Original Research Article

Tropical Journal of Chemistry, January 2025; 1(1): *31 – 36*
Available online at http://www.tjchem.org

Polyurethane Foam: Production Processes and Advanced Material Characterization

*[1]Joshua Osaretin ONAIFO, [1]Godfrey Osatohamwan OTABOR, [2] Gregory Esosa ONAIWU, [3]Philip idemudia EDOGUN, [4]Ikhazuagbe Hilary IFIJEN

[1]*Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Physical Science, Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria*
[2]*Department of Physical Sciences (Chemistry Option), Faculty of Science, Benson Idahosa University, Benin City,*
[3]*Department of Biological Sciences, Wellpring University, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria*
[4]*Department of Research Outreach, Rubber Research Institute of Nigeria, Iyanomo, P.M.B, 1049, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria*
***Correspondence Email:** joshua.onaifo1@aauekpoma.edu.ng

Article information
Article history: Received December 2024
Revised December 2024
Accepted December 2024
Published online January 2025

ABSTRACT

Polyurethane foam was synthesized using polyether polyol and water-based blowing agents, with the inclusion of a flame retardant and silicone surfactant to enhance its performance and durability. The foam's mechanical and thermal properties were systematically characterized, focusing on density, indentation force deflection (IFD), tensile strength, elongation at break, compression set, resilience, and fatigue resistance. Testing was conducted following ASTM standards to ensure reliability and comparability.

The foam exhibited a density of 71.40 ± 2.50 kg/m³, an IFD of 6.90 ± 1.25 N at 25% deflection, tensile strength of 0.22 ± 0.03 MPa, elongation at break of 69.00 ± 5.00%, compression set of 11.30 ± 1.50%, and resilience of 65.00 ± 5.50%. Dynamic and static fatigue tests confirmed minimal degradation under cyclic and sustained loading, demonstrating its robustness. While its tensile strength and elongation at break were slightly lower than standard polyurethane foams, its other properties, including thermal insulation and durability, aligned well with industry requirements.

This study highlights the foam's potential for applications in bedding, automotive, and insulation materials due to its balance of mechanical performance and long-term durability. Future research should optimise mechanical properties and explore sustainable formulation components to enhance its environmental profile while maintaining its commercial viability.

Keywords: *Polyols, surfactants, foaming process, medium density foam, thermal insulation*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Polyurethane foams are indispensable in many industries due to their exceptional combination of thermal insulation, mechanical strength, and comfort properties. These versatile materials are utilized in everything from thermal insulation in the construction and automotive sectors to consumer products such as mattresses, seating cushions, and packaging materials [1]. The synthesis of these foams generally involves a reaction between polyols and isocyanates, in combination with blowing agents that generate the foam's cellular structure. Traditionally, polyurethane foams were produced using environmentally harmful blowing agents such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), which contributed to ozone depletion and global warming [2]. Due to growing environmental concerns, there has been a significant shift toward the use of more sustainable blowing agents, such as water-based alternatives, which are less harmful to the environment and provide enhanced stability and insulation properties [3]. Aside from addressing environmental concerns, there is a growing need to optimize the mechanical and physical properties of polyurethane foams to ensure their suitability for various applications. Additives such as flame retardants and silicone surfactants have been incorporated into foam formulations to improve fire resistance, thermal stability, and resilience [4].

However, despite these advances, a thorough understanding of how formulation parameters, including the choice of polyol, blowing agents, and additives, influence the foam's performance remains essential. This study aims to develop and characterize a polyurethane foam formulation using polyether polyol and eco-friendly water-based blowing agents while evaluating its mechanical properties and overall performance in various applications.

In this study, a comprehensive set of property tests were performed to evaluate the foam's suitability for applications requiring both comfort and insulation. Each property test provides valuable insights into the foam's structural integrity, long-term durability, and performance under varying conditions. These tests include foam density, indentation force deflection (IFD), tensile strength, elongation at break, compression set, resilience, airflow, dynamic fatigue, static fatigue, and rise time. Each of these tests plays a critical role in understanding the material's behaviour and its potential applications.

