

### Development and characterization of a conductive ink for In-Mold Electronics.

Thomas Guérin, Philippe Lombard, Tony Gerges, Murat Arli, Hayet Lakhar, Bruno Allard, J-y Charmeau, Guy Masse, Michel Cabrera

#### ► To cite this version:

Thomas Guérin, Philippe Lombard, Tony Gerges, Murat Arli, Hayet Lakhar, et al.. Development and characterization of a conductive ink for In-Mold Electronics.. LOPEC, Mar 2023, Munich (Allemagne), Germany. 2023. hal-04241549

#### HAL Id: hal-04241549 https://hal.science/hal-04241549

Submitted on 13 Oct 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Development and characterization of a conductive ink for In-Mold Electronics

**Thomas Guérin, Tony Gerges, Philippe Lombard,** Murat Arli, Hayet Lakhar, Bruno Allard, Jean-Yves Charmeau, Guy Masse, Michel Cabrera Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Ecole Centrale de Lyon INSA-Lyon, CNRS, Laboratoire Ampère, F-69622, Villeurbanne, France, Encres Dubuit, 77290, Mitry-Mory, France

## **Questions:**

 $\Rightarrow$  How to formulate a conductive ink for thermoforming process ?

 $\Rightarrow$  What is the effect of the binder in the characteristics of the ink?

# **Introduction and context**

In the context of the IME process, a conductive ink is formuled to be able to be printed, thermoformed and over-moulded, with a good electric conductivity.

Influence of the thermoforming process is tested with 7 inks with different binders and a commercial reference ink DuPont ME604.



(1) $\Rightarrow$ Aluminium tool, with 6 radius of curvature, R=5mm to R=30mm and a conical tail.



 $(2) \Rightarrow$  Simulation of the reduction of the polymer thickness with T-SIM software.(Polycarbonate substrate, initial polymer thickness 375µm, Covestro Makrolon<sup>®</sup>).



 $(3) \Rightarrow$  Thermoformed PC sheet with a grid printed on it (aluminium tool). Stretched areas are highlighted in red.

# 4-Results for different binders

## Methodology

 $\Rightarrow$ Inks are printed with 90.40 or 110.40 threads per cm, on PC substrate.  $\Rightarrow$  Resistance is mesured before and after thermoforming, on tracks.  $\Rightarrow$  Resistivity is calculated after curing (oven), before thermoforming. ⇒Resistivity after thermoforming is mesured on no-deformed tracks to exhibite the temperature influence of thermoforming.

 $\Rightarrow$  The printing pattern is designed with 3 tracks for each stage of curvature.

Measurements of resistance before and after thermoforming of inks with





# 1-Formulation of the inks with different binders

General formula :

 $\Rightarrow$  60% wd silver content (fixed).

 $\Rightarrow$  10%wd to 16%wd binder (variable amount to adapt the rheology).  $\Rightarrow$  24%wd to 30%wd cetone-type solvent (fixed, amount in function of binder). Mixing with planetary system (Hauschild Speedmixer DAC400).

# 2-Measurement of electrical resistivity

Calculation of resistivity :



where :  $\rho = resistivity (\mu \Omega. cm)$  $R = resistance (\Omega)$  $s = section (\mu m^2)$ L = length

 $\Rightarrow$  Determination of the track profile with a confocale probe.

 $\Rightarrow$  Measurement of the resistance R of a conductive track with a four point probes.

 $\Rightarrow$  Calculation of the conductive section (s), according to formula.

 $\Rightarrow$  Distance between internal probes is fixed (1.27mm) (L).

# 3-Thermoforming characterization





20				
Inks/ binders (%wd content)	Resistivity 2D before thermoforming in μΩ.cm (mΩ.sq.mil)	Resistivity 2D after thermoforming (no deformation) in μΩ.cm (mΩ.sq.mil)	Resistivity modification due to thermoforming (no deformation) based on μΩ.cm	Cracked tracks ratio
DuPont ME604	43 ± 2 (16)	34 ± 2 (13)	-21% ± 4%	9% ± 5%
Vinylic-type (16%)	65 ± 3 (26)	64 ± 5 (25)	-2% ± 8%	16% ± 1%
Polyurethane thermoplastic-type 1 (10%)	47 ± 4 (19)	45 ± 4 (18)	-3% ± 2%	14% ± 2%
Polyurethane thermoplastic-type 2 (6%)	48 ± 2 (19)	34 ± 3 (13)	-28% ± 6%	7% ± 12%
Acid vinylic-type (10%)	26 ± 2 (10)	27 ± 2 (11)	3% ± 2%	27% ± 2%
Epoxy-type (10%)	39 ± 3 (15)	40 ± 3 (16)	2% ± 2%	33% ±2%
Polyester type (10%)	53 ± 6 (21)	45 ± 6 (18)	-16% ± 2%	6% ± 2%
Polyurethane-type (10%)	65 ± 9 (26)	47 ± 9 (19)	-27% ± 2%	6% ± 2%

## Results interpretation :

 $\Rightarrow$  DuPont ME604 is used as a reference ink, with 34µΩ.cm after thermoforming.  $\Rightarrow$  Outliers data may be caused by manual screen printing.

⇒Before thermoforming, acid vinylic ink shows the best resistivity value with  $24\mu\Omega$ .cm but cracks easily.

 $\Rightarrow$  After thermoforming, TPU-type 2 is promissing with a conductivity of 34µΩ.cm which can be compared with DuPont ME604.

# **Conclusions & outlooks**

⇒Binders have differents behaviours before and after thermoforming. After printing and curing, differents values of resistivity are observed from  $26\mu\Omega$ .cm to  $65\mu\Omega.cm$ . On flat surface, the resistivity will decrease from 0% (TPU1) to 30% (TPU-type2 & DuPont ME604), depending on the nature of the binder. During 3D forming, all inks will be deformed and the electrical conductivity will gradually decrease, in function of the deformation, until crack.  $\Rightarrow$  TPU-type 2 ink formula will be investigated to improve performances. To complete the IME process, inks should be tested in over-moulding then tested in electrical resistivity.

