Aluminium oxide barrier films on polymeric web and their conversion for packaging applications

C.F. Struller [a,b,*], P.J. Kelly [a], N.J. Copeland [b], V. Tobin [c], H.E. Assender [c], C.W. Holliday [d], S.J. Read [d]

[a] Surface Engineering Group, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M1 5GD, UK
[b] Bobst Manchester Ltd., Pilsworth Road, Heywood, Lancashire OL10 2TL, UK
[c] Department of Materials, University of Oxford, Begbroke Science Park, Oxford OX5 1PF, UK
[d] Innovia Films Ltd., Lowther R&D Building, West Road, Wigton, Cumbria CA7 9XX, UK

ABSTRACT

In recent years, inorganic transparent barrier layers such as aluminium oxide or silicon oxide deposited onto polymer films have emerged as an attractive alternative to polymer based transparent barrier layers for flexible food packaging materials. For this application, barrier properties against water vapour and oxygen are critical. Aluminium oxide coatings can provide good barrier levels at thicknesses in the nanometre range, compared to several micrometres for polymer-based barrier layers. These ceramic barrier coatings are now being produced on a large scale using industrial high speed vacuum deposition techniques, here, reactive evaporation on a 'boat-type' roll-to-roll metalliser. For the thin barrier layer to be useful in its final packaging application, it needs to be protected. This can be either via lamination or via an additional topcoat. This study reports on acrylate topcoats, but also undercoats, on aluminium oxide coated biaxially oriented polypropylene films. The effect of the acrylate layer on barrier levels and surface topography and roughness was investigated. The acrylate was found to smooth the substrate surface and improve barrier properties. Furthermore, the activation energy for water vapour and oxygen permeation was determined in order to investigate barrier mechanisms. The oxide coated film was, additionally, converted via adhesive lamination, which also provided improvement in barrier levels.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Transparent barrier films have been attracting increasing interest in recent years. Applications range from moderate barrier levels required for food packaging to very high barrier levels for encapsulating electronic devices. With the transparent barrier flexible packaging market growing worldwide at a rate of 10 to 15% per year [1], the use of vacuum deposition techniques to produce transparent barrier layers such as aluminium oxide (AlO_x) or silicon oxide has become a favourable and powerful tool. For food packaging, this market is traditionally dominated by ethylene vinyl alcohol copolymer co-extruded barrier layer films and polyvinylidene chloride coated films [2]. However, vacuum-deposited barrier coatings only require a small fraction of the thickness of these barrier layers, i.e. their thickness is three orders of magnitude smaller, whilst still producing comparable barrier properties. The standard aluminium metallisation process, usually carried out in a roll-to-roll coater, can be modified by the injection of oxygen into the aluminium vapour in order to deposit a transparent aluminium oxide barrier layer; a process that has been developed over the last few decades [3–7]. The use of such large scale and high speed coating equipment can potentially provide vast economic and environmental benefits, which is of great importance for the cost sensitive food packaging market, where profit margins generally are small. Considering the low profit margins within the packaging market, the associated cost of the base substrate also plays an important role. On this point, biaxially oriented polypropylene (BOPP) base film still remains at a lower cost level than polyethylene terephthalate (PET) film, which causes it to be the material of choice regarding commodity clear barrier films. Nevertheless, whilst PET films coated with reactively evaporated AlO_x give reliable barrier properties against water vapour and oxygen, BOPP films have proven to be a more difficult substrate material. Here, the barrier levels strongly depend on the film surface characteristics and the resulting growth conditions for the AlO_x layer, as discussed in more detail in our earlier paper [7]. After coating with the thin barrier layer, there is, though, a further conversion step required in order to obtain the final packaging structure. This is either achieved by laminating the vacuum coated films (adhesive lamination, extrusion lamination) or via application of an additional polymer coating on top of the inorganic layer, both serving the purpose of protecting the thin barrier layer during its final packaging application. Hence, it is

* Corresponding author. Bobst Manchester Ltd, Pilsworth Road, Pennine Business Park, OL10 2TL Heywood, United Kingdom. Tel.: +44 1706 622 442; fax: +44 1706 622 772.
E-mail address: Carolin.Struller@bobst.com (C.F. Struller).

essential that barrier loss upon conversion due to damage of the coating is avoided. In the course of this investigation, the effects of adhesive lamination as well as acrylate coatings on AlO_x coated polymer film were examined.

2. Experimental details

2.1. Substrate material, coating and conversion processes

The film used in this study was a 20 μm thick three layer coextruded biaxially oriented polypropylene film with a homopolymer core and either a co- or terpolymer skin layer on each side. The film was also corona treated in-house by the film manufacturer. The corona treated side was coated with a 10 nm thin AlO_x layer via reactive thermal evaporation on an industrial roll-to-roll metalliser using a Bobst Manchester (formerly General Vacuum Equipment) General K4000 vacuum metalliser. This vacuum coater has a source consisting of resistively heated evaporation boats, onto which aluminium wire is continuously fed. Oxygen is introduced into the aluminium vapour cloud to produce a transparent aluminium oxide coating and an optical monitoring beam and closed loop control system are used to achieve consistent optical properties of the coated film across the web width and length. The pressure during aluminium oxide deposition is of the order of 0.05 Pa. AlO_x layers were deposited onto rolls of film (for acrylate topcoats and lamination) and A4 samples mounted onto a carrier web (for acrylate undercoats). In the development work carried out, all coated film samples exhibit a transparency between 90 and 92% visible light transmission, which is approximately equivalent to the light transmission of the uncoated BOPP substrate used. The transparency level is also maintained during the subsequent conversion processes of acrylate topcoating and lamination.