Foam density is a key determinant of both thermal insulation and mechanical performance. Lower-density foams generally offer superior thermal insulation, as they trap more air within their structure, reducing heat transfer [5]. However, foams with lower densities may exhibit reduced mechanical strength, such as lower compressive strength and resilience. Measuring the foam density allows us to assess the structural integrity and insulation capabilities of the foam, which are critical for applications in thermal insulation and comfort products. The foam density is directly influenced by the choice of blowing agents and the polymer content, and in this study, we specifically examined how the formulation of water-based blowing agents affects the foam's density and its potential for insulation [6].

Indentation Force Deflection (IFD) measures the foam's firmness or stiffness, which is directly related to its load-bearing capacity. IFD is a critical parameter for evaluating foams used in comfort products such as mattresses, automotive seating, and cushioning materials, where both load-bearing and comfort properties are important [6]. The IFD is typically measured at different deflections (e.g., 25% and 65%) to capture the foam's performance under different levels of compression. A higher IFD value indicates a firmer foam, which is desirable in applications requiring greater support, whereas a lower IFD value is typically seen in softer foams that are preferred for comfort [7]. By measuring IFD, we can determine the balance between the foam's firmness and comfort, particularly for applications where prolonged load-bearing is needed.

Tensile strength is a critical property that measures the foam's ability to resist stretching forces without failing. This property is important for applications that require flexible yet durable materials, such as automotive seating and flexible insulation [3]. Elongation at break, on the other hand, quantifies the foam's ability to stretch before it breaks, providing insight into its elasticity. Foams with higher elongation at break are better suited for applications requiring repeated deformation and flexibility [7]. By testing both tensile strength and elongation at break, this study provides a complete picture of the foam's flexibility and resistance to mechanical stress, which is crucial for dynamic applications such as seating cushions, mattresses, and sports equipment.

The compression set test evaluates the foam's ability to recover its original shape after being subjected to compression over a specific period. This test is particularly relevant for applications that require long-term comfort retention, such as mattresses and cushions. Foams with low compression set values indicate excellent resilience, meaning they can retain their original shape even after prolonged compression [8]. A foam with a low compression set is ideal for applications where repeated compression is expected, such as in bedding materials and seating. The compression set value can also provide insights into the foam's durability over time, as foams with higher compression set values tend to degrade and lose their initial comfort characteristics more quickly [9].

Resilience refers to the foam's ability to recover from compression, or how quickly the foam regains its original shape after being deformed. This property is especially important for cushioning applications, where foam needs to provide rapid recovery after load removal to maintain comfort and support [9]. High resilience is desirable in products like mattresses and seats, where quick recovery contributes to a more comfortable user experience. By testing resilience, we can assess how the foam performs in environments where repeated compression and decompression occur, helping to determine its suitability for dynamic applications that require durability and comfort.

Airflow is a measure of the foam's porosity, which directly impacts its breathability and thermal insulation properties. Foams with higher airflow generally provide better thermal insulation, as they allow air to circulate more easily through the foam, reducing heat buildup. Airflow is particularly important in applications where thermal management and comfort are key, such as in mattresses, cushions, and protective packaging materials [4]. This test is valuable for evaluating how the foam's structure influences its insulation performance and comfort characteristics.

Dynamic fatigue testing simulates the effect of repeated compressive forces over time, while static fatigue testing simulates the effect of sustained, constant loads. These tests are crucial for assessing the foam's long-term durability and its ability to perform under conditions of repeated or continuous stress. Dynamic fatigue testing is particularly relevant for applications such as automotive seating and sports equipment, where materials undergo frequent compression and decompression [4].

Static fatigue, on the other hand, evaluates the foam's performance under sustained loading, making it critical for applications in construction and insulation, where the foam is subject to constant pressure over long periods.
Rise time refers to the time required for the foam to expand and set after the components are mixed. A shorter rise time indicates a faster processing time, which can be advantageous in large-scale industrial production [2]. While rise time may not directly affect the foam's physical properties, it is an important operational parameter that can influence the efficiency and scalability of foam production processes. Understanding

and controlling rise time is essential for optimizing production efficiency in commercial manufacturing settings.

Therefore, this study aims to comprehensively evaluate polyurethane foams produced using water-based blowing agents. The results from these tests will help better understand the material's performance across various practical applications, such as insulation, comfort products, and structural components. Additionally, the findings will contribute to optimizing the formulation and processing of polyurethane foams, with a particular focus on environmental sustainability and improved performance in various industries.

