Published by :
https://www.ijert.org/
An International Peer-Reviewed Journal

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

From Steel to Carbon Fiber: A Comparative Study of Automotive Lightweight Materials and the Path Toward Scalable Manufacturing for the Future

Akarshit Thakur
Independent Researcher
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering
Mandi