The acrylate deposition was achieved via flash evaporation of a monomer liquid in vacuum. These monomers condense as a liquid film on the substrate surface and are subsequently cured using electron beam radiation (with a current of 400 mA) to obtain a cross-linked layer. Acrylate deposition was carried out on a system licensed by Sigma Technologies International Inc. (USA). Tripropylene glycol diacrylate was chosen as a monomer and an acrylate thickness of 0.75 μm was deposited. Acrylate layers were coated onto A4 samples as undercoats and topcoats prior and after AlO_x deposition as an off-line process.

Lamination of the AlO_x coated film was performed on an industrial laminator (Bobst Rotomec CL850) via solvent-based adhesive lamination. A high performance two component polyurethane adhesive was used and the AlO_x coated BOPP was laminated against another plain 20 μm BOPP film.

2.2. Analytical methods

Oxygen and water vapour transmission rates (OTR/WVTR) were determined in compliance with ASTM F 1927 and ASTM F 1249/ISO 15106-3 using a Mocon Oxtran 2/20 and Systech Illinois 8001 for oxygen permeation and a Mocon Permatran-W 3/33 and Systech Illinois 7001 for water vapour permeation. Test conditions for OTR were 23 °C and 50% relative humidity (RH), whilst WVTR is stated for 37.8 °C and a gradient of 90% RH. During WVTR measurement of coated samples, the coated side was always facing the 0% RH. For the determination of the apparent activation energy of oxygen/moisture permeation, barrier measurements were carried out at 4 different temperatures (20 °C, 30 °C, 40 °C in addition to the respective temperature for a standard measurement).

A Veeco DI CP II atomic force microscope (AFM) in tapping mode was used to acquire roughness data and topography images. All images were corrected by first order line-wise levelling. Root mean square (RMS) values were calculated from 5×5 μm² size scans.

Table 1
Barrier performance of AlO_x coated BOPP in combination with acrylate top- and undercoats.

Description	OTR	WVTR
	cm³/(m² d)	g/(m² d)
BOPP (uncoated)	≈2100	6–7
BOPP + Acrylate undercoat	1675.50 ± 129.40	6.59 ± 0.08
BOPP + Acrylate undercoat + AlO_x	15.83 ± 1.94	1.93 ± 0.21
BOPP + AlO_x	26.68 ± 3.07	4.73 ± 0.07
BOPP + AlO_x + Acrylate topcoat	13.65 ± 0.49	0.46 ± 0.07

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Acrylate coated films

3.1.1. Barrier performance

The barrier performance of AlO_x coated BOPP with and without the application of acrylate top- and undercoats is summarised in Table 1. Additionally, the barrier properties of the plain BOPP film and the acrylate coated BOPP film prior to AlO_x deposition are listed. As can be seen, the OTR of the plain film can be significantly reduced by the application of the inorganic AlO_x layer. Nevertheless, the improvement of WVTR is only marginal. These differences have been attributed to the film surface properties affecting coating nucleation and growth and thus the final structure of the thin AlO_x barrier layer [7,8]. Furthermore, the use of an acrylate undercoat prior to AlO_x deposition can additionally enhance the oxygen as well as water vapour barrier, though the acrylate on its own only slightly improves the plain film OTR and leaves the WVTR unchanged. This has also been reported by other research groups for AlO_x layers on polypropylene [9] and polyethylene terephthalate [10–13] and is assigned to a variety of changes the acrylate confers to the polymer film. Acrylate layers have the capability to smoothen the substrate surface, eliminate surface features and thus decouple its defects from the subsequently deposited inorganic barrier layer [10,12–15]. Furthermore, the barrier properties of the acrylate itself, which has a better oxygen barrier than BOPP [16], play a role, as these can affect and reduce the concentration gradient of the permeating substances in the polymer layer adjacent to the defects in the inorganic barrier layer [17,18]. Finally, the acrylate represents a change of surface chemistry, which may offer more nucleation sites to the depositing inorganic coating thus resulting in a denser coating structure [9,12]. The improvement seen when applying an acrylate topcoat, especially the significant enhancement of WVTR to less than 1 g/(m² d), could be attributed to the protection of the barrier layer by the topcoat from damage during winding and handling, which is generally argued to be the reason for the barrier improvement [9,10]. However, it is possible that infiltration of the acrylate into the defects of the AlO_x layer ('pore-filling') could lead to a reduction of the permeation coefficient within the defects from that of air to that of the acrylate [19]. A reduction in permeation has previously been reported for a post-winding laminated barrier film [20], and, more recently, a post-production chemical vapour deposition layer has also been reported to fill defects [21]. In our case, the samples were rewound in vacuum after AlO_x deposition as well as being handled prior to depositing the topcoat. Subsequently, an acrylate coat was applied. So in our experiments, we were able to test whether the acrylate topcoat gave an inherent improvement in barrier due to pore-filling, rather than acting as a protection layer during winding and handling. Once again, the barrier properties of the acrylate should be mentioned here. Acrylate has a better oxygen barrier than BOPP, nevertheless, it does not enhance the moisture barrier of BOPP (see Table 1), i.e. its water vapour barrier is inferior. Hence, we conclude that to some degree the oxygen barrier improvement seen by the application of the topcoat may also be caused by the better oxygen barrier of the acrylate (and therefore the resulting lower concentration gradient in the direct vicinity of defects). For the water vapour barrier improvement seen, we assume, though, that the pore-filling plays a major role.