HEMP CARBON NANOSHEETS

The Potential of Hemp-Derived Porous Graphitic Carbon in Polymer, Bioepoxy, Metal and Ceramic Composites

An evidence-led research monograph | 12 November 2026

RESEARCH MONOGRAPH | EVIDENCE, HYPOTHESES, EXPERIMENTAL ROADMAP

Editorial notice

This book is an evidence-led technical synthesis and experimental research proposal, not a claim that the proposed composite formulations have been fabricated or validated. Bibliography entries were assembled from available source records; readers should verify current standards, bibliographic metadata and patent status before laboratory or commercial use. Material performance and economic comparisons are conditional on grade and test method.

Contents

Executive synthesis

1. Definitions and taxonomy

2. The scientific history and the priority question

3. How hemp becomes graphitic porous carbon

4. Why nanosheets could change composite behavior

5. Epoxy: the first proving ground

6. Bioepoxy and recyclable vitrimers

7. Thermoplastics, elastomers and coatings

8. Metals and ceramics: high-reward, high-risk matrices

9. Multiscale architectures and functional systems

10. Sustainability, safety and economics

11. The definitive research programme

12. Data integrity, intellectual property and publication

Conclusion: the question worth answering

References and further reading

Executive synthesis

Hemp-derived carbon nanosheets are a family of carbon-rich, sheet-like solids obtained by thermochemical conversion of hemp biomass. Their promise is real but not yet equivalent to demonstrated structural performance. This monograph separates evidence, mechanisms, hypotheses and experiments. The central research question is whether controlled hemp-derived graphitic platelets can improve composite properties more economically or sustainably than established carbon fillers.

Principal findings

The landmark 2013 ACS Nano paper demonstrated interconnected, partially graphitic nanosheets from hemp bast fibre with 10-30 nm thickness, surface area as high as 2,287 square metres per gram, mesopore volume fraction up to 58%, and electrical conductivity reported at 211-226 S/m [1]. These values characterize selected products of that synthesis, not every hemp carbon powder. Subsequent work has investigated hemp carbon in energy-storage architectures, hemp-derived carbon fibres in epoxy, and graphene fillers in hemp-fibre composites [2-6]. The latter are not direct evidence that the original porous hemp nanosheets mechanically reinforce epoxy.

The falsifiable proposition

At controlled loading and dispersion, hemp-derived porous graphitic carbon nanosheets may increase fracture resistance, stiffness, conductivity, barrier performance or multifunctionality of selected matrices. A different outcome is equally possible: excessive porosity, weak interfaces and aggregation may make them worse than commercial graphene nanoplatelets or even ordinary biochar. The question must be resolved experimentally.

Evidence classification

Throughout the book, DEMONSTRATED means directly reported for the specified material and test; ANALOGY means established for a related filler or matrix; HYPOTHESIS means a proposed mechanism; and TARGET means an engineering objective. A promising concept must never be silently promoted into a measured result.

1. Definitions and taxonomy

The word graphene is often used loosely in commercial materials marketing. Rigorous nomenclature is essential because monolayer graphene, few-layer graphene, graphene nanoplatelets, activated carbon and graphitic carbon nanosheets are not interchangeable.

What constitutes a nanosheet

A nanosheet has a lateral dimension substantially larger than its thickness. The morphology alone says nothing conclusive about crystalline order. A partially graphitic carbon nanosheet can contain graphitic nanodomains embedded in amorphous or turbostratic carbon. High porosity can make the accessible surface area much greater than that of a compact platelet, but also introduces mechanical discontinuities.

Four categories to keep separate

(A) Hemp-derived porous activated carbon nanosheets: highly porous and partially graphitic, typified by Wang et al. [1]. (B) Hemp-derived graphene-like multilayer carbon: potentially more graphitically ordered, typified by the 2026 Khan and Vander Wal characterization [2]. (C) Hemp biochar: generally heterogeneous carbon particles that need not be sheet-like. (D) Hemp-derived carbon fibres: elongated carbon reinforcement, with different aspect ratio and load transfer. A fifth category, graphene added to hemp-fibre composites, uses hemp in the fibre phase and conventional graphene in the nanofiller phase [4,5].

