



Designation: D3884 – 09

Standard Test Method for Abrasion Resistance of Textile Fabrics (Rotary Platform, Double-Head Method)¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation D3884; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This test method covers the determination of the abrasion resistance of textile fabrics using the rotary platform, double-head tester (RPDH).

NOTE 1—Other procedures for measuring the abrasion resistance of textile fabrics are given in Test Methods D3885, D3886, D4157, D4158, D4966, and AATCC 93.

1.2 The values stated in SI units are to be regarded as standard; the values in English units are provided as information only and are not exact equivalents.

1.3 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety problems, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:²

- D123 Terminology Relating to Textiles
- D1776 Practice for Conditioning and Testing Textiles
- D3885 Test Method for Abrasion Resistance of Textile Fabrics (Flexing and Abrasion Method)
- D3886 Test Method for Abrasion Resistance of Textile Fabrics (Inflated Diaphragm Apparatus)
- D4157 Test Method for Abrasion Resistance of Textile Fabrics (Oscillatory Cylinder Method)
- D4158 Guide for Abrasion Resistance of Textile Fabrics (Uniform Abrasion)
- D4850 Terminology Relating to Fabrics and Fabric Test Methods
- D4966 Test Method for Abrasion Resistance of Textile Fabrics (Martindale Abrasion Tester Method)

¹ This test method is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee D13 on Textiles and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee D13.60 on Fabric Test Methods, Specific.

Current edition approved Jan. 15, 2009. Published March 2009. Originally approved in 1980. Discontinued January 2001 and reinstated as D3884 – 01. Last previous edition approved in 2007 as D3884 – 07. DOI: 10.1520/D3884-09.

² For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

D5034 Test Method for Breaking Strength and Elongation of Textile Fabrics (Grab Test)

D5035 Test Method for Breaking Force and Elongation of Textile Fabrics (Strip Method)

D7255 Test Method for Abrasion Resistance of Leather (Rotary Platform, Double-Head Method)

2.2 Other Documents:

AATCC 93 Abrasion Resistance of Fabrics: Accelerator Method³

3. Terminology

3.1 For all terminology relating to D13.60, Fabric Test Methods, Specific, refer to Terminology D4850.

3.1.1 The following terms are relevant to this standard: abrasion, abrasion cycle, breaking force.

3.2 For all other terminology related to textiles, refer to Terminology D123.

4. Summary of Test Method

4.1 A specimen is abraded using rotary rubbing action under controlled conditions of pressure and abrasive action. The test specimen, mounted on a turntable platform, turns on a vertical axis, against the sliding rotation of two abrading wheels. One abrading wheel rubs the specimen outward toward the periphery and the other, inward toward the center. The resulting abrasion marks form a pattern of crossed arcs over an area of approximately 30 cm². Resistance to abrasion is evaluated by various means which are described in Section 13.

5. Significance and Use

5.1 The measurement of the resistance to abrasion of textile and other materials is very complex. The resistance to abrasion is affected by many factors, such as the inherent mechanical properties of the fibers; the dimensions of the fibers; the structure of the yarns; the construction of the fabrics; and the type, kind, and amount of finishing material added to the fibers, yarns, or fabric.

³ Available from American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists (AATCC), P.O. Box 12215, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, http://www.aatcc.org.

5.2 The resistance to abrasion is also greatly affected by the conditions of the tests, such as the nature of abradant, variable action of the abradant over the area of specimen abraded, the tension of the specimen, the pressure between the specimen and abradant, and the dimensional changes in the specimens.

5.3 Abrasion tests are all subject to variation due to changes in the abradant during specific tests. The abradant must accordingly be discarded at frequent intervals or checked periodically against a standard. With disposable abradants, the abradant is used only once or discarded after limited use. With permanent abradants that use hardened metal or equivalent surfaces, it is assumed that the abradant will not change appreciably in a specific series of tests. Similar abradants used in different laboratories will not change at the same rate, due to differences in usage. Permanent abradants may also change due to pick up of finishing or other material from test fabrics and must accordingly be cleaned at frequent intervals. The measurement of the relative amount of abrasion may also be affected by the method of evaluation and may be influenced by the judgment of the operator.

5.4 The resistance of textile materials to abrasion as measured on a testing machine in the laboratory is generally only one of several factors contributing to wear performance or durability as experienced in the actual use of the material. While “abrasion resistance” (often stated in terms of the number of cycles on a specified machine, using a specified technique to produce a specified degree or amount of abrasion) and “durability” (defined as the ability to withstand deterioration or wearing out in use, including the effects of abrasion) are frequently related, the relationship varies with different end uses, and different factors may be necessary in any calculation of predicted durability from specific abrasion data. Laboratory tests may be reliable as an indication of relative end-use performance in cases where the difference in abrasion resistance of various materials is large, but they should not be relied upon where differences in laboratory test findings are small. In general, they should not be relied upon for prediction of actual wear-life in specific end uses unless there are data showing the specific relationship between laboratory abrasion tests and actual wear in the intended end-use.

5.5 These general observations apply to all types of fabrics, including woven, nonwoven, and knit apparel fabrics, household fabrics, industrial fabrics, and floor coverings. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that there are many different types of abrasion testing machines, abradants, testing conditions, testing procedures, methods of evaluation of abrasion resistance and interpretation of results.

