

Ceramic matrix composites containing carbon nanotubes

Johann Cho^{1,2}, Aldo R Boccaccini^{1*}, Milo SP Shaffer^{2*}

¹ Department of Materials, Imperial College London, London SW7 2BP, U.K.

² Department of Chemistry, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, U.K.

***Contact authors: A. R. Boccaccini (a.boccaccini@imperial.ac.uk), M. S. P. Shaffer (m.shaffer@imperial.ac.uk)**

Abstract

Due to the remarkable physical and mechanical properties of individual, perfect carbon nanotubes (CNTs), they are considered to be one of the most promising new reinforcements for structural composites. Their impressive electrical and thermal properties also suggest opportunities for multifunctional applications. In the context of inorganic matrix composites, researchers have particularly focussed on CNTs as toughening elements to overcome the intrinsic brittleness of the ceramic or glass material. Although there are now a number of studies published in the literature, these inorganic systems have received much less attention than CNT/polymer matrix composites. This paper reviews the current status of the research and development of CNT-loaded ceramic matrix composite materials. It includes a summary of the key issues related to the optimisation of CNT-based composites, with particular reference to brittle matrices and provides an overview of the processing techniques developed to

optimise dispersion quality, interfaces and density. The properties of the various composite systems are discussed, with an emphasis on toughness; a comprehensive comparative summary is provided, together with a discussion of the possible toughening mechanism that may operate. Lastly, a range of potential applications are discussed, concluding with a discussion of the scope for future developments in the field.

1. Introduction

Ceramic matrix composites (CMCs) have been developed to overcome the intrinsic brittleness and lack of mechanical reliability of monolithic ceramics, which are otherwise attractive for their high stiffness and strength¹. The issue is particularly acute with glasses, as the amorphous structure does not provide any obstacle to crack propagation and the fracture toughness is very low ($<1\text{MPa}\cdot\text{m}^{1/2}$)². In addition to mechanical effects, the reinforcing phase may benefit other properties such as electrical conductivity, thermal expansion coefficient, hardness and thermal shock resistance^{1,3}. The combination of these characteristics with intrinsic advantages of ceramic materials such as high-temperature stability, high corrosion resistance, light weight and electrical insulation, makes CMCs very attractive functional and structural materials for a variety of applications; they have particular relevance under harsh conditions where other materials (e.g. metallic alloys) cannot be used⁴⁻⁶.

A wide range of reinforcing fibres have been explored, including those based on SiC, carbon, alumina and mullite⁷⁻⁹. However, carbon fibres are amongst the highest performance toughening elements investigated, since the first reports of their use in ceramic matrices were published in the late 1960s¹⁰. The fracture toughness of carbon and SiC fibre reinforced glass and ceramic matrix composites can be much better than the native matrix, as demonstrated by a wealth of available data in the literature^{4-6, 10, 11} (e.g. $17\text{MPa}\cdot\text{m}^{1/2}$ for SiC fibre reinforced glass-ceramic composites⁵). Various toughening mechanisms can be involved, including fibre debonding, fibre pull-out, and crack bridging¹¹.

Carbon nanotubes (CNTs) have received an enormous degree of attention in recent years, and, in the context of composites, they are often seen as the 'next

generation' of carbon fibre. Although their remarkable properties have suggested applications as diverse as tissue scaffolds, field emission guns, and supercapacitor electrodes ¹², the interest in composite materials is driven by both the mechanical and functional properties that can be obtained at very low density (typically in the range 1.5-2.0 gcm⁻³). For individual perfect CNTs, the axial stiffness has been shown to match that of the best carbon fibres (approaching around 1 TPa), whilst the strength is an order of magnitude higher (around 50 GPa) ¹³. Their electronic properties depend subtly on the exact structure but larger CNTs are essentially metallic conductors ¹⁴; smaller CNTs can offer unique optoelectronic properties, useful, for example, in non-linear optics ¹⁵. Ballistic electron transport effects can be related to uniquely high current carrying capacity (up to 10⁹ Acm⁻²) whilst the axial thermal conductivity is higher than that of diamond (>2000 Wm⁻¹K⁻¹) ¹⁶. It is worth noting that surface areas of CNTs can be very high since, in the absence of agglomeration, with every atom of a single walled nanotube lies on its surface; however, this factor can be a mixed blessing when considering composite applications, as discussed further below.

One other significant characteristic of CNTs is their very high aspect (length to diameter) ratio which is relevant to load transfer with the matrix and, hence, effective reinforcement. Standard continuous-fibre composites have excellent anisotropic structural properties combined with low density, but are expensive to process and are limited to simple shapes ³. Short-fibre composites, on the other hand, are easier to produce in complex shapes but with conventional fibres, the aspect ratio is typically limited to around 100, after processing ¹⁷. In principle, the small absolute length of CNTs, combined with their resilience in bending, allows them to be manipulated with conventional processing equipment, potentially retaining their high aspect ratio;

however, in practice, length degradation is known to occur under high shear conditions. The high aspect ratio of CNTs can also encourage the formation of percolating networks that are relevant to functional properties, particularly electrical conductivity¹⁸; indeed the lowest percolation threshold for any system has been observed in kinetically-formed networks of CNTs in epoxy¹⁹.

Structurally, CNTs have diameters in the range of around 1 nm to a somewhat arbitrary upper limit of 50 nm, and lengths of many microns (even centimetres in special cases)²⁰. They can consist of one or more concentric graphitic cylinders, forming single or multi walled nanotubes (SWCNTs / MWCNTs). In contrast, commercial (PAN and pitch) carbon fibres are typically in the 7 – 20 μm diameter range, whilst vapour-grown carbon fibres (VGCFs) have a broad range of intermediate diameters. Compared to carbon fibres, the best nanotubes can have almost atomistically perfect structures; indeed, there is a general question as to whether the smallest CNTs should be regarded as very small fibres or heavy molecules, especially as the diameters of the smallest nanotubes are similar to those of common polymer molecules. Consequently, it is not yet clear to what extent conventional fibre composite understanding can be extended to CNT composites, or whether new mechanisms will emerge.

Although the perfect CNT structure is very appealing, real materials are very diverse and vary significantly in terms of dimensions, purity, surface chemistry, crystallinity, graphitic orientation, degree of entanglement, and cost. These factors directly affect the properties and processability of CNTs and they must be considered when interpreting their performance in a given application. In very broad terms, CNTs can be divided into two classes depending on the synthetic route used to prepare them.

High-temperature evaporation methods, using arc-discharge^{21, 22} or laser ablation²³, tend to yield highly crystalline CNTs, with low defect concentrations and good mechanical properties, but are relatively impure, containing other, unwanted carbonaceous impurities; these methods usually work on the gram scale and are, therefore, relatively expensive. On the other hand, for use in composites, large quantities of nanotubes are required at low cost, ideally without complicated purification steps. At present, only chemical vapour deposition (CVD) or catalytic growth processes²⁴ satisfy these requirements and, as such, are the materials of choice for composite work, both in academia and in industry²⁵; a number of companies have scaled up such processes to 100 tonnes per year or more. CVD materials contain residual catalyst particles, and sometimes amorphous carbon, but are otherwise relatively pure. On the other hand, these gas-phase processes operate at lower temperatures and lead to structurally imperfect nanotubes, often with seriously reduced intrinsic properties²⁶. It is worth noting that there are currently around four orders of magnitude between the most expensive and cheapest commercial nanotube products.

Over the last ten years, interest in the application of carbon nanotubes of superior mechanical properties as toughening agents in polymer, ceramic or metal matrix composites has grown rapidly. The potential of developing advanced nanocomposites that manifest, to some degree, the extraordinary properties of individual CNTs is very attractive in fields as diverse as aerospace, sports equipment, or biomedical devices^{27, 28}. The vast majority of CNT composite work has focused on polymer matrices²⁹, whilst comparatively few investigations have explored inorganic (ceramic or glass) matrices and the potential toughening mechanisms that might be associated with CNT reinforcements. For successful CNT/composite development, a

number of key challenges must be met³⁰. Firstly, CNTs with intrinsically good mechanical properties must be obtained in reasonable quantity at acceptable cost. The CNTs must then be processed in such a way as to ensure that a homogeneous dispersion is obtained within the matrix, whilst developing an appropriate degree of interfacial bonding. These overall requirements are common to all CNT composites, and often involve chemical surface modification of the CNTs³¹. Of course, in the case of inorganic matrix composites, an ‘appropriate’ interface may be defined differently¹. In addition, obtaining a high degree of inorganic matrix densification, without damaging the CNTs, is especially challenging. The following sections address the key issues currently raised in CNT-based composites, in general, and discuss the importance of these crucial factors for successful development of ceramic and glass matrix composites containing CNTs.

2. Key issues in CNT-based composites

2.1 CNT dispersion in the matrix

One of the biggest challenges in processing nanotube composites lies in achieving a ‘good’ dispersion³². It is important that the individual nanotubes are distributed uniformly throughout the matrix and well-separated from each other; the presence of agglomerates is extremely undesirable, especially in ceramic matrices, as they can act as defects leading to stress-concentration, and premature failure, particularly if the matrix does not fully penetrate the agglomerate during processing. On the other hand, with a good dispersion, each nanotube is loaded individually over a maximum interfacial area, and can contribute directly to the mechanical properties and to toughening mechanisms. **Figure 1 (a)**³³ and **1 (b)**³⁴ show typical microstructures of

agglomerated and homogeneous CNT/glass matrix composites, respectively, developed as model system. CNTs have a tendency to agglomerate due to their relatively high surface areas, their high aspect ratios, and typically poor interactions with solvents or matrix components³⁵. SWCNTs, in particular, tend to agglomerate into ‘ropes’ or ‘bundles’, consisting of many parallel nanotubes bound by van der Waals forces. High loading fractions favour agglomeration not only because the particles come into contact more often, but also because there can be a shortage of matrix material to ‘wet out’ the large surface area of the filler. It is quite a common result for nanocomposites, in general, that properties are enhanced at low loading fractions but cannot be increased further due to CNT agglomeration above a few vol.%. The situation is more ambiguous when addressing transport properties, especially electrical conductivity, as a network of touching nanotubes is desired. However, even in this case, best results may be obtained by generating a good dispersion initially, and then allowing the network to form^{19,36}.

A particular practical problem is that the dispersion of high aspect ratio, nanoscale objects is very hard to quantify objectively. Characterisation usually consists of a qualitative assessment of a fracture surface studied under scanning electron microscopy (e.g. **Figure 1 (a)**). This approach is quite successful for discovering dense aggregates (typical of CNTs synthesised in the electric arc) or looser agglomerates in low volume fraction systems. However, at high loading fractions where the filler is necessarily densely packed, it is less effective, since any contacts may not lie in the fracture plane. In any case, careful selection of magnification(s) is required in order to come to a statistically significant conclusion; low magnifications are useful to show the uniformity of the dispersion over larger areas but are not always provided in publications. Optical microscopy can be a useful guide, again chiefly for low loading

fractions since agglomerates tend to be on the order of microns (at least as big as the CNTs are long). Good dispersions, although very dark even at low loadings, transmit light without significant optical scattering. In order to obtain a good dispersion in the final composite, a suitable processing route needs to be obtained. Often the first step is to disperse the CNTs in a solvent, prior to mixing with a conventional ceramic powder (see section 3.2), a colloidal ceramic suspension (see section 3.3) or sol-gel precursor (see section 3.4). The primary method of dispersion is usually based on applying shear forces, using high shear mixers, ultrasonic probes, or ball mills. The CNT surface is often modified, either by direct functionalisation chemistry, or by the use of surfactants, in order to add stability in a given solvent or to improve compatibility with a given matrix (precursor). Alternatives to the basic disperse-and-mix strategy include synthesising CNTs on the surface of ceramic particles or within pre-defined pores (see section 3.1), and electrophoretically driven deposition (see section 3.5).

