

CASE STUDY

# Synergex<sup>™</sup> LA amine additive

in a semisynthetic metalworking fluid formulation



eastman.com/synergex



## Introduction

This case study was conducted to compare Synergex<sup>™</sup> LA amine additive and Amietol<sup>™</sup> M12 (MDEA, CAS 105-59-9) to a more conventional amine combination. The formulations were as similar as possible to allow for a fair comparison.

### Table 1. Formulations

| Raw material                                | Description                          | Formulation 405A            | Formulation 405B |  |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Ergon HyGold 100                            | 100 SUS naphthenic oil               | 100 SUS naphthenic oil 40.0 |                  |  |  |
| Polartech <sup>®</sup> EA 700               | Polymeric emulsifier                 | Polymeric emulsifier 7.0    |                  |  |  |
| Altapyne <sup>®</sup> M-28B                 | High-rosin tall oil fatty acids      | 2.0                         | 2.0              |  |  |
| Polartech <sup>®</sup> LA <sup>™</sup> 8005 | Polymerized ricinoleic acid          | 3.0                         | 3.0              |  |  |
| ACC EM-8                                    | Nonionic emulsifier                  | 4.0                         | 4.0              |  |  |
| ACC AE-43                                   | EO/PO alcohol                        | 3.0                         | 3.0              |  |  |
| AKYPO <sup>®</sup> TEC AM                   | Ether carboxylate                    | 1.5                         | 1.5              |  |  |
| Rhodafac <sup>®</sup> AS 010                | Aluminum stain inhibitor             | 0.75                        | 0.75             |  |  |
| OPP 40%                                     | Bactericide/fungicide; 40% in glycol | 3.75                        | 3.75             |  |  |
| MIPA  | Amine                                | 2                           |                  |  |  |
| TEA 99 LFG                                  | Triethanolamine                      | 5.0                         | —                |  |  |
| Amietol M12                                 | Amine                                | _                           | 5.0              |  |  |
| Synergex LA                                 | Specialty amine                      | _                           | 3.0              |  |  |
| Cola <sup>®</sup> Cor 232                   | Corrosion inhibitor blend            | 4.0                         | 4.0              |  |  |
| Cola <sup>®</sup> Cor RP                    | Amine borate complex                 | 4.0                         | 4.0              |  |  |
| DI water                                    | Deionized water                      | 18.45                       | 17.45            |  |  |
| TT50  | Sodium tolyltriazole 50%             | 0.50                        | 0.50             |  |  |
| Foam Ban <sup>®</sup> HV-810G               | Defoamer                             | 0.05 0.05                   |                  |  |  |
| Coupler                                     |                                      |                             |                  |  |  |
| Propylene glycol                            |                                      | 1.0                         |                  |  |  |
| EO alcohol                                  | High-HLB emulsifier                  | _                           | 1.0              |  |  |

## Figure 1. The prototype concentrates



Both samples show the same color and stability in concentrate form. No defoamers were used to better differentiate the foaming performance or gauge sample stability. The goal was to perform basic testing to indicate the performance benefits that can be achieved using Synergex LA.

## Foam testing

Foam testing was performed by preparing 5% dilutions in water with 100 ppm hardness and blending with a kitchen mixer for five minutes. For the foam to break completely, the lapse times were:

- 405A: 19 seconds
- 405B: 105 seconds

## Figure 2. Samples after the completion of the foam testing





The lower foam break times associated with sample 405A correspond to less emulsion stability. A closer look at the top of these emulsions shows the instability of sample 405A.

## Cast iron chip testing

Cast iron chip corrosion testing was performed on both samples at 2%, 3%, and 4% in 200 ppm water. In the test, 2.5 grams of cast iron chips were added to a plastic Petri dish that contained a piece of filter paper. The chips were covered with the test fluid for five minutes and then drained. The Petri dishes remained covered for 24 hours and then were allowed to dry.



Figure 3. Cast iron chips after corrosion testing (top row is 405A and the bottom row is 405B)

All three concentrations displayed improved cast iron chip corrosion resistance in sample 405B. This indicates that the amine combination in sample 405B (Amietol M12 and Synergex LA) provides better protection than the combination used in sample 405A (MIPA and TEA).

## **Emulsion stability**

Emulsion stability testing was performed by preparing emulsions at 5% in water with 650 ppm hardness and allowing them to sit for 24 hours.



#### Figure 4. Emulsions after stability testing

A closer inspection of the top of these emulsions shows more instability in sample 405A than in 405B.

## **Aluminum stain testing**

Aluminum stain testing was done by soaking five different aluminum specimens (319, 356-T6, 2024, 6061-T6, and 7075) for 24 hours in emulsions of the prototypes prepared at 5% in water with 200 ppm.

