
Identifying Factors Influencing Medium Density Fiberboard Production from Young *Eucalyptus grandis*, *E. amplifolia*, *Corymbia torelliana* and Cottonwood

Donald L. Rockwood ^{a*}, Jerrold E. Winandy ^{b++}
and Neil R. Gribbins ^b

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/bpi/raeges/v9/2004>

Peer-Review History:

This chapter was reviewed by following the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. This chapter was thoroughly checked to prevent plagiarism. As per editorial policy, a minimum of two peer-reviewers reviewed the manuscript. After review and revision of the manuscript, the Book Editor approved the manuscript for final publication. Peer review comments, comments of the editor(s), etc. are available here: <https://peerreviewarchive.com/review-history/2004>

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this study was to evaluate and compare the broad suitability of young *Eucalyptus grandis* W. Hill ex Maiden (EG), *E. amplifolia* Naudin (EA), *Corymbia torelliana* (F. Muell.) K.D.Hill & L.A.S. Johnson (CT), and *Populus deltoides* W. Bartram ex Marshall (PD) for making MDF by evaluating the basic wood properties of MDF produced from defibrillated Short Rotation Woody Crops (SRWC). Fast-growing EG, EA, CT, and PD may be deployed in SRWC systems in the lower Southeastern USA, especially in Florida. To evaluate these species for possible use as medium density fiberboard (MDF) and other composites, 2.5 m logs of three EG clones, three PD clones, six EA progenies, four CT trees, and one *P. tremuloides* Michx. (PT) tree from northern Wisconsin as a control were characterized for basic wood properties before being chipped, pulped, and pressed into MDF. The chips were thermomechanically pulped (TMP) for a two-phase study of the factors expected to influence suitability for MDF production: wood characteristics, refining system, resin system, and MDF formation. Phase I used TMP and 4% phenol-formaldehyde (PF) resin to produce 17 MDF species/genotype batches (S/GB). Thickness Swell (TS), Water Absorption (WA), Internal Bonding (IB), Modulus of Elasticity (MOE), and Modulus of Rupture (MOR) were evaluated to: 1) assess within species and within tree variation, 2) relate basic wood properties to MDF potential, and 3) examine repeatability of MDF-making. There was considerable variation among and within species, but only minor variation within individual trees. The analyses also

^a School of Forest, Fisheries, and Geomatics Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA.

^b US Forest Service Forest Products Laboratory (FPL), Madison, WI 53726, USA.

⁺⁺ Retired;

*Corresponding author: E-mail: dlrock@ufl.edu;

examined the effects of species, genotype, and/or log on MDF panel properties, with a significance level of 5%. Species and S/GB means were tested using Duncan's multiple-range test. Six of the 17 S/GBs had superior physical and mechanical MDF properties. In Phase II, two of the six better-performing Phase I S/GBs were evaluated, along with three average Phase I S/GBs. Phase II compared the effects on IB from using tube and drum blenders for resin application, the influence of using unscreened versus screened fibers, and the differences between using PF resin at 4% or 6% versus urea-formaldehyde (UF) resin at 8% or 12%. Overall, genetic variation among species, and particularly within these species, affected their potential for commercial MDF. Log specific gravity (SG), fines, MDF SG, and fiber length influenced MDF properties, as did refining and MDF-processing variables. Further study of specific processing requirements can optimize the potential of young *EG*, *EA*, *PD*, and *CT* genotypes grown as SRWCs for MDF and many other wood composites. These results are encouraging for the development and use of wood composites from SRWCs in Florida, the southeastern USA, and elsewhere.

Keywords: *Eucalyptus grandis*; *Eucalyptus amplifolia*; *Corymbia torelliana*; *Populus deltoides*; *Populus tremuloides*; cottonwood; aspen; genetic variation; MDF; wood composites.

1. INTRODUCTION

MDF was designed for noble purposes. MDF has excellent physical properties that guarantee workability and machinability, mainly in the furniture industry and civil construction [1]. SRWC systems involving the fast-growing hardwoods *EG*, *EA*, *CT*, and *PD* may be implemented in appropriate portions of Florida and the lower Southeast. *EG*, *CT*, and *PD* are also important plantation species worldwide. As a pure species or as parent of hybrid varieties, *E. grandis* can reach high productivity in suitable sites and produce timber with amenable properties to a wide range of uses [2]. On suitable southeastern USA sites and/or with intensive culture, *EG*, *EA*, and *PD* may reach harvestable size in as few as three years [3,4]. *EG* is the most productive of the three, largely because of a tree improvement program conducted by the US Forest Service from the late 1960s to 1984 [5,6]. *EG* is now grown commercially in southern Florida for landscape mulch. *EA* may be grown from central Florida into the lower southeastern USA, while *PD* can be grown across much of the US. *CT* is used as a windbreak for vegetable crops and citrus in central and southern Florida. *EA* and *CT* genetic improvement has been conducted in the lower southeastern USA by UF and collaborators since 1980. Most *Eucalyptus* plantings in Florida before 1970 were windbreaks, ornamentals, and shade trees in central and southern Florida [7]. While these SRWCs have been shown to be suitable for some traditional products and for energy wood [8], little is known about their suitability for a wider range of value-added products.

Accordingly, our general objective was to determine the potential for using these SRWCs as wood-composite products. Previous research on wood-based composites and other similar hybrid composites provided a foundation for this study. The properties of wood-based composites are known to be a function of

wood fiber species, source, and quality [9–15]. They are also related to composite processing parameters [16–20]. The age of the woody fiber source, especially related to wood juvenility, is also well recognized as being important, which could definitely be an issue with SWRC fiber [15,21–24]. Many of these same issues would also likely be a concern in the use of SRWCs as a fiber source for inorganic bonded wood composites [6,25,26].