Characterization minimum

Record feedstock, hemp tissue, pretreatment, carbonization temperature, atmosphere, residence time, activation chemistry, yield, ash and moisture. Determine morphology by SEM/TEM and size distributions; graphitic ordering by Raman and XRD; surface chemistry by XPS and FTIR where appropriate; porosity by gas sorption; electrical transport using documented specimen geometry; and density using an appropriate method. No single technique establishes graphene identity.

2. The scientific history and the priority question

A novelty claim must be narrow, dated and supported by a reproducible search strategy. Absence from a limited search is not proof of absence.

The 2013 foundational result

Wang and collaborators prepared interconnected partially graphitic hemp carbon nanosheets and demonstrated electrochemical utility in supercapacitors [1]. The paper established a viable biomass-to-carbon-nanosheet route. Its excellent electrochemical performance cannot be directly translated into tensile strength, fracture toughness or polymer adhesion.

The adjacent composite literature

Bartoli and colleagues reported epoxy composites filled with waste hemp-derived carbon fibres, examining mechanical, electrical, thermal and tribological behavior [3]. Bulut and Erkliğ investigated graphene nanoparticles in hemp-fibre-reinforced epoxy [4]. Bodduru and colleagues studied graphene and MXene in glass/hemp hybrid epoxy laminates [5]. These establish nearby engineering feasibility while preserving the crucial difference in filler identity.

A narrower open question

The claim worth testing is: Have interconnected porous hemp-derived graphitic carbon nanosheets of a clearly specified grade been compounded into structural epoxy, bioepoxy, thermoplastic, metal or ceramic matrices, and have their mechanical properties been independently measured against suitable controls? The literature reviewed here does not resolve every matrix and jurisdiction. Patent applications, theses, conference proceedings and proprietary work may contain earlier disclosures.

A transparent novelty workflow

Search Crossref, Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, Lens, Google Patents and WIPO PATENTSCOPE with exact and synonym-rich queries. Combine hemp/cannabis/bast with carbon nanosheet/graphitic platelet/graphene-like carbon, and with epoxy/vitrimer/polymer/aluminum/alumina/ceramic/composite. Screen full texts, inspect materials-and-methods sections, and classify by actual filler provenance rather than title keywords. Preserve search dates, exclusions and a living evidence register.

3. How hemp becomes graphitic porous carbon

Carbon nanosheets are products of a manufacturing process, not intrinsic components of raw hemp. Processing choices determine structure, performance, cost and environmental impact.

Feedstock and precursor variability

Hemp bast, hurd and other fractions differ in cellulose, hemicellulose, lignin, minerals and ash. Harvest conditions and storage can affect reproducibility. Separate incoming feedstock lots and measure moisture and mineral residues before comparing carbon products.

Thermochemical routes

Hydrothermal carbonization can alter biomass before subsequent thermal treatment. Pyrolysis or carbonization in controlled atmospheres increases carbon content and reorganizes carbon networks. Chemical or physical activation creates additional pores; high-temperature graphitization or catalytic processes may improve graphitic order. These are families of methods rather than one universal recipe.

Process trade-offs

Activation may raise surface area while reducing carbon yield and damaging continuous load-bearing pathways. Greater graphitization may raise conductivity while lowering oxygen functionality useful for adhesion. Aggressive chemical activation adds washing and effluent treatment burdens. The optimum electrode material may be the wrong optimum for a structural epoxy.

Industrial specifications

A credible supply specification should include particle size distribution, thickness distribution, BET area, micro/mesopore distribution, Raman metrics, conductivity, residual metals and salts, ash, moisture, bulk density, batch coefficient of variation, and a documented safety data sheet. Scale-up needs mass and energy balances, not merely a laboratory synthesis photograph.

4. Why nanosheets could change composite behavior

Nanofillers influence properties through geometry, surface chemistry, spatial distribution and the matrix response. A highly conductive filler is not automatically a strong reinforcing filler.