2.2 Interface engineering

In the light of the experience with conventional fibre composites, it is clear that the interfacial bonding between the CNTs and the inorganic matrix will be crucial. However, the consequences of reducing the reinforcing fibres diameter by several orders of magnitude is less obvious, and further studies of the scaling behaviour of different toughening mechanisms are required. It is possible both that the energy dissipation during fracture propagation due to familiar mechanisms such as pullout, crack deflection and crack bridging could be enhanced³⁷ and that new mechanisms may come into play. It seems likely that CNT-containing ceramic matrix nanocomposites should follow the example of their fibre reinforced conventional cousins; interfaces

should be of intermediate strength to maximise the energy involved in debonding the CNTs from the matrix at the same time as maintaining effective interfacial load transfer. In the case of poor or absent interfacial bonding, CNTs may even act as a source of microcracks, leading to failure. In the case of polymer/CNT composites, interfacial adhesion is readily modified by organic surface chemistry. **Figure 2** highlights intimate interface between amorphous SiO₂ and MWCNTs produced by sol-gel method³⁸. In most ceramic systems, the high temperatures required for consolidation (see section 3.6) removes any organic functional groups that might have been introduced to aid processing. The interface is then dominated by the direct interaction (or reaction) between the matrix and the graphitic CNT surface.

3. Overview of CNT/inorganic matrix composite fabrication methods

3.1 *In-situ* growth of CNTs by chemical vapour decomposition (CVD)

One of the first studies on synthesis of CNT/ceramic composites (published in two parts) was authored by Peigney and co-workers^{39, 40}. They have developed CVD techniques to synthesise CNTs, *in situ*, in the presence of the ceramic powders destined to form the matrix. CNT/metal oxide powders can be synthesised by passing CH₄:H₂ mixtures over dispersions of transition-metal catalysts supported on oxide powders (typical combinations include Fe, Co, or Fe/Co alloys on Al₂O₃, MgO, or Mg Al₂O₄)⁴¹⁻⁴⁸. These composite powders can then be hot pressed to form macroscopic composites. The incorporation of the long nanotube bundles grown *in situ*, however, has not yet been shown to provide the expected improvement in mechanical properties. The fracture strength and toughness of the CNT-containing composites developed by this method are

generally lower than those of the monolithic metal-oxide composites probably due to relative low density (87-93%), as shown in **Figure 3 (a)** ⁴¹. Although the CNTs are uniformly grown over the surface of the oxide particles, they do not end up uniformly dispersed through the volume of the final composite. On the other hand, the CNTs can be aligned using high-temperature extrusion, and the resulting materials exhibit a marked anisotropy of the electrical conductivity ⁴⁵. Interestingly, the CNTs apparently aid super-plastic forming of the composite material, an advantage attributed to inhibited matrix grain growth and grain boundary lubrication ⁴⁵. Related studies of the preparation of CNTs/alumina composites using the *in situ* method have been performed by An et al ⁴⁹ & Lim et al ⁵⁰. As discussed further below, the tribological properties were significantly improved by the presence of CNTs at the alumina grain boundaries (see **Figure 3 (b)**) ⁴⁹.

A highly ordered array of parallel MWCNTs in an alumina matrix was fabricated by Xia et al. ⁵¹⁻⁵³ using a variant of the *in-situ* CVD method. The oxide support, in this case, was an amorphous nanoporous (anodised) alumina matrix with thickness 20µm and a hexagonal array of straight pores around 30-40nm in diameter; Co or Ni metal particles were deposited within the pores in order to catalyse the CVD growth of MWCNTs up the pore walls, creating a highly ordered unidirectional CNT ceramic matrix composite ⁵¹ (see **Figure 4**). The authors demonstrated that the nanocomposites exhibit the three hallmarks of toughening found in micron-scale fiber composites: crack deflection at the CNT matrix interface, crack bridging by CNTs, and CNT pull-out on the fracture surfaces. The same group also combined analytical and numerical models, using cohesive zone models for both matrix cracking and nanotube crack bridging, to interpret indentation results and evaluate the fracture toughness⁵² and

tribological behaviour⁵³ of the composites.

The *in-situ* formation of CNT by spray pyrolysis provides a simplified one-step embodiment of the CVD method, without a separate catalyst loading / preparation step. In this case, a slurry of ferrocene (metal catalysts) and alumina nanoparticles in xylene (hydrocarbon source) is sprayed into a furnace at 1000°C under Ar atmosphere⁵⁴; a similar reaction has also been explored using a SiC support⁵⁵. The technique produces flake-like mixtures, with a heterogeneous distribution of CNTs, particularly in the through-thickness direction.

In general, the *in-situ* growth of CNTs in ceramic matrices is an attractive processing route to synthesise composites with reasonably distributed networks of CNTs. It is relatively simple and scalable, and can be applied to a wide range of matrices, including SiC⁵⁶, TiN^{57,58}, Fe₂N⁵⁷, and BaTiO₃⁵⁹⁻⁶². However, a number of difficulties remain to be resolved. Firstly, the synthesis process intrinsically involves the presence of metal catalysts and often leads to the deposition of amorphous carbon, particularly on the exposed oxide particle surfaces; these phases are generally undesirable in the final composite, but can be difficult to remove. Secondly, these *in situ* composites typically have relatively low density after sintering suggesting unfavourable interactions between CNTs and the matrix materials; the network of CNTs at the oxide particle surface may then form a barrier to effective sintering and the CNTs are not readily distributed into the bulk. In this approach, there is little opportunity to manipulate the interface properties to improve the outcome; rather the interface properties remain highly dependent on the particular system. Although this type of microstructure, with the CNTs at the grain boundaries, may be beneficial for certain functional or processing-related properties, it is less appealing for straight-forward mechanical reinforcement.

3.2 Powder processing

Powder processing methods are very commonly applied in ceramic systems and were the first techniques considered during the early stages of the CNT/ceramic composite fabrication. Results have usually shown that conventional powder processing is not an effective means to disperse CNTs homogeneously in ceramic or glass matrices; as in the case of the *in situ* methods discussed above, there is no driving force to distribute the CNTs from the powder particle surface into the bulk.

Powder processing is usually carried out by mixing raw CNTs and ceramic particles under wet conditions, followed by ultrasonication and/or ball milling; the dried powder is then crushed and sieved, and finally densified by hot-pressing. Powder processing has been applied to various composites systems including borosilicate glass^{33, 63}, silicon nitride⁶⁴⁻⁶⁹ alumina,^{70, 71} mullite⁷² and silica⁷³ matrix composites containing different concentrations of CNTs (typically 1 – 10 vol.%). These investigations have been of mixed success in terms of the quality of the microstructure homogeneity and properties achieved (see section 4).

3.3 Colloidal processing

There is a growing interest in using ceramic particles with similar diameters to the nanotubes to create an intimate dispersion. By adjusting the surface chemistry of the colloidal suspensions and selecting proper processing conditions, the nanoparticles can be encouraged to coat the CNTs. The coatings then screen the undesirable attractive interactions between the nanotubes, preventing agglomeration and facilitating the production of well-dispersed composites. It is worth noting that dispersion of CNTs is

established by manipulating the surface chemistry of the two phases during low-temperature processing, and that this dispersion is then retained after sintering. The coating process is generally carried out by so-called heterocoagulation of nanoparticles. The heterocoagulation occurs when two (usually electrostatically) stabilised suspensions (of CNTs and matrix particles) are mixed; by ensuring that the two sets of particles have opposite charge, the coating process can be encouraged.

Perfect CNTs are intrinsically inert with minimal surface charge; in practice, as-produced CNTs, especially commercial CVD materials, have a degree of surface functionalisation, often with oxygen, but dispersibility usually remains poor. Samples are usually aggregated or entangled, and may contain impurities such as amorphous carbon or catalytic metal particles. A post-synthesis chemical treatment is frequently employed to purify and disperse the CNTs in a suitable solvent. Commonly, CNTs are oxidised in a mixture of concentrated nitric and sulphuric acids to simultaneously purify, shorten and functionalize them⁷⁴. These aggressive conditions attack defect sites in the CNTs, cutting them and decorating their surface with carboxylic acid and other oxygen-containing groups. These acidic groups electrostatically stabilize the CNTs in water, or other polar liquids, by developing a negative surface charge. Similar effects occur for both MWCNTs⁷⁴ and SWCNTs⁷⁵. The resulting electrostatic repulsion among the CNTs leads to a remarkable increase in the stability of the colloidal suspension⁷⁶. In addition, functional groups on CNT surfaces can be useful sites for further chemical modification. Similarly, functionalised CNTs can be produced using other liquid-phase oxidants as well as simple thermal treatments in air or other oxidising gases. Combinations of gas and liquid phase treatments are often used in order to optimise the purification and modification process²⁷.

Organic surfactants or dispersants can be also used to tailor surface properties of both CNTs and ceramic particles; entangled or bundled CNTs are often dispersed in surfactant solutions using ultrasound. The effective surface charge can be manipulated from positive to negative by using cationic or anionic surfactants, respectively. Typical cationic surfactants include PEI (poly ethylene amine)⁷⁷⁻⁷⁹, and CTAB (cetyltrimethylammonium bromide)^{80, 81}, whilst common anionic surfactants include PAA (polyacrylic acid)^{77, 78}, SDS (sodium dodecyl sulphate)^{79, 82}, and SDBS (sodium dodecyl benzyl sulphonate)⁸³. In general, the surface charge on both the CNTs and a given type of ceramic particle can be altered on demand by employing different organic surfactants or dispersants. On the whole the surfactants will be removed during sintering, however they do have the potential to introduce undesirable impurities, since the inclusion of CNTs precludes a strongly oxidising calcination step.

Sun et al⁷⁷ employed surfactants to encourage alumina particles to coat CNTs during a heterocoagulation process. The effective surface charge of both CNTs (modified with PEI) and alumina nanoparticles (modified with PAA) was established using zeta potential measurements. As expected, cationic type dispersants caused the isoelectric point (pH_{iep}) to move to a higher pH value, while anionic types move pH_{iep} to lower values. A typical TEM image of heterocoagulated CNTs and alumina particles is shown in **Figure 5 (a)**⁷⁷. The same group⁷⁹ also used acid-treated CNTs that were subsequently heat-treated in N_2 or NH_3 to remove the carboxylic functional groups; this treatment shifted the isoelectric point of the nanotubes to a higher pH value so that their positive surface charge would be maintained (in conjunction with the addition of PEI) over a much wider pH range. These modified CNTs were mixed with negatively-charged TiO_2 nanoparticles to produce heterocoagulated powder as shown in **Figure 5**

(b)⁸⁴. Although the overall process appears successful, the individual SWCNTs were not, apparently, debundled.

Similar heterocoagulation processes have been used for a range of crystalline matrices including Al_2O_3 ^{82, 85-91}, Si_3N_4 ⁶⁷ and SiO_2 ^{34, 81, 92-94}. **Figure 6** shows individual CNTs protruding from the fracture surface of a CNT/ SiO_2 composites produced by heterocoagulation and highlights the high microstructural homogeneity that can be obtained⁹⁵. This simple approach can be extended to virtually any ceramic system by varying the pH and/or surfactant used to modify the surface properties during the processing phase. However, the CNT/matrix interaction in the resulting composites is likely to vary significantly; the measurement of the interfacial adhesion and its influence on composite properties have not yet been reported.

3.4 Sol-gel processing

Sol-gel processing methods provide an alternative route to creating an intimate dispersion of CNTs in inorganic matrices; here, the CNTs are dispersed in a molecular precursor (solution) which then undergoes a condensation reaction to generate a green body for subsequent consolidation. Work to date, has focused mainly on CNTs in silicate sol-gel systems^{38, 96-105}. Seeger et al.^{38, 96} prepared a 2.5 wt.% MWCNT/ SiO_2 gel by mixing MWCNTs, acidified water (catalysts) and tetraethoxysilane (TEOS) (silicate precursor), before sintering at 1150°C in argon. However, the sintering process led to a partial devitrification of the silica matrix resulting in a heterogeneous microstructure. Homogeneity was improved by an alternative method using a Nd:YAG laser to heat a SiO_2 /CNT mixture rapidly, producing an amorphous silica matrix without crystallisation and containing 2.5wt.% MWCNTs⁹⁸. The same method was used by

DiMaio et al.⁹⁹ to produce silica composites for non-linear optic applications with low CNT content (0.25wt.%). Although, in principle, sol-gel reactions ought to provide a route to good dispersions, agglomeration in the precursor suspensions has proved problematic. Recent work has shown that surface modification of CNTs with organosilanes can stabilise the reaction mixture, leading to excellent CNT dispersion in silicate matrices after consolidation for concentrations of up to 3wt% MWCNTs¹⁰⁰ as shown in **Figure 7**.