Recognizing these critical issues, the specific objectives of our investigations were to evaluate and compare the broad suitability of young *EG*, *EA*, *CT*, and *PD* for making MDF by evaluating the basic wood properties of MDF produced from defibrillated SRWCs. Then, within- and between-tree variations influencing MDF production were evaluated to assess their potential for use for other wood-composite products.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

EA, *EG*, *CT*, and *PD* from Florida were assessed for their MDF suitability. The *EG*, *EA*, and *PD* genotypes included three superior *EG* and three superior *PD* clones and six top *EA* progenies, based on statewide genetic tests (Table 1) [6]. The 30.5 cm diameter at breast height (DBH) *EG* 2805 was harvested from a clonal test near Haines City, FL; the 20.3 cm *EG* 2814 and 30.5 cm *EG* 2817 came from a study at Tampa, FL; each provided 2.5 m long basal logs. The nine *PD* trees harvested from a study near Sumterville, FL, averaged 10.2 cm in DBH, and each provided one to three logs per tree. Six *EA* trees in a study near Old Town, FL, averaging 15.2 cm in DBH, provided basal logs. Five logs from an *EA* 4836 progeny were used to estimate within-tree variability. Four approximately 15-year-old *CT* trees harvested from a windbreak near Clewiston, FL, averaged 25.4 cm in DBH and also contributed basal logs. For comparison to species commonly used commercially for MDF, one 20.4 cm *PT* log provided by LP Corporation in Hayward, WI, was included [6].

Table 1. S/GB IDs, age, number of trees, and number of logs per tree of *PT*, *PD*, *EG*, *EA*, and *CT* in this study

Species	Genotype	S/GB	Age (Years)	# of Trees	# of Logs
<i>PT</i>	unknown	Pt1	unknown	1	1
<i>PD</i>	94-1	Pd2-3	3.2	3	2-3
<i>PD</i>	Ken-8	Pd4	3.2	2	1-3
<i>PD</i>	S13C20	Pd5	3.2	2	2-3
<i>EG</i>	2805	Eg1	11.8	1	1
<i>EG</i>	2814	Eg2	6.7	1	1
<i>EG</i>	2817	Eg3	13.3	1	1
<i>EA</i>	4853	Ea1	8.3	1	1
<i>EA</i>	-	Ea2/3	8.3	-	-
<i>EA</i>	4875	Ea4	8.3	1	1
<i>EA</i>	4836	Ea5	8.3	1	5
<i>EA</i>	4543	Ea6	8.3	1	1

Species	Genotype	S/GB	Age (Years)	# of Trees	# of Logs
CT	unknown	Ct1	15	1	1
CT	unknown	Ct2	15	1	1
CT	unknown	Ct3	15	1	1
CT	unknown	Ct4	15	1	1

The 2.5 m long logs were harvested and shipped to FPL, where they were cut into 1.2 m lengths with a 50-mm thick mid-log disk removed for anatomical study. The 1.2 m lengths were then debarked, sectioned to chippable sizes, and stored at 4.5°C [6]. The mid-log disks were then saturated in water, weighed green, and dried at 103°C to determine wood moisture content (MC) and SG. Each of the resulting 17 MDF S/GBs was chipped (usually the day before being defibrillated by TMP) by presteaming for 10 min and then steaming at 167°C with 0.621 MPa for ~6 min using a 1 kg/min feed rate at 3000 rpm in a Sprout-Bauer Model 121CP (Andritz, Inc., Muncy, PA, USA), a 305-mm thermal mechanical single-disk refiner operated with a digester at 620 Pa and an energy consumption of 200–250 watts/kg when using a 0.152 mm separation between refiner plates (Sprout-Bauer D2B503). The resulting fiber was then immediately dried in a tray drier for approximately 24 h at 104°C.

For each S/GB, the MC of the dried fiber was determined to assess how much fiber was needed for a 4% blend with PF resin (Dynea/Arclin 13CO85, 50.3% non-volatiles, typical of those used at the FPL [27]) in a tube blender. After blending, the MC was again estimated to derive the amount of the blend necessary to hand-form an 1810 g, 406 × 406 × 12.5 mm MDF board with a target SG of 0.72. The board was then hot-pressed at a constant 180 °C for two minutes; the maximum panel pressure during closing was set at 6.0 MPa and was reduced to 0.11 MPa after the 12.5 mm thickness was reached [6]. The first board of each S/GB was cut up and inspected to ensure the hot-press and blending processes were appropriate for that S/GB. Then, another five MDF boards for each S/GB (nine for PD2/PD3) were subsequently made. The second through the sixth MDF boards of each S/GB (8–12 for PD2/PD3) were hot-stacked and cooled. They were then included in subsequent physical and mechanical testing in Phase I.

In Phase I, the flexural properties, internal bond strength, and dimensional stability were determined according to ASTM Standard D1037-12 [28] using seven samples cut from each board. All seven test samples were conditioned at 27 °C and 65% relative humidity (RH) for 7 days. MOR, MOE, and board SG and MC were evaluated for two 76.5 × 356 mm samples. IB was derived from three 51 × 51 mm samples. TS and WA were evaluated by immersion of two 152 × 152 mm samples horizontally in a soak tank and weighed after 2 and 24 h at ambient temperature [6].

Phase II involved studying two of the “best” Phase I S/GBs (Eg2, Pd4) and three nearly average Phase I S/GBs (Ea4, Ct3, Pt1). Using TMP fiber from the earlier pulping process, another three new MDF boards were made using the same methods and processes as Phase I to hand-form and hot press an 1810 g, 406 ×

406 × 12.5 mm MDF board with a target SG of 0.72. These Phase II evaluations specifically compared the use of tube or drum blenders, determined the effect of using unscreened or screened fiber, and compared the use of PF resin at 4% or 6% with UF resin (GP789D16, 47% solids, typical of those used at the FPL [29,30]) at 8% or 12%. The various effects of these different MDF processes were determined using one to five IB samples per S/GB (Table 2) [6].