Mechanical reinforcement mechanisms

Well-dispersed platelets may constrain polymer chain mobility, transfer load across bonded interfaces, deflect cracks, promote crack pinning or bridging, and alter local plastic deformation. These mechanisms are established in broader graphene-epoxy literature [6,7], but must be demonstrated by fracture-surface microscopy and mechanical tests for each hemp-derived material.

The porosity paradox

Large surface area can improve interfacial contact if resin penetrates and wets the pores. Conversely, inaccessible pores, trapped gas, resin uptake, rough agglomerates and stress concentrations can weaken a composite. Porosity increases neither intrinsic platelet strength nor adhesion by itself. Compare porous and relatively dense hemp-derived nanosheets to isolate this variable.

Electrical percolation

A connected network of conductive nanosheets may lower volume resistivity at sufficiently high loading. The threshold depends on aspect ratio, tunneling distances, dispersion, contact resistance and processing. Report conductivity of the cured composite, not just compressed powder or electrode pellets. Shielding effectiveness and antistatic performance need their own standardized tests.

Thermal and barrier behavior

Graphitic platelets may change thermal diffusivity, thermal expansion, moisture transport and gas permeability. The direction and magnitude depend on alignment, porosity, interfacial thermal resistance and defects. High carbon loading can also darken materials, change curing exotherm and raise viscosity.

5. Epoxy: the first proving ground

Epoxy thermosets offer a tractable baseline for determining whether nanosheet chemistry and morphology yield real composite benefits.

Formulation principles

Use one well-characterized resin-hardener system with a fixed stoichiometric ratio. Dry and condition filler to a documented protocol. Introduce filler with reproducible mixing energy and time; control temperature and degassing. If a solvent is used, verify its removal and run a solvent-processed neat-resin control. Record pot life, exotherm and final degree of cure.

Experimental design

Begin with neat epoxy and four candidate nanosheet loadings: 0.10, 0.25, 0.50 and 1.00 wt% of the total cured composite. Include a conventional graphene nanoplatelet benchmark and a hemp biochar benchmark at matched loadings. Randomize preparation order, use independent synthesis batches and enough replicate specimens to estimate variability. Optimize after screening rather than claiming a predetermined optimum.

Primary endpoints

Measure tensile modulus and strength, strain at break, flexural response, fracture toughness, glass-transition temperature, viscosity, void content, density and electrical resistivity. Use standards suitable for the specimen and material, for example ASTM D638, D790 and D5045 where their applicability criteria are met. For load-bearing claims, fatigue, moisture aging and impact resistance follow only after credible baseline performance.

Failure interpretation

If modulus rises but toughness falls, the filler may be stiffening the network while embrittling it. If conductivity improves while strength drops, agglomeration or porosity may be responsible. If results vary strongly by batch, characterization and process control take precedence over further formulation claims.

6. Bioepoxy and recyclable vitrimers

Bio-based matrices introduce additional scientific opportunities and risks. Bio-content is a compositional attribute; it is not synonymous with biodegradability or safe end-of-life.

Bioepoxy selection

Choose a resin with documented biogenic carbon fraction, epoxy equivalent weight, viscosity and curing chemistry. Compare it against conventional epoxy using consistent filler metrics, but do not interpret between-resin differences as a nanosheet effect. Bioepoxy systems can vary greatly in crosslink density, flexibility and thermal stability.

Dynamic covalent networks

Vitrimers use exchangeable covalent bonds that may allow stress relaxation, welding or reprocessing under suitable conditions. Carbon fillers can alter catalyst accessibility, heat transport, crosslink distribution and exchange kinetics. An apparent self-healing result may reflect polymer flow or adhesion rather than recovery of original load-bearing performance.

Testing reversibility

Measure stress relaxation across temperature, dynamic mechanical behavior, repeated processing cycles, retained mechanical properties and gel fraction or solvent swelling where appropriate. Compare the same chemistry with and without nanosheets. Avoid promising recyclability until repeated recovery, degradation and contamination effects are quantified.

The Hempoxies opportunity

A staged hemp-derived carbon platform could compare nanosheets alone, biochar alone, carbon fibre alone and combinations. A multiscale hybrid may help combine crack resistance, stiffness and conductivity, but interaction effects are not necessarily additive. A factorial design is preferable to selecting an elaborate mixture without component-level controls.