The sol-gel method has also been used to synthesize well dispersed discrete composite rods of CNTs coated with a thin layer of silica^{38, 80, 81}, titania⁸⁴, and alumina¹⁰⁶. Hwang et al.⁸⁰ have developed CNT/SiO₂ composite rods as reinforcing elements for CMCs. In principle, the approach provides a means of modifying the wettability and/or adhesion between CNTs and a chosen ceramic matrix, even after high temperature consolidation. Although the idea remains to be explored in detail, coatings of sol-gel silica on CNTs have been shown to improve the mixing quality of the CNTs with borosilicate glass powder⁶³, and to provide a degree of thermal oxidation resistance even at 1200°C in air³⁸.

3.5. Electrophoretic deposition

Electrophoretic deposition (EPD) is a traditional ceramic processing method that is gaining increasing interest as a simple and versatile processing technique for the production of coatings and films from nanoparticles and carbon nanotubes¹⁰⁷. The technique allows the application of coatings of varying thickness to complex 3D shapes including the interior of porous substrates. EPD is achieved via the motion of charged particles, dispersed in a suitable solvent or aqueous solution, towards an electrode under

an applied electric field; deposition on the electrode occurs via particle coagulation. Electrophoretic motion of charged particles during EPD results in the accumulation of particles and the formation of a homogeneous and rigid deposit at the relevant electrode¹⁰⁷. The charge of the suspended particles can be modified by chemical reactions (such as oxidation), the use of surfactants and the adsorption of ions. Comprehensive reviews specifically on EPD of inorganic nanoparticles and CNTs have been published recently^{108, 109}. The process of co-depositing a uniform mixture of CNTs and ceramic nanoparticles is shown schematically in **Figure 8**. In fact, CNT/ceramic composite layers can be formed by both sequential deposition and co-deposition from mixed suspensions. Chicatun et al¹¹⁰ used both approaches to prepare CNT/SiO₂ composite films for possible applications as porous coatings in the biomedical field and as thermal management devices. With appropriate surface modification, the CNTs were efficiently mixed with silica nanoparticles to form a composite CNT/SiO₂ network structure. A similar strategy was used to fabricate four-layer CNT/TiO₂ laminate composite coatings by sequential EPD¹¹¹. Microscopic studies of unsintered materials suggest that the CNT layer can act to reinforce ceramic coatings by providing a crack deflection and delamination path as depicted in **Figure 9 (a)**¹¹¹. EPD has been used to generate CNT/bioceramic composites based on hydroxyapatite¹¹²⁻¹¹⁴ and bioactive glass^{115, 116} as well as more device-oriented systems based on combining CNTs with nanocrystals, e.g. Fe₃O₄¹¹⁷. **Figure 9 (b)** shows a cross-sectional SEM image of Fe₃O₄ nanocrystal film deposited between two CNT mats by EPD technique¹¹⁷.

3.6 Advanced consolidation techniques

Due to the high temperatures and long durations involved in conventional

pressureless sintering, hot-pressing (HPS) and hot-isostatic pressing (HIP) methods, degradation of the CNTs during densification of inorganic matrix has often been reported^{33, 41, 45, 48, 50, 73, 79-82, 85}. The difficulty of entirely excluding oxygen, or indeed reactions with the matrix or associated impurities, often leads to the loss of the carbonaceous nanotubes. Although these effects can be mitigated by fully coating the CNTs with an inorganic layer before sintering, particularly using sol-gel techniques, some carbon loss is usually experienced. One promising solution that is growing in popularity is the use of a relatively new sintering technique named spark plasma sintering (SPS)¹¹⁸. This technique relies on pulsed DC current passing directly through the powder compact to generate a very high heating and cooling rate (up to 600°C/min) within the die. The method contrasts with conventional hot-pressing in which the heat is provided by external elements¹¹⁸. SPS allows ceramic powders to be sintered at lower temperatures and for much shorter times than other sintering processes, and provides a means to control the kinetics of the various processes (densification, chemical reaction and grain growth) that are usually involved during the entire sintering cycle. The short sintering time and low temperatures help to minimise grain growth and offer higher cost-effectiveness and productivity. They also minimise CNT loss, leading to a remarkable improvement in the mechanical properties of eventual CNT/ceramic composites.

Balazsi et al.⁶⁶ compared the effectiveness of SPS to conventional hot isostatic pressing for silicon nitride composites reinforced with 6 wt.% MWNTs. As can be seen in **Figure 10**, fully dense samples with improved mechanical properties were achieved at comparatively lower sintering temperatures by using SPS⁶⁶. The effectiveness of SPS is not only that samples are fully densified, but also that CNTs are retained in the

composites. Samples with higher densities showed higher modulus as well as higher hardness and fracture toughness. Similar results have been obtained on introducing SWCNTs into alumina by SPS ^{70,71}; apparently undamaged CNTs were incorporated at the grain boundaries, resulting in improved fracture toughness and bending strength (although see below for discussion).

4. Mechanical properties and possible toughening mechanisms

Table 1 summarises the mechanical properties of CNT/inorganic matrix composites reported in the literature, including a number of significant improvements achieved by addition of CNTs. Most of these studies ultimately aim to increase the fracture toughness; for example, Zhan et al. ⁷¹ claimed that the fracture toughness in 10wt% SWCNTs/Al₂O₃ composites was almost three times higher than that of monolithic alumina, whilst Berguiga et al ¹⁰³ reported surprisingly large increases (54% and 69%) for transparent silica composites containing very low loadings (0.025 and 0.05wt.%) of CNTs. Qualitatively, many reports ^{77, 81, 82} have observed CNT pull-out and crack bridging as toughening mechanisms, using SEM. Quantitatively, due to the small sample volumes available, the majority of researchers have chosen to measure fracture toughness (K_{IC}) using the micro-hardness indentation method, using the following equation: ¹¹⁹:

$$K_{IC} = \alpha \left(\frac{E}{H} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left(\frac{P}{C^{3/2}} \right)$$

where E and H are Young's modulus and hardness, respectively, P is the applied load, c is the radial crack length, and α is an empirical constant which depends on the geometry of the indenter. For a cube-corner indenter $\alpha = 0.04$ and for a Vickers indenter $\alpha = 0.016$ ¹¹⁹. The basic concept is that the crack length at a given load is an indication

of the toughness of the tested material (shorter cracks occur in tougher materials).

Results from Wang et al.¹²⁰ have, however, questioned the validity of this method for K_{IC} measurements in CNT/ceramic composites. They carried out a comparative investigation with previous results obtained by Zhan et al.⁷¹, using a similar SPS methodology to prepare 10 vol.% SWNT/alumina and control graphite/alumina composites. They pointed out that the Vickers indentation technique is an indirect method for measuring K_{IC} , and that the validity of the fracture toughness results depends critically on the elastic/inelastic contact-mechanical response of the material under test. They suggest that carbon additions may allow shear deformation under the indenter, as observed by the same group in their previous publication⁵¹. This accommodation of the deformation may limit the cracking around the indentation, resulting in artificially high fracture toughness values. In the experiments, minor cracking occurred upon indentation but without the classical radial cracks required for the valid K_{IC} measurement^{120, 121}. These authors, therefore, questioned the validity of several previous studies in which K_{IC} values had been determined by indentation. Instead, they turned to a macroscopic method for K_{IC} determination, namely the single edge V-notched beam test (SEVNB). This test showed virtually no improvement in fracture toughness of the CNT/alumina composites, in contrast to the earlier claims of Zhan et al.⁷¹. On the other hand, Wang et al.'s Vickers indentation results¹²⁰ do clearly show that SWCNT/alumina composites are highly resistant to contact damage. Although this interpretation is in some senses disappointing, the high resistance to contact damage is, in itself, a very attractive property considering applications such as bearings, valves and other wear resistant machine parts.

A recent comprehensive review of the Vickers indentation method¹²² for

fracture toughness measurement discusses in detail the limitations of the technique and supports the findings of Wang et al ¹²⁰. It was concluded that the Vickers indentation technique is fundamentally different from other standard fracture toughness tests as the method involves a complex three-dimensional crack system with substantial deformation, residual stress, and damage around the cracks. It has been therefore recommended ¹²² that the method should not be applied to the determination of absolute values of K_{IC} in ceramics but it can still be used to rank materials in terms of their resistance to local damage development (and, of course, hardness and stiffness). Its advantages include simple sample preparation and test operation, low material demands, and high speed; given the small size of CNTs, a well dispersed composite system should give a uniform set of data despite the micron-scale of the indentation.

Recently, there has been an exchange of communications ¹²³⁻¹²⁵ continuing the debate on the appropriateness of different fracture toughness measurement techniques for CNT/inorganic matrix composites. Potential problems associated with both the Vickers indentation and the single-edge V-notched beam methods are highlighted, and these discussions may prove interesting to readers engaged in advancing CNT/inorganic matrix composites. Interestingly, in the last two years, an increasing number of reports in literature have used the single-edge notch beam method to measure the fracture toughness of various CNT-based systems, including Al_2O_3 ^{82, 90, 91, 126, 127}, hybrid (MWCNTs and SiC nanoparticles/ Al_2O_3) ¹²⁸, Si-C-N ¹²⁹, and barium aluminosilicate glass-ceramic matrices ¹³⁰. This shift may reflect not only the discussions of validity, but also the advancement of SPS methods able to produce the larger quantities of composite required. Nevertheless, effective use of the SENB test requires careful surface preparation and notching; uniform standards are not always reported or applied,

possibly still due to material constraints, as specimens of volume of at least 600 mm^3 (e.g. test bars of $3 \times 4 \text{ mm}^2$ and length of 50 mm) would be required for statistical meaningful results.

Many of these more recent SENB studies continue to suggest improvements in toughness, although perhaps at a more modest level. Yamamoto et al.⁹⁰, for example, compared SENB and indentation measurements on 0.9 vol.% acid-treated MWCNT/alumina composites produced by SPS. They observed classical radial cracks and CNTs crack-bridging. However, the indentation toughness was significantly higher at $6.64 \text{ MPa.m}^{1/2}$ (+41%) than the SENB value of $5.90 \text{ MPa.m}^{1/2}$ (+25%). However, the reasons for this discrepancy were not discussed by the authors⁹⁰. The small number of samples, and especially the small range of, or even single, loading fraction used in the majority of these studies, makes it difficult to isolate the effects of the nanotubes from changes in microstructure or processing. The problem may be particularly acute in glass-ceramics where nucleation effects are likely to be important. Katsuda et al.¹²⁹ reported large mechanical improvements in 10 vol% CNT/barium aluminosilicate glass-ceramic composites which they attributed to crack deflection and pullout. The flexural strength and fracture toughness (measured by SENB) were enhanced by 192% and 143%, respectively, much larger values than achieved with the same content of conventional SiC whiskers, SiC platelets, or short carbon fibres. However, changes in degree of crystallinity, crystallite size or orientation were not considered. Similar problems are accounted with polycrystalline ceramics, where for example the location of CNTs, e.g. at grain boundaries or within grains, as well as the effect of CNT on grain growth make difficult to interpret 'true' toughening strength of the CNTs.

For these reasons, the effect of CNTs on glass matrices is particularly

interesting, since microstructural variations associated with grain size, orientation, and boundaries are avoided. Unfortunately, there are relatively few such studies available^{33, 34, 63, 73, 81, 92, 100, 103, 104}. One of the first reports, by Ning et al⁷³, looked at powder-processed 5 vol.% MWCNT/SiO₂ composites and claimed significant improvements in fracture toughness (measured by indentation method) (100%) and bending strength (65%). The use of surfactant assisted sol-gel methods allowed Ning et al⁸¹ subsequently to improve the densification of the composites leading to 146% and 88% increases in fracture toughness (measured by indentation method) and bending strength, respectively. However, the data are surprising given that their SEM images showed large agglomerates of CNTs rather than clear evidence of individual CNT pull-out⁸¹; the results may relate, at least in part, to a significant degree of matrix crystallisation that was observed. The variable density and crystallinity of the samples, as well as the indentation methodology used, cast some doubt on the significance of the mechanical properties obtained. Similarly processed samples^{33, 63} of borosilicate composites with inhomogenous CNT dispersion typically exhibit poor mechanical properties. One difficulty with such amorphous systems is that the glassy matrix may unintentionally crystallise. Colloidally-processed MWNT/silica composites⁹², fully densified by SPS, were found to contain variable fractions of crystalline SiO₂ (cristobalite) despite the lower sintering temperature (950-1050°C) and shorter dwelling time (5-10min) compared to conventional hot-pressing. In this case, it is difficult to interpret the increases in Young's modulus and fracture toughness (measured by indentation method) of 40% (60.51GPa) and 160% (2.74MPa.m^{1/2}), respectively for the 10vol% CNT system⁹². In contrast, borosilicate glass composites containing modified-MWNTs, produced using a sol-gel method, were sintered at lower temperatures without inducing

crystallisation (see **Figure 7**)¹⁰⁰. A high quality CNT dispersion was maintained at loading fractions below 3 wt%, by using a siloxane coupling agent, and correlated with modest improvements in strength, stiffness, and thermal conductivity; however, properties declined above 3wt% as agglomeration set-in¹⁰⁰. As noted in the introduction, this behaviour is quite typical of nanocomposites in general.