Table 2. Number of 254 × 254 mm MDF boards by S/GB and blender/screening/resin treatments in Phase II

S/GB	Tube Blender				Drum Blender			
	PF		PF Screened		UF		UF	
	Unscreened				Unscreened		Unscreened	
	4%	6%	4%	6%	8%	12%	8%	12%
Pt1	5	1	1	1	1	1		
Pd4	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Eg2	5	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
Ea4	5	1	2	1	1	1		
Ct3	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	25	6	7	6	6	6	3	3

Analyses of variance and covariance examined differences in MOR, MOE, IB, TS, and WA, with panel density as a covariate. MOR, MOE, IB, LE, TS, and WA of MDF panels were related to wood and fiber characteristics such as wood density, pH and base buffering capacity, and fiber coarseness. The analyses also examined the effects of species, genotype, and/or log on MDF panel properties, with a significance level of 5%. Species and S/GB means were tested using Duncan's multiple range test. Finally, a series of progressive weighted-rank analyses of physical and mechanical properties sorted the 17 S/GBs for the MDF properties evaluated in Phase I and the five S/GBs of Phase II [6].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Phase I

A number of differences were noted for certain wood properties among and within the Florida-grown *EG*, *EA*, *PD*, and *CT* S/GBs (Table 3) [6]. The *EG* clones were generally the denser *Eucalyptus*, while *EA* was generally less dense based on the limited genotypes and ages represented in this study. Considerable within-species variation for wood properties was evident in each species, suggesting that the deployment of favorable clones would be advantageous in producing currently used energy products. Similar variations in the characteristics of refined fibers also emphasized the importance of genetic variation in making other products such as value-added wood composites.

Table 3. Age and various physical MDF properties of EG, EA, CT, and PD, and the PT control (adapted from [31])

Species S/GB	Genotype	Age (Years)	No. of Trees	Density (kg/m ³)	Moisture Content (%)	Fines (%)	pH	Fiber Length (mm)
EG	3 clones	10.6	3	544	107	38.9	4.05	0.673
Eg1	2805	11.8	1	522	104	30.3	3.96	-
Eg2	2814	6.7	1	470	129	32.1	4.30	-
Eg3	2817	13.3	1	640	89	54.1	3.92	-
EA	4 progenies	8.3	4	508	108	59.5	3.97	0.502
Ea1	4853	8.3	1	506	109	70.7	-	-
Ea4	4875	8.3	1	529	88	60.5	4.11	-
Ea5	4836	8.3	1	527	107	53.1	3.89	-
Ea6	4843	8.3	1	469	115	53.5	3.89	-
CT	4 trees	15	4	526	101	50.0	4.20	0.472
Ct1	unknown	15	1	526	80	48.6	4.17	-
Ct2	unknown	15	1	610	98	52.6	4.20	-
Ct3	unknown	15	1	555	94	37.1	4.23	-
Ct4	unknown	15	1	411	131	61.5	4.21	-
PD	3 clones	3.2	4	367				0.670
Pd2-3	94-1	3.2	1	369			4.54	-
Pd4	Ken8	3.2	1	381			4.51	-
Pd5	S13C20	3.2	1	351			4.41	-
P Pt1	unknown	~55	1	360			4.17	0.754

At the S/GB level, relatively few log fiber and MDF variables were correlated. Log SG was only correlated with MDF TS and WA (Table 4) [6]. MDF TS was strongly correlated with WA, MOE with MOR, and both MOE and MOR were correlated with IB (Table 5) [6].

Table 4. Correlations of log fiber variables with MDF variables for 17 S/GBs in Phase I

	TS	WA	MOE	MOR	IB
Log SG	0.77	0.78	0.13	0.04	0.06
kW	0.50	0.51	-0.10	-0.12	-0.09
Fines	-0.44	-0.36	-0.38	-0.33	-0.30
pH	-0.54	-0.56	-0.21	-0.18	-0.36
Buff	0.35	0.42	-0.24	-0.23	0.00

Table 5. Correlations among MDF variables for 17 S/GBs in Phase I

	TS	WA	MiOE	MOR	IB
TS		0.96	0.19	0.19	0.20
WA			0.07	0.05	0.06
MOE				0.97	0.76
MOR					0.81

The strength properties and dimensional stability of the MDF panels made from the five species varied at many levels (Table 6) [6]. Species differed significantly for TS and WA but not IB, MOE, and MOR. Differences between genotypes/species were significant for IB, MOE, and MOR. The boards/batch were typically highly significant for each property.

At the S/GB level, the strength properties and dimensional stability of the MDF panels varied considerably (Table 7) [6]. For example, some of the 17 S/GBs were clearly consistently better than others for the MOR–MOE relationship (Fig. 1) [6]. Similar separations were noted between the 17 S/GBs for the other properties.

A rank order analysis compiling ranked performance data from five properties (TS₂₄, WA₂₄, IB, MOE and MOR) ranked the five species and 17 S/GBs from best to poorest performance (Table 8). In Table 8, all five sets of the tested properties are evenly weighted using an “Importance Factor” (IF) of 1.0 for each of the five properties. We then repeated the ranking three additional times by first applying weights for TS and WA = 0.5, IB = 0.75, and MOE and MOR = 1.0, then ranking by weights for TS and WA = 0.6, IB = 0.8, and MOE and MOR = 1.0, and finally weights for TS and WA = 0.75, IB = 1.0, and MOE and MOR = 1.25. All four rank-ordered analyses of the ranked scores for all five MDF properties consistently ranked the six S/GBs higher than the other 11 groups. Ea6, Pd4, Ea1, Pt1, Ea2, and Eg2 were consistently from 29% to 40% better than the next batch (overall ranked as 7th) and even much better than the others ranked from #8 to #17 [6].