7. Thermoplastics, elastomers and coatings

Polymer families require different processing windows and application-specific performance criteria.

Thermoplastics

PLA, polypropylene, polyethylene, polyamide and TPU are plausible research candidates. Melt compounding requires control of thermal degradation, shear history, dispersion and moisture. Compatibilizers can improve wetting but also complicate interpretation. Assess rheology, crystallization, impact strength, creep and processability as well as modulus.

Elastomers

In flexible materials, filler networks can affect hysteresis, fatigue, tear strength and electrical sensing. A high-surface-area carbon may strongly alter viscosity and curing chemistry. Test cyclic behavior and recovery rather than extrapolating from tensile strength alone.

Coatings and adhesives

Protective coatings may benefit from tortuous diffusion paths, antistatic behavior or mechanical abrasion resistance. However, porous filler can also create moisture pathways and compromise coating integrity. Adhesives require lap-shear, peel, fracture and environmental durability tests; a stiffer adhesive is not necessarily a tougher bond.

Printed materials

Conductive inks and additive-manufacturing feedstocks may be nearer-term markets than aircraft structures. Their success metrics include dispersion stability, printability, curing, electrical percolation and surface finish, not just ultimate strength.

8. Metals and ceramics: high-reward, high-risk matrices

Graphitic carbon fillers have precedent in metal and ceramic composites, but porous hemp-derived sheets add uncharacterized interfaces and thermal-processing constraints.

Aluminum and magnesium

Powder metallurgy, pressure-assisted consolidation and carefully controlled casting routes are potential pathways. Challenges include wetting, particle distribution, oxidation, interfacial reactions and thermal expansion mismatch. Aluminum carbide formation may help or harm depending on morphology and processing; it must be characterized rather than assumed universally beneficial.

Copper and conductive metals

Copper composites may target electrical and thermal functions, but residual oxygen, ash, porosity and interface resistance can negate the intrinsic conductivity of carbon. Compare bulk electrical conductivity, thermal conductivity and mechanical performance against unfilled metal.

Oxide and non-oxide ceramics

Alumina, zirconia and silicon carbide are conceptual candidates. During air sintering, carbon may oxidize; during inert or vacuum consolidation, densification and interfaces remain difficult. Spark plasma sintering and other controlled routes may help but are capital intensive. Measure relative density, grain size, flexural strength, indentation or standardized fracture toughness, and oxidation stability.

Decision gate

Do not begin metal or ceramic programmes until filler identity, impurity profile and thermal stability are known. These matrices are not merely harder versions of epoxy: their processing can transform or destroy the proposed reinforcement.

9. Multiscale architectures and functional systems

The strongest application may be a multifunctional material rather than a universal substitute for graphene.

Hybrid reinforcement

Nanosheets may occupy regions between larger carbon fibres and biochar particles, potentially modifying interfacial shear transfer, conductivity and crack trajectories. But mixed fillers can also segregate, agglomerate and increase viscosity. Test interaction terms explicitly in a factorial experimental design.

Electromagnetic and sensing uses

Electrically percolated composites can be evaluated for strain sensing, static dissipation and electromagnetic interference shielding. Shielding requires frequency-resolved measurement of reflection, absorption and transmission with specified specimen thickness. Conductivity alone does not prove effective shielding.

Transport and energy systems

Battery enclosures, corrosion-resistant housings, tooling and noncritical panels could be intermediate targets. Claims about aerospace certification, ballistic resistance or structural safety require extensive independent qualification. A lab coupon is not an approved aircraft or protective product.

Application prioritization

Rank candidate markets by performance upside, cost sensitivity, regulatory burden, achievable sample size and test cost. Noncritical coatings, conductive adhesives and molded enclosures may offer faster learning than primary structural components.

10. Sustainability, safety and economics

A biomass origin does not automatically confer environmental superiority. The relevant comparison is the entire functional unit and life cycle.

Life-cycle boundaries

Account for cultivation, agricultural inputs, transport, drying, hydrothermal or thermal conversion, chemical activation, washing, effluent management, energy use, filler manufacturing, composite processing, service life and disposal. Compare per kilogram of qualifying filler and per unit of achieved composite function.

