penetrant activity. Usually, the mass of penetrant  $M$  [kg] is taken as this quantity (Crank and Park 1968). Results of kinetic experiments are normally presented by plots of  $M$  as a function of time ( $t$ ) or square root of time ( $t^{1/2}$ ). Free films are usually subjected to a constant external penetrant activity at both sides of the film. For films applied to a substrate, single-sided moistening is commonly performed. In case the substrate is impermeable, experimental data use to be processed in the same way as for free films with the restriction that only half of the film thickness is used. However, due to factors like polarity and surface energy, such assumption may not be justified, i.e. free and applied films may show quite different characteristics. Corti et al. (1982) studied the effect of steel and glass substrates on water absorption in epoxy-polyamide clear varnish and concluded that free films showed a tendency towards greater water uptake.

In the next part of this paragraph, a number of typical plots is given and categorized according to their appearance.



### Fickian sorption




Fig. 3. Stylized picture of a typical Fickian absorption curve. The relative weight gain  $M(t)/M_\infty$  is plotted as a function of the square root of time.

Figure 3 is a typical plot for so called Fickian absorption kinetics. Characteristic features of such curve are (Kishimoto 1972): <1> An initially linear plot of  $M$  as a function of  $t^{1/2}$ ; <2> with increasing  $t$ , the absorption curve smoothly levels off to a saturation level  $M_\infty$ ; <3> When  $M(t)/M_\infty$  is plotted as a function of  $t^{1/2}/l$  (where  $l$  is the film thickness) a “reduced” plot is obtained, which is identical for different values of film thickness. Fickian desorption curves show the same features. “Reduced” absorption and desorption curves coincide over the entire range of  $t^{1/2}$  when  $D$  is constant.

“Reduced” absorption curves lie above the corresponding desorption curves when  $D$  is an increasing function of concentration. The features that are described here only apply when two conditions are met: Firstly, local equilibrium at the material surface must be maintained. Secondly, the external penetrant activity must be kept constant over the entire experiment. Analytical solutions for equation (1) that describe the curve in Figure 3 have been obtained by Crank (1975). In these solutions,  $D$  is assumed to be constant. Actually, this assumption may not be valid since  $D$  may be a function of concentration. In that case, the solution may only be considered an averaged value. Practical approximations for constant  $D$  are given by Balik (1996).

Absorption and desorption are normally classified as non-Fickian when anomalous plots are obtained under experimental conditions similar to those mentioned above. Non-Fickian effects are commonly classified according to their appearance in kinetic plots. Well-known anomalous appearances are two-stage, sigmoidal, and Case II sorption. Many models have been developed to link kinetics with presumed underlying transport mechanisms.

Two-stage sorption

'Two-stage' sorption is a frequently encountered anomalous type of absorption. Its general appearance is shown in Figure 4. The name 'two-stage' sorption is chosen since the curve appears to be composed of two different parts: <1> Fast Fickian absorption; <2> Slow non-Fickian absorption. In figure 4, the curve is Fickian from the start until the moment it starts to level off. However, instead of reaching the saturation level typical for Fickian absorption, the curve is extended through a non-Fickian part. Ultimately, saturation will be reached for all instances. A theory, satisfactorily describing the features of 'two-stage' sorption, has been proposed by Berens and Hopfenberg (1978).




Fig. 4. Stylized picture of a typical two-stage absorption curve. The relative weight gain  $M(t)/M_\infty$  is plotted as a function of the square root of time.  $M(t)/M_\infty = 1$  for the (fictitious) Fickian saturation level.

In their diffusion-relaxation model they considered the absorption process to be composed of two phenomenologically independent contributions: A diffusion part  $M_F(t)$  that is governed by Fick's laws and a structural part  $M_R(t)$ , resulting from polymer relaxations. The total weight gain at time  $t$  may be expressed as the linear superposition of these contributions.

$$M(t) = M_F(t) + M_R(t) \tag{3}$$

$M_F(t)$  is given by solutions of the diffusion equation (1). It is assumed that more than one independent relaxation process is possible, so  $M_R(t)$  is given by:

$$M_R(t) = \sum_i M_{\infty,i} [1 - e^{-k_i t}] \tag{4}$$

where,  $M_{\infty,i}$  represents the equilibrium absorption due to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  relaxation process, and  $k_i$  is the first-order relaxation constant of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  relaxation process. Originally, the model has been developed for diffusion in spherical particles, but it this has also been applied to diffusion in polymer films, e.g. by Sun and Lee (1996).

#### Sigmoidal sorption




Fig. 5. Stylized picture of a typical sigmoidal (S-shaped) absorption curve. The relative weight gain  $M(t)/M_{\infty}$  is plotted as a function of the square root of time.

Sigmoidal sorption is another typical non-Fickian behaviour (Figure 5). Curves are S-shaped, showing a point of inflection. In the early sixties, Long and Richman (1960) proposed the “variable surface concentration” (VCS) model, giving a satisfying description of the experimental data. They assumed that the transport process in the film is Fickian, but due to slow establishment of equilibrium at the surface of the film, kinetics appear anomalous. Initial sigmoidal effects may be followed by subsequent two-stage effects. See for example De Wilde and Shopov (1994) who combined the diffusion-relaxation model and the VCS model to describe their kinetics adequately.

### Case II sorption




Fig. 6. Stylized picture of a typical Case II absorption curve. The relative weight gain  $M(t)/M_\infty$  is plotted as a function of time.

An apparently totally different form of non-Fickian kinetics is named Case II sorption (Figure 6). It was noticed that some systems of polymer sheets and liquid penetrant showed linear kinetics, i.e. mass uptake proportional to time. This was accompanied by a considerable amount of swelling. Optical density scans of absorption of methanol by a sheet of PMMA revealed "step-type" concentration profiles, showing negligible concentration gradient behind sharp fronts (Thomas 1978). As Case II sorption principally requires a sharp diffusion front, and a constant progress of that front in time, overall linear kinetics will not occur in case of a geometry other than a unidimensional sheet (e.g. a sphere) (Windle 1985).

