



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**ELECTROMAGNETIC CHARACTERIZATION OF Sm-YIG AND Sm-YIG-
PVDF COMPOSITES PREPARED USING MODIFIED CONVENTIONAL
MIXING OXIDE TECHNIQUE**

RAMADAN MASOUD AL-HABASHI

ITMA 2009 3



**ELECTROMAGNETIC CHARACTERIZATION
OF Sm-YIG AND Sm-YIG-PVDF COMPOSITES
PREPARED USING MODIFIED
CONVENTIONAL MIXING OXIDE TECHNIQUE**

RAMADAN MASOUD AL-HABASHI

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

2009



**ELECTROMAGNETIC CHARACTERIZATION OF Sm-YIG AND
Sm-YIG-PVDF COMPOSITES PREPARED USING MODIFIED
CONVENTIONAL MIXING OXIDE TECHNIQUE**

By

RAMADAN MASOUD AL-HABASHI

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

September 2009



Appendixes

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my son, daughters, wife and parents; to whom their true love and support motivated my success.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**ELECTROMAGNETIC CHARACTERIZATION OF Sm-YIG AND
Sm-YIG-PVDF COMPOSITES PREPARED USING MODIFIED
CONVENTIONAL MIXING OXIDE TECHNIQUE**

By

RAMADAN MASOUD AL-HABASHI

September 2009

Chairman: Zulkifly Bin Abbas, PhD

Institute: Advanced Technology

Samarium substituted-yttrium iron garnet (Sm-YIG) nanoparticles were fabricated via a modified conventional mixing oxides (MCMO) method according to the $Y_{3-x}Sm_xFe_5O_{12}$ system ($0 \leq x \leq 3$). In this research, utilization of an organic compound (ethanol) and metal oxides in conjunction with mixing the reactants directly without adding water are the key techniques of this method. Using ethanol solution instead of water could produce nanoparticles with better homogeneity and smoother surface structure. Single-phase garnet structure of Sm-YIG nanoparticles was produced at 1350 °C sintering temperature with an average particle size ranged from 25 to 39 nm. XRD results of Sm-YIG samples at $x = 2$ and 2.5, presented some unknown peaks which speculated to, the time or/and sintering temperature is/are not enough to form the garnet structure phase of the samples. The true density values of 5.245 and 6.221 g.cm⁻³ were calculated for pure yttrium iron garnet (YIG, $x=0$) and samarium iron garnet (SmIG, $x=3$) samples, respectively which reached around 99% of the theoretical density of the samples.



Real permittivities of the Sm-YIG samples presented almost flat values ranged from 7 to 10 with loss factors around 0.1 to 0.3, for YIG ($x=0$) and SmIG ($x=3$) respectively, within 10 MHz to 1 GHz frequency range. The real permeability value 19.5 is presented by pure YIG at 13.4 MHz and declined rapidly to be around 2 at 1 GHz, and decreased with increasing x . The higher permeability resulted in lower permittivity and vice versa for all the Sm-YIG samples.

This work was also carried out to prepare the 10 wt% Sm-YIG in Poly-vinylidene-fluoride (PVDF) composite samples and study their electromagnetic properties. Sm-YIG samples prepared via MCMO method, PVDF powder and Ethyl-methyl-ketone (MEK) were used to prepare such composites. High permittivities of composite samples observed at lower frequency range indicated to the heterogeneous conduction in the multiphase structure of the composites. The real permeabilities presented almost flat values through all the range of the frequency from 10 MHz to 1 GHz, with value of 1.06 at $x=0$ and 1.13 at $x=3$, for 10 wt% Sm-YIG loading in the composites. MCMO technique appears to be another alternative to the conventional (manufactured) technique, due to the decreasing of the particle size with better homogeneity, high purity, reduction of the cost, and high yield in a nano-scale product compared to other preparations techniques.