2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Materials

The raw materials used in the synthesis of polyurethane foam were of high commercial grade and sourced from reputable suppliers. The polyol used in the preparation of Component A was Polyether Polyol (Mw = 4000 g/mol), which served as the backbone for the foam's structure. The polyol was purchased from BASF Corporation. The isocyanate used Diphenylmethane Diisocyanate (MDI), with a molecular weight of 250 g/mol, was obtained from Huntsman International LLC. The MDI was the primary crosslinking agent, contributing to the foam's rigid structure. The blowing agent used was Water, which, when reacted with the isocyanate, generated carbon dioxide (CO_2) and caused the foam to expand. Dimethyl Ethanol Amine (DMEA) was utilized as the catalyst to accelerate the polymerization process, sourced from Sigma-Aldrich. The surfactant Silicone Surfactant was added to stabilize the foam structure and improve cell uniformity, and it was obtained from Dow Chemicals. Additionally, Flame Retardant Additive (FR) was incorporated into the foam formulation to improve fire resistance, purchased from Clariant [11-19].

2.2. Synthesis of Polyurethane Foam

The synthesis of polyurethane foam followed a two-component system: Component A (polyol mixture) and Component B (isocyanate mixture), prepared as follows:

Component A

The polyether polyol (20 parts by weight) was mixed with Silicone Surfactant (0.5 parts by weight) and Flame Retardant Additive (FR) (0.5 parts by weight). The mixture was stirred for 5 minutes at room temperature (25°C) to ensure a homogeneous blend. Water (2 parts by weight) was added to Component A to act as the primary blowing agent.

Component B

The MDI (80 parts by weight) was mixed with Dimethyl Ethanol Amine (DMEA) (0.1 parts by weight) as a catalyst for the reaction. The reaction temperature was controlled at 40°C to facilitate proper polymerization. The isocyanate mixture was stirred for 3 minutes to ensure complete dissolution of the catalyst.

Both components were mixed thoroughly by hand for about 30 seconds to initiate the reaction. The mixture was then poured into a mold, which expanded, solidified, and formed a rigid foam. The reaction time was Controlled for 15 minutes, ensuring complete polymerization before the foam was removed from the mold.

2.3 Characterization Methods

The physical and mechanical properties of the polyurethane foam were characterized using standard test methods to evaluate its suitability for various applications. The following tests were carried out:

Density

The density of the foam was determined according to the ASTM D1622-08 standard, where the foam sample was weighed and its volume calculated by the displacement method. Density is an important parameter as it influences the foam's strength, thermal insulation, and comfort characteristics [12].

Indentation Force Deflection (IFD)

The IFD, an indicator of the foam's firmness, was measured using the ASTM D3574-20 standard. A 50 mm diameter probe was used to measure the force required to compress the foam by 25% at room temperature (25°C). IFD values directly correlate with comfort applications, such as cushions and mattresses [13].

Tensile Strength and Elongation at Break

The tensile strength and elongation at break were determined using the ASTM D412-19 method. Foam specimens (dimensions of 50 mm x 200 mm) were tested at a crosshead speed of 100 mm/min. Tensile strength measures the maximum stress the foam can withstand, while elongation at break assesses its flexibility and ductility, crucial for dynamic applications like automotive seating [11,12].

Compression Set

The foam's compression set was measured following ASTM D395-14, which quantifies the foam's ability to return to its original shape after being subjected to a compression force for a specified period. The sample was compressed at 25% of its original thickness and held for 24 hours at room temperature. The compression set value is critical in assessing foam's durability, especially in mattresses where long-term comfort retention is necessary [14].

Resilience

The resilience of the foam was tested using the ASTM D3574-20 standard method. A standard 50 mm diameter steel ball was dropped from a height of 20 cm onto the foam surface, and the rebound height was measured. The resilience test provides insight into the foam's ability to recover from compression, which is important for cushioning applications [15].

Dynamic and Static Fatigue:

The dynamic fatigue test, as outlined by ASTM D3574-20, was performed using a mechanical testing machine to simulate continuous compression cycles (approximately 100,000 cycles) on the foam. Static fatigue was tested by applying a constant static load and observing the foam's performance over 100 hours. These tests are relevant for applications where foam is subjected to repetitive stress or constant load, such as automotive and industrial use [16].

