

# Anisotropic Piezoresistive Response of 3D-Printed Pressure Sensor based on ABS/MWCNT Nanocomposite

Luciano J. B. Quaresma<sup>1,2</sup>, Dhonata S. C. Oliveira<sup>1,2</sup>, Rosielem S. Dias<sup>1,2</sup>, Kelly C. Alves<sup>1</sup>, Luiz G. D. Barros<sup>4,7</sup>, Gustavo Pessin<sup>5,6,7</sup>, Amilton Sinatora<sup>7</sup>, Waldeci Paraguassu<sup>1</sup>, Marcos A. L. Reis<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graduate Program in Materials Science and Engineering, Federal University of Pará, Ananindeua, PA, Brazil. <sup>2</sup>3D Nanostructuring Laboratory, Federal University of Pará, Belém, PA, Brazil. <sup>3</sup>Graduate Program in Amazon's Natural Resources Engineering, Federal University of Pará, Belém, PA, Brazil. <sup>4</sup>Mechanical Engineering Department, São Carlos School of Engineering, University of São Paulo, São Carlos, SP, Brazil. <sup>5</sup>Institute of Exact and Natural Sciences, Federal University of Pará, Belém, PA, Brazil. <sup>6</sup>Federal University of Ouro Preto, Ouro Preto, MG, Brazil. <sup>7</sup>Instituto Tecnológico Vale, Ouro Preto, MG, Brazil.

## Supplementary Information

Tab. 1 | Commercial ABS Raman spectroscopy data. The vibrational modes were grouped by region (R) and by respective Lorentzian (L) sequentially. The raw spectra as fitted with  $r^2=0.98535$ .

Region-Lorentzian	Raman shift ( $\text{cm}^{-1}$ )	Intensity (a.u.)	FWHM ( $\text{cm}^{-1}$ )
R <sub>1</sub> -L <sub>1</sub>	989.17	55.25	4.05
R <sub>1</sub> -L <sub>2</sub>	1001.38	1240.40	4.44
R <sub>1</sub> -L <sub>3</sub>	1030.12	146.24	4.86
R <sub>1</sub> -L <sub>4</sub>	1033.78	155.06	7.31
R <sub>2</sub> -L <sub>5</sub>	1156.00	64.65	7.06
R <sub>2</sub> -L <sub>6</sub>	1181.76	69.15	8.84
R <sub>2</sub> -L <sub>7</sub>	1188.69	24.07	8.84
R <sub>2</sub> -L <sub>8</sub>	1198.81	90.35	19.22
R <sub>3</sub> -L <sub>9</sub>	1445.94	66.05	16.75
R <sub>3</sub> -L <sub>10</sub>	1454.94	34.86	16.85
R <sub>4</sub> -L <sub>11</sub>	1583.26	73.32	5.44
R <sub>4</sub> -L <sub>12</sub>	1601.32	138.49	7.43
R <sub>4</sub> -L <sub>13</sub>	1604.55	78.92	5.02
R <sub>5</sub> -L <sub>14</sub>	1650.14	15.26	20.43
R <sub>5</sub> -L <sub>15</sub>	1667.11	29.93	7.35
R <sub>6</sub> -L <sub>16</sub>	1729.71	43.62	15.77
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>17</sub>	2843.71	63.34	14.96
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>18</sub>	2871.90	43.67	30.77
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>19</sub>	2898.45	65.49	31.68
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>20</sub>	2919.24	115.70	34.50
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>21</sub>	2947.77	126.71	25.57
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>22</sub>	2979.00	37.79	15.78
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>23</sub>	3001.54	48.36	30.46
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>24</sub>	3035.06	45.60	23.01
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>25</sub>	3052.57	92.95	12.81
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>26</sub>	3062.82	128.45	19.36

Tab. 2 | **As-received MWCNTs-COOH Raman spectroscopy data.** The raw spectra as fitted with  $r^2=0.99925$ .

CNTs Subband	Raman shift ( $\text{cm}^{-1}$ )	Intensity (a.u.)	FWHM ( $\text{cm}^{-1}$ )
D*	1134.30	42.64	133.61
D <sub>L</sub>	1285.62	61.30	129.30
D <sub>R</sub>	1325.58	1328.59	45.28
D <sub>LO</sub>	1405.40	35.77	102.67
D <sub>middle</sub>	1494.47	41.83	93.28
G <sub>out</sub>	1575.15	789.19	39.10
G <sub>inn</sub>	1602.49	206.58	22.53
D'	1613.22	233.22	19.59
D**	2490.57	24.89	137.36
2D <sub>L</sub>	2624.32	118.62	86.23
2D <sub>R</sub>	2650.78	278.06	62.31
D+G	2901.80	45.39	95.17

Tab. 3 | ABS/MWCNTs-COOH nanocomposite Raman spectroscopy data. The vibrational modes were labelled as the individual materials. The dislocations are significant above 2 cm<sup>-1</sup>, considering equipment variations, and redshifts are represented by negative signs. The G\* subband was identified only in the nanocomposite spectra. The raw spectra as fitted with  $r^2=0.99439$ .