The numerical optimization method performed using MATLAB program is to estimate the effective complex permittivity and/or permeability of each component of the 10 wt% Sm-YIG-PVDF composite samples. It is found that, the optimum impedance values are very close to the measured ones for each composite. The optimized values of the complex permittivities and permeabilities for both

components [Sm-YIG and PVDF] are within the estimated ranges. The optimization process eliminated the difference between the measured impedance and the calculated one from Maxwell-Garnett (MG) formula via a specific objective function.

Results of a developed formula based on MG formula with a comparison of various theoretical models including the MG, Looyenga, Bruggeman and Sen-Scala-Cohen, have been carried out and discussed with comparisons to the measurements for the 10 wt% Sm-YIG-PVDF composite samples. This was to calculate the complex permittivity and permeability of such composite materials. The lowest mean error percentage values were detected from the developed MG formula for each composite, which was different from composite to composite depend on the mole fraction x . The developed MG model appears to add a new contribution to the theoretical models to calculate the effective permittivity and permeability of mixture ferrite-polymer materials, due to its accuracy as compared with others.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**PENCIRIAN ELEKTROMAGNETIK KOMPOSIT Sm-YIG DAN
Sm-YIG-PVDF MENGGUNAKAN TEKNIK DIMODIFIKASI
KONVENSIONAL CAMPURAN OKSIDA**

Oleh

RAMADAN MASOUD AL-HABASHI

September 2009

Pengerusi: Zulkifly Bin Abbas, PhD
Institut: Teknologi Maju

Zarah nano Samarium-YIG telah difabrikasikan melalui kaedah pengubahsuaian konvensional pencampuran oksida (MCMO) berdasarkan kepada sistem $Y_{3-x}Sm_xFe_5O_{12}$ ($0 \leq x \leq 3$). Dalam kajian ini, penggunaan sebatian organik (etanol) dan oksida logam bersama dengan campuran reaktan secara terus tanpa penambahan air adalah kunci teknik untuk kaedah ini. Menggunakan larutan etanol menggantikan air boleh menghasilkan zarah nano dengan keseragaman yang lebih baik dan struktur permukaan yang lebih halus. Zarah nano Sm-YIG berstruktur garnet fasa tunggal telah dihasilkan pada suhu pemanasan $1350\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ dengan purata saiz zarah berjulat antara 25 ke 39 nm. Keputusan XRD bagi sampel Sm-YIG pada $x=2$ dan 2.5 menunjukkan beberapa puncak yang tak diketahui yang menggambarkan masa atau/dan suhu pemanasan adalah tidak mencukupi untuk membentuk struktur fasa garnet pada sampel. Nilai ketumpatan sebenar adalah 5.245 dan 6.221 g.cm^{-3} telah dikira untuk yttrium iron garnet (YIG, $x=0$) tulen dan samarium iron garnet (SmIG, $x=3$) masing-masing dimana mencapai 99% ketumpatan sampel secara teori.

Ketelusan sebenar bagi sampel Sm-YIG menunjukkan adalah kebanyakan nilai rata berjulat daripada 7 ke 10 dengan faktor kehilangan sekitar 0.1 ke 0.3 untuk YIG ($x=0$) dan SmIG ($x=3$) masing-masing dalam julat frekuensi 10 MHz ke 1 GHz. Nilai sebenar ketelapan 19.5 didapati dari YIG tulen pada 13.4 MHz dan berkurang dengan cepat sekitar 2 pada 1GHz dan berkurang dengan peningkatan jumlah x . Semakin tinggi nilai ketelapan menyebabkan semakin rendah nilai ketelusan dan sebaliknya untuk semua sampel Sm-YIG.