There appeared to be little difference in how the different combinations affected the amount of stain observed. The aluminum stain profile did not get worse, even with the improvement in cast iron chip corrosion performance.

#### Figure 5. Aluminum specimens after stain testing





## **Microbial resistance**

Both samples were submitted to Biosan Laboratories for ASTM E686 testing to determine their resistance to bacteria and fungal growth. In addition to the gathered data, it was noted that sample 405A turned a light brown color during testing, whereas sample 405B did not.

## Table 2. Aerobic bacteria and fungi levels

|         | 16881-1 GMA-405A at 7% |                     |      | 16881-2 GMA-405B at 7% |                       |      |
|---------|------------------------|---------------------|------|------------------------|-----------------------|------|
|         | Bacteria/mL            | Fungi/mL            | рН   | Bacteria/mL            | Fungi/mL              | ρН   |
| Time 0* | 1 x 10 <sup>7</sup>    | 4 x 10 <sup>5</sup> | 9.53 | 9.5 x 10 <sup>6</sup>  | 1.5 x 10 <sup>6</sup> | 9.51 |
| Week 6  | < 2                    | < 2                 | 9.31 | 52                     | < 2                   | 9.36 |

\*After inoculation

## pH stability

Testing was performed on 5% emulsions of both samples to determine pH stability over time. The testing involved preparing 500 mL of a 5% emulsion of each sample in DI water and allowing the emulsions to sit uncovered for two weeks. The pH was measured daily on both fluids. Sample 405B displayed slightly better pH stability than sample 405A. The pH data from the Biosan Laboratories report coincide with these data.

|        | 405A | 405B |
|--------|------|------|
| Day 1  | 9.46 | 9.48 |
| Day 2  | 9.43 | 9.48 |
| Day 5  | 9.44 | 9.48 |
| Day 6  | 9.38 | 9.39 |
| Day 7  | 9.36 | 9.38 |
| Day 8  | 9.35 | 9.38 |
| Day 9  | 9.34 | 9.38 |
| Day 12 | 9.34 | 9.38 |
| Day 13 | 9.34 | 9.38 |
| Day 14 | 9.34 | 9.38 |
| Day 15 | 9.33 | 9.38 |

#### Table 3. pH levels

## **Results and conclusion**

The purpose of this case study was to determine if improvements in biological resistance could be shown using Synergex LA. It also was meant to reveal any other tangible benefits. While significant improvement in microbial resistance in the Synergex LA/Amietol M12 formulation (405B) over the MIPA/TEA formulation (405A) was not reported, the data does show that excellent microbial control can be achieved with relatively modest levels of 1.5% *ortho*-phenylphenol (OPP) in combination with Synergex LA.

The formulation utilizing Synergex LA and Amietol M12 displayed emulsion stability enhancement along with better ferrous corrosion resistance and a reduction in the aluminum stain. Furthermore, a slight improvement in pH stability existed in sample 405B (Synergex LA/Amietol M12) over 405A (MIPA/TEA).

For more information on Synergex multifunctional amine additives, visit eastman.com/Synergex or contact your Eastman representative or your authorized Eastman distributor.



#### Eastman Corporate Headquarters P.O. Box 431 Kingsport, TN 37662-5280 U.S.A.

U.S.A. and Canada, 800-EASTMAN (800-327-8626) Other locations, +(1) 423-229-2000

eastman.com/locations

Although the information and recommendations set forth herein are presented in good faith, Eastman Chemical Company ("Eastman") and its subsidiaries make no representations or warranties as to the completeness or accuracy thereof. You must make your own determination of its subsibility and completeness for your own use, for the protection of the environment, and for the health and safety of your employees and purchasers of your products. Nothing contained herein is to be construed as a recommendation to use any product, process, equipment, or formulation in conflict with any patent, and we make no representations or warranties, express or implied, that the use thereof will not infringe any patent. NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES, EITHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, OR OF ANY OTHER NATURE ARE MADE HEREUNDER WITH RESPECT TO INFORMATION OR THE PRODUCT TO WHICH INFORMATION REFERS AND NOTHING HEREIN WAIVES ANY OF THE SELLER'S CONDITIONS OF SALE.

Safety Data Sheets providing safety precautions that should be observed when handling and storing our products are available online or by request. You should obtain and review available material safety information before handling our products. If any materials mentioned are not our products, appropriate industrial hygiene and other safety precautions recommended by their manufacturers should be observed.

© 2023 Eastman. Eastman brands referenced herein are trademarks of Eastman or one of its subsidiaries or are being used under license. Non-Eastman brands referenced herein are trademarks of their respective owners.