Mass balance and cost

A proposed cost per tonne is meaningless without feedstock-to-product yield, electricity and heat consumption, activation chemicals, waste treatment, labor, equipment utilization, quality control and shipping. Compare against commercial graphene nanoplatelets of a specified grade and against lower-cost carbon black or biochar. Laboratory graphene pricing is not a valid baseline for industrial graphene nanoplatelet substitution.

Occupational health

Dry nanopowders may create inhalation and combustible-dust hazards. Use institutional risk assessment, suitable enclosure or local exhaust ventilation, respiratory protection as determined by exposure assessment, and procedures for powder spills. Avoid assuming that renewable feedstock means harmless dust. Assess residual activation reagents and heavy metals.

End of life

Carbon-filled thermosets are not automatically compostable or biodegradable. Reprocessable matrices can reduce waste only if actual recovery routes exist. Metal and ceramic recycling may be affected by carbon contamination or interfacial chemistry. End-of-life claims need measured evidence.

11. The definitive research programme

The goal is to move from an interesting material to a defensible structure-property map with transparent uncertainty.

Stage zero: material qualification

Acquire at least two independent hemp nanosheet batches and one commercial graphene nanoplatelet reference. Record full provenance and use the characterization package from Chapter 1. Reject or segregate materials with poorly controlled ash, moisture or particle distributions.

Stage one: formulation screen

Run neat epoxy, hemp nanosheet dose series, commercial GNP controls and biochar controls. Measure viscosity and cure first; do not fabricate a large specimen campaign with an unworkable mixture. Include process blanks and independently prepared replicates.

Stage two: mechanism and robustness

Select promising formulations for microscopy, fracture toughness, thermal aging, water exposure and fatigue. Compare porous versus denser nanosheets, untreated versus surface-modified filler, and alternate mixing routes. Seek causal explanations, not just favorable graphs.

Stage three: transferability

Repeat the strongest formulation in a bioepoxy and one thermoplastic. Test at least two production batches and an external laboratory. Use predeclared primary endpoints, effect sizes and confidence intervals. Archive raw data and negative results.

Stage four: qualification and economics

Calculate cost per unit property improvement, manufacturing energy, yield and lifecycle impacts. Select one market for a pilot, define acceptance criteria and obtain independent performance testing. Do not extrapolate to all composite classes.

12. Data integrity, intellectual property and publication

Scientific priority and commercial defensibility require more than posting an ambitious formulation.

Publication discipline

Separate concepts, predictions, simulations, unverified AI-assisted drafts and experimentally measured results. Label each revision, date the search and identify what changed. Publish protocols and data alongside conclusions when licensing permits.

Patents and freedom to operate

A prior patent on a hemp carbon synthesis route may affect manufacturing even if a particular composite application is novel. Patentability, inventorship and freedom to operate are separate questions. Seek qualified patent counsel and perform jurisdiction-specific searches before making commercial commitments.

Responsible claims

Avoid saying "stronger than graphene," "first ever," "100% recyclable," or "carbon negative" without clearly defined comparators and robust supporting evidence. Use precise language: candidate reinforcement, measured improvement in a specified test, and unverified novelty where appropriate.

Open collaboration

A reproducible research package can include a public materials specification, coded sample identifiers, standardized data templates, experimental methods, uncertainty reporting and a corrections log. Independent replication should be designed into the programme rather than treated as an afterthought.

Conclusion: the question worth answering

Hemp-derived porous graphitic nanosheets deserve to be tested in composite matrices. The case for trying them rests on demonstrable morphology, accessible carbon feedstocks and plausible mechanisms established by adjacent carbon-nanocomposite science. The case for using them commercially remains conditional on dispersion, interfaces, reproducibility, properties, cost, safety and lifecycle performance.

The decisive comparison

Make a chemically and structurally characterized hemp nanosheet, compound it into a controlled epoxy matrix, benchmark it against commercial graphene nanoplatelets and ordinary biochar, then publish the full outcome. A positive result would establish a new materials opportunity; a negative result would reveal why this form of carbon is better suited to electrodes or other functions. Both outcomes have scientific value.