Table 6. Variation in various physical and mechanical properties of MDF from four Florida-grown species and the PT control in Phase I (Species means not sharing the same letter are significantly different at the 5% level)

Species	TS ₂₄ (%)		WA ₂₄ (%)		IB (kPa)		MOE (GPa)		MOR (MPa)	
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Pt	60.7 bc	-	156.6 bc	-	296	-	1.47	-	7.72	-
Pd	48.7 c	41.8–58.8	137.6 c	130.5–145.7	445	0.0–445	1.17	0.88–1.70	5.01	3.37–9.52
Eg	77.1 a	73.6–81.6	186.4 a	179.1–186.0	226	169–272	1.59	1.42–1.84	8.01	6.64–10.27
Ea	71.0 ab	62.8–77.9	173.9 ab	160.5–189.2	294	193–483	1.47	1.20–1.71	7.74	5.82–9.41
Ct	80.5 a	64.5–88.9	192.2 a	177.8–205.6	196	138–263	1.24	0.93–1.45	5.90	4.43–7.74
Ave.	68.1		170.7		264		1.35		6.76	
Significance of Source of Variation										
Species	0.0004		0.0002		0.4025		0.3429		0.4270	
Geno	0.0150		0.0909		<0.0001		<0.0001		<0.0001	
Batch	0.0412		0.1772		0.5240		0.4877		0.8014	
Board	<0.0001		<0.0001		<0.0001		0.0095		<0.0001	

Table 7. Means and significance (S/GBs not sharing the same letter are significantly different at the 5% level) for 17 S/GBs for six MDF properties tested in Phase I

S/GB	Density (kg/m ³)	TS24 (%)	WA ₂₄ (%)	MOE (GPa)	MOR (MPa)	IB (kPa)
Pt1	360	60.7	156.6	1.466 bcdef	7.72 bc	269.9 b
Pd2-3	369	45.4	137.1	0.885 bcdef	3.37 h	-
Pd4	381	58.8	145.7	1.697 abc	9.52 a	445 a
Pd5	351	41.8	130.5	0.919 gh	3.77 gh	-
Eg1	11.8	73.6	179.1	1.418 cdef	6.64 bcde	-
Eg2	6.7	76.2	186.0	1.835 a	10.27 a	272 bcd
Eg3	13.3	81.6	194.1	1.507 bcde	7.12 bcd	169 bcd
Ea1	506	70.4	168.4	1.591 abcd	7.86 b	301 b
Ea2	-	69.6	170.3	1.754 ab	9.59 a	237 bcd
Ea3	-	72.7	184.9	1.273 ef	6.32 cde	193 bcd
Ea4	529	77.9	177.2	1.254 ef	7.14 bcd	265 bcd
Ea5	527	73.0	189.2	1.195 fg	5.82 def	281 bc
Ea6	469	62.8	160.5	1.709 abc	9.62 a	488 a
Ct1	526	88.9	205.6	0.927 gh	4.44 fgh	138 d
Ct2	610	80.0	198.4	1.197 fg	5.14 efg	159 cd
Ct3	555	74.5	177.8	1.370 def	6.30 cde	263 bcd
Ct4	411	78.5	187.0	1.448 cdef	7.74 bc	225 bcd

Table 8. Relative weighted rank-order analysis of five species and 17 S/GBs using TS24, WA24, IB, MOE and MOR and Importance Ranking Factors of: TS, WA, IB, MOE, and MOR = 1.0

Species: S/GB	TS24	WA24	IB	MOE	MOR	Average Rank & Factored Score	Combined Rank
Ct	5	5	5	4	4		
Ct1	17	17	15	15	15	15.80	15
Ct2	15	16	14	13	14	14.40	14
Ct3	11	9	8	10	12	10.00	10
Ct4	14	13	11	8	6	10.40	9
Ea	3	3	3	2	2		
Ea1	7	6	3	5	5	5.20	3
Ea2	6	7	10	2	3	5.60	5
Ea3	8	11	12	11	11	10.60	11
Ea4	13	8	5.5	12	8	9.30	7
Ea5	9	14	5.5	14	13	11.10	13
Ea6	5	5	1	3	2	3.20	1
Eg	4	4	4	1	1		
Eg1	10	10	9	9	10	9.60	8
Eg2	12	12	7	1	1	6.60	6
Eg3	16	15	13	6	9	11.80	12
Pd	1	1		5	5		
Pd2	2	2	-	17	17	-	
Pd4	3	3	2	4	4	3.20	2
Pd5	1	1	-	16	16	-	
Pt	2	2	2	3	3		
Pt1	4	4	4	7	7	5.20	4




Fig. 1. Relationship between average MOE and MOR of 17 S/GBs

The various minimum property requirements for the evaluation of MDF panels for interior applications are listed in ANSI Standard A208.2-2016 [32]. For MDF, three grade levels are given. None of the 17 S/GBs of MDF panels tested in Phase I met the minimum requirements for MOR of interior-use MDF panels. For MOE, 12 of the 17 groups of MDF panels met the ANSI requirements of the lowest Grade 115 MDF panels, but none met the requirements for the intermediate Grade 130. Only one of the 17 S/GBs (Ea6) met the ANSI minimum requirement of IB. We did not compare the WA and TS requirements because no wax nor other water-repellant additives were used in the manufacture of these Phase I MDF panels. While the general results of these comparisons of MOR, MOE, and IB did not generally meet the minimum requirements for commercial MDF, these results are not entirely negative [6]. Recalling that these initial test results are based on first-run fiber and manufacturing processes, it is quite reasonable to assume that future evaluations will have considerably higher material properties, as fiber and manufacturing processes are optimized for fiber prep, resin type, concentration and blender application, and as hot-pressing parameters are improved, more desirable panel density profiles are achieved, and performance enhancing additives are developed and used.