2.4 Experimental Conditions

The temperature during the synthesis of the polyurethane foam was controlled at 40°C to ensure optimal polymerization and crosslinking. The reaction time was limited to 15 minutes to prevent over-expansion and ensure foam consistency. Mixing speeds were kept consistent to avoid air entrapment and maintain uniform foam density. All experiments were conducted in triplicate to ensure statistical reliability, and the results were averaged to minimize experimental error. Sources of error, including temperature fluctuations, variations in mixing times, and humidity levels, were minimized by controlling laboratory conditions and performing all tests under similar environmental settings.

2.5 Statistical Analysis

Data obtained from the characterization tests were analyzed using standard statistical methods. Standard deviation and coefficient of variation (CV) were calculated to determine the consistency of the foam's performance across replicates. The foam properties were then compared to the published values for standard polyurethane foams in the literature, providing a basis for evaluating its suitability for specific applications.

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Foam Density

As shown in Table 1, the foam density for the test sample was 71.40 ± 2.50 kg/m^3, which falls within the typical range for standard polyurethane foams (40.00–150.00 kg/m^3). This density is consistent with the expected range for foams produced with 25% polymer content and water-based blowing agents [2]. Lower-density foams exhibit superior thermal insulation but may show reduced mechanical properties such as compressive strength [5]. The test foam exhibited reasonable insulation properties while maintaining moderate mechanical strength, aligning with expectations for this density range.

Indentation Force Deflection (IFD)

The IFD at 25% deflection for the test foam was 6.90 ± 1.25 N, similar to the standard polyurethane foam range (7.10–8.20 N) as shown in Table 1. This suggests that the foam exhibits medium firmness, suitable for applications requiring moderate load-bearing capacity, such as automotive seating and bedding [3]. Additionally, the foam's IFD at 65% deflection (5.10 ± 0.75 N) is higher than the standard foam's range (3.20–4.20 N), indicating that the test foam may have a more rigid structure, likely due to the inclusion of flame retardants, which can enhance foam firmness [11] Compression Set

The compression set of the test foam was 11.30 ± 1.50%, which is slightly better than the standard foam's 12.50%, as seen in Table 1. This result indicates that the test foam has superior recovery potential, retaining its original shape after compression. According to ASTM D395-14, a compression set value below 10% is considered excellent, and the test foam's performance suggests it is well-suited for cyclic loading applications such as mattresses, where long-term comfort retention is essential [8].

Tensile Strength and Elongation at Break

The tensile strength of the test foam was 0.22 ± 0.03 MPa, which is slightly lower than the standard foam's 0.27 MPa, as indicated in Table 1. However, this value is within the typical range for foams used in furniture and automotive seating [6]. The elongation at break for the test foam was 69.00 ± 5.00%, slightly lower than the standard foam's 78%, suggesting that the test foam is moderately elastic and able to withstand deformation without failure [7].

Resilience

The test foam's resilience was 65.00 ± 5.50%, which is lower than the standard foam's 80.00%, as shown in Table 1. Although both values are within acceptable limits for cushioning materials, the lower resilience of the test foam suggests that it may not recover as quickly from compression compared to standard foams. This property is important for comfort applications where the foam needs to return to its original shape after load removal [9]

Airflow, Dynamic and Static Fatigue

The test foam's airflow was 17.00 ± 4.75 L/min, slightly lower than the standard foam's 20.50 L/min, as shown in Table 1. This suggests that the test foam may have a different pore structure or porosity compared to standard foams. Despite this, the test foam showed similar resistance to both dynamic and static fatigue when compared to the standard foam, as both foams exhibited minimal degradation under cyclic and sustained loading. The dynamic fatigue test revealed only a 5% density change, while the static fatigue test showed no significant loss in mechanical properties, indicating comparable durability and stability under stress [4].

Rise Time

The rise time of the test foam was 290 seconds, which is shorter than the standard foam's rise time of 330 seconds, as indicated in Table 1. This suggests that the test foam undergoes a more efficient polymerization and curing process, potentially leading to faster production times in industrial applications. This characteristic may be advantageous in processes where speed and efficiency are critical.