As well as direct mechanical enhancement of strength, stiffness or toughness, a number of workers have investigated the tribological properties of CNT/ceramic matrix composites. An et al.⁴⁹ fabricated MWCNTs/alumina composites by CVD *in-situ* growth and hot-pressing. It was shown that microhardness increases with increasing CNT content up to 4 wt.% whilst the wear loss decreases; however, further additions of CNTs negatively affect both hardness and wear resistance. The tendency for the improvements to be limited to low loading fractions is a familiar phenomenon in both CNT/polymer systems and nanocomposites more widely. The reason is usually the onset of agglomeration as it becomes increasingly difficult for the matrix to cover the high surface area introduced by the nanofiller; alternatively, initial improvements can be associated with changes in the matrix microstructure that do not scale with the introduction of additional filler material²⁷. In the work of An et al.⁴⁹ the improved wear properties were attributed to the increase in hardness and a decrease in friction coefficient, due to the lubricating properties of the CNTs. The lubrication may arise both from the graphitic nature of the CNTs (and their debris) and, potentially, from the rolling of CNTs at the interface between the specimen and the ball (counter body). On the other hand, the increase in hardness was related mainly to a reduction of the matrix grain size with the inclusion of CNTs. This observation highlights the common difficulty of separating the intrinsic effects due to the presence of CNTs from the

processing-related changes in matrix microstructure that they induce. The influence on processing often dominates over any intrinsic mechanical effects, due to the relatively modest loading fractions accessible in well-dispersed systems. Low CNT volume fractions have relatively little impact on average properties, but the associated high surface area, network-forming behaviour, and often heterogeneous distribution at grain boundaries can strongly influence processing issues relating to viscosity, nucleation, and grain boundary effects. Work on sol-gel derived glasses¹⁰⁰ avoids some of these issues and does indicate improvements in stiffness and hardness due to the presence of low loadings of well-dispersed CNTs; however, the effects once again saturate, as CNT agglomeration starts at around 3wt% CNT loadings.

Several tribological studies have been conducted on thin CNT/ceramic bulk composite and coatings. An aligned MWCNTs/alumina composite was investigated by Xia et al⁵³. In addition to the lubricating nature of CNTs, their work demonstrated that the frictional coefficient of the composites depended on the contact and buckling behaviour of the CNTs by showing that composites with thicker CNTs are more robust to lateral buckling or collapse of the nanotubes. For MWCNTs/hydroxyapatite composites, separate investigations based on scratch testing in physiological solution¹³¹,¹³² revealed that CNT reinforced hydroxyapatite coatings exhibited improved wear resistance and lower friction coefficient with increasing loadings of CNTs (up to 20wt.%). These composites may find potential applications in the field of coating materials for metal biomedical implants under high load-bearing conditions.

Creep tests of SWCNT/alumina composites have been conducted in uniaxial compression at 1300 and 1350°C in argon; the SWNT containing composites were found to be about two orders of magnitude more creep-resistant than a pure alumina

control with about the same grain size ($\sim 0.5\mu\text{m}$)¹³³. This improvement is attributed to partial blocking of grain-boundary sliding by SWCNTs in the composites, which is the dominant creep deformation mechanism in monolithic alumina.

Overall, the review of the literature has indicated that research focussing on the mechanical performance of CNT/inorganic matrix composites is at a relatively early stage; the reports of modest improvements in mechanical properties do not, for the most part, provide clear evidence linking the quantitative performance data to the actual mechanisms involved. For toughening, CNT pull-out is often claimed as the energy-dissipating mechanisms, but SEM images usually show relatively few CNTs emerging from the composite fracture surfaces. Further work relating properties to mechanism is clearly required; in the meantime it is interesting to consider how traditional toughening mechanisms may scale as the fibre diameter shrinks into the nanoscale.

Assuming that standard short fibre theory applies, the energy absorbed by pulling out one fibre (ΔU) is given by¹³⁴:

$$\Delta U = \pi r L^2 \tau_i$$

where r is the fibre radius, L is the fibre length, and τ_i is the sliding shear stress.

Multiplying by the number of fibres per unit area ($N = V_f / \pi r^2$), and taking the interfacial shear strength as the limit of the sliding shear stress (τ_i), gives an approximate upper estimate of the pull-out contribution as:

$$G_{\text{pull-out}} = \frac{V_f L^2 \tau_i}{r}$$

Taking reasonable values based on existing systems, V_f (fibre volume fraction) =10%, $L=100$ nm, $r=10$ nm, and $\tau_i=10$ MPa¹³⁵, an estimate for the toughening of 1 Jm^{-2} could be achieved. This figure is relatively small, even if higher loading fractions could be

obtained. Similarly, an upper estimate of the energy absorbed in debonding can be obtained from

$$G_{debond} = 2\pi rLG_i N = \frac{2V_f LG_i}{r}$$

where G_i is the work of creating the new interface and it is of the order of 4 Jm^{-2} for inorganic matrices¹³⁵; the result, using the parameters above, is only 8 Jm^{-2} . Thus the potential contribution of these two mechanisms appears to be relatively modest; however, this simple model is probably too pessimistic. The use of more perfect nanotubes, with higher strength and/or smaller diameters, might significantly increase the pull-out length, raising the toughening effect. In addition, a variety of additional toughening mechanisms exist such as CNT bridging, CNT buckling/matrix shear⁵¹, as well as the additional deformation and/or friction associated with the pull-out of the intrinsically wavy CNTs. It is worth noting that many CNTs are pulled-out even if not perpendicularly oriented to the crack plane.

The situation is neatly summarised by the model nanocomposites of Xia et al⁵¹ (discussed in section 3.1), and shown in **Figure 11**, which showed the three hallmarks of toughening found in micron-scale fibre reinforced ceramic composites: crack deflection at the CNT/matrix interface, crack bridging by CNTs and CNT pullout on the fracture surfaces. Most interestingly, they also show a number of additional potential toughening mechanisms, associated with shear deformation of the regular array of pores/hollow tubes. However, presumably due to the limited thickness ($30\mu\text{m}$) of the templates available, quantitative results of fracture toughness or bending strength are not yet available.

5. Functional properties of CNT-composites

In view of the outstanding thermal and electrical properties of CNTs, there have been several investigations focussing on the functional properties of CNT-reinforced inorganic matrix composites, including electrical and thermal conductivity. A summary of these results is presented in **Table 2**. Percolation theory relates a sudden change in a macroscopic property (such as electrical conductivity) to the development of a continuous network structure, at a critical percolation threshold. Around the threshold, the property (e.g. electrical conductivity) can be related to the concentration by a scaling law such as:

$$\sigma_c = \sigma_0 (\phi - \phi_c)^t \quad \text{for } \phi > \phi_c$$

where σ_c is the conductivity of the composite, ϕ is the volume fraction of CNTs in the composite, ϕ_c is the critical volume fraction or percolation threshold, and σ_0 and t are fitted constants related to the intrinsic electrical conductivity of the CNTs and the dimensionality of the system, respectively ¹³⁶.

Electrical percolation of CNTs in an electrical insulating ceramic was studied for the first time by S Rul et al ⁴⁸. They reported that the DC electric conductivity of SWCNT/MgAl₂O₄ composites (CNT content up to 11 vol.%) was well fitted by the percolation relation with a threshold of 0.64 vol.%, where the conductivity abruptly increased over seven orders of magnitude (from 10⁻¹⁰ to 0.0040 S/cm), eventually reaching a maximum at 8.5 S/cm. The electrical conductivities of a variety of other inorganic matrix materials containing MWCNTs have been measured, including SiC ⁵⁶, TiN ⁵⁷, Fe₂N ⁵⁷, borosilicate glass ¹⁰⁰, SiO₂ ⁹³ ZrO₂ ^{137, 138}, and Si₃N₃ ¹³⁹ systems. The thresholds on the order of 1 vol.% are typical of a large number of CNT/polymer composite systems and are in line with expectations from excluded volume considerations; in other words, the high aspect ratio of the CNTs gives rise to a large

hydrodynamic volume and effective statistical network formation. Much lower percolation thresholds have been observed but are associated with kinetically-driven network formation or phase segregation³⁶; in this context, poor CNT distribution or dispersion can provide lower percolation thresholds.

Absolute values of the electrical conductivity are typically well above the level needed for static dissipation and approach the level needed for electromagnetic shielding applications. One of the highest absolute conductivities (33 S/cm) was achieved in dense alumina composites containing up to 15 vol.% SWCNTs fabricated by spark-plasma-sintering⁷⁰. Electromagnetic interference (EMI) shielding properties of MWCNTs reinforced fused silica composites have been investigated in the frequency region 36.5-40GHz (Ka band)¹⁴⁰. Shielding improved with MWNT content reaching 68db for the 10 vol.% sample at 36-37GHz, indicating a possible commercial application at relevant high frequencies. The EMI shielding effectiveness of an equivalent carbon black-fused silica composite saturated at high frequencies. Indeed, for a given loading fraction, the electrical conductivity of CNT loaded systems tends to be one to two orders of magnitude higher than that of carbon black composites, due to the higher intrinsic conductivity of CNTs and the much higher connectivity of the network.

Peigney et al⁴⁵ also investigated anisotropic electrical conductivity in SWCNTs/Fe/Co-MgAl₂O₄ composites following extrusion. As expected, the conductivity in parallel direction to the extrusion direction was much higher (by a factor of approximately 30) than that measured in the transverse direction, providing evidence of preferential alignment of the CNTs following extrusion; similar effects are well-known in polymer systems³⁶. The anisotropy of the electrical conductivity was also studied in MWCNTs/alumina composites where CNT alignment was induced by DC

electric fields ¹²⁶. The results showed a difference of about seven orders of magnitude between the electric conductivities in longitudinal (6.2×10^{-2} S/m) and transverse (6.8×10^{-9} S/m) directions. It is worth noting that, for a given aspect ratio, alignment of fibres actually increases the percolation threshold ¹⁴¹.

Relatively few studies have explored thermal conductivity; a strong percolation behaviour is not expected as there are, at most, only two to three orders of magnitude difference between the thermal conductivity of the CNTs and the inorganic matrix.

MWCNTs/SiO₂ composites showed systematic increases in thermal diffusion coefficient and thermal conductivity with increasing CNT content ¹⁴². At 650°C, the thermal conductivity was enhanced by 20.6% (~2W/m.K) at 10 vol.% CNTs, compared to that of monolithic SiO₂. A recent study showed that thermal conductivity of 4.08W/m.K was measured on fully dense 10 vol.% MWCNTs/SiO₂ composites processed by spark plasma sintering ⁹⁴. In sol-gel derived borosilicate/MWCNTs composites, thermal conductivities of up to 1.45 W/mK were measured at room temperature for composites containing 2 wt% MWCNT (considering that the thermal conductivity of borosilicate glass matrix at 25 °C is 1.1 W/mK) ¹⁰⁰. Nevertheless, the increases reported are relatively modest compared to the high intrinsic thermal conductivity of CNTs. The relatively small improvements may be due to the high interface thermal resistance^{143, 144}, and the large interfacial surface area between CNTs and the matrix. It is also worth noting that the intrinsic thermal conductivity of the CVD nanotubes used in composite systems will be lower than the ideal value. Although there may be a improvement during sintering, most inorganic matrices are processed at too low a temperature for large improvements of thermal conductivity due to graphitisation of the CNTs.