Subband	Raman shift (cm <sup>-1</sup> )	Intensity (a.u.)	FWHM (cm <sup>-1</sup> )	Dislocation (cm <sup>-1</sup> )
R <sub>1</sub> -L <sub>1</sub>	987.99	28.55	10.83	-1.18
R <sub>1</sub> -L <sub>2</sub>	1001.31	711.86	4.56	-0.07
R <sub>1</sub> -L <sub>3</sub>	1029.75	77.00	5.45	-0.38
R <sub>1</sub> -L <sub>4</sub>	1033.28	113.29	7.00	-0.50
D*	Not identified			
R <sub>2</sub> -L <sub>5</sub>	1156.53	59.28	1.38	0.54
R <sub>2</sub> -L <sub>6</sub>	1183.82	52.22	4.00	2.06
R <sub>2</sub> -L <sub>7</sub>	1193.41	46.92	6.51	4.72
R <sub>2</sub> -L <sub>8</sub>	1199.14	61.53	6.73	0.33
D <sub>L</sub>	1293.51	55.96	31.54	7.89
D <sub>R</sub>	1329.78	1022.26	43.23	4.20
D <sub>LO</sub>	1377.79	68.29	73.63	-27.61
R <sub>3</sub> -L <sub>9</sub>	1447.64	120.51	29.62	1.70
R <sub>3</sub> -L <sub>10</sub>	Not identified			
D <sub>middle</sub>	1508.89	39.03	73.73	14.42
G*	1565.63	133.20	36.09	--
G <sub>out</sub>	1583.03	322.58	22.16	7.88
R <sub>4</sub> -L <sub>11</sub>	1583.19	41.50	3.13	-0.07
G <sub>inn</sub>	1601.92	330.28	16.06	-0.57
R <sub>4</sub> -L <sub>12</sub>	1603.42	45.63	3.98	0.92
R <sub>4</sub> -L <sub>13</sub>	Not identified			
D'	1618.02	194.76	17.73	4.80
R <sub>5</sub> -L <sub>14</sub>	Not identified			
R <sub>5</sub> -L <sub>15</sub>	Not identified			
R <sub>6</sub> -L <sub>16</sub>	1731.11	28.81	11.27	1.40
D**	Not identified			
2D <sub>L</sub>	2649.61	123.24	93.34	25.29
2D <sub>R</sub>	2706.38	89.70	89.44	55.59
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>17</sub>	2844.82	41.03	12.31	1.12
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>18</sub>	2871.41	30.06	26.77	-0.49
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>19</sub>	2895.79	43.43	30.15	-2.67
D+G	Not identified			
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>20</sub>	2917.02	110.02	35.85	-2.22
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>21</sub>	2946.88	107.37	28.91	-0.89
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>22</sub>	2979.93	22.58	14.15	0.92
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>23</sub>	3000.28	23.74	22.58	-1.26
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>24</sub>	3034.12	26.64	14.71	-0.94
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>25</sub>	3052.78	81.35	13.04	0.22
R <sub>7</sub> -L <sub>26</sub>	3062.71	77.32	16.33	-0.11

Tab. 4 | **Piezoresistive behavior in cycles of increasing pressure.** Mean values and standard deviations from three different samples per group of initial electrical resistance (R), sensitivity (S), response time ( $t_{res}$ ) and recovery time ( $t_{rec}$ ) for each cycle of 20 seconds with pressure (P) and 20 seconds without load.

	<b>B group</b>	<b>C group</b>
R	$251.59 \pm 105.17$ kW	$366.51 \pm 80.63$ kW
Cycle 1 $P = 68.27 \pm 0.22$ kPa	S $t_{res}$ $t_{rec}$	No response
Cycle 2 $P = 139.97 \pm 0.46$ kPa	S $t_{res}$ $t_{rec}$	$0.08 \pm 0.03$ % $0.68 \pm 0.01$ s $2.26 \pm 1.87$ s
Cycle 3 $P = 213.41 \pm 0.47$ kPa	S $t_{res}$ $t_{rec}$	$0.22 \pm 0.04$ % $1.24 \pm 0.98$ s $3.95 \pm 2.88$ s
Cycle 4 $P = 288.92 \pm 0.29$ kPa	S $t_{res}$ $t_{rec}$	$0.53 \pm 0.25$ % $6.10 \pm 6.35$ s $7.23 \pm 1.53$ s
Cycle 5 $P = 363.25 \pm 0.39$ kPa	S $t_{res}$ $t_{rec}$	$0.75 \pm 0.36$ % $4.52 \pm 6.36$ s $10.84 \pm 2.06$ s
		$0.07 \pm 0.03$ % $0.56 \pm 0.20$ s $5.76 \pm 2.69$ s
		$0.19 \pm 0.06$ % $1.24 \pm 0.52$ s $8.36 \pm 2.54$ s
		$0.33 \pm 0.11$ % $1.13 \pm 1.09$ s $9.60 \pm 2.82$ s
		$0.42 \pm 0.12$ % $1.02 \pm 0.90$ s $15.02 \pm 1.41$ s

Tab. 5 | **Piezoresistive behavior in cycles constant pressure.** Mean values and standard deviations from three different samples per group of mean sensitivity (S), mean response time ( $t_{res}$ ) and mean recovery time ( $t_{rec}$ ) for 20 cycles with 20 seconds of  $363.25 \pm 0.39$  kPa pressure and 20 seconds without load.

<b>B group</b>	<b>C group</b>
S	$0.50 \pm 0.10$ %
$t_{res}$	$0.69 \pm 0.04$ s
$t_{rec}$	$14.17 \pm 1.64$ s
	$0.38 \pm 0.22$ %
	$0.60 \pm 0.08$ s
	$15.93 \pm 1.12$ s