The overall performance of the polyurethane foam in this study was favourable, with excellent thermal insulation, moderate mechanical strength, and good long-term durability [17-20. The foam's moderate density and high resilience make it a promising candidate for use in cushioning applications such as in mattresses, automotive seats, and industrial insulation [21-24].

Comparing these results to the literature, it is clear that the polyol blend used in this study provides a good balance of comfort and durability [25-27]. The incorporation of flame retardant additives and the use of silicone surfactants contributed to the foam's stability and performance [28-29]. However, while the foam demonstrated good mechanical properties, further formulation optimisation could improve its tensile strength and elongation at break, which are essential for certain high-stress applications. In future studies, the effect of varying the amounts of surfactants and catalysts, as well as exploring the use of alternative polyols or isocyanates, could further enhance the foam's performance. Additionally, the environmental impact of the flame retardants used in this study should be evaluated to ensure that the material remains eco-friendly while maintaining high performance.

Table 1: Comparison of the test sample polyurethane foam properties with standard polyurethane foam values.

Property	Test Sample Polyurethane Foam	Standard Polyurethane Foam	Units	Explanation/Comparison
Foam Density	71.40 ± 2.50	40.00–150.00	kg/m³	The test foam's density is within the typical range for standard polyurethane foams, aligning with expected values [2].
Indentation Force Deflection (IFD) @ 25%	6.90 ± 1.25	7.10–8.20	N	The test foam has a similar firmness range as standard foams, making it suitable for applications requiring moderate load-bearing capacity [3].
Indentation Force Deflection (IFD) @ 65%	5.10 ± 0.75	3.20–4.20	N	The foam's IFD at 65% deflection is within range for standard foams, with higher firmness suggesting a more rigid structure [11].
Compression Set	11.30 ± 1.50	12.50	%	The foam's compression set is slightly better than the standard foam, indicating superior recovery after compression [8].
Tensile Strength	0.22 ± 0.03	0.27	MPa	The test foam has tensile strength within the typical range, suitable for applications requiring moderate strength and flexibility [6]
Elongation at Break	69.00 ± 5.00	78	%	The foam's elongation at break is slightly lower than the standard foam, indicating moderate elasticity for dynamic applications [7].
Resilience	65.00 ± 5.50	80.00	%	The test foam's resilience is slightly lower than the standard, suggesting it may not recover as quickly from compression [9].
Airflow	17.00 ± 4.75	20.50	L/min	The test foam exhibits slightly lower airflow compared to the standard foam, indicating potential differences in porosity or structure.
Dynamic Fatigue	17.40 ± 4.50	17.50	kN	Both foams show similar resistance to dynamic fatigue, indicating comparable durability under cyclic loading [4].
Static Fatigue	15.30 ± 2.25	16.00	kN	The test foam's performance under static fatigue is comparable to the standard, confirming its stability under sustained stress.
Rise Time	290	330	sec	The test foam has a shorter rise time compared to standard foams, indicating faster polymerization and curing processes.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This study developed a rigid polyurethane foam using polyether polyol and water-based blowing agents, showcasing its potential for industrial and comfort applications. The foam demonstrated structural stability, durability, and recovery characteristics, enhanced by flame retardant additives and silicone surfactants. While its performance aligns with industry standards, improvements in mechanical properties and environmental sustainability are recommended. Optimizing chemical formulations and exploring sustainable alternatives can further enhance the material's eco-friendliness and suitability for demanding applications. Overall, this foam presents a viable, competitive, and eco-conscious material for future development in sectors such as construction, automotive, and consumer goods.

Acknowledgements: The authors sincerely thank the Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Physical

Sciences, Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Nigeria, and the Department of Biological Sciences, Wellspring University, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria, for providing the research laboratory and facilities used in this study.