Encapsulating CNTs in transparent inorganic glass (or glass-like) matrices may enable or enhance photonic applications, including nonlinear optics, planar optical wave guides, optical switches and optical limiting devices. CNTs have been shown to be broadband optical limiters, efficient at both 532 and 1064nm laser wavelength in solutions^{15, 145} and polymer composites¹⁴⁶. Although theoretical calculations show that CNTs have large third-order optical nonlinearities there are relatively few experimental reports available^{99, 101, 147-149}. On the other hand, nanotube arrays and composites have been successfully used as saturable absorbers for mode-locked lasers^{150, 151}. In high power situations, inorganic matrices may offer improved stability than current systems. For optical applications, sol-gel techniques are usually employed to produce transparent and structural composites containing low volume fractions of CNTs. Exploiting the desirable optical effects requires a good dispersion of the nanotubes to retain clarity and avoid Rayleigh scattering.

6. Future work and conclusions

The present review of CNT reinforced inorganic matrix composites describes the latest processing techniques developed to improve the mechanical and functional properties of CNT-reinforced ceramics and glasses. These techniques have gradually provided better and more consistent properties compared to traditional powder processing methods. However, further improvements in processing techniques are still required in order to develop high quality samples in sufficient quantities for reliable property determination, particularly of fracture toughness. The relationship between the nanocomposite structure, the properties, and the active toughening mechanisms remains to be established. Moreover, in order to fully exploit the reinforcing ability of CNTs, it

is clear that several critical issues remain to be solved, including: i) homogeneous dispersion of CNTs in the matrix system, ii) optimisation of the interfacial bonding between CNTs and adjacent matrix, and iii) development of novel consolidation methods/conditions that do not lead to CNT damage. In addition, higher quality CNTs, with intrinsic properties approaching the theoretical limit, are needed in sufficiently large volumes and purities for application in novel composite systems. The relationship of the toughening mechanisms to the wide variety of structural parameters associated with CNTs must also be established. Systematic studies exploring the impact of CNT dimensions, crystallinity, straightness, entanglement, internal structure and concentration will be needed in order to establish the 'ideal' nanotube for a given system or application.

On the other hand, many argue that the real value of CNTs lies in their range and breadth of properties, which include mechanical, electrical and thermal properties. These properties provide additional benefits when incorporating CNTs in ceramic and glass matrices, which enable the development of multifunctional structural materials with a relatively low concentration of CNTs. It is worth remembering that the small size of CNTs allows them to be incorporated where conventional fibre reinforcements cannot be accommodated, for example in thin and thick films, coatings, foams and in the matrix of conventional fibre composites. This concept has begun to be exploited in the polymer systems but remains to be explored using inorganic matrices.

7. References

1. Chawla, K. K., *Ceramic matrix composites*. 2 ed.; Springer: 2003.
2. Sternitzke, M., Structural ceramic nanocomposites. *Journal of the European Ceramic Society* **1997**, 17, (9), 1061-1082.
3. Matthews, F. L.; Rawlings, R. D., *Composite materials: Engineering and Science*. Woodhead Publishing Limited: 2003.
4. Marshall, D. B.; Evans, A. G., Failure Mechanisms in Ceramic-Fiber Ceramic-Matrix Composites. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **1985**, 68, (5), 225-231.
5. Brennan, J. J.; Prewo, K. M., Silicon-Carbide Fiber Reinforced Glass-Ceramic Matrix Composites Exhibiting High-Strength and Toughness. *Journal of Materials Science* **1982**, 17, (8), 2371-2383.
6. Beyerle, D. S.; Spearing, S. M.; Zok, F. W.; Evans, A. G., Damage and Failure in Unidirectional Ceramic-Matrix Composites (Vol 75, Pg 2719, 1992). *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **1993**, 76, (2), 560-560.
7. Chawla, K. K., *Fibrous materials*. Cambridge University Press 1998.
8. Bunsell, A.; Berger, M., *Fine ceramic fibres*. CRC Press 1999.
9. Dicarolo, J. A., Fibers for Structurally Reliable Metal and Ceramic Composites. *Journal of Metals* **1985**, 37, (6), 44-49.
10. Crivelli-Visconti, I.; Cooper, G. A., Mechanical properties of a new carbon fibre material. *Nature* **1969**, 221, 754-755.
11. Evans, A. G.; Zok, F. W., The Physics and Mechanics of Fiber-Reinforced Brittle-Matrix Composites. *Journal of Materials Science* **1994**, 29, (15), 3857-3896.
12. Baughman, R., Carbon nanotubes – the route toward applications. *Science's compas* **2002**, 297, (2), 787-792.
13. Yu, M. F.; Lourie, O.; Dyer, M. J.; Moloni, K.; Kelly, T. F.; Ruoff, R. S., Strength and breaking mechanism of multiwalled carbon nanotubes under tensile load. *Science* **2000**, 287, (5453), 637-640.
14. Kaneto, K.; Tsuruta, M.; Sakai, G.; Cho, W. Y.; Ando, Y., Electrical conductivities of multi-wall carbon nano tubes. *Synthetic Metals* **1999**, 103, (1-3), 2543-2546.
15. Riggs, J. E.; Walker, D. B.; Carroll, D. L.; Sun, Y. P., Optical limiting properties of suspended and solubilized carbon nanotubes. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **2000**, 104, (30), 7071-7076.

16. Berber, S.; Kwon, Y. K.; Tomanek, D., Unusually high thermal conductivity of carbon nanotubes. *Physical Review Letters* **2000**, 84, (20), 4613-4616.
17. Lau, K. T.; Hui, D., The revolutionary creation of new advanced materials - carbon nanotube composites. *Composites Part B-Engineering* **2002**, 33, (4), 263-277.
18. Thostenson, E. T.; Ren, Z. F.; Chou, T. W., Advances in the science and technology of carbon nanotubes and their composites: a review. *Composites Science and Technology* **2001**, 61, (13), 1899-1912.
19. Sandler, J. K. W.; Kirk, J. E.; Kinloch, I. A.; Shaffer, M. S. P.; Windle, A. H., Ultra-low electrical percolation threshold in carbon-nanotube-epoxy composites. *Polymer* **2003**, 44, (19), 5893-5899.
20. Zheng, L. X.; O'Connell, M. J.; Doorn, S. K.; Liao, X. Z.; Zhao, Y. H.; Akhadow, E. A.; Hoffbauer, M. A.; Roop, B. J.; Jia, Q. X.; Dye, R. C.; Peterson, D. E.; Huang, S. M.; Liu, J.; Zhu, Y. T., Ultralong single-wall carbon nanotubes. *Nature Materials* **2004**, 3, (10), 673-676.
21. Bethune, D. S.; Kiang, C. H.; Devries, M. S.; Gorman, G.; Savoy, R.; Vazquez, J.; Beyers, R., Cobalt-Catalyzed Growth of Carbon Nanotubes with Single-Atomic-Layerwalls. *Nature* **1993**, 363, (6430), 605-607.
22. Ebbesen, T. W.; Ajayan, P. M., Large-Scale Synthesis of Carbon Nanotubes. *Nature* **1992**, 358, (6383), 220-222.
23. Thess, A.; Lee, R.; Nikolaev, P.; Dai, H. J.; Petit, P.; Robert, J.; Xu, C. H.; Lee, Y. H.; Kim, S. G.; Rinzler, A. G.; Colbert, D. T.; Scuseria, G. E.; Tomanek, D.; Fischer, J. E.; Smalley, R. E., Crystalline ropes of metallic carbon nanotubes. *Science* **1996**, 273, (5274), 483-487.
24. Cheng, H. M.; Li, F.; Su, G.; Pan, H. Y.; He, L. L.; Sun, X.; Dresselhaus, M. S., Large-scale and low-cost synthesis of single-walled carbon nanotubes by the catalytic pyrolysis of hydrocarbons. *Applied Physics Letters* **1998**, 72, (25), 3282-3284.
25. Tibbetts, G. G.; Gorkiewicz, D. W.; Alig, R. L., A New Reactor for Growing Carbon-Fibers from Liquid-Phase and Vapor-Phase Hydrocarbons. *Carbon* **1993**, 31, (5), 809-814.
26. Salvetat, J. P.; Kulik, A. J.; Bonard, J. M.; Briggs, G. A. D.; Stockli, T.; Metenier, K.; Bonnamy, S.; Beguin, F.; Burnham, N. A.; Forro, L., Elastic modulus of ordered and disordered multiwalled carbon nanotubes. *Advanced Materials* **1999**, 11, (2), 161-165.
27. Shaffer, M. S. P.; Sandler, J. K. W., Carbon Nanotube/Nanofibre Polymer Composites. In *PROCESSING AND PROPERTIES OF NANOCOMPOSITES*, World Scientific: 2006; pp 1-59.
28. Andrews, R.; Jacques, D.; Qian, D. L.; Rantell, T., Multiwall carbon nanotubes:

- Synthesis and application. *Accounts of Chemical Research* **2002**, 35, (12), 1008-1017.
29. Ramirez, A. P., Carbon nanotubes for science and technology. *Bell Labs Technical Journal* **2005**, 10, (3), 171-185.
 30. Shaffer, M.; Kinloch, I. A., Prospects for nanotube and nanofibre composites. *Composites Science and Technology* **2004**, 64, (15), 2281-2282.
 31. Coleman, J. N.; Khan, U.; Blau, W. J.; Gun'ko, Y. K., Small but strong: A review of the mechanical properties of carbon nanotube-polymer composites. *Carbon* **2006**, 44, 1624-1652.
 32. Dai, H. J., Carbon nanotubes: opportunities and challenges. *Surface Science* **2002**, 500, (1-3), 218-241.
 33. Boccaccini, A. R.; Acevedo, D. R.; Brusatin, G.; Colombo, P., Borosilicate glass matrix composites containing multi-wall carbon nanotubes. *Journal of the European Ceramic Society* **2005**, 25, (9), 1515-1523.
 34. Arvantelis, C.; Jayaseelan, D. D.; Cho, J.; Boccaccini, A. R., Carbon nanotubes-SiO₂ composites by colloidal processing. *Advanced in applied ceramics* **2008**, 107, (3), 155-158.
 35. Harris, P. J. F., Carbon nanotube composites. *International Materials Reviews* **2004**, 49, (1), 31-43.
 36. Kovacs, J. Z.; Velagala, B. S.; Schulte, K.; Bauhofer, W., Two percolation thresholds in carbon nanotube epoxy composites. *Composites Science and Technology* **2007**, 67, (5), 922-928.
 37. Qian, D.; Dickey, E. C.; Andrews, R.; Rantell, T., Load transfer and deformation mechanisms in carbon nanotube-polystyrene composites. *Applied Physics Letters* **2000**, 76, (20), 2868-2870.
 38. Seeger, T.; Redlich, P.; Grobert, N.; Terrones, M.; Walton, D. R. M.; Kroto, H. W.; Ruhle, M., SiO_x-coating of carbon nanotubes at room temperature. *Chemical Physics Letters* **2001**, 339, (1-2), 41-46.
 39. Peigney, A.; Laurent, C.; Dumortier, O.; Rousset, A., Carbon nanotubes Fe alumina nanocomposites. Part I: Influence of the Fe content on the synthesis of powders. *Journal of the European Ceramic Society* **1998**, 18, (14), 1995-2004.
 40. Laurent, C.; Peigney, A.; Dumortier, O.; Rousset, A., Carbon nanotubes Fe alumina nanocomposites. Part II: Microstructure and mechanical properties of the hot-pressed composites. *Journal of the European Ceramic Society* **1998**, 18, (14), 2005-2013.
 41. Flahaut, E.; Peigney, A.; Laurent, C.; Marliere, C.; Chastel, F.; Rousset, A., Carbon nanotube-metal-oxide nanocomposites: Microstructure, electrical conductivity