Kerja ini juga telah dilaksanakan untuk menyediakan 10 wt% Sm-YIG dalam sampel komposit Poly-vinylidene-fluride (PVDF) dan mengkaji sifat-sifat elektromagnetiknya. Sm-YIG sampel disediakan melalui kaedah MCMO, Serbuk PVDF dan Ethyl-methyl-ketone (MEK) telah digunakan untuk menyediakan komposit seperti ini. Ketelusan tinggi bagi sampel komposit telah diperhatikan pada julat frekuensi rendah menunjukkan kepada konduksi heterogen di dalam struktur multifasa komposit. Ketelapan sebenar menunjukkan kebanyakan nilai rata sepanjang kesemua julat untuk frequency dari 10 MHz hingga 1 GHz, dengan nilai 1.06 pada $x=0$ dan 1.13 pada $x=3$, bagi 10% Sm-YIG di dalam komposit. Ini menunjukkan percampuran baik campuran homogen komposit ferrite-polimer. Teknik MCMO juga adalah sebagai alternative lain bagi teknik konvensional (penghasilan), kerana dapat menghasilkan pengurangan saiz zarah dengan homogen yang baik, ketulenan yang tinggi, pengurangan kos, dan hasil yang tinggi dalam produk skala-nano berbanding dengan teknik penghasilan yang lain.

Teknik pengoptimuman berangka telah dilakukan menggunakan program MATLAB. Ini adalah untuk menganggarkan ketelusan dan/atau ketelapan kompleks berkesan

bagi setiap komponen sampel komposit 10 wt% Sm-YIG di dalam PVDF. Didapati bahawa, nilai impedan optimum adalah sangat hampir dengan nilai yang diukur bagi setiap komposit. Nilai optimum bagi ketelusan dan ketelapan kompleks pada kedua-dua komponen [Sm-YIG dan PVDF] adalah didalam julat anggaran. Proses pengoptimuman telah menghapuskan perbezaan di antara impedan yang telah diukur dan yang dikira daripada formula Maxwell-Garnett (MG) dengan membezakan antara pelbagai model teori termasuk MG, Looyenga, Bruggeman dan Sen-Scala-Cohen, telah dijalankan dan dibincangkan dengan membezakan nilai pengukuran pada 10% Sm-YIG di dalam komposit sampel PVDF. Ini adalah untuk mengira ketelusan dan ketelapan kompleks bagi bahan komposit itu. Bagi setiap komposit, nilai purata ralat yang terendah telah didapati daripada formula MG yang telah dibangunkan, yang mana ini adalah berbeza daripada kebergantungan komposit kepada komposit pada pecahan mol x . Formula model MG yang telah dibangunkan dapat memberikan sumbangan baru kepada model teori untuk mengira ketelusan dan ketelapan efektif bagi bahan campuran polimer ferrite, berdasarkan kepada ketepatannya berbanding dengan yang lain.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, great thanks to the Most Gracious and Most Merciful ALLAH (S.W.T) without his wish and help this work would not have been possible. I also would like to express the most sincere appreciation to those who made this work possible: Advisory members, Friends and Family.

I would like to thank Dr. Zulkify Abbas for providing me with the opportunity to complete my PhD. studies under his valuable guidance, for the many useful advice and discussions, for his constant encouragement and guidance, and for co-authoring and reviewing my publications, where his practical experience and technical knowledge made this research and those publications more interesting and relevant. Also special thanks extend to the supervisory committee members; Prof. Dr. Kaida Khalid and Prof. Dr. Mohd Maarof HJ Abd Moxsin. I am grateful for their willingness to serve on my supervisory committee, constant encouragement, helpful advice and many fruitful discussions.

I also wish to extend my special appreciation to the staff of Institute Advanced Technology for their constant encouragement, kindness and helpful advice; the special thanks to the Program Manager, Electronic Material, AMNL, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mansor Hashim for his kindness and helpful advice; and I would like to thank all my colleagues in AMNL for their helpful advice and many fruitful discussions. I also wish to extend my appreciation to Mrs. Rosnah Nawang and to the technician of AMNL, Mohd Kadri Masoud, for their kindness, support and for providing help whenever needed. Special thanks extend to Prof. Dr. Abd. Halim Shaari “Physics department” for his kindness, and providing help whenever needed.



I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to all who have support me during my life, in special, Mr. Alabyad, head of Plasma Physics Department, Tajoura Research Center, Libya. Ministry of Higher Education of Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is gratefully acknowledged.