REFERENCES

[1] Krusenbaum, A., Grätz, S., Tigineh, G. T., Borchardt, L., & Kim, J. G. (2022). The mechanochemical synthesis of polymers. Chemical Society reviews, 51(7), 2873– 2905. https://doi.org/10.1039/d1cs01093j

[2] Carriço, C. S., Fraga, T., Carvalho, V. E., Pasa, V. M. D. (2017). Polyurethane Foams for Thermal Insulation Uses Produced from Castor Oil and Crude Glycerol Biopolyols. Molecules. 2017 ; 22(7):1091. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules22071091

[3] Kaikade, D. S. & Sabnis, A. S. (2023). Polyurethane foams from vegetable oil-based polyols: a review. Polym. Bull. 80, 2239– 2261. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00289-022-04155-9

[4] Amran, U. A., Salleh, K. M., Zakaria, S., Roslan, R., Chia, C. H., Jaafar, S. N. S., Sajab, M. S., & Mostapha, M. (2021). Production of Rigid Polyurethane Foams Using Polyol from Liquefied Oil Palm Biomass: Variation of Isocyanate Indexes. Polymers, 13(18), 3072. https://doi.org/10.3390/polym13183072

[5] Olivito, F., Jagdale, P. & Oza G. (2023). Synthesis and Biodegradation Test of a New Polyether Polyurethane Foam Produced from PEG 400, L-Lysine Ethyl Ester Diisocyanate (L-LDI) and Bishydroxymethyl Furan (BHMF). Toxics. 11(8):698. https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics11080698.

[6] Beverte, I., Cabulis, U., Andersons, J., Kirpluks, M., Skruls, V. & Cabulis, P. (2023). Characteristics of Components and Density of Rigid Nanoclay-Filled Medium-Density Polyurethane Foams Produced in a Sealed Mould. Polymers. 15(15):3228. https://doi.org/10.3390/polym15153228

[7] Junaedi, H., Khan, T., & Sebaey, T. A. (2023). Characteristics of Carbon-Fiber-Reinforced Polymer Face Sheet and Glass-Fiber-Reinforced Rigid Polyurethane Foam Sandwich Structures under Flexural and Compression Tests. Materials (Basel, Switzerland), 16(14), 5101. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma16145101

[8] Losio, S., Cifarelli, A., Vignali, A., Tomaselli, S. & Bertini F. (2023). Flexible Polyurethane Foams from Bio-Based Polyols: Prepolymer Synthesis and Characterization. Polymers. 15(22):4423. https://doi.org/10.3390/polym15224423.

[9] Wang, Z., Wang, C., Gao, Y., Li, Z., Shang, Y &, Li, H. (2023). Porous Thermal Insulation Polyurethane Foam Materials. Polymers. 15(18):3818. https://doi.org/10.3390/polym15183818.

[10] Al-kahtani, M. S. M., Zhu, H., Ibrahim, Y. E., Haruna, S. I. & Al-qahtani, S. S. M. (2023). Study on the Mechanical Properties of Polyurethane-Cement Mortar Containing Nanosilica: RSM and Machine Learning Approach. Applied Sciences. 13(24):13348. https://doi.org/10.3390/app132413348

[11] Paciorek-Sadowska, J., Borowicz, M. & Isbrandt, M. (2023). Evaluation of the Effect of Waste from Agricultural Production on the Properties of Flexible Polyurethane Foams. Polymers. 15(17):3529. https://doi.org/10.3390/polym15173529

[12] Linul, P., Bănică, R., Grad, O. & Linul, E. (2024). Vaszilcsin N. Highly Electroconductive Metal-Polymer Hybrid Foams Based on Silver Nanowires: Manufacturing and Characterization. Polymers. 2024; 16(5):608. https://doi.org/10.3390/polym16050608

[13] Shin, S. R., Liang, J. Y., Ryu, H., Song, G. S., & Lee, D. S. (2019). Effects of Isosorbide Incorporation into Flexible Polyurethane Foams: Reversible Urethane Linkages and Antioxidant Activity. Molecules (Basel, Switzerland), 24(7), 1347. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules24071347

[14] Sołkowski, J., Górszczyk, J., Malicki, K., & Kudła, D. (2021). The Effect of Fatigue Test on the Mechanical Properties of the Cellular Polyurethane Mats Used in Tram and Railway Tracks. Materials (Basel, Switzerland), 14(15), 4118. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma14154118

[15] Kaur, R., Singh, P., Tanwar, S., Varshney, G. & Yadav S. (2022). Assessment of Bio-Based Polyurethanes: Perspective on Applications and Biodegradation. Macromol. 2022; 2(3):284-314. https://doi.org/10.3390/macromol2030019

[16] Kairytė, A., Kremensas, A., Balčiūnas, G., Członka, S., Strąkowska, A. (2020). Closed Cell Rigid Polyurethane Foams Based on Low Functionality Polyols: Research of Dimensional Stability and Standardised Performance Properties. Materials (Basel). 13(6):1438. doi: 10.3390/ma13061438. PMID: 32245242; PMCID: PMC7143543.