5.6 All the test procedures and instruments that have been developed for abrasion resistance of fabrics may show a high degree of variability in results obtained by different operators and in different laboratories, however, they represent the procedures most widely used in the industry. Because there is a definite need for measuring the relative resistance to abrasion, this is one of the several procedures that is useful to help minimize the inherent variation in results that may occur.

5.7 Before definite predictions of fabric usefulness can be drawn from an abrasion test as made on the rotary platform, double-head (RPDH) abrader (Fig. 1), actual end-use trials should be conducted and related to the abrasion test. Different types of wear (for example, wear on men’s clothing at cuffs, crotch, etc.) may correspond to different ratings of the RPDH test.

5.8 In making a comparison of different fabrics (that is, of different fibers, weights, etc.) the RPDH test will not always reveal a difference known to exist when the fabrics are actually used. Therefore, end-use trials should be conducted in conjunction with the RPDH abrasion test, at least as a guide for future testing of these fabrics.

5.9 Uncontrolled manufacturing or finishing variations occurring within a fabric or within lots of the same style of fabric can, however, be detected satisfactorily with the RPDH tester.

5.10 Because of the conditions mentioned above, technicians frequently fail to get good agreement between results obtained on the same type of testing instrument both within and between laboratories, and the precision of these test methods is uncertain. This test method is accordingly not recommended for acceptance testing in contractual agreements between purchaser and supplier because of the poor between-laboratory precision of the test method.

5.11 If there are differences of practical significance between reported test results for two laboratories (or more), comparative tests should be performed to determine if there is a statistical bias between them, using competent statistical assistance. As a minimum, the test samples used are to be as homogeneous as possible, drawn from the material from which the disparate test results were obtained, and randomly assigned in equal numbers to each laboratory for testing. The test results from the two laboratories should be compared using a statistical test for unpaired data, at a probability level chosen prior to the testing series. If bias is found, either its cause must be found and corrected, or future test results must be adjusted in consideration of the known bias.

6. Apparatus

6.1 *Rotary Platform, Double-Head (RPDH) Abrader*⁴(Fig. 1), consisting of the following elements described in 6.1.1-6.1.5

6.1.1 Removeable, turntable platform that includes a rubber pad, clamp plate and knurled nut, and clamp ring to secure the specimen. The specimen holder shall be motor driven, and mounted so as to produce circular surface travel of a flat specimen in the plane of its surface.

6.1.2 Pair of pivoted arms to which the abrasive wheels and accessory weights are attached.

⁴ The sole source of supply of the apparatus known to the committee at this time is Taber Industries, 455 Bryant St. North Tonawanda, NY 14120. If you are aware of alternate suppliers, please provide this information to ASTM headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend.



FIG. 1 Rotary Platform Double Head Abrader

6.1.3 Motor capable of rotating the platform and specimen at a speed of 72 ± 2 r/min.

6.1.4 Vacuum nozzle and vacuum cleaner for removal of lint and debris from specimen. The height of the vacuum nozzle shall be adjustable and the nozzle will have two openings – one opening positioned between the two wheels and over the wear path and the other placed diametrically opposite. The distance between the axes of the two openings shall be 76.0 ± 1.0 mm.

6.1.5 Counter for indicating the revolutions of the specimen holder.

6.2 *Abrasive wheels*, which are attached to the free end of the pivoted arms and rotate freely about horizontal spindles.

6.2.1 Their internal faces shall be 52.4 ± 1.0 mm apart and the hypothetical line through the two spindles shall be 19.05 ± 0.3 mm away from the central axis of the turntable (see Fig. 2). When resting on the specimen, the wheels will have a peripheral engagement with the surface of the specimen, the direction of travel of the periphery of the wheels and of the specimen at the contacting portions being at acute angles, and the angles of travel of one wheel periphery being opposite to that of the other. Motion of the abrasive wheels, in opposite directions, is provided by rotation of the specimen and the associated friction therefrom.

6.2.2 The abrasive wheels⁴ are either resilient or vitrified-based. Both types of wheels consist of hard particles embedded in a binder material and are manufactured in different grades of abrasive quality. The wheels shall be 12.7 ± 0.3 mm thick and have an external diameter of 51.9 ± 0.5 mm when new, and in no case less than 44.4 mm.

6.3 *Accessory Loads*, The RPDH abrader is provided with a load adjustment for varying the load of the abrader wheels on the specimen. The pivoted abrader arms without auxiliary weights or counter weights apply a load against the specimen of 250 g per wheel (exclusive of the mass of the wheel itself). The manufacturer provides additional weights that can be used to increase the load to 500 or 1000 g per wheel, and a counterweight attachment that can be used to reduce the load on the specimen to 125 g per wheel.

6.4 *Auxiliary Apparatus*—Resurfacing discs (S-11), of carborundum-coated paper, are used to resurface the resilient wheels.

6.5 *Abrasion Wheel Resurfacing Device*, for resurfacing vitrified based wheels or for correcting uneven wheel wear.

7. Sampling

7.1 Take a lot sample as directed in the applicable material specification, or as agreed upon by the purchaser and seller. In the absence of such a specification or other agreement, take a laboratory sample as directed in 7.1.1. Consider rolls or pieces of fabric to be the primary sampling unit.

7.1.1 Take a laboratory sample that is the full width of the fabric and at least 50 cm (approximately 20 in.) long, from each roll or piece of fabric in the lot sample. The laboratory sample should be taken no closer than 1 m (1 yd) from the end of each roll or piece of fabric.

7.2 Sample shipments of garments as agreed upon by purchaser and seller.