3.2 Phase II

Phase II involved comparisons of the two better-performing and three average-performing S/GBs, as determined in Phase I. Phase II IB testing suggests that G/SBs behave differently to the various MDF resin systems and application rates. MDF made using a tube blender for resin application was better than that made using a rotary drum blender (Fig. 2). The percentage of fines when using unscreened fiber clearly negatively influenced MDF properties (Fig. 3). It was also clear that the use of UF resin was far more suitable for making better MDF than PF resin (Figs. 4 and 5) [6]. Higher UF resin rates may be needed with these low

SG woods, as such fiber density-to-MDF performance ratios are commonly used in commercial MDF manufacture.




Fig. 2. Influence of UF resin at 8% or 12%, two blender types, and five S/GBs on IB in Phase II




Fig. 3. Unscreened vs. screened TMP fiber and S/GB influences on IB for tube-blender applied PF resin 4% or 6% in Phase II




Fig. 4. Resin and S/GB influences on IB for tube-blender applied PF resin of 4% or 6% or UF resin at 8% or 12% in Phase II

The ANSI A208.2-2016 Standard was used to assess the potential of these experimental MDF panels for commercial interior applications. The IB of Phase II panels was clearly a function of the selection of fiber- and composite-processing variables (Figs. 2–5) [6]. Only 12 of 17 S/GBs met the ANSI A208.2 requirements for the lowest 115-grade of MDF; none met the next higher 130-grade for MOE. No Phase II S/GB MDF met the MOR requirements, and only one of the 17 S/GBs met the ANSI A208.2 requirements for the lowest 115-grade of MDF for IB. It is highly likely that many of these differences can be compensated for by optimizing refining parameters to reduce fines in the fiber content in the pulp and then improving the hot-pressing parameters, resin selection and application rates, and fiber preparation processes so that more desirable panel density profiles and in-service performance properties can be achieved.

These preliminary Phase I and II examinations of the potential for 17 S/GBs clearly showed that some have a high potential for further studies to examine their potential for commercial MDF use and possibly other fiber-based composites. More EG, EA, PD, and CT genotypes should be considered [6]. Additional study is needed on the thermal pretreatment of the wood [33] and the MDF pressing schedule [34]. Field drying of EG trees or logs can lower MC by up to 40% in one month and up to 60% in two months, for example (Table 9). The incorporation of nanoclay, zeolite, or cationic starch which could provide distinct benefits for MDF, oriented strand board (OSB), and particle board (PB) production [35]. Enhancements in IB, WA, and TS and in achieving lower press energy requirements by 10–25%, depending on product specifications, are potentially possible. These additives are commercially available and are amenable to commercial applications. Finally, all additives can be readily incorporated into modern composite board production facilities. These results provide board producers new additive technologies and treatments to enhance board products while reducing energy requirements [6].




Fig. 5. Influences of S/GB and all processing factors on IB in Phase II

Table 9. Number of trees and whole tree average moisture content (MC, %) by EG tree form, season, and field drying duration (months) [36]

Tree Form	Season	n	MC by Duration		
			0	1	2
Whole	Spring	3	115.9	86.1	71.1
Whole	Summer	3	106.0	63.5	57.8
Log	Spring	3	128.2	83.7	62.4
Log	Summer	3	122.0	80.4	60.9

Based on these combined Phase I and II results, with future work on improving fiber and fiberboard processing, young trees of certain *EG*, *EA*, and *CT* genotypes may be suitable for use as a primary or supplemental fiber source for commercial MDF and other commercial interior-use composite products [37,38], such as OSB [39-42], PB [43-45], glue-laminated timber [46], wood-cement composites [47,48], and thermoplastic, stabilized, and nanocellulosic composites [49-51], and as energy products [31].

4. CONCLUSIONS

This two-phase study of a limited number of genotypes suggests that appropriate young *EG*, *EA*, *CT*, and *PD* genotypes, with additional fiber and processes experience and improvements in refining, resin, and formation, may be used for wood composites such as MDF [6]:

1. In Phase I, using 4% PF resin in a tube blender, there was some variation among species, considerable variation within species, minor within-tree variation, and some influence of basic wood characteristics on MDF properties TS, W, IB, MOE, and MOR, and a large sampling variation for some MDF properties;
2. The top six of the 17 S/GB genotypes were three of the six 8.3-year-old *EA* progenies (Ea1, Ea2, and Ea6), one of the three 7- to 13-year-old *EG* clones (Eg2), one of three 3.2-year-old *PD* clones (Pd4), and the one ~55-year-old *PT* tree (Pt1);
3. Phase II, involving the six top S/GBs, provided valuable insight into the needed fiber and process improvements. For example, MDF made with UF resin at 8% or 12% had generally better performance properties than PF resin at 4% or 6% [6];
4. Screened TMP fiber produced better MDF than unscreened fiber, and resin application by tube blenders made better MDF than by drum blenders;
5. Overall, genetic variation among and, particularly, within these species affected MDF performance properties;
6. Refining and MDF-making aspects have such major impacts on MDF properties that specific processing requirements are needed and must be optimized for future commercial MDF options for appropriate *EG*, *EA*, *PD*, and/or *CT* genotypes;

7. *EG* and *EA* utilization may, thus, expand from the current mulch wood market to various interior-use wood composites such as MDF and cement board.