I would like to extend my special thanks and appreciation to all my brothers, sisters and mother, brothers, sisters in laws for their unreserved encouragement throughout my study period and before.

Thanks and acknowledgements are meaningless if not extended to my parents who deserve my deepest appreciation. I am grateful for the countless sacrifices they made to ensure that I could pursue my dreams by always being there for me. Real and deepest thanks to them (May ALLAH bless and protect them and may live long and healthy). All praise and thanks words said to them will not be enough.

Lastly but not least, very very special thanks to my wife, son and daughters; confidante and true love. Their love, support, patience and encouragement are behind my success. They were always there to strengthen my soul during the darker hours and have always lightened-up my days.



I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 17 September 2009 to conduct the final examination of Ramadan Masoud Al-Habashi on his thesis entitled “Electromagnetic Characterization of Sm-YIG and Sm-YIG-PVDF Composites Prepared Using Modified Conventional Mixing Oxide Technique” in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Examination Committee were as follows:

Wan Mohd Daud Wan Yusoff, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Science
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Azmi Zakaria, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Science
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Jumiah Hassan, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Science
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Ibrahim Abu Talib, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Science and Technology
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
(External Examiner)

BUJANG KIM HUAT, PhD

Professor/ Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:



This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Zulkifly Abbas, PhD

Lecturer
Faculty of Science
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Kaida Khalid, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Science
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Mohd Maarof Bin HJ Abd Moxsin, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Science
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

HASANAH MOHD GHAZALI, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 16 November 2009



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously, and is not concurrently, submitted for any other degree at Universiti Putra Malaysia or at any other institution.

RAMADAN MASOUD AL-HABASHI

Date:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
APPROVAL	xi
DECLARATION	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxiv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 General	1
1.2 Nanomaterials and Nanostructures	2
1.3 Polymer Composite of Magnetic Particles	3
1.4 Preparation Techniques of Ferrite Material	4
1.5 Permittivity and Permeability Concepts	5
1.6 Soft Ferrites	6
1.7 Problem Statement	7
1.8 Aims/Objectives	8
1.9 Significant of This Study	9
1.11 Thesis Layout	9
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Preparation and Characterization of YIG Samples	11
2.3 Ferrite-Polymer composite	27
2.4 Optimization and Numerical models	30
3 THEORY	35
3.1 Introduction	35
3.2 Classification of Magnetic Materials	35
3.3 Garnet Structure	38
3.4 Bragg's Law and Lattice Parameters	40
3.5 Sintering and Grain Growth	43
3.5.1 Solid-state sintering	44
3.5.2 Sintering stages	45
3.5.3 Grain growth	47
3.5.4 Factors affecting solid-state sintering	47
3.6 Permittivity and Permeability Study	49
3.6.1 Parallel-plate capacitor measurement method	49
3.6.2 Induction measurement method	52
3.6.3 Dielectric properties of materials	55



3.6.4	Magnetic Properties of materials	57
4	METHODOLOGY	59
4.1	Introduction	59
4.2	MCMO Technique for Sm-YIG Samples Preparation	61
4.3	Sm-YIG-PVDF Composite Samples Preparation	63
4.4	Materials Characterizations	64
4.4.1	Shrinkage	65
4.4.2	XRD for structure and phase analysis	65
4.4.3	FESEM, EDX and TEM for microstructure observations	66
4.4.4	RF-Impedance/material analyzer	67
4.5	Numerical Optimization and Theoretical Models Study	69
4.5.1	Optimization method	69
4.5.2	Developed Maxwell-Garnett formula	71
5	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	74
5.1	Introduction	74
5.2	Structure Characterization of Sm-YIG Samples	75
5.2.1	XRD profiles	75
5.2.2	Lattice constant	82
5.2.3	Density	83
5.2.4	Crystallite size	85
5.3	Shrinkage of Sm-YIG Samples	88
5.4	Microstructure Observations of Sm-YIG Samples	90
5.4.1	FESEM and EDX results	90
5.4.2	TEM micrographs	99
5.5	RF-Impedance/Material Analyzer Results	101
5.5.1	PTFE permittivity results	101
5.5.2	Permittivity and permeability of PVDF sample	102
5.5.2.1	Permittivity results	102
5.5.2.2	Permeability results	104
5.5.3	Permittivity and permeability of Sm-YIG samples	105
5.5.3.1	Permittivity results	105
5.5.3.2	Permeability results	108
5.5.4	Permittivity and permeability of Sm-YIG-PVDF	112
5.5.4.1	Permittivity results	112
5.5.4.2	Permeability results	115
5.6	Optimization Results of Sm-YIG-PVDF Samples	117
5.6.1	Estimated permittivity results	117
5.6.2	Estimated permeability results	124
5.7	Developed MG Formula and Different Models Results	130
5.7.1	Permittivity results of Sm-YIG-PVDF samples	131
5.7.2	Permeability results of Sm-YIG-PVDF samples	136
6	SUMMARY, CONTRIBUTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	143
6.1	Summary of the Study	143
6.2	Main Contributions	149
6.3	Suggestions for Future Study	149
	REFERENCES	151