Final research thesis

Hemp-derived porous graphitic carbon nanosheets are not proven universal graphene replacements. They are plausible, under-tested candidate fillers whose optimal role may be mechanical, conductive, barrier-related or multifunctional. A well-controlled experimental programme can determine which claim, if any, survives.

References and further reading

[1] Wang, H. et al. (2013). Interconnected Carbon Nanosheets Derived from Hemp for Ultrafast Supercapacitors with High Energy. ACS Nano 7, 5131-5141.
https://doi.org/10.1021/nn400731g

[2] Khan, R. & Vander Wal, R. (2026). Hemp-Derived Graphene-like Materials: A Renewable Pathway Toward Scalable Conductive Carbon Nanomaterials. Minerals 16, 475.
https://doi.org/10.3390/min16050475

[3] Bartoli, M. et al. (2022). Mechanical, electrical, thermal and tribological behavior of epoxy resin composites reinforced with waste hemp-derived carbon fibers. Journal of Materials Science 57, 14861-14876.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10853-022-07550-9

[4] Bulut, M. & Erkliğ, A. (2025). Investigation of Mechanical and Impact Properties of Hemp Fiber Reinforced Epoxy-Based Nanocomposites. Polymer Composites.
https://doi.org/10.1002/pc.30135

[5] Bodduru, K. et al. (2026). Dynamic mechanical and thermogravimetric analysis of glass/hemp reinforced hybrid polymer composites modified with 2D Graphene and MXene fillers.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s40712-026-00429-6

[6] Graphene/epoxy nanocomposites for improved fracture toughness: A focused review on toughening mechanism (2023).
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceja.2023.100537

[7] Ahmed, M. R., Maio, L. & Potluri, P. (2025). Graphene-enhanced epoxy composites: A comprehensive review. Progress in Aerospace Sciences.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paerosci.2025.101142

[8] Theethan, B. & Singh, B. (2026). Enhancement of Mechanical Properties in Hemp Fiber-Reinforced Epoxy Composites Using Graphene Nanoplatelets. Journal of Polymer & Composites.
https://journals.stmjournals.com/jopc/article%3D2026/view%3D235500/

[9] Landry, M.-S. S. (2026). Proposal: Hempoxies 74 Platform: Multiscale Bio-Carbon Reinforcement in Structural Vitrimer Composites. Zenodo. Conceptual proposal, not validation.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21325001

[10] Kumar, D. S. et al. (2026). Improving the inter-laminar fracture behaviour of hemp/epoxy composites under mode-II loading using alkali treated fiber and CNT modified matrix.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s42252-026-00112-1

[11] ASTM D638. Standard Test Method for Tensile Properties of Plastics.
https://www.astm.org/d0638-22.html

[12] ASTM D790. Standard Test Methods for Flexural Properties of Unreinforced and Reinforced Plastics and Electrical Insulating Materials.
https://www.astm.org/d0790-17.html

[13] ASTM D5045. Standard Test Methods for Plane-Strain Fracture Toughness and Strain Energy Release Rate of Plastic Materials.
https://www.astm.org/d5045-14.html

[14] U.S. EPA. Life Cycle Assessment: Principles and Practice.
https://www.epa.gov/lca

[15] ISO 14040. Environmental management - Life cycle assessment - Principles and framework.
https://www.iso.org/standard/37456.html

[16] ISO 14044. Environmental management - Life cycle assessment - Requirements and guidelines.
https://www.iso.org/standard/38498.html

[17] NIOSH. Nanotechnology: Occupational Safety and Health.
https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/nano/

[18] WIPO. PATENTSCOPE patent search database.
https://patentscope.wipo.int/

[19] Google Patents. Public patent search.
https://patents.google.com/

[20] Crossref. Scholarly metadata and DOI search.
https://search.crossref.org/

[21] PubMed. Wang et al. 2013 bibliographic record.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23651213/

[22] Hemp-glass fiber polymer composites reinforced with graphene and MXene nanofillers (2026). Polymer Composites.
https://doi.org/10.1002/pc.70703