These results are encouraging for the development and use of wood composites from SRWCs in Florida, the southeastern USA, and elsewhere.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Authors DLR and JEW conceptualized the study, did software, formal analysis, investigation, visualization, supervised the work, and helped in project administration and funding acquisition. Authors DLR, JEW and NRG performed the methodology, did validation, searched for resources, did data curation, and wrote, reviewed and edited the manuscript. Author DLR wrote and prepared the original draft of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

The authors hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the significant contributions of Research Work Units 4706 and 4709 at the FPL and the following associated staff: A Rudie, C Hillary, G Cook, J Muehl, P Walsh, J O'Dell, K Rosenberger, R Foss, J Balczewski, S Fishwild, M Begel, T Nelson, K Hirth, N Ross-Sutherland, D Foster, S Ralph, D Schulenburg, R Simonsen, and S Schmeiding. UF staff, having substantial involvement in the study, included B Becker, B Tamang, P Proctor, and W McKinstry. The Florida Organics Recycling Center for Excellence project, "Sumter County Compost for Forest Crops", was the source of the *PD* in the study; the Tampa Port Authority and D Mason supplied the *EG* logs; R Hodges provided the *EA* logs; and C & B Farms supplied the *CT* logs. Mark Burns of the LP Corporation in Hayward, WI, provided *PT* logs for the comparative analyses.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Selvatti TD, Borges LA, Soares HC, Souza ÁN, Coelho Junior LM. Global production concentration of medium density fiberboard (MDF)(1995-2016). *Revista Árvore*. 2019 Feb 4;42:e420506.

2. Silva PH, Marco M, Alvares CA, Lee D, Moraes ML, Paula RC. Selection of *Eucalyptus grandis* families across contrasting environmental conditions. *Crop Breeding and Applied Biotechnology*. 2019 Apr 11;19(01):47-54.
3. Rockwood DL, Carter DR, Langholtz MH, Stricker JA. *Eucalyptus* and *Populus* short rotation woody crops for phosphate mined lands in Florida USA. *Biomass Bioenergy*. 2006;30:728–734. [CrossRef]
4. Langholtz MH, Carter DR, Alavalapati J, Rockwood DL. The economic feasibility of reclaiming phosphate mined lands with short-rotation woody crops in Florida. *J. For. Econ.* 2007;12:237–249. [CrossRef]
5. Meskimen GF, Rockwood DL, Reddy KV. Development of *Eucalyptus* clones for a summer rainfall environment with periodic severe frosts. *New For.* 1987;3:197–205.
 Available:<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00118757>
 (accessed on 15 January 2022). [CrossRef]
6. Rockwood DL, Winandy JE, Gribbins NR. Processing and wood factors influence medium density fiberboard production from young *Eucalyptus grandis*, *E. amplifolia*, *Corymbia torelliana*, and cottonwood grown in Florida USA. *Forests*. 2022 Feb 8;13(2):266.
7. Rockwood DL, Huber DA, Crawford MA, Rucks PC, Lamb E, Fabbro KW, Minogue PJ, Jump R, Hodge GR. *Eucalyptus amplifolia* and *Corymbia torelliana* in the Southeastern USA: Genetic Improvement and Potential Uses. *Forests*. 2022 Jan 6;13(1):75.
8. Segrest SA, Rockwood DL, Stricker JA, Green AES. Biomass cofiring with coal at Lakeland Utilities. Southeastern Regional Biomass Energy Program Publication No. 219287-1, TVA, Muscle Shoals, AL; 1998.
 Available:<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.197.5270&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
 (accessed on 15 January 2022)
9. Groom LH, Mott L, Shaler SM. Relationship between fiber furnish properties and the structural performance of MDF. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Particleboard/Composite Materials Symposium Proceedings*, Pullman, WA, USA; 13–15 April 1999.
10. Geimer RL. Properties of structural flakeboard manufactured from 7-year-old intensively cultured poplar, tamarack, and pine. *For. Prod. J.* 1986;36:42–46.
11. Geimer RL, Crist JB. Structural flakeboard from short-rotation, intensively cultured hybrid populus clones. *For. Prod. J.* 1980;30:42–48.
12. Gorrini B, Poblete H, Hernandez G, Dunn F. Particleboard and MDF using *Eucalyptus nitens*: Industrial scale experiments. *Bosque*. 2004;25:89–97. [CrossRef]
13. Jones EJ. The relation of fiber and pulp properties to the properties of structural fiberboard products. *Tappi*. 1960;43:600–602.
14. Krzysik AM, Muehl JH, Youngquist JA, Franca FS. Medium density fiberboard made from *Eucalyptus saligna*. *For. Prod. J.* 2001;51:47–50.
15. Shi JL, Zhang SY, Riedl B, Brunette G. Flexural properties, internal bond strength, and dimensional stability of medium density fiberboard panels made from hybrid poplar clones. *Wood Fiber Sci.* 2005;37:629–637.