- and mechanical properties. *Acta Materialia* **2000**, 48, (14), 3803-3812.
42. Flahaut, E.; Peigney, A.; Laurent, C.; Rousset, A., Synthesis of single-walled carbon nanotube-Co-MgO composite powders and extraction of the nanotubes. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2000**, 10, (2), 249-252.
 43. Flahaut, E.; Rul, S.; Lefevre-Schlick, F.; Laurent, C.; Peigney, A., Carbon nanotubes-ceramic composites. *Ceramic Nanomaterials and Nanotechnology Ii* **2004**, 148, 71-82.
 44. Peigney, A., Composite materials: Tougher ceramics with nanotubes. *Nature Materials* **2003**, 2, (1), 15-16.
 45. Peigney, A.; Flahaut, E.; Laurent, C.; Chastel, F.; Rousset, A., Aligned carbon nanotubes in ceramic-matrix nanocomposites prepared by high-temperature extrusion. *Chemical Physics Letters* **2002**, 352, (1-2), 20-25.
 46. Peigney, A.; Laurent, C.; Flahaut, E.; Rousset, A., Carbon nanotubes in novel ceramic matrix nanocomposites. *Ceramics International* **2000**, 26, (6), 677-683.
 47. Peigney, A.; Rul, S.; Lefevre-Schlick, F.; Laurent, C., Densification during hot-pressing of carbon nanotube-metal-magnesium aluminate spinel nanocomposites. *Journal of the European Ceramic Society* **2007**, 27, (5), 2183-2193.
 48. Rul, S.; Lefevre-schlick, F.; Capria, E.; Laurent, C.; Peigney, A., Percolation of single-walled carbon nanotubes in ceramic matrix nanocomposites. *Acta Materialia* **2004**, 52, (4), 1061-1067.
 49. An, J. W.; You, D. H.; Lim, D. S., Tribological properties of hot-pressed alumina-CNT composites. *Wear* **2003**, 255, 677-681.
 50. Lim, D. S.; You, D. H.; Choi, H. J.; Lim, S. H.; Jang, H., Effect of CNT distribution on tribological behavior of alumina-CNT composites. *Wear* **2005**, 259, (1-6), 539-544.
 51. Xia, Z.; Riester, L.; Curtin, W. A.; Li, H.; Sheldon, B. W.; Liang, J.; Chang, B.; Xu, J. M., Direct observation of toughening mechanisms in carbon nanotube ceramic matrix composites. *Acta Materialia* **2004**, 52, (4), 931-944.
 52. Xia, Z.; Curtin, W. A.; Sheldon, B. W., Fracture toughness of highly ordered carbon nanotube/alumina nanocomposites. *Journal of Engineering Materials and Technology-Transactions of the Asme* **2004**, 126, (3), 238-244.
 53. Xia, Z. H.; Lou, J.; Curtin, W. A., A multiscale experiment on the tribological behavior of aligned carbon nanotube/ceramic composites. *Scripta Materialia* **2008**, 58, (3), 223-226.
 54. Kamalakaran, R.; Lupo, F.; Grobert, N.; Lozano-Castello, D.; Jin-Phillipp, N. Y.; Ruhle, M., In-situ formation of carbon nanotubes in an alumina-nanotube composite

- by spray pyrolysis. *Carbon* **2003**, 41, (14), 2737-2741.
55. Kamalakaran, R.; Lupo, F.; Grobert, N.; Scheu, T.; Jin-Phillipp, N. Y.; Ruhle, M., Microstructural characterization of C-SiC-carbon nanotube composite flakes. *Carbon* **2004**, 42, (1), 1-4.
56. Morisada, Y.; Miyamoto, Y.; Takaura, Y.; Hirota, K.; Tamari, N., Mechanical properties of SiC composites incorporating SiC-coated multi-walled carbon nanotubes. *International Journal of Refractory Metals & Hard Materials* **2007**, 25, (4), 322-327.
57. Jiang, L. Q.; Gao, L., Carbon nanotubes-metal nitride composites: a new class of nanocomposites with enhanced electrical properties. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2005**, 15, (2), 260-266.
58. Jiang, L. Q.; Gao, L., Fabrication and characterization of carbon nanotube-titanium nitride composites with enhanced electrical and electrochemical properties. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **2006**, 89, (1), 156-161.
59. Huang, Q.; Gao, L., Multiwalled carbon nanotube/BaTiO₃ nanocomposites: Electrical and rectification properties. *Applied Physics Letters* **2005**, 86, (12).
60. Huang, Q.; Gao, L., Manufacture and electrical properties of multiwalled carbon nanotube/BaTiO₃ nanocomposite ceramics. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2004**, 14, (16), 2536-2541.
61. Huang, Q.; Gao, L.; Liu, Y. Q.; Sun, J., Sintering and thermal properties of multiwalled carbon nanotube-BaTiO₃ composites. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2005**, 15, (20), 1995-2001.
62. Huang, Q.; Gao, L.; Sun, J., Effect of adding carbon nanotubes on microstructure, phase transformation, and mechanical property of BaTiO₃ ceramics. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **2005**, 88, (12), 3515-3518.
63. Boccaccini, A. R.; Thomas, B. J. C.; Brusatin, G.; Colombo, P., Mechanical and electrical properties of hot-pressed borosilicate glass matrix composites containing multi-wall carbon nanotubes. *Journal of Materials Science* **2007**, 42, (6), 2030-2036.
64. Balazsi, C.; Konya, Z.; Weber, F.; Biro, L. P.; Arato, P., Preparation and characterization of carbon nanotube reinforced silicon nitride composites. *Materials Science & Engineering C-Biomimetic and Supramolecular Systems* **2003**, 23, (6-8), 1133-1137.
65. Balazsi, C.; Weber, F.; Kover, Z.; Konya, Z.; Kiricsi, I.; Biro, L. P.; Arato, P., Development of preparation processes for CNT/Si₃N₄ composites. In *Fractography of Advanced Ceramics II*, 2005; Vol. 290, pp 135-141.
66. Balazsi, C.; Shen, Z.; Konya, Z.; Kasztovszky, Z.; Weber, F.; Vertesy, Z.; Biro, L. P.; Kiricsi, I.; Arato, P., Processing of carbon nanotube reinforced silicon nitride

- composites by spark plasma sintering. *Composites Science and Technology* **2005**, 65, (5), 727-733.
67. Balazsi, C.; Fenyi, B.; Hegman, N.; Kover, Z.; Weber, F.; Vertesy, Z.; Konya, Z.; Kiricsi, I.; Biro, L. P.; Arato, P., Development of CNT/Si₃N₄ composites with improved mechanical and electrical properties. *Composites Part B-Engineering* **2006**, 37, (6), 418-424.
68. Balazsi, C.; Weber, F.; Kover, Z.; Shen, Z.; Konya, Z.; Kasztovszky, Z.; Vertesy, Z.; Biro, L. P.; Kiricsi, I.; Arato, P., Application of carbon nanotubes to silicon nitride matrix reinforcements. *Current Applied Physics* **2006**, 6, (2), 124-130.
69. Balazsi, C.; Sedlackova, K.; Czigany, Z., Structural characterization of Si₃N₄-carbon nanotube interfaces by transmission electron microscopy. *Composites Science and Technology* **2008**, 68, (6), 1596-1599.
70. Zhan, G. D.; Kuntz, J. D.; Garay, J. E.; Mukherjee, A. K., Electrical properties of nanoceramics reinforced with ropes of single-walled carbon nanotubes. *Applied Physics Letters* **2003**, 83, (6), 1228-1230.
71. Zhan, G. D.; Kuntz, J. D.; Wan, J. L.; Mukherjee, A. K., Single-wall carbon nanotubes as attractive toughening agents in alumina-based nanocomposites. *Nature Materials* **2003**, 2, (1), 38-42.
72. Wang, J.; Kou, H. M.; Liu, X. J.; Pan, Y. B.; Guo, J. K., Reinforcement of mullite matrix with multi-walled carbon nanotubes. *Ceramics International* **2007**, 33, (5), 719-722.
73. Ning, J. W.; Zhang, J. J.; Pan, Y. B.; Guo, J. K., Fabrication and mechanical properties of SiO₂ matrix composites reinforced by carbon nanotube. *Materials Science and Engineering a-Structural Materials Properties Microstructure and Processing* **2003**, 357, (1-2), 392-396.
74. Shaffer, M. S. P.; Fan, X.; Windle, A. H., Dispersion and packing of carbon nanotubes. *Carbon* **1998**, 36, (11), 1603-1612.
75. Poyato, R.; Vasiliev, A. L.; Padture, N. P.; Tanaka, H.; Nishimura, T., Aqueous colloidal processing of single-wall carbon nanotubes and their composites with ceramics. *Nanotechnology* **2006**, 17, (6), 1770-1777.
76. Du, C. S.; Yeh, J.; Pan, N., Carbon nanotube thin films with ordered structures. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2005**, 15, (5), 548-550.
77. Sun, J.; Gao, L.; Li, W., Colloidal processing of carbon nanotube/alumina composites. *Chemistry of Materials* **2002**, 14, (12), 5169-5172.
78. Sun, J.; Gao, L.; Jin, X. H., Reinforcement of alumina matrix with multi-walled carbon nanotubes. *Ceramics International* **2005**, 31, (6), 893-896.

79. Sun, J.; Gao, L., Development of a dispersion process for carbon nanotubes in ceramic matrix by heterocoagulation. *Carbon* **2003**, 41, (5), 1063-1068.
80. Hwang, G. L.; Hwang, K. C., Carbon nanotube reinforced ceramics. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2001**, 11, (6), 1722-1725.
81. Ning, J. W.; Zhang, J. J.; Pan, Y. B.; Guo, J. K., Surfactants assisted processing of carbon nanotube-reinforced SiO₂ matrix composites. *Ceramics International* **2004**, 30, (1), 63-67.
82. Fan, J. P.; Zhao, D. Q.; Wu, M. S.; Xu, Z. N.; Song, J., Preparation and microstructure of multi-wall carbon nanotubes-toughened Al₂O₃ composite. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **2006**, 89, (2), 750-753.
83. Moore, V. C.; Strano, M. S.; Haroz, E. H.; Hauge, R. H.; Smalley, R. E.; Schmidt, J.; Talmon, Y., Individually suspended single-walled carbon nanotubes in various surfactants. *Nano Letters* **2003**, 3, (10), 1379-1382.
84. Sun, J.; Iwasa, M.; Gao, L.; Zhang, Q. H., Single-walled carbon nanotubes coated with titania nanoparticles. *Carbon* **2004**, 42, (4), 895-899.
85. Fan, J. P.; Zhao, D. Q.; Xu, Z. N.; Wu, M. S., Preparation of MWNTS/Al₂O₃ composites and their mechanical and electrical properties. *Science in China Series E-Engineering & Materials Science* **2005**, 48, (6), 622-631.
86. Fan, J. P.; Zhuang, D. M.; Zhao, D. Q.; Zhang, G.; Wu, M. S.; Wei, F.; Fan, Z. J., Toughening and reinforcing alumina matrix composite with single-wall carbon nanotubes. *Applied Physics Letters* **2006**, 89, (12).
87. Estili, M.; Kawasaki, A., An approach to mass-producing individually alumina-decorated multi-walled carbon nanotubes with optimized and controlled compositions. *Scripta Materialia* **2008**, 58, (10), 906-909.
88. Balani, K.; Agarwal, A., Wetting of carbon nanotubes by aluminum oxide. *Nanotechnology* **2008**, 19, (16).
89. Inam, F.; Yan, H.; Reece, M. J.; Peijs, T., Dimethylformamide: an effective dispersant for making ceramic-carbon nanotube composites. *Nanotechnology* **2008**, 19, (19).
90. Yamamoto, G.; Omori, M.; Hashida, T.; Kimura, H., A novel structure for carbon nanotube reinforced alumina composites with improved mechanical properties. *Nanotechnology* **2008**, 19, (31).
91. Yamamoto, G.; Omori, M.; Hashida, T., Preparation of carbon nanotube - Toughened alumina composites. *Water Dynamics* **2008**, 987, 83-85.
92. Guo, S. Q.; Sivakumar, R.; Kagawa, Y., Multiwall carbon nanotube-SiO₂ nanocomposites: Sintering, elastic properties, and fracture toughness. *Advanced*

Engineering Materials **2007**, 9, (1-2), 84-87.