APPENDICES	158
BIODATA OF STUDENT	186

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1 Amounts of the raw materials used to prepare Sm-YIG samples.	62
4.2 Amount of the raw materials used to prepare 10 wt% Sm-YIG in PVDF composite samples.	64
5.1 Intensity and 2Theta for Sm-YIG samples calcined at 1350 °C.	81
5.2 Lattice constant 'a' for Sm-YIG samples calcined at 1350 °C.	83
5.3 True density of Sm-YIG samples sintered at 1350 °C.	85
5.4 Crystallite size of Sm-YIG samples sintered at 1350 °C.	87
5.5 Percentage shrinkages values of Sm-YIG samples.	89
5.6 Quantitative analysis of Y3 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	92
5.7 Quantitative analysis of Y2.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	93
5.8 Quantitative analysis of Y2 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	94
5.9 Quantitative analysis of Y1.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	95
5.10 Quantitative analysis of Y1 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	96
5.11 Quantitative analysis of Y0.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	97
5.12 Quantitative analysis of Y0 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	98
5.13 Estimated and optimized values of relative permittivity and, objective function of 10wt% Y3 in PVDF composite.	119
5.14 Estimated and optimized values of relative permittivity and, objective function of 10wt% Y2.5 in PVDF composite.	120
5.15 Estimated and optimized values of relative permittivity and, objective function of 10wt% Y2 in PVDF composite.	120
5.16 Estimated and optimized values of relative permittivity and, objective function of 10wt% Y1.5 in PVDF composite.	121
5.17 Estimated and optimized values of relative permittivity and, objective function of 10wt% Y1 in PVDF composite.	122



5.18	Estimated and optimized values of relative permittivity and, objective function of 10wt% Y0.5 in PVDF composite.	122
5.19	Estimated and optimized values of relative permittivity and, objective function of 10wt% Y0 in PVDF composite.	123
5.20	Estimated and optimized values of relative permeability and, objective function of 10wt% Y3 in PVDF composite.	126
5.21	Estimated and optimized values of relative permeability and, objective function of 10wt% Y2.5 in PVDF composite.	126
5.22	Estimated and optimized values of relative permeability and, objective function of 10wt% Y2 in PVDF composite.	127
5.23	Estimated and optimized values of relative permeability and, objective function of 10wt% Y1.5 in PVDF composite.	128
5.24	Estimated and optimized values of relative permeability and, objective function of 10wt% Y1 in PVDF composite.	128
5.25	Estimated and optimized values of relative permeability and, objective function of 10wt% Y0.5 in PVDF composite.	129
5.26	Estimated and optimized values of relative permeability and, objective function of 10wt% Y0 in PVDF composite.	130
5.27	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permittivity models and, mean relative permittivity of 10wt% Y3 in PVDF composite.	132
5.28	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permittivity models and, mean relative permittivity of 10wt% Y2.5 in PVDF composite.	133
5.29	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permittivity models and, mean relative permittivity of 10wt% Y2 in PVDF composite.	133
5.30	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permittivity models and, mean relative permittivity of 10wt% Y1.5 in PVDF composite.	134
5.31	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permittivity models and, mean relative permittivity of 10wt% Y1 in PVDF composite.	135
5.32	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permittivity models and, mean relative permittivity of 10wt% Y0.5 in PVDF composite.	135
5.33	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permittivity models and, mean relative permittivity of 10wt% Y0 in PVDF composite.	136