16. Maloney TM. Modern Particleboard & Dry-Process Fiberboard Manufacturing; Updated Edition; Miller Freeman Inc.: San Francisco, CA, USA; 1993.
17. Myers GC. Relationship of Fiber Preparation and Characteristics to Performance of Medium-Density Hardboards; 1983.
Available:<https://www.fpl.fs.fed.us/documnts/pdf1993/myers93b.pdf> (accessed on 15 January 2022).
18. Myers GC, Crist JB. Feasibility of manufacturing hardboard from short-rotation intensively cultured *Populus*. For. Prod. J. 1986;36:37–44.
19. Nelson ND. Effects of wood and pulp properties on medium density, dry formed hardboard. For. Prod. J. 1973;23:72–80.
20. Woodson GE. Effects of bark, density profile, and resin content on medium density fiberboards from Southern hardboards. For. Prod. J. 1976;26:39–42.
21. Pugel AD, Price EW, Hse CY. Composites from southern pine juvenile wood. Part 1. Panel fabrication and initial properties. For. Prod. J. 1989;40:29–33.
22. Pugel AD, Price EW, Hse CY. Composites from southern pine juvenile wood. Part 2. Durability and dimensional stability. For. Prod. J. 1990;40:57–61.
23. Shi JL, Zhang SY, Riedl B. Effect of juvenile wood on strength properties and dimensional stability of black spruce medium density fiberboard panels. Holzforschung. 2005;59:1–9. [CrossRef]
24. Shi JL, Zhang SY, Riedl B. Multivariate modeling of MDF panel properties in relation to wood fiber characteristics. Holzforschung. 2006;60:285–293. [CrossRef]
25. Savastano H, Jr, Warden PG, Coutts RSP. Potential of alternative fibre cements as building materials for developing areas, Cement and Concrete Composites. Infrastruct. Dev. 2003;25:585–592.
Available:<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0958946502000719270c4f3ceba4d414c895120ca31aa2de> (accessed on 15 January 2022).
26. Savastano H, Jr, Warden PG, Coutts RSP. Microstructure and mechanical properties of waste fibre–cement composites. Cem. Concr. Compos. 2005;27:583–592. [CrossRef]
27. Cai Z, Wescott JM, Winandy JE. Strandboard made from soy-based adhesive with high soy content. In Proceedings of the Wood Adhesives 2005, San Diego, CA, USA, 2–4 November 2005; Forest Products Society: Madison, WI, USA. 2005;531–537.
28. American Society for Testing and Materials. Standard Test Methods for Evaluating Properties of Wood-Base Fiber and Particle Panel Materials; Annual Book of ASTM Standards. ASTM D 1037–12; ASTM: West Conshohocken, PA, USA; 2019.
29. Cai Z, Muehl JH, Winandy JE. Effects of panel density and mat moisture content on processing medium density fiberboard. For. Prod. J. 2006;56:20–25.

30. Li X, Cai Z, Winandy JE, Basta AH. Effect of oxalic acid and steam pretreatment on the primary properties of UF-bonded rice straw particleboards. *Ind. Crops Prod.* 2011;33:665–669. [CrossRef]
31. Rockwood, D.L, Rudie, A.W, Ralph, S.A, Zhu, J.Y, Winandy, J.E. Energy product options for *Eucalyptus* species grown as Short Rotation Woody Crops. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2008, 9, 1361–1378. [CrossRef]
32. American National Standard Institute. Standard ANSI A208.2-2016 Medium Density Fiberboard (MDF) for Interior Applications; Composite Panel Association: Leesburg, VA, USA, 2016;12.
33. Pelaez-Samaniego MR, Yadama V, Lowell E, Espinoza-Herrera R. A review of wood thermal pretreatments to improve wood composite properties. *Wood Sci. Technol.* 2013;47:1285–1319. [CrossRef]
34. Cai Z, Muehl JH, Winandy JE. Effects of pressing schedule on formation of vertical density profile for MDF panels. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Wood Composites Symposium Proceedings*, Seattle, WA, USA, 11–12 April 2006; Washington State University: Pullman, WA, USA; 2006.
35. Ragauskas AJ. Fast Curing of Composite Wood Products; USDOE Office of Industrial Technologies (OIT)-(EE-20). Final Technical Report GO10625; USDOE Office of Industrial Technologies: Atlanta, GA, USA; 2006. Available:<https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/892708-g8YT2y/> (accessed on 15 January 2022).
36. Rockwood DL, B Tamang, MF Ellis. Field drying for enhancing biomass quality of *Eucalyptus* logs and trees in Florida, USA. *Forests.* 2023;14(5):899. Available:<https://doi.org/10.3390/f14050899>
37. Stark N, Cai Z. Chapter 11: Wood-based composite materials: Panel products, glued laminated timber, structural composite lumber and wood-nonwood composites. In 2021. *Wood Handbook: Wood as an Engineering Material*; FPL-GTR-282; Forest Products Laboratory: Madison, WI, USA. 2021;29.
38. Cai Z, Senalik CA, Ross RJ. Chapter 12: Mechanical properties of wood-based composite materials. In *Wood Handbook: Wood as an Engineering Material*. FPL-GTR-282; Forest Products Laboratory: Madison, WI, USA. 2021;15.
39. Iwakiri S, Albuquerque CEC, Prata JG. Utilization of wood of *Eucalyptus grandis* and *Eucalyptus dunnii* for oriented strand-board—OSB manufacturing. *Ciencia Florestal.* 2008;18(2):265-270. Available:<https://www.bioline.org.br/request?cf08024>
40. Rosli MAA, Purwanto NB, Chen LW, Bhkari NM, Geng BJ, Selamat ME, et al. An overview of Medium-Density Fiberboard and Oriented Strand Board made from *Eucalyptus* wood. In: Lee SH, Lum WC, Antov P, Krišťák Ľ, Rahandi Lubis MA, Fatriasari W. (eds) *Eucalyptus*. Springer, Singapore; 2023. Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-7919-6_5
41. Rosa TSD, Trianoski R, Iwakiri S, Bonduelle GM, Guimarães CDC. Optimization of properties of *Eucalyptus* oriented strand boards by specific gravity of panels. *Madera y Bosques.* 2018;24(2).