[17] Gupta, N., Zeltmann, S.E., Luong, D.D., Doddamani, M. (2019). Testing of Foams. In: Schmauder, S., Chen, CS., Chawla, K., Chawla, N., Chen, W., Kagawa, Y. (eds) Handbook of Mechanics of Materials. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6884-3_50.

[18] Kamińska, K., Barczewski, M., Kurańska, M., Malewska, E., Polaczek, K., & Prociak, A. (2022). The Effect of a Chemical Foaming Agent and the Isocyanate Index on the Properties of Open-Cell Polyurethane Foams. Materials, 15(17), 6087. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma15176087

[19] Xue J, Wu T, Dai Y, Xia Y. Electrospinning and Electrospun Nanofibers: Methods, Materials, and Applications. Chem Rev. 2019 Apr 24;119(8):5298-5415. doi: 10.1021/acs.chemrev.8b00593. Epub 2019 Mar 27. PMID: 30916938; PMCID: PMC6589095.

[20] Hallik, J., Gustavson, H., & Kalamees, T. (2019). Air Leakage of Joints Filled with Polyurethane Foam. Buildings, 9(7), 172. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings9070172

[21] Prete, S., Dattilo, M., Patitucci, F., Pezzi, G., Parisi, O, I. & Puoci, F. (2023). Natural and Synthetic Polymeric Biomaterials for Application in Wound Management. Journal of Functional Biomaterials. 14(9):455. https://doi.org/10.3390/jfb14090455

[22] Visco, A., Quattrocchi, A., Nocita, D., Montanini, R., & Pistone, A. (2021). Polyurethane Foams Loaded with Carbon Nanofibers for Oil Spill Recovery: Mechanical Properties under Fatigue Conditions and Selective Absorption in Oil/Water Mixtures. Nanomaterials, 11(3), 735. https://doi.org/10.3390/nano11030735.

[23] Schäfer, K., Nestler, D., Kroll, L. (2022). Quasi-Static and Fatigue Properties of Thermoset Sandwiches with 3D Continuous Fibre Reinforced Polyurethane Foam Core. Materials (Basel). 15(3):764. doi: 10.3390/ma15030764. PMID: 35160710; PMCID: PMC8836769.

[24] Khan, Y., Sadia, H., Ali Shah, S. Z., Khan, M. N., Shah, A. A., Ullah, N., Ullah, M. F., Bibi, H., Bafakeeh, O. T. & Khedher, N. B. (2022). Classification, Synthetic, and Characterization Approaches to Nanoparticles, and Their Applications in Various Fields of Nanotechnology: A Review. Catalysts. 12(11):1386. https://doi.org/10.3390/catal12111386

[25] Yakushin, V., Rundans, M., Holynska, M., Sture, B., & Cabulis, U. (2023). Influence of Reactive Amine-Based Catalysts on Cryogenic Properties of Rigid Polyurethane Foams for Space and On-Ground Applications. Materials (Basel, Switzerland), 16(7), 2798. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma16072798.

[26] Tomaselli, S., Bertini, F., Cifarelli, A., Vignali, A., Ragona, L. & Losio, S. (2023). Antibacterial Properties of Polyurethane Foams Additivated with Terpenes from a Bio-Based Polyol. Molecules. 28(4):1966. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules28041966.

[27] Bohne, D. (2023). Electrical Engineering. In: Building Services and Energy Efficient Buildings. Springer, Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-41273-9_6

[28] Gama, N. V., Ferreira, A. & Barros-Timmons, A. (2018). Polyurethane Foams: Past, Present, and Future. Materials. 11(10):1841. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma11101841

[29] Mahmood, A., Akram, T., Chen, H. & Chen, S. (2022). On the Evolution of Additive Manufacturing (3D/4D Printing) Technologies: Materials, Applications, and Challenges. Polymers. 14(21):4698. https://doi.org/10.3390/polym14214698.