5.34	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permeability models and, mean relative permeability of 10wt% Y3 in PVDF composite.	138
5.35	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permeability models and, mean relative permeability of 10wt% Y2.5 in PVDF composite.	139
5.36	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permeability models and, mean relative permeability of 10wt% Y2 in PVDF composite.	139
5.37	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permeability models and, mean relative permeability of 10wt% Y1.5 in PVDF composite.	140
5.38	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permeability models and, mean relative permeability of 10wt% Y1 in PVDF composite.	141
5.39	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permeability models and, mean relative permeability of 10wt% Y0.5 in PVDF composite.	141
5.40	Impedance error percentage calculated via various permeability models and, mean relative permeability of 10wt% Y0 in PVDF composite.	142



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
3.1 (a) Random orientation of atomic magnetic moments in an unmagnetized substance. (b) When an external field B is applied, the atomic magnetic moments tend to align with the field.	36
3.2 Different magnetic behaviours.	37
3.3 Structural units and positions of cations in 'a', 'c' and 'd' sites of YIG structure (Barsoum, 1997).	38
3.4 (a) Two dimensional lattice showing the set of planes with the Miller indices $(1, 1)$. (b) Three dimensional unit cell showing the plane $(1, 1, 1)$.	40
3.5 (a) Scattering of waves by crystal planes. (b) and (c) both have the same lattice type, but quite different unit cells and crystal structures (Barsoum, 1997).	41
3.6 (a) liquid-phase sintering; (b) solid-state sintering (Barsoum, 1997).	44
3.7 Schematic of two possible paths by which a collection of particles can lower its energy, (a) Densification followed by grain growth. (b) Coarsening where the large grains grow at the expense of the smaller ones (Barsoum, 1997).	45
3.8 (a) Initial stage of sintering model represented by spheres in tangential contact, (b) Near end of initial stage; spheres have begun to coalesce, (c) Intermediate stage; grains adopted shape of dodecahedra, enclosing pore channels at grain edges, (d) Final stage; pores are tetrahedral inclusions at corners where four dodecahedra meet (Barsoum, 1997).	46
3.9 Schematic of parallel plate electrodes structure (Agilent, 1999).	49
3.10 Material has some loss for permittivity measurement.	50
3.11 Edge effect (Agilent, 1999).	51
3.12 Basic relationship of magnetic flux density, magnetic flux, and current (Agilent, 1999).	53
3.13 Schematic structure of 16454A fixture (Agilent, 1999).	54
3.14 Material has loss for permeability measurement (Agilent, 1999).	55
3.15 Frequency dependence of permittivity for a hypothetical dielectric material.	56