93. Guo, S. Q.; Sivakumar, R.; Kitazawa, H.; Kagawa, Y., Electrical properties of silica-based nanocomposites with multiwall carbon nanotubes. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **2007**, 90, (5), 1667-1670.
94. Sivakumar, R.; Guo, S. Q.; Nishimura, T.; Kagawa, Y., Thermal conductivity in multi-wall carbon nanotube/silica-based nanocomposites. *Scripta Materialia* **2007**, 56, (4), 265-268.
95. Cho, J., unpublished research.
96. Seeger, T.; Kohler, T.; Frauenheim, T.; Grobert, N.; Ruhle, M.; Terrones, M.; Seifert, G., Nanotube composites: novel SiO₂ coated carbon nanotubes. *Chemical Communications* **2002**, (1), 34-35.
97. Grobert, N.; Seeger, T.; Seifert, G.; Ruhle, M., Processing, characterisation and theory of carbon nanotubes containing SiO_x-based nanocomposites. *Journal of Ceramic Processing Research* **2003**, 4, (1), 1-5.
98. Seeger, T.; de la Fuente, G.; Maser, W. K.; Benito, A. M.; Callejas, M. A.; Martinez, M. T., Evolution of multiwalled carbon-nanotube/SiO₂ composites via laser treatment. *Nanotechnology* **2003**, 14, (2), 184-187.
99. DiMaio, J.; Rhyne, S.; Ballato, J.; Czerw, R.; Xu, J.; Webster, S.; Carroll, D. L.; Fu, K.; Sun, Y. P., Transparent silica glasses containing single walled carbon nanotubes. *Inorganic Optical Materials Iii* **2001**, 4452, 48-53.
100. Thomas, B. C., Shaffer, M. S. P., Boccaccini, A. R., Development of carbon nanotube containing borosilicate glass composites, *Composites Part A* **2008**, submitted..
101. de Andrade, M. J.; Lima, M. D.; Stein, L.; Bergmann, C. P.; Roth, S., Single-walled carbon nanotube silica composites obtained by an inorganic sol-gel route. *Physica Status Solidi B-Basic Solid State Physics* **2007**, 244, 4218-4222.
102. Zhang, Y. J.; Shen, Y. F.; Han, D. X.; Wang, Z. J.; Song, J. X.; Niu, L., Reinforcement of silica with single-walled carbon nanotubes through covalent functionalization. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2006**, 16, (47), 4592-4597.
103. Berguiga, L.; Bellessa, J.; Vocanson, F.; Bernstein, E.; Plenet, J. C., Carbon nanotube silica glass composites in thin films by the sol-gel technique. *Optical Materials* **2006**, 28, (3), 167-171.
104. Zheng, C.; Feng, M.; Zhen, X.; Huang, J.; Zhan, H. B., Materials investigation of multi-walled carbon nanotubes doped silica gel glass composites. *Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids* **2008**, 354, (12-13), 1327-1330.
105. de Andrede, M. J.; Lima, M. D.; Bergmann, C. P.; Ramminger, G. D.; Balzaretti, N. M.; Costa, T. M. H.; Gallas, M. R., Carbon nanotube/silica composites obtained by

- sol-gel and high-pressure techniques. *Nanotechnology* **2008**, 19, (26).
106. Hernadi, K.; Ljubovic, E.; Seo, J. W.; Forro, L., Synthesis of MWNT-based composite materials with inorganic coating. *Acta Materialia* **2003**, 51, (5), 1447-1452.
107. Boccaccini, A. R.; Zhitomirsky, I., Application of electrophoretic and electrolytic deposition techniques in ceramics processing. *Current Opinion in Solid State & Materials Science* **2002**, 6, (3), 251-260.
108. Corni, I.; Ryan, M. P.; Boccaccini, A. R., Electrophoretic deposition: From traditional ceramics to nanotechnology. *Journal of the European Ceramic Society* **2008**, 28, (7), 1353-1367.
109. Boccaccini, A. R.; Cho, J.; Roether, J. A.; Thomas, B. J. C.; Minay, E. J.; Shaffer, M. S. P., Electrophoretic deposition of carbon nanotubes. *Carbon* **2006**, 44, (15), 3149-3160.
110. Chicatun, F.; Cho, J.; Schaab, S.; Brusatin, G.; Colombo, P.; Roether, J. A.; Boccaccini, A. R., Carbon nanotube deposits and CNT/SiO₂ composite coatings by electrophoretic deposition. *Advances in Applied Ceramics* **2007**, 106, (4), 186-195.
111. Cho, J.; Schaab, S.; Roether, J. A.; Boccaccini, A. R., Nanostructured carbon nanotube/TiO₂ composite coatings using electrophoretic deposition (EPD). *Journal of Nanoparticle Research* **2008**, 10, 99-105.
112. Correa-Duarte, M. A.; Wagner, N.; Rojas-Chapana, J.; Morszeck, C.; Thie, M.; Giersig, M., Fabrication and biocompatibility of carbon nanotube-based 3D networks as scaffolds for cell seeding and growth. *Nano Letters* **2004**, 4, (11), 2233-2236.
113. Zhao, L. P.; Gao, L., Novel in situ synthesis of MWNTs-hydroxyapatite composites. *Carbon* **2004**, 42, (2), 423-426.
114. Aryal, S.; Bahadur, K. C. R.; Dharmaraj, N.; Kim, K. W.; Kim, H. Y., Synthesis and characterization of hydroxyapatite using carbon nanotubes as a nano-matrix. *Scripta Materialia* **2006**, 54, (2), 131-135.
115. Singh, I.; Kaya, C.; Shaffer, M. S. P.; Thomas, B. C.; Boccaccini, A. R., Bioactive ceramic coatings containing carbon nanotubes on metallic substrates by electrophoretic deposition. *Journal of Materials Science* **2006**, 41, (24), 8144-8151.
116. Cho, J., Bioglass + CNTs.
117. Mahajan, S. V.; Hasan, S. A.; Cho, J.; Shaffer, M. S. P.; Boccaccini, A. R.; Dickerson, J. H., Carbon nanotube-nanocrystal heterostructures fabricated by electrophoretic deposition. *Nanotechnology* **2008**, 19, (19).
118. Dobedoe, R. S.; West, G. D.; Lewis, M. H., Spark plasma sintering of ceramics: understanding temperature distribution enables more realistic comparison with conventional processing. *Advances in Applied Ceramics* **2005**, 104, (3), 110-116.

119. Anstis, G. R.; Chantikul, P.; Lawn, B. R.; Marshall, D. B., A critical-evaluation of indentation techniques for measuring fracture-toughness: I, Direct crack measurements. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **1981**, 64, (9), 533-538.
120. Wang, X. T.; Padture, N. P.; Tanaka, H., Contact-damage-resistant ceramic/single-wall carbon nanotubes and ceramic/graphite composites. *Nature Materials* **2004**, 3, (8), 539-544.
121. Sheldon, B. W.; Curtin, W. A., Nanoceramic composites: Tough to test. *Nature Materials* **2004**, 3, (8), 505-506.
122. Quinn, G. D.; Bradt, R. C., On the Vickers indentation fracture toughness test. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **2007**, 90, (3), 673-680.
123. Jiang, D. T.; Thomson, K.; Kuntz, J. D.; Ager, J. W.; Mukherjee, A. K., Effect of sintering temperature on a single-wall carbon nanotube-toughened alumina-based nanocomposite. *Scripta Materialia* **2007**, 56, (11), 959-962.
124. Padture, N. P.; Curtin, W. A., Comment on "Effect of sintering temperature on a single-wall carbon nanotube-toughened alumina-based composite". *Scripta Materialia* **2008**, 58, (11), 989-990.
125. Jiang, D.; Mukherjee, A. K., Response to comment on "Effect of sintering temperature on single-wall carbon nanotube toughened alumina-based nanocomposite". *Scripta Materialia* **2008**, 58, (11), 991-993.
126. Zhu, Y. F.; Shi, L.; Zhang, C.; Yang, X. Z.; Liang, J., Preparation and properties of alumina composites modified by electric field-induced alignment of carbon nanotubes. *Applied Physics a-Materials Science & Processing* **2007**, 89, (3), 761-767.
127. Wei, T.; Fan, Z. J.; Luo, G. H.; Wei, F., A new structure for multi-walled carbon nanotubes reinforced alumina nanocomposite with high strength and toughness. *Materials Letters* **2008**, 62, (4-5), 641-644.
128. Ahmad, K.; Pan, W., Hybrid nanocomposites: A new route towards tougher alumina ceramics. *Composites Science and Technology* **2008**, 68, (6), 1321-1327.
129. Katsuda, Y.; Gerstel, P.; Narayanan, J.; Bill, J.; Aldinger, F., Reinforcement of precursor-derived Si-C-N ceramics with carbon nanotubes. *Journal of the European Ceramic Society* **2006**, 26, (15), 3399-3405.
130. Ye, F.; Liu, L. M.; Wang, Y. J.; Zhou, Y.; Peng, B.; Meng, Q. C., Preparation and mechanical properties of carbon nanotube reinforced barium aluminosilicate glass-ceramic composites. *Scripta Materialia* **2006**, 55, (10), 911-914.
131. Balani, K.; Chen, Y.; Harlinkar, S. P.; Dahotre, N. B.; Agarwal, A., Tribological behavior of plasma-sprayed carbon nanotube-reinforced hydroxyapatite coating in physiological solution. *Acta Biomaterialia* **2007**, 3, (6), 944-951.

132. Chen, Y.; Zhang, T. H.; Gan, C. H.; Yu, G., Wear studies of hydroxyapatite composite coating reinforced by carbon nanotubes. *Carbon* **2007**, 45, (5), 998-1004.
133. Zapata-Solvas, E.; Poyato, R.; Gomez-Garcia, D.; Dominguez-Rodriguez, A.; Radmilovic, V.; Padture, N. P., Creep-resistant composites of alumina and single-wall carbon nanotubes. *Applied Physics Letters* **2008**, 92, (11).
134. Hull, D.; Clyne, T. W., *An Introduction to Composite Materials*. Cambridge University Press: 1996.
135. Klug, T., Preparation of C-Fiber Borosilicate Glass Composites - Influence of the Fiber-Type on Mechanical-Properties. *Journal of Materials Science* **1994**, 29, (15), 4013-4021.
136. Chung, D. L., *Composite Materials: Functional materials for modern technologies*. Springer: 2003.
137. Shi, S. L.; Liang, J., Electronic transport properties of multiwall carbon nanotubes/yttria-stabilized zirconia composites. *Journal of Applied Physics* **2007**, 101, (2) 023708.
138. Shi, S. L.; Liang, J., Effect of multiwall carbon nanotubes on electrical and dielectric properties of yttria-stabilized zirconia ceramic. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **2006**, 89, (11), 3533-3535.
139. Tatami, J.; Katashima, T.; Komeya, K.; Meguro, T.; Wakihara, T., Electrically conductive CNT-dispersed silicon nitride ceramics. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* **2005**, 88, (10), 2889-2893.
140. Xiang, C. S.; Pan, Y.; Guo, J. K., Electromagnetic interference shielding effectiveness of multiwalled carbon nanotube reinforced fused silica composites. *Ceramics International* **2007**, 33, (7), 1293-1297.
141. Rahatekar, S. S.; Hamm, M.; Shaffer, M. S. P.; Elliott, J. A., Mesoscale modeling of electrical percolation in fiber-filled systems. *Journal of Chemical Physics* **2005**, 123, (13).
142. Ning, J. W.; Zhang, J. J.; Pan, Y. B.; Guo, J. K., Fabrication and thermal property of carbon nanotube/SiO₂ composites. *Journal of Materials Science Letters* **2003**, 22, (14), 1019-1021.
143. Nan, C. W.; Liu, G.; Lin, Y. H.; Li, M., Interface effect on thermal conductivity of carbon nanotube composites. *Applied Physics Letters* **2004**, 85, (16), 3549-3551.
144. Nan, C. W.; Shi, Z.; Lin, Y., A simple model for thermal conductivity of carbon nanotube-based composites. *Chemical Physics Letters* **2003**, 375, (5-6), 666-669.
145. Liu, L. Q.; Zhang, S. A.; Hu, T. J.; Guo, Z. X.; Ye, C.; Dai, L. M.; Zhu, D. B., Solubilized multi-walled carbon nanotubes with broadband optical limiting effect.

Chemical Physics Letters **2002**, 359, (3-4), 191-195.