- Available:<https://doi.org/10.21829/myb.2018.2421114>.
42. Sugahara E, Dias A, Arroyo F, Christoforo A, Costa ML, Botelh EC, et al. Study of the influence of heat treatment on OSB panels produced with *Eucalyptus* wood in different layer compositions. *Forests*. 2022;13:2083. Available:<https://doi.org/10.3390/f13122083>.
 43. Rosa TSD, Trianoski R, Iwakiri S, Bonduelle GM. Use of five eucalyptus species for particleboards manufacture. *Revista Árvore*. 2017b ;41: e410215. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-90882017000200015>
 44. Scatolino MV, Costa AD, Guimarães JB, Protásio TD, Mendes RF, Mendes LM. *Eucalyptus* wood and coffee parchment for particleboard production: Physical and mechanical properties. *Ciência e Agrotecnologia*. 2017;41:139-46. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-70542017412038616>
 45. Sugahara ES, Silva SAM, Buzo ALSC, Campos CI, Morales EAM, et al. High-density particleboard made from agro-industrial waste and different adhesives. *Bio Resources*. 2019;14:5162–5170. Available:<https://doi.org/10.15376/biores.14.3.5162-517>
 46. de Alcântara Segundinho PG, Lopes NF, Gonçalves FG, Oliveira RF, de Oliveira RGE, da Silva Oliveira JT, et al. Analysis of physical and mechanical properties of glued laminated timber elements produced from *Eucalyptus* residues. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Wood Science*. 09 May 2024;1-8.
 47. Garcez M, Garcez E, Machado A, Gatto D. Assessment of mix proportions for developing lightweight cementitious composites with wood wastes. *Revista Árvore*. 2017;41.
 48. Rosa TSD, Schweitzer VR, Trianoski R, Iwakiri S. Physical and mechanical properties of oriented wood-cement boards produced with five *Eucalyptus* species. *Floresta*. 2017a;47(3):317-322. Available:<https://doi.org/10.5380/rev.v47i1.50789>
 49. Chiromito EMS, Trovatti E, Carvalho AJF. Thermoformable fiberboards of wood pulp and nanofibrillated cellulose. *Industrial Crops and Products*. 2022;187(Part B):P.115433. ISSN 0926-6690. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2022.115433>
 50. Lustosa EC, Del Menezzi CH, Melo RR. Production and properties of a new wood laminated veneer/high-density polyethylene composite board. *Materials Research*. 2015 Sep, 18;994-9. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-1439.010615>
 51. Hillig É, Iwakiri S, Andrade MZ, Zattera AJ. Characterization of composites made from high density polyethylene (HDPE) and furniture industry sawdust. *Revista Árvore*. 2008;32:299-310. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-67622008000200013>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

Biography of author(s)



Dr. Donald L. Rockwood

School of Forest, Fisheries, and Geomatics Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA.

He is a Professor Emeritus at the School of Forest, Fisheries, and Geomatics Sciences (SFFGS), University of Florida, and has over 45 years of experience with the development and use of *Eucalyptus amplifolia*, *E. grandis*, *Corymbia torelliana*, cottonwood, cypress, and slash pine hybrids in Florida and elsewhere. He is also the President of Florida FGT LLC and is actively involved with the genetic improvement of several Short Rotation Woody Crop (SRWC) species, including the commercial release of *E. grandis* cultivars, and the development and utilization of SRWC systems using these species.

He served at the School of Forest Resources and Conservation (SFRC) as an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor from 1972 until retiring at the end of February 2009. During these 37 years, he was privileged to teach Forest Mensuration and related subjects to two generations of Forestry majors, to advise undergraduates in forestry and natural resources at SFRC and Florida A&M University, to mentor over 50 graduate students and post-doctorates in forest tree improvement, short rotation woody crops, and dendroremediation, and to conduct research in the same fields. These activities were supported by over \$3 million of extramural funding and have resulted in over 320 publications. His tree improvement research also returned the iconic Senator cypress to Seminole County's Big Tree Park and to Reiter Park in Longwood, FL. His contributions were noted by two SFRC Teacher of the Year Awards, the Stephen Spurr Award from the Florida Society of American Foresters, and the SFRC Distinguished Service Award.




Dr. Jerrold E. Winandy (Retired)

US Forest Service Forest Products Laboratory (FPL), Madison, WI 53726, USA.

He retired from the USDA Forest Products Laboratory in 2008 and now teaches at the University of Minnesota. He founded and ran a consulting firm specializing in forensic wood science, wood durability and engineering performance from 2008 to 2024. He is recognized for his research on the effects of chemicals and chemical processing on the structural performance of wood and wood composites. He has published over 225 publications on the effects of the chemical and thermal environment on the physical and mechanical properties of wood.

His collaborative work on the very early stages of biological decay empirically and theoretically related how changes in the chemical composition of the wood caused significant reductions in wood strength before measurable weight loss occurred. These studies established the basic relationship between the degradation of hemicellulose and early wood strength losses. From an engineering perspective, estimating strength loss and residual strength is the critical element in assessing wood serviceability/durability for structures in-service as affected by wood decay. The residual strength of degraded wood was then predicted using models developed by his collaborative team. The changes in chemical composition and their effect on wood properties appear to be similar in both the biological and chemical systems. Understanding the relationship between chemical composition and strength loss is critical in developing models to estimate strength loss caused by biological, chemical or thermal agents.



Neil R. Gribbins

US Forest Service Forest Products Laboratory (FPL), Madison, WI 53726, USA.

He studied Forestry at the Southern Illinois University (SIU) - Carbondale, IL, prior to accepting a Physical Science Technician position at USDA Forest Service – Forest Products Laboratory (FPL) – Madison, WI in 2004. He currently contributes to the mission of the Forest Service by providing technical support to FPL scientists working in the Performance Engineered Composites group (RWU 4706) and has co-authored publications relating to wood-plastic composites and the utilization of forest resources in building materials.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the publisher (BP International).

DISCLAIMER

This chapter is an extended version of the article published by the same author(s) in the following journal. Forests, 13(266), 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/f13020266>

Peer-Review History:

This chapter was reviewed by following the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. This chapter was thoroughly checked to prevent plagiarism. As per editorial policy, a minimum of two peer-reviewers reviewed the manuscript. After review and revision of the manuscript, the Book Editor approved the manuscript for final publication. Peer review comments, comments of the editor(s), etc. are available here: <https://peerreviewarchive.com/review-history/2004>