3.16	Frequency dependence of permeability for hypothetical magnetic material.	57
4.1	Preparation via MCMO technique and characterization of Sm-YIG samples and 10 wt% Sm-YIG in PVDF composite samples flow chart.	61
4.2	Heating and cooling rate during the pre-sintering process.	63
4.3	Dimensional measurement of toroidal sample.	66
4.4	Structure of the (a) 16453A fixture & (b) 16454A fixture (Agilent,1999).	69
4.5	Applicable MUT size of the (a)16453A & (b)16454A (Agilent, 1999).	70
4.6	The structure chart of the optimization MATLAB program.	72
5.1	XRD profile of Y3 sample calcined at different temperatures.	78
5.2	XRD profile of Y2.5 sample calcined at different temperatures.	79
5.3	XRD profile of Y2 sample calcined at different temperatures.	79
5.4	XRD profile of Y1.5 sample calcined at different temperatures.	79
5.5	XRD profile of Y1 sample calcined at different temperatures.	80
5.6	XRD profile of Y0.5 sample calcined at different temperatures.	80
5.7	XRD profile of Y0 sample calcined at different temperatures.	80
5.8	XRD profile of Sm-YIG samples calcined at 1350 °C.	81
5.9	Lattice constant vs mole fraction for Sm-YIG samples sintered at 1350 °C.	82
5.10	True density vs mole fraction for Sm-YIG samples sintered at 1350 °C.	85
5.11	Crystallite size vs mole fraction for Sm-YIG samples sintered at 1350 °C.	88
5.12	Percentage shrinkage vs mole fraction for Sm-YIG samples sintered at 1350 °C.	89
5.13	FESEM micrograph of Y3 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	92
5.14	EDX spectrum of Y3 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	92
5.15	FESEM micrograph of Y2.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	93
5.16	EDX spectrum of Y2.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	93
5.17	FESEM micrograph of Y2 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	94
5.18	EDX spectrum of Y2 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	94

5.19	FESEM micrograph of Y1.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	95
5.20	EDX spectrum of Y1.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	95
5.21	FESEM micrograph of Y1 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	96
5.22	EDX spectrum of Y1 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	96
5.23	FESEM micrograph of Y0.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	97
5.24	EDX spectrum of Y0.5 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	97
5.25	FESEM micrograph of Y0 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	98
5.26	EDX spectrum of Y0 sample sintered at 1350 °C in air.	98
5.27	TEM images of nanosized pure YIG (Y3) powders sintered at 1350 °C in air.	100
5.28	TEM images of nanosized pure SmIG (Y0) powders sintered at 1350 °C in air.	100
5.29	Measured impedance of PTFE standard sample.	101
5.30	Relative permittivity of PTFE standard sample.	102
5.31	Measured impedance of PVDF sample for permittivity calculation.	103
5.32	Measured relative permittivity of PVDF sample.	103
5.33	Measured impedance of PVDF sample for permeability calculation.	104
5.34	Measured relative permeability of PVDF sample.	105
5.35	Measured impedance of Sm-YIG samples for permittivity calculation.	107
5.36	Relative real permittivity vs frequency of Sm-YIG samples.	107
5.37	Loss factor permittivity vs frequency of Sm-YIG samples.	108
5.38	Measured impedance of Sm-YIG samples for permeability calculation.	111
5.39	Relative real permeability vs frequency of Sm-YIG samples.	111
5.40	Loss factor permeability vs frequency of Sm-YIG samples.	112
5.41	Measured impedance of 10wt% Sm-YIG in PVDF composites for permittivity calculation.	114
5.42	Real permittivity vs frequency 10wt% Sm-YIG in PVDF composite.	114
5.43	Loss factor vs frequency of 10wt% Sm-YIG in PVDF composite.	114
5.44	Measured impedance of 10wt% Sm-YIG in PVDF composites for	

permeability calculation.	116
5.45 Real permeability vs frequency of 10wt% Sm-YIG in PVDF composite.	116
5.46 Loss factor vs frequency of 10wt% Sm-YIG in PVDF composite.	117
5.47 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y3 in PVDF composite.	119
5.48 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y2.5 in PVDF composite.	120
5.49 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y2 in PVDF composite.	121
5.50 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y1.5 in PVDF composite.	121
5.51 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y1 in PVDF composite.	122
5.52 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y0.5 in PVDF composite.	123
5.53 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y0 in PVDF composite.	123
5.54 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y3 in PVDF composite.	126
5.55 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y2.5 in PVDF composite.	127
5.56 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y2 in PVDF composite.	127
5.57 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y1.5 in PVDF composite.	128
5.58 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y1 in PVDF composite.	129
5.59 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y0.5 in PVDF composite.	129
5.60 Optimized (optimum values) MG, calculated MG and measured impedance vs frequency of 10wt% Y0 in PVDF composite.	130
5.61 Various impedance results calculated via different permittivity models vs frequency of 10wt% Y3 in PVDF composite.	132