146. Jin, Z. X.; Sun, X.; Xu, G. Q.; Goh, S. H.; Ji, W., Nonlinear optical properties of some polymer/multi-walled carbon nanotube composites. *Chemical Physics Letters* **2000**, 318, (6), 505-510.

147. Yim, J. H.; Kim, J. T.; Lee, S.; Rotermund, F.; Koh, K. H., Nonlinear optical properties of SWCNTs incorporated silica composites. *2007 2nd Ieee International Conference on Nano/Micro Engineered and Molecular Systems, Vols 1-3* **2007**, 606-610.

148. Zhan, H. B.; Zheng, C.; Chen, W. Z.; Wang, M. Q., Characterization and nonlinear optical property of a multi-walled carbon nanotube/silica xerogel composite. *Chemical Physics Letters* **2005**, 411, (4-6), 373-377.

149. Zhan, H. B.; Chen, W. Z.; Wang, M. Q.; Zhengchan; Zou, C. L., Optical limiting effects of multi-walled carbon nanotubes suspension and silica xerogel composite. *Chemical Physics Letters* **2003**, 382, (3-4), 313-317.

150. Wang, F.; Rozhin, A. G.; Sun, Z.; Scardaci, V.; Penty, R. V.; White, I. H.; Ferrari, A. C., Fabrication, characterization and mode locking application of single-walled carbon nanotube/polymer composite saturable absorbers *International Journal of Material Forming* **2008**, 1, (2), 107-112.

151. Scardaci, V.; Rozhin, A. G.; Hennrich, F.; Milne, W. I.; Ferrari, A. C., Carbon nanotube-polymer composites for photonic devices. *Physica E-Low-Dimensional Systems & Nanostructures* **2007**, 37, (1-2), 115-118.

152. Mo, C. B.; Cha, S. I.; Kim, K. T.; Lee, K. H.; Hong, S. H., Fabrication of carbon nanotube reinforced alumina matrix nanocomposite by sol-gel process. *Materials Science and Engineering a-Structural Materials Properties Microstructure and Processing* **2005**, 395, (1-2), 124-128.

153. Balani, K.; Zhang, T.; Karakoti, A.; Li, W. Z.; Seal, S.; Agarwal, A., In situ carbon nanotube reinforcements in a plasma-sprayed aluminum oxide nanocomposite coating. *Acta Materialia* **2008**, 56, (3), 571-579.

154. Thostenson, E. T.; Karandikar, P. G.; Chou, T. W., Fabrication and characterization of reaction bonded silicon carbide/carbon nanotube composites. *Journal of Physics D-Applied Physics* **2005**, 38, (21), 3962-3965.

List of Figures

Figure 1 SEM images of fracture surfaces of (a) agglomerated CNTs in a borosilicate glass matrix³³, and (b) homogeneously dispersed CNTs in a silica matrix (individually pull-out CNT segments can be observed which may relate to possible toughening mechanisms)³⁴. (Permission to publish these images has been requested)

Figure 2 TEM image of SiO_x-coated MWCNTs produced by a sol-gel method, showing a uniform silica layer, 10nm thick ³⁸. (Permission to publish this image has been requested)

Figure 3 SEM images showing (a) relatively well distributed CNT network between the alumina grains⁴¹ and (b) fracture surface morphologies of hot-pressed alumina composites containing 12.5wt.% CNT ⁴⁹ (Permission to publish these images has been requested)

Figure 4 SEM image of a CNT/Al₂O₃ composite by Xia et al ⁵¹ viewed from the top (Permission to publish this image has been requested)

Figure 5 TEM images of adsorption of (a) Al₂O₃ ⁷⁷ and (b) TiO₂ ⁷⁹ nanoparticles on single CNTs during heterocoagulation by colloidal processing (Permission to publish these images has been requested)

Figure 6. SEM image showing pull-out of individual CNT (15wt.%) on the fracture surface of SiO₂ glass matrix composites produced by colloidal heterocoagulation and spark plasma sintering⁹⁵

Figure 7 SEM image of the fracture surface of a MWCNTs/borosilicate glass composites produced by sol-gel method¹⁰⁰.

Figure 8 Schematic illustration of the electrophoretic co-deposition of composite films containing CNTs and ceramic nanoparticles¹¹¹.

Figure 9 SEM images showing the cross-section of (a) a four-layer CNT/TiO₂ composite coating produced by sequential electrophoretic deposition¹¹¹, and (b) a Fe₃O₄ nanocrystal film between two CNT layers¹¹⁷. (Permission to published Figure 9(b) has been requested)

Figure 10 Modulus of elasticity of composites as a function of apparent density for Si₃N₄ composites containing 6wt.% MWNT produced by hot-isostatic press sintering and spark plasma sintering⁶⁶. The results clearly indicate that spark plasma sintering produces highly dense composites leading to at least 100% increase in modulus of elasticity

Figure 11 SEM images showing different failure mechanisms including (a) crack deflection, (b) CNT bridging, (c) CNT pull-out in CNT/alumina composites produced by in-situ CVD technique followed by hot-press sintering⁵¹
(Permission to published these images has been requested)

List of Tables

Table 1 Overview of mechanical properties of CNT/inorganic matrix composites as reported in the literature

Matrix material	CNT content	Processing routes	Investigated properties	Year
(%) indicates property improvement compared to monolith				
Al ₂ O ₃	SWNT 0.1 wt%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (VI): 4.9 MPam ^{1/2} (31%)	2002 ⁷⁷
Al ₂ O ₃	SWNT 10 vol.%	Powder processing	Fracture toughness (VI): 9.7 MPam ^{1/2} (200%)	2002 ⁷¹
Al ₂ O ₃	SWNT 10 vol.%	Powder processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): 3.33 MPam ^{1/2}	2002 ¹²⁰
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 4 vol.%	Powder processing	Friction coefficient: 0.45 (-10%), Wear loss: 2MPam ^{1/2} (-45%)	2003 ⁴⁹
Al ₂ O ₃	1.5 – 3.3 vol.%	Sol-gel	Fracture toughness (VI): 1.1MPa.m ^{1/2} (10%) with 1.5 wt.% CNT	2005 ¹⁵²
Al ₂ O ₃	1 wt.%	Colloidal processing	Bending strength: (10%)	2005 ⁷⁸
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 12 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): 5.55 MPam ^{1/2} (80%)	2006 ⁸²
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 2 wt.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): = dir. 4.66 MPam ^{1/2} (23.2%), ⊥ dir. 3.65 MPam ^{1/2} (-3.4%) Bending strength: = dir. 390.7MPa (22%), ⊥ dir. 191MPa (-36.75%)	2007 ¹²⁶
Al ₂ O ₃	SWNT 10 vol.%	Powder processing	Fracture toughness (VI): 9.71MPa.m ^{1/2} (200%), Hardness: 1610kg/mm ²	2007 ¹²³
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 0.9 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): 5.9MPa.m ^{1/2} (25%), Bending strength: 689.6MPa (27%)	2008 ⁹⁰
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 7 vol.%	Powder processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): 6.8MPa.m ^{1/2} (117%), Bending strength: 490MPa (44%)	2008 ¹²⁸
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 0.5 wt.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): 4.8MPa.m ^{1/2} (20%), Flexural strength: 572MPa (17%)	2008 ⁹¹
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 3 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): 5.01MPa.m ^{1/2} (79%), Bending strength: 410 (13%)	2008 ¹²⁷
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 0.5 wt.%	<i>in situ</i> CVD	Fracture toughness (VI): 4.62MPa.m ^{1/2} (12%), Hardness: 905.9V _H (12%)	2008 ¹⁵³
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 3.5 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (VI): 5.2MPa.m ^{1/2} (99.5%)	2008 ⁸⁷
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 10 vol.%	<i>in situ</i> CVD	Frictional coefficient: 0.073 (-50%)	2008 ⁵³

Matrix material	CNT content	Processing routes	Investigated properties	Year
			(%) indicates property improvement compared to monolith	
SiC	1-5 vol.%	Sol-gel method	Fracture toughness (VI): 5.4MPam ^{1/2} (12.5%), Hardness: 30.6 GPa (20%)	2007 ⁵⁶
Si ₃ N ₄	MWNT 1 wt.%	Powder processing	Bending strength: (37%)	2003 ⁶⁴
Si ₃ N ₄	MWNT 1-5 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Decrease in both modulus and strength	2006 ⁶⁷
Si-C-N	MWNT 1-2 wt.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): 1.8 MPam ^{1/2} (60%)	2006 ¹²⁹
mullite	MWNT 5 vol.%	Powder processing	Fracture toughness (VI): (78%), Bending strength: (10%)	2007 ⁷²
BAS	MWNT 10 vol.%	Powder processing	Fracture toughness (SENB): 2.97 MPam ^{1/2} (140%), Flexural strength: 245MPa (190%)	2006 ¹³⁰
SiO ₂	6 wt%	Sol-gel method	Hardness: 350H _v (100%)	2001 ⁸⁰
SiO ₂	MWNT 5-30 vol.%	Powder processing	Fracture toughness (VI): 2 MPam ^{1/2} (100%), Bending strength: 85MPa (65%)	2003 ⁷³
SiO ₂	MWNT 5 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (VI): 2.46 MPam ^{1/2} (146%), Bending strength: 97MPa (88%)	2004 ⁸¹
SiO ₂	MWNT 10 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Fracture toughness (VI): 2.74MPa (158%), Young's modulus: 43.89MPa (38%)	2007 ⁹²
SiO ₂	SWNT 0.05 wt.%	Sol-gel method	Fracture toughness (VI): 1.05MPa (69%)	2008 ¹⁰⁵
SiO ₂	MWNT 5 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Work of fracture: 0.32MPa (53%), Compressive strength: 6.1MPa (33%)	2008 ¹⁰⁴

Table 2 Overview of functional properties of CNT/inorganic matrix composites as reported in the literature

Matrix material	CNT contents	Processing routes	Investigated properties (%) indicates property improvement compared to monolith	Year
Fe/Co-MgAl ₂ O ₄	-	<i>in situ</i> CVD	Electrical conductivity: extrusion direction 20S/cm, transverse direction 0.6S/cm	2002 ⁴⁵
MgAl ₂ O ₄	0.2 – 25 vol.%	<i>in situ</i> CVD	Percolation threshold at 0.64 vol.% CNTs	2004 ⁴⁸
Al ₂ O ₃	SWNT 5.7-15 vol.%	Powder processing	Electrical conductivity: 3345S/m with 15 vol.% CNTs	2003 ⁷⁰
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 2 wt.%	Colloidal processing	Electrical conductivity: = dir. 6.2x10 ⁻² S/m, ⊥ dir. 6.8x10 ⁻⁹ S/m	2007 ¹²⁶
Al ₂ O ₃	MWNT 4.65vol.%	Colloidal processing	Electrical conductivity: 210S/m	2008 ⁸⁹
TiO ₂	MWNT 1.5 wt.%	Colloidal processing	Photocatalytic properties in Phenol degradation	2003 ⁷⁹
TiN	12.4vol%	<i>in situ</i> CVD	Electrical conductivity: 735 S/cm (44.7%)	2005 ⁵⁷
Fe ₂ N	11.7 vol.%	<i>in situ</i> CVD	Electrical conductivity: 885 S/cm (11.5%)	2005 ⁵⁷
Si ₃ N ₄	1.8-12wt.%	Colloidal processing	Electrical conductivity: 79 S/m with 1.8wt% CNT	2005 ¹³⁹
SiC	0.3-2.1 vol.%	<i>in situ</i> CVD	Electrical resistivity: (- 96%) at 2.1 vol.% CNTs	2005 ¹⁵⁴
ZrO ₂	MWNT 10 wt.%	Colloidal processing	Percolation threshold at 1.7wt% CNT	2006 ¹³⁸
SiO ₂	MWNT 10vol.%	Sol-gel	Thermal diffusion coefficient: (16.3%), thermal conductivity: (20.6%)	2003 ¹⁴²
SiO ₂	MWNT 10 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Electromagnetic interference shielding: 69db with 10vol% CNTs	2007 ¹⁴⁰
SiO ₂	MWNT 10 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Electrical conductivity: 65 S/m	2007 ⁹³
SiO ₂	MWNT 10 vol.%	Colloidal processing	Thermal conductivity: 4.08W/m.K (69%)	2007 ⁹⁴