Many models have been proposed to account for the features of Case II diffusion. Crank (1953) and Petropoulos and Roussis (1967I, 1967II, 1969) developed a theory which included a history dependent diffusion coefficient. Peterlin (1965) rewrote the diffusion equation (1), incorporating a term to describe the constant velocity movement of a penetrant front. Van Westing et al. (1994), who studied an epoxy coating system with impedance measurements, reported one of the few examples of Case II sorption with liquid water as the penetrant. They observed linear kinetics, preceded by a Fickian-like induction period. They suggested that initially, water molecules do not interact with polarizable groups of the coating, but only fill up pores and interstitial sites, without disturbing the polymer. Next, swelling occurs, ascribed to interaction of the coating polymer and the water molecules. In order to account for the swelling, they simply added a swelling coefficient ( $S_e$ ) to the analytical solution of (1) given by Crank (1975) for Fickian kinetics with a constant  $D$ . The swelling coefficient was taken to be linear in time and the swelling is consequently given by  $S_e t$ . It seems to us that a constant diffusion coefficient is not expected in the first place when swelling (involving local water storage) is concerned, so the use of the solution of Crank is principally unacceptable. It

goes without saying that addition of a swelling coefficient that is linear in time results in linear kinetics, provided that the contribution is large enough compared to the Fickian contribution.

Opposite to these empirical methods, Thomas and Windle (1982) developed a theory with physical foundation. They studied the absorption of liquid methanol in PMMA extensively; their experimental data for methanol sorption in PMMA sheets of 1 mm thickness at 24°C agreed well with calculated concentration profiles and sorption plots.

Their basic assumption is that the diffusion of the penetrant is much faster in a swollen element than in a glassy element. When initially penetrant molecules enter the element, they “clear the way” for successive molecules; the plasticizing effect causes next molecules to enter more rapidly and so on. Accumulation is at least initially much faster than transport to the next element. This condition results in a sharp front. For a sheet of polymer that is immersed in a bath of penetrant, this will continue until the fronts have met in the center of the sample. At that point, the polymer sample is totally plasticized. In terms of penetrant activity, the mechanism described above results in the following diffusion equation for filling of an initially glassy element (Windle 1985):

$$\left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}\right)_x = \frac{\partial}{\partial X} \left[ D(\phi) \left( \frac{\phi}{a} \frac{\partial a}{\partial X} \right) \right] \quad (5)$$

Here,  $\phi$  is  $\phi(X,t)$  [-]; the ratio of actual and saturation concentration of the  $X^{\text{th}}$  element as a function of time, and  $a$  [-] is the penetrant activity.

Recently, Samus and Rossi (1996) questioned the tendency to describe any deviation from the “Fickian” curve as “anomalous” or “non-Fickian”. In that case, the “Fickian” curve refers to the curve commonly considered Fickian. In line with that, they criticized the common practice of fitting Fick’s law to kinetic data by means of (often vaguely defined) relaxation parameters. They reason that apparent non-Fickian curves may actually result from Fick’s law (1) if geometrical constraints on swelling behaviour are taken into account properly. For instance, solvent uptake in a polymer film or slab causes a sharp front, separating the glassy from the plasticized region, and swelling is only possible in the direction perpendicular to the film surface. The rigid inner region restricts swelling in the other two directions and, consequently, the concentration of solvent in the overall swollen state is limited to a lower level than the final equilibrium concentration. The constraint from the rigid core is released when the solvent reaches the central region of the film and the material in this region becomes entirely plasticized. Only at this point, the polymer can swell in the other two directions and the solvent concentration grows to the final equilibrium value in the entire material. They believe that the regime of accelerated uptake, leading to two-stage absorption curves, originates from this effect of hindered swelling. On the other hand, for spherical samples constraint release is gradual, since swelling can take place isotropically from the start. For this geometry, no dramatic signature of accelerated uptake in the sorption curves is expected. Processes of the kind just described play a role even in the absence of a sharp concentration front between the glassy and plasticized region. If sorption experiments are carried out just above the nominal  $T_g$ , the elastic moduli can still experience significant changes as the concentration of solvent within the sample increases.

### Typical permeation kinetics

Permeation experiments offer a different approach to characterize transport kinetics. In a permeation experiment, the penetrant activity at both sides of the film is different. Consequently, the driving force for diffusion is directed from the high activity side of the film towards the low activity side and penetrant migrates through the film, from one side to the other.




Fig. 7. Stylized picture of a typical permeation curve. The total amount of penetrant  $Q$ , which has passed through the film in time  $t$ , is plotted as a function of time. The slope  $F$  of the linear part is the penetrant flux.

In Figure 7, a typical permeation plot is shown. Here,  $Q$  [ $\text{kg m}^{-2}$ ] is the total amount of penetrant, which has passed through the film during a period of time  $t$  from the start. Initially, penetrant also accumulates in the film, which is essentially a sorption process and shows up as an induction period. When steady-state conditions occur, a diffusion coefficient can be extracted from the slope of the linear part:

$$F = -D \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} \quad (6)$$

actually being Fick's first law of diffusion. Here,  $F$  [ $\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ] is the rate of transfer through the film – i.e. the flux,  $\Delta Q / \Delta t$  –, which is constant in the steady state. This diffusion coefficient principally differs from the one derived from sorption experiments, since the underlying differential equation does not include a time parameter  $t$ .

Therefore, the rate of permeation is generally expressed by the permeability ( $P$ ) [ $\text{m}^3 (\text{m s})^{-1}$ ] rather than by a diffusion coefficient. The permeability is dependent on both the (steady state) diffusion

coefficient ( $D$ ) derived from equation (6) and the solubility ( $S$ ) [ $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ ] of the penetrant in the film (Blahnik 1983):

$$P = DS \quad (7)$$

The solubility  $S$  is the slope of the sorption isotherm, and is constant for the linear sorption isotherm, which obeys Henry's law (see paragraph 3.4.). This equation apparently is similar to the relationship between the isothermal vapour diffusivity  $D(\varphi)$ , the slope of the sorption isotherm ( $\partial\varphi / \partial a$ ), and vapour permeability (in rigid porous materials (Adan 1994).

As in that case the vapour permeability is a function of the penetrant activity  $a$  (or concentration  $C$ ), a functional relationship between  $D$  and  $a$  (or  $C$ ) may be estimated. However, considering inaccuracies in determination of both the permeability and sorption isotherm, such approach may lead to considerable mistakes (Adan 1994). Apart from this, in case of polymer systems, transport may be highly affected by glassy-rubbery state transitions, and by volume effects in each state. As both the permeability  $P$  and solubility  $S$  are in fact steady-state quantities, not taking account of such effects, the  $D(C)$  relationship may not be estimated on the basis of equation (7).

Although the permeation experiments discussed above do not reflect kinetics, closer examination of the induction period should give information about kinetic behaviour. Performing differential permeation experiments – i.e. measurements of the rate of transfer  $F$  as a function of time – may offer more insight into the period before reaching steady state. Experiments of Nguyen et al. (1996) suggest that for permeation anomalous features may be distinguished similar to those of absorption, related to volume changes of the film during the experiment.

### 3.4 *Equilibrium sorption*

The preceding part dealt with diffusion, this part with equilibrium. Within the field of polymer physics, the term usually refers to any equilibrium uptake of vapour or liquid. Brunauer et al. (1938, 1940) developed a still leading classification, the so-called "Brunauer-Emmett-Teller" (BET) classification, on equilibrium sorption behaviour of porous materials, as reflected by their sorption isotherms. Sorption isotherms describe equilibrium sorption of porous materials in the non-saturated region as a function of the penetrant activity, including adsorption (i.e. formation of molecular multilayers) and capillary condensation. In the saturated region, equilibrium sorption is described by the so-called capillary pressure curve. The BET classification originally distinguished five types of sorption isotherm (Figure 8) (Brunauer et al. 1940):




Fig. 8. Stylized picture of the five types of sorption isotherm according to the BET-classification (Brunauer et al. 1940), and the linear isotherm according to Henry's law. The volume fraction of sorbed penetrant is plotted as a function of the relative pressure ( $p/p_0$ ).

Type I is the well-known Langmuir isotherm, which is applicable to microporous solids. Type II and type III isotherms describe adsorption of gases on macroporous or non-porous solids, and type IV and V isotherms are applicable to both mesoporous or microporous solids. The presence of hysteresis loops is characteristic for type IV and V, but may also appear in the other isotherms. Brunauer et al. (1938) originally stated their theory at least to be valid for gases that do not possess considerable dipole moments. Water molecules possess a large dipole moment. Nevertheless, the BET classification has been adopted without much doubt for water in polymers, e.g. by Barrie (1968) in his classic review. Polymers may show a widely varying appearance of water sorption isotherms. Type II isotherms are commonly encountered with hydrophilic polymers such as wool, silk and cellulose acetate. For less hydrophilic ones (ethylcellulose, polydimethyl siloxane) type III isotherms are observed. Linear isotherms are found for hydrophobic polymers (polystyrene, polyethylene). These findings justify the assumption that these types of polymer may be considered non-porous. Linear isotherms imply that Henry's law is valid over the entire range of penetrant activities. Since Henry's law expresses ideality of dissolution, this also implies insignificance of penetrant-polymer interactions, which is plausible for water sorption in hydrophobic polymers. Non-linear isotherms consequently indicate that the sorption process deviates from ideality, i.e. they reflect interactions between water molecules and polymer structure. The nature of these interactions will be discussed in paragraph 3.5.



### Localized sorption theories

Brunauer et al. (1940) proposed a model to describe features of five different types of sorption isotherm. Starting point of their model is the presence of a dynamic equilibrium, in which condensation of molecules onto bare sites equals the evaporation from occupied sites. As polymers are commonly regarded as non-porous the classical BET model is normally used in a linearized two-parameter form, assuming the number of adsorbed molecular layers to be infinite, e.g. Blahník (1983):

$$\frac{a}{\varphi(1-a)} = \frac{1}{\varphi_m c_{\text{BET}}} + \left( \frac{c_{\text{BET}} - 1}{\varphi_m c_{\text{BET}}} \right) a \quad (8)$$

where  $\varphi$  is the volume fraction of penetrant as related to the total volume [ $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ ];  $a$  is penetrant activity ( $a = p/p_0$ ;  $p$  [bar] is the vapour pressure;  $p_0$  [bar] is the saturation vapour pressure);  $\varphi_m$  [-] is the volume fraction of a complete penetrant monolayer;  $c_{\text{BET}}$  [-] is a parameter of the BET model, reflecting the partitioning of higher sorption layers. This parameter can be calculated approximately by:

$$c_{\text{BET}} = e^{(\phi_1 - \phi_L)/(RT)} \quad (9)$$

where  $\phi_1$  is the heat of adsorption of the first penetrant layer, and  $\phi_L$  is the heat of liquefaction. Although  $c_{\text{BET}}$  can be calculated, it is normally used as a fitting parameter for polymers, thereby actually casting doubt on the theoretical basis. In addition, a three-parameter form, assuming a limited built-up of molecular layers, was presented in the original paper (Brunauer et al. 1938). It has not been commonly applied for polymers, according to Jonquière et al. (1998) because it required an – in that time difficult – non-linear mathematical analysis. A better explanation would be that finiteness of the number of layers is only important for porous materials, and polymers are generally characterized as non-porous. The BET model is considered to give good agreement with experimental values at activities ( $a$ ) between 0 and 0.5 for water vapour in hydrophilic glassy polymers (Jonquière et al. 1998), thus being better than originally reported by Brunauer et al. (1940) for porous materials. In contrast to non-porous polymers, for porous materials the application of BET is limited at activities above 0.3 due to capillary condensation effects.

Anderson (1946) discussed a modification to the BET model by assuming that the heat of adsorption in the multilayer system is less than the heat of liquefaction. Together with work of Guggenheim (1966) and De Boer (1968), this led to the three-parameter Guggenheim-Anderson-de Boer ( $G_{\text{AB}}$ ) equation. A slightly modified form is given by Jonquière et al. (1998):

$$\varphi = \frac{\varphi_m c_{\text{GAB}} k a}{(1 - k a)} \frac{1}{1 + (c_{\text{GAB}} - 1) k a} \quad (10)$$

The parameters in this equation are the same as for the BET model, except for  $c_{\text{GAB}}$  [-] and  $k$  [ $\text{J J}^{-1}$ ], being a fitting parameter of the  $G_{\text{AB}}$  model, and the ratio of heat of adsorption and the heat of liquefaction, respectively.  $k$  is assumed to be less than 1. Jonquière and Fane (1998) recently showed that the  $G_{\text{AB}}$  equation is effective for fitting data of non-ideal water sorption in polymers (Type II or III) over activity ranging from 0–0.95, which is not the case for the classic BET model.

Another localized sorption model is the so-called “Dual Sorption model”, which is developed by Vieth et al. (1976). The model is a combination of the linear isotherm according to Henry’s law, accounting for normal dissolution, and the Langmuir isotherm, which is included in the BET model and accounts for immobilization of penetrant at fixed sites within the medium (microvoids or holes in the glassy polymer structure). Still, the GAB model fits type III isotherms better than the Dual Sorption model (Jonquière et al. 1998).

#### Dissolution theories

In localized sorption theories, penetrant is considered to bind at specific sites in the polymeric structure, e.g. in cracks, pores, or at specific polar groups which are capable of interaction with polar penetrants like water. The so-called dissolution theory offers another – macroscopic – approach to penetrant sorption. A number of models have been proposed assuming homogeneous dissolution of penetrant in polymers. Flory (1942) discussed the entropy of mixing small molecules and high polymers. The starting point of his theory was that for polymer-penetrant systems that do not display strong interactions, observed deviations from ideal behaviour should be attributed to incompatibility of their molecule sizes. This basic concept was evolved by Huggins (1942) and Flory (1953), leading to the following “Flory-Huggins” relation:

$$\ln(a) = 1 - \varphi + \ln(\varphi) + \chi(1 - \varphi)^2 \quad (11)$$

In this model,  $\varphi$  [ $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ ] is the volume fraction of dissolved penetrant, and  $a$  is the penetrant activity. The compatibility of polymer and penetrant is expressed by a dimensionless interaction parameter  $\chi$  (Gee 1946). According to Flory (1953) the theory is limited to relatively apolar systems, interacting only weakly. In contrast to that starting point, the Flory-Huggins relation is also used for fitting water sorption. Barrie (1968) notes that the relation tends to be useful for water in relatively hydrophobic polymers for activities larger than 0.5. Perrin et al. (1997) show for the type III isotherms of water vapour sorption in hydrophilic cellulose acetate good agreement for low and intermediate activities ( $a_w < 0.7$ ), which is a totally different range than was indicated by Barrie. It may be concluded that the application of the Flory-Huggins relation with respect to the type of polymer-penetrant system as well as to the penetrant activity range is still questioned.

The assumption that clustering of penetrant may cause the sorption isotherm to depart from the Flory-Huggins relation for higher penetrant activities (Beck and Tomka 1997), led to another approach of Favre et al. (1993) and Perrin et al. (1997) by taking penetrant-polymer as well as penetrant-penetrant interactions into account. A second interaction parameter  $k_s$  was introduced to account for these mutual penetrant interactions. In this model the interactions between polymer and penetrant are reflected by the parameter  $k_p$ , comparable to the Flory-Huggins interaction parameter  $\chi$ . The following relation was empirically derived for the solvent fraction as a function of the penetrant activity ( $a$ ):

$$\varphi = \frac{e^{(k_s - k_p)a} - 1}{(k_s - k_p)/k_p} \quad (12)$$

This two-parameter model, named after the ENSIC laboratory, may describe some type III isotherms over nearly the entire activity range, whereas Flory-Huggins fails at higher activities.

### 3.5 Interactions of water in polymers

Water molecules are highly dipolar. This character is due to the high electronegativity of oxygen compared to hydrogen. Partial electrostatic charges due to this difference in electronegativity result in strong interactions of water and other charged or polar groups and between water molecules mutually in polymers. Both the types of interaction as well as the degree of interaction depend strongly on polymeric structure. It is generally accepted that for sorbed water molecules at least three different states are possible:

<1> Single water molecules, which neither show significant interactions with other water molecules nor with their environment.

<2> Aggregated water molecules. These are water molecules, which interact with other water molecules to form agglomerates or clusters. Usually, such clusters are not large enough to resemble bulk water properties.

<3> Localized interactions of water molecules and polymer groups.

It is suggested that for highly hydrophilic polymers, such as polyvinyl alcohol, <3> is even subdivided into two states (Nakamura et al. 1983, Hodge et al. 1996):

<3a> Non-freezing water, i.e. water that is strongly bound to polar groups in the polymer.

<3b> Freezable bound water, i.e. water that is weakly bound to the polymer or to the non-freezing water.

It may be suggested that for porous polymers, similar to other porous materials also bulk water is present.

Transport of water in hydrophobic systems is normally by single water molecules <1>, especially at low water activities. Interactions of water molecules and hydrophobic polymers are minimal, since the polarizability of water is small, and dispersion forces only weakly contribute to interaction with nonpolar materials. As indicated in the previous paragraph, linear sorption isotherms are found, indicating ideal dissolution of water molecules in the matrix.

It was already mentioned that clustering of water molecules <2> may cause a marked deviation from Henry's law. Water clusters stem from a high mutual affinity of water molecules, combined with a relatively low affinity of water molecules for the polymeric matrix. Consequently, clustering of water is expected primarily in hydrophobic polymers for high water activities (Barrie 1968). On the other hand, also for hydrophilic polymers clustering may be expected if the amount of water molecules in the polymer is higher than the quantity that can be bound to the polymer. For weak penetrant-polymer interactions (e.g. water-hydrophobic polymer), Zimm (1953) and Zimm and Lundberg (1956) developed a statistical analysis to determine the extent of clustering from measured sorption isotherms. For an amorphous polymer, they arrived at the following expression:

$$\frac{G_{ww}}{V_w} = -(1 - \varphi_w) \left[ \frac{\partial(a_w/\varphi_w)}{\partial a_w} \right]_{PT} - 1 \quad (13)$$

$G_{ww}$  is the so-called cluster integral;  $V_w$  and  $a_w$  are the partial volume and activity of water molecules in the polymer, respectively; and  $\varphi_w$  is the volume fraction of water in the polymer.

The cluster integral indicates whether clustering takes place or not. For ideal solutions, it follows from equation (13) that  $G_{ww}/V_w = -1$ , indicating that a particular water molecule does not affect the

distribution of other water molecules. If  $G_{ww}/V_w > -1$ , there is a tendency to cluster. In this case, the concentration of water molecules in the neighbourhood of a given water molecule is higher than would be the case for random distribution. The relation can only be applied for comparative purpose.

Whereas the cluster integral is suited for weakly interacting penetrant-polymer systems, a model for clustering of water in hydrophilic polymers is given by Favre et al. (1993) and Perrin et al. (1997). They characterize in their previously described ENSIC model clustering in terms of a 'Mean Cluster Size' ( $MCS$ ) [-] as a function of penetrant volume fraction:

$$MCS = \frac{(1 - \varphi)(k_2\varphi + 1) \ln(k_2\varphi + 1)}{k_2\varphi} + \varphi \quad (14)$$

In this relation,  $k_2 = (k_s - k_p)/k_p$ . In the case of water, the quantity  $MCS$  is interpreted as the number of water molecules near another absorbed water molecule. The advantage of the  $MCS$  is that an interpretation in quantitative terms is provided, whereas the Zimm-Lundberg cluster integral is mainly qualitative. However, the starting points for the models are different and suitability of the models depends mainly on the hydrophobicity of the polymer.

The overall solubility of water in the polymer is determined by the amount and nature of polar groups in the polymer. Hydroxyl, carboxyl and peptide groups were found to bind water molecules strongly (McLaren 1951). Furthermore, equilibrium sorption depends also on the position of the polar group at the polymer chain. For example, some polyamides show low equilibrium sorption values, although the amide group is highly polar. This notion has been attributed to interchain hydrogen bonds sufficiently strong to resist interactions with water molecules (Barrie 1968).

Hodge et al. (1996) suggested that the non-freezing type of bound water  $\langle 3a \rangle$  is an important plasticizer in highly hydrophilic polymers, i.e. this type of water binding causes a transition from glass to rubber to occur upon water absorption. It is discussed that polar groups facilitate equilibrium sorption of water, both by the localized binding in itself, and by plasticization effects. However, for diffusion the two factors are contradictory (Blahník 1983). Plasticization tends to facilitate diffusion, since rubbery polymers entail higher diffusion coefficients than glassy polymers. On the other hand, immobilization of water molecules at polar binding sites causes the diffusion coefficient to decrease for low water concentrations.

## 4 Coatings

### 4.1 Effects of pigments and fillers

#### Ideal pigmentation

Pigments are generally dense inorganic compounds, with little or no water solubility. Ideally, these pigments are non-hydrophilic, well dispersed, and uniformly distributed through the film, and there are no flocculates within the film. Furthermore, the pigments are strongly bound to the binder polymer, and as a result the interface will allow only minimal penetration. In such an ideal system, water can only permeate by circumnavigation of the pigment particles, increasing the effective path length for diffusion and therefore lowering the permeability (Hare 1997). This is a combined effect

including: <1> a correction of the diffusion coefficient  $D$  for increased path length; <2> a decrease of water solubility in the film resulting from an increasing volume fraction  $\varphi_p$  [ $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ ] of impermeable pigment (Blahník 1983). The first correction is expressed as:

$$D_s = KD_b \quad (15)$$

Here,  $D_s$  is the overall unidimensional diffusion coefficient in the coating, and  $D_b$  is the diffusion coefficient in the binder fraction. The correction factor  $K$  [-] in fact is a sort of 'tortuosity' and  $K = K(\varphi_p)$ . The effect of overall solubility in the film is described as:

$$S_s = (1 - \varphi_p)S_b \quad (16)$$

where  $S_s$  is the overall solubility in the coating;  $S_b$  is the solubility in the binder fraction. Using equation (7), consequently the relationship between permeability of coating ( $P_s$ ) and binder ( $P_b$ ) is given by:

$$P_s = K(1 - \varphi_p)P_b \quad (17)$$

According to Nielsen (1967), the dependence of  $K$  on  $\varphi_p$  can be estimated as:

$$K = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2}(l_p/w_p)\varphi_p} \quad (18)$$

where  $l_p/w_p$  is the ratio between the length and width of the pigment particles assuming ellipsoid particle shape ( $l_p/w_p = 1$  for a sphere). Basically, this equation assumes a random distribution of particle orientation. For a non-spherical geometry, the estimated and actual permeability may differ strongly if the particle orientation is not random. Especially platy pigments with large  $l_p/w_p$  ratio's may show a large decrease of permeability due to orientation of pigment particles parallel to the substrate.

Even for ideal pigmentation, the volume fraction of pigment  $\varphi_p$  cannot be increased unrestrictedly. Above the *CPVC* the binder is not able to wet the pigment particles completely, resulting in a porous coating. With increasing pigment volume concentrations above *CPVC*, the permeability rises steeply (Figure 9), corresponding with enhanced transport through the pores of the film. Therefore, the *CPVC* is observed to coincide with the minimum in permeability.




Fig. 9. Stylized picture of the water permeability ( $P$ ) as a function of the pigment volume concentration (PVC) for ideal pigmentation. The dotted line represents the critical PVC.

#### Non-ideal pigmentation

Many pigmented coatings do not show the ideal behaviour described above. Non-ideal behaviour includes hydrophilic and not fully dispersed pigments, including irregular distribution through the film and particle flocculation.

Due to hydrophilicity of pigment particles, pigments may be bound insufficiently to the binder, resulting in “vulnerable” interfaces. Water accumulation – i.e. water layer formation – around pigments causes expansion of the overall volume of pigment and adsorbed water. Within these interspaces liquid transport takes place, which is faster than diffusion through the binder matrix (Hare 1997). According to Michaels (1967) water permeation through the interfaces between pigment and binder is important for hydrophilic pigments, since these pigments facilitate water solubility in the film.

Pigment agglomeration, caused by incomplete dispersion or flocculation, affects water transport. Pigment particles in the agglomerates are not completely wetted, and may therefore contain empty volume, facilitating water transfer. Furthermore, circumnavigation is hindered less by agglomerates than by the individual pigment particles (Hare 1997).

In conclusion, pigmentation can significantly lower moisture transport in coatings. However, factors like incomplete dispersion, flocculation, and poor binding between pigment and polymer may diminish this effect substantially and may even lead to an overall rise in moisture transport compared to non-pigmented films.

#### 4.2 *Effects of additives*

Since most additives attract water, they increase both the solubility and equilibrium absorption of coatings. Despite general knowledge, little is really known in detail about their influence. Recently, Shay et al. (1996) found marked differences with respect to water absorption properties of different types of thickener. However, their research only covered pure thickeners, and not their effect on coating performance. Furthermore, most additives leach out of the coating during service because of their (slight) solubility in water. Consequently, the actual coating performance may vary in time, since the hygroscopicity decreases and empty volume in the film increases. Furthermore, more coating free space may also result from degradation of binder and additives.

Roulstone et al. (1992) studied effects of surfactants on the water vapour permeability of polybutyl methacrylate latex films. They found that the cationic surfactant dodecylethyldimethyl ammonium bromide (DEDAB) significantly increased water vapour permeability. This effect was attributed to incompatibility of the surfactant with the binder. On the other hand, small quantities of the more compatible anionic surfactant sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) were found to lower permeability due to formation of denser films.

## 5 Discussion and conclusions

The distinction between Fickian and non-Fickian effects is usually based on the appearance of kinetic curves, inherently including effects of boundary conditions and/or experimental circumstances. Such distinction does not take account of mechanistic aspects. Actually, any kinetic curve governed by Fick's law should be designated as Fickian by definition. In this respect, it is curious that the 'variable surface concentration' model of Long and Richman (1960) is treated as a model for non-Fickian effects, considering the determinative role of boundary conditions.

Samus and Rossi (1996) support this view towards Fickian behaviour, suggesting that geometrical constraints on swelling behaviour may cause anomalies in the overall kinetic curve, however still responding to Fick's law.

Transport of penetrant in a polymer is at least a function of both penetrant concentration and temperature. Essentially two views towards this complicated relationship are recognized. The concept of Hopfenberg and Frisch (1969) assumes concentration independent transport at very low temperatures, as well as at very low concentrations. On the other hand, the Deborah theory of Vrentas et al. (1975, 1977, 1997) introduces three zones in the temperature-concentration plane, each showing different transport features corresponding to Fickian or non-Fickian behaviour. It may be said that those concepts appear not compatible. The Deborah plot shows that, especially near the boundary lines characterized by the so-called threshold temperatures  $T_v$  and  $T_e$  respectively, a transition takes place from Fickian towards non-Fickian (or reversely), corresponding to a change in diffusion coefficient. As the Deborah theory deals with temperature effects on diffusion more soundly, application of this concept appears more realistic.

The concentration dependence of diffusion coefficients in polymers and coatings has never been fairly determined due to insufficient spatial resolution of measuring techniques. Determination of such relationship requires measuring of time-dependent penetrant concentration profiles in the thin polymer film or coating. Recently, the successful application of new techniques in the area of

moisture transport in porous materials has been demonstrated (Pel et al. 1996). However, the spatial resolution of those techniques still does not allow monitoring of profiles in polymer films and coatings.

In order to derive the dependence of the diffusion coefficient  $D$  on penetrant concentration, a functional relationship between these parameters is therefore assumed in advance. Even more generally, a constant (or concentration independent) diffusion coefficient is adopted, probably since it addresses the analytical solution of Crank (1975).

After entering the relationship in the model, the sorption curve can be calculated from the solution of the transport equation for given boundary conditions. Providing that the experimental conditions correspond to the boundary conditions in the model, the diffusion coefficient can be deduced from adjustment of the chosen relationship to obtain the best fit of calculations with measurements. A major drawback of this method is the assumption of the functional description of  $D$ . Actually, obtaining such a relationship is the main objective of the experiments.

No theoretical difference exists between absorption of water vapour and liquid water in polymers in case polymeric films and coatings are considered non-porous (Barrie 1968). Obviously, in such systems water cannot be connected to a state of liquid or vapour. In porous media, diffusion mechanisms are different for vapour and liquid water, but both are usually assimilated into one overall diffusion coefficient (Philip and The Vries 1957). Consequently, diffusion in coatings with pigment volumes above the CPVC, which are considered porous, should be mechanistically different from polymers and coatings below their CPVC.

It is questionable when polymeric films should be considered porous media. Polymeric films may contain a large amount of free space, especially rubbery polymers. However, such free volume is not generally related to pores. It is rather considered an enlargement of the volume in which a polymer segment statistically can be present because of an increase in temperature. Of course, the latter process is accompanied by swelling of the film.

The glass transition is critical in this respect, since in glassy polymers free volume can be 'frozen' in the polymer below  $T_g$ . In conclusion, however, a consistent definition of the glass transition is still lacking. To quote Bondi (1968): *'None of the attempts that have been made to define  $T_g$  in terms of free-volume theory or in terms of thermodynamic arguments or in terms of mechanical properties has been entirely successful. A general theory of glass transition may not be developed until its phenomenological definition has been clarified. Conversely, we may well find that the sharp rise in viscosity, characteristic of or even the cause of glass transition, cannot be tied consistently to any equilibrium argument. In that case, there will be no clear-cut definition and no general theory.'*

For equilibrium sorption, different models have been considered. Two basic types are recognized, localized sorption (adsorption) models and dissolution models. Originally, adsorption models have been developed to account for equilibrium surface adsorption at the walls of pores in porous materials. It is not clear beforehand that these models are also applicable to polymer films and coatings, since most polymeric materials are still considered non-porous. Furthermore, localized binding stemming from polar-polar interactions of water and hydrophilic groups in the polymer is mechanistically clearly distinct from classical adsorption, and may give rise to similar descriptions. Neither the traditional localized sorption model (BET) nor the traditional dissolution model (Flory-Huggins) describes sorption isotherms well over the entire range of activities. Numerous 'improve-



ments' to the theories have been proposed, introducing an increasing number of fitting parameters. It is obscure to what extent such curve fitting originates from mechanistic considerations. The same doubts can be cast on the kinetic models.

Pigments and fillers as well as additives may clearly affect diffusion kinetic parameters ( $D$ ,  $P$ ), as well as equilibrium parameters ( $S$ ,  $\phi$ ). Actually, the critical pigment concentration ( $CPVC$ ) is a transition point with respect to moisture transport.

Most additives seriously enlarge solubility and equilibrium absorption values of water in the coating, thereby increasing permeability. Furthermore, leaching of soluble additives may affect water permeation. Water-borne coatings are most prone to this, sometimes intensified by imperfect film formation due to the process of coalescence. These effects are, however, more qualitatively than quantitatively known.

In conclusion, a profound understanding of transport mechanisms in organic polymers and coatings is still missing. Firstly, the concentration dependence of diffusion in many polymer-penetrant systems is hardly understood, partly due to the lack of adequate measuring techniques. Secondly, free volume and porosity in polymers and coatings is still a subject of discussion. Therefore, future research should concentrate on development of suitable models, accompanied by improvement of experimental techniques.

## References

- ADAN, O.C.G., 1994, On the fungal defacement of interior finishes, Ph. D. Thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology.
- ADAN, O.C.G., 1995, Determination of moisture diffusivities in gypsum renders, *HERON*, Vol. 40, 201-215.
- ANDERSON, R.B., 1946, Modifications of the Brunauer, Emmett and Teller Equation, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, Vol. 68, 686-691.
- BALIK, C.M., 1996, On the extraction of diffusion coefficients from gravimetric data for sorption of small molecules by polymer thin films, *Macromolecules*, Vol. 29, 3025-3029.
- BARRIE, J.A., 1968, Water in polymers, *Diffusion in polymers* (Eds. Crank, J. and Park, G.S.), Academic Press, London, Ch. 8.
- BEAR, J., BACHMAT, Y., 1990, Introduction to modeling of transport phenomena in porous media, Vol. 4, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- BECK, M.I., TOMKA, I., 1997, Effects of the degree of substitution in ethyl cellulose on the clustering of sorbed water, *J. Macromol. Sci.-Phys.*, Vol. B36, 19-39.
- BERENS, A.R., HOPFENBERG, H.B., 1978, Diffusion and relaxation in glassy polymer powders: 2. Separation of diffusion and relaxation parameters, *Polymer*, Vol. 19, 489-496.
- BLAHNIK, R., 1983, Problems of measuring water sorption in organic coatings and films, and calculations of complicated instances of moistening, *Prog. Org. Coat.*, Vol. 11, 353-392.
- BOER, J.H. DE, 1968, *The Dynamical Character Of Adsorption*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- BONDI, A., 1968, *Physical properties of molecular crystals, liquids, and glasses*, Wiley, New York.

- BRUNAUER, S., DEMING, L.S., DEMING, W.E., TELLER, E., 1940, Theory of the Van der Waals Adsorption of gases, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, Vol. 62, 1723-1732.
- BRUNAUER, S., EMMETT, P.H., TELLER, E., 1938, Adsorption of gases in multimolecular layers, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, Vol. 60, 309-319.
- CALBO, L.J. (Ed.), 1987, *Handbook of coatings additives*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.
- CHALLA, G., 1993, *Polymer chemistry: an introduction*, Prentice Hall.
- CORTI, H., FERNANDEZ-PRINI, R., GÓMEZ, D., 1982, Protective organic coatings: membrane properties and performance, *Prog. Org. Coat.*, Vol. 10, 5-33.
- CRANK, J., 1953, A theoretical investigation of the influence of molecular relaxation and internal stress on diffusion in polymers, *J. Polym. Sci.*, Vol. 11, 151-168.
- CRANK, J., 1975, *The mathematics of diffusion*, Clarendon Press, London.
- CRANK, J., PARK, G.S., 1968, Methods of measurement, *Diffusion in polymers* (Eds. Crank, J., Park, G.S.), Academic Press, London, Ch. 1.
- DUDA, J.L., ZIELINSKI, J.M., 1996, Free-volume theory, *Diffusion in polymers* (Ed. Neogi, P.), Marcel Dekkers, Inc., New York, Ch. 3.
- FAVRE, E., CLÉMENT, R., NGUYEN, Q.T., SCHAETZEL, P., NÉEL, J., 1993, Sorption of organic solvents into dense silicone membranes. Part 2. Development of a new approach based on a clustering hypothesis for associated solvents, *J. Chem. Soc., Farad. Trans.*, Vol. 89, 4347-4353.
- FLORY, P.J., 1942, Thermodynamics of high polymer solutions, *J. Chem. Phys.*, Vol. 10, 51-61.
- FLORY, P.J., 1953, *Principles of Polymer Chemistry*, Cornell University Press, New York.
- GAUTHIER, C., GUYOT, A., PEREZ, J., SINDT, O., 1996, Film formation and mechanical behavior of polymer latices, *Film formation in waterborne coatings* (Eds. Provder, T., Winnik, M.A., Urban, M.W.), ACS Symposium Series, Washington DC, Ch. 10.
- GEE, G., 1946, The interaction between rubber and liquids. IX. The elastic behaviour of dry and swollen rubbers, *Trans. Faraday. Soc.*, Vol. 42, 585-598.
- GUGGENHEIM, E.A., 1966, *Applications of Statistical Mechanics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- HARE, C.H., 1997, Water permeability in pigmented films, *Journal of protective coatings & linings*, Vol. 14, Nr. 10, 77-94.
- HODGE, R.M., BASTOW, T.J., EDWARD, G.H., SIMON, G.P., HILL, A.J., 1996, Free volume and the mechanism of plasticization in water-swollen poly(vinyl alcohol), *Macromolecules*, Vol. 29, 8137-8143.
- HOPFENBERG, H.B., FRISCH, H.L., 1969, Transport of organic micromolecules in amorphous polymers, *J. Polym. Sci. B*, Vol. 7, 405-409.
- HUGGINS, M.L., 1942, Theory of solutions of high polymers, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, Vol. 64, 1712-1719.
- HULDÉN, M., HANSEN, C.M., 1985, Water permeation in coatings, *Prog. Org. Coat.*, Vol. 13, 171-194.
- JONQUIÈRES, A., FANE, A., 1998, Modified BET models for modeling water vapor sorption in hydrophilic glassy polymers and systems deviating strongly from ideality, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, Vol. 67, 1415-1430.
- KISHIMOTO, A., 1972, Diffusion of vapours in organic coatings, *Prog. Org. Coat.*, Vol. 1, 91-112.
- LONG, F.A., RICHMAN, D., 1960, Concentration gradients for diffusion of vapors in glassy polymers and their relation to time dependent diffusion phenomena, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, Vol. 82, 513-519.
- McLAREN, A.D., ROWEN, J.W., 1951, Sorption of water vapor by proteins and polymers: a review, *J. Polym. Sci.*, Vol. 7, 289-324.
- MICHAELS, A.S., 1967, *Official Digest*, June, 942.

- NAKAMURA, K., HATAKEYAMA, T., HATAKEYAMA, H., 1983, Relationship between hydrogen bonding and bound water in polyhydroxystyrene derivatives, *Polymer*, Vol. 24, 871-876.
- NEOGI, P. (ed.), 1996, *Diffusion in polymers*, Marcel Dekkers, Inc., New York.
- NGUYEN, X.Q., SÍPEK, M., NGUYEN, Q.T., HYNEK, V., 1996, Transport of water vapour and gases in modified cellulose acetate matrices. Influence of the nature of the penetrant on diffusion and relaxation kinetics, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, Vol. 197, 715-727.
- NIELSEN, L.E., 1967, Models for the permeability of filled polymer systems, *J. Macromol. Sci. (Chem.)*, Vol. A1, 929-942.
- PEL, L., BROCKEN, H., KOPINGA, K., 1996, Determination of moisture diffusivity in porous media using moisture concentration profiles, *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, Vol. 39, 1273-1280.
- PERKINS, P.H., 1997, *Repair, protection and waterproofing of concrete structures*, Third ed., E&FN Spon, London.
- PERRIN, L., NGUYEN, Q.T., SACCO, D., LOCHON, P., 1997, Experimental studies and modelling of sorption and diffusion of water and alcohols in cellulose acetate, *Polym. Int.*, Vol. 42, 9-16.
- PETERLIN, A., 1965, Diffusion in a network with discontinuous swelling, *J. Polym. Sci.*, Vol. B3, 1083-1087.
- PETROPOULOS, J.H., ROUSSIS, P.P., 1967, Study of "non-Fickian" diffusion anomalies through time lags. I. Some time-dependent anomalies, *J. Chem. Phys.*, Vol. 47, 1491-1496.
- PETROPOULOS, J.H., ROUSSIS, P.P., 1967, Study of "non-Fickian" diffusion anomalies through time lags. II. Simpler cases of distance- and time-distance-dependent anomalies, *J. Chem. Phys.*, Vol. 47, 1496-1500.
- PETROPOULOS, J.H., ROUSSIS, P.P., 1969, Anomalous diffusion of good and poor solvents or swelling agents in amorphous polymers, *J. Polym. Sci.: Part C*, Vol. 22, 917-926.
- PHILIP, J.R., VRIES, D.A. DE, 1957, Moisture movement in porous materials under temperature gradients, *Trans. Amer. Geophys. Union*, Vol. 38, 222-232.
- RICHARD, J., 1995, Structure-property relationships of latex films: a special emphasis on viscoelastic behavior and water vapor permeability, *Polymers for advanced technologies*, Vol. 6, 270-275.
- RICHARD, J., 1996, Dynamic viscoelastic properties of polymer latex films, *Film formation in waterborne coatings* (Eds. Provder, T., Winnik, M.A., Urban, M.W.), ACS Symposium Series, Washington DC, Ch. 8.
- ROULSTONE, B.J., WILKINSON, M.C., HEARN, 1992, Studies on polymer latex films: II. Effect of surfactants on the water vapour permeability of polymer latex films, *J. Polym. Int.*, Vol. 27, 43-50.
- SAMUS, M.A., ROSSI, G., 1996, Methanol absorption in ethylene-vinyl alcohol copolymers: relation between solvent diffusion and changes in glass transition temperature in glassy polymeric materials, *Macromolecules*, Vol. 29, 2275-2288.
- SHAY, G.D., OLESEN, K.R., STALLINGS, J.L., 1996, Predicting the water-sensitivity of film-forming coatings additives by water vapor sorption: with application to thickeners and rheology modifiers, *J. Coat. Tech.*, Vol. 68, 51-63.
- SUN, Y.-M., LEE, H.-L., 1996, Sorption/desorption properties of water vapour in poly (2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate): 2. Two-stage sorption models, *Polymer*, Vol. 37, 3921-3928.
- THOMAS, N.L., WINDLE, A.H., 1978, Case II swelling of PPMA sheet in methanol, *J. Membrane Sci.*, Vol. 3, 337-342.

- THOMAS, N.L., WINDLE, A.H., 1982, A theory of Case II diffusion, *Polymer*, Vol. 23, 529-542, and references cited herein..
- VIETH, W.R., 1991, *Diffusion in and through polymers: principles and applications*, Hanser Publishers, Munich Vienna New York Barcelona.
- VIETH, W.R., HOWELL, J.M., SHIEH, J.H., 1976, Dual sorption theory, *J. Membr. Sci.*, Vol. 1, 177-220.
- VISSCHERS, M., LAVEN, J., GERMAN, A.L., 1997, Current understanding of the deformation of latex particles during film formation, *Prog. Org. Coat.*, Vol. 30, 39-49.
- VRENTAS, J.S., DUDA, J.L., 1977, Diffusion in polymer solvent systems. III. construction of Deborah number diagrams, *J. Polym. Sci.: Polym. Phys. Ed.*, Vol. 15, 441-453.
- VRENTAS, J.S., DUDA, J.L., LING, H.-C., 1988, Antiplasticization and volumetric behavior in glassy polymers, *Macromolecules*, Vol. 21, 1470-1475.
- VRENTAS, J.S., JARZEBSKI, C.M., DUDA, J.L., 1975, A Deborah number for diffusion in polymer-solvent systems, *AIChE J.*, Vol. 21, 894-901.
- VRENTAS, J.S., VRENTAS, C.M., 1989, Volumetric behavior of glassy polymer-penetrant systems, *Macromolecules*, Vol. 22, 2264-2266.
- VRENTAS, J.S., VRENTAS, C.M., 1990, Predictions of volumetric behavior for glassy polymer-penetrant systems, *J. Polym. Sci., Polym. Phys.*, Vol. 28, 241-244.
- VRENTAS, J.S., VRENTAS, C.M., HUANG W.J., 1997, Anticipation of anomalous effects in differential sorption experiments, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, Vol. 64, 2007-2013.
- WEL, G.K. VAN DER, ADAN, O.C.G., BANCKEN, E.L.J., 1998, Towards an ecofriendlier control of fungal growth on coated plasters?, XXIV. FATIPEC Kongress, Volumen C, 15-26.
- WEL, G.K. VAN DER, ADAN, O.C.G., BANCKEN, E.L.J., 1999, Towards an ecofriendlier control of fungal growth on coated plasters?, *Prog. Org. Coat.*, Vol. 36, 173-177.
- WESTING, E.P.M. VAN, FERRARI, G.M., WIT, J.H.W. DE, 1994, The determination of coating performance with impedance measurements. II. Water uptake of coatings, *Corros. Sci.*, Vol. 36, 957-978.
- WILDE, W.P. DE, SHOPOV, P.J., 1994, A simple model for moisture sorption in epoxies with sigmoidal and two-stage sorption effects, *Composite Structures*, Vol. 27, 243-252.
- WINDLE, A.H., 1985, Case II sorption, *Polymer permeability* (Ed. J. Comyn), Elsevier Appl. Sci. Publ., London, Ch. 3.
- ZIMM, B.H., 1953, Simplified relation between thermodynamics and molecular distribution functions for a mixture, *J. Chem. Phys.*, Vol. 21, 934-935.
- ZIMM, B.H., LUNDBERG, J.L., 1956, Sorption of vapors by high polymers, *J. Phys. Chem.*, Vol. 60, 425-428.
- ZOSEL, A., 1995, Mechanical properties of films from polymer lattices, *Polymers for advanced technologies*, Vol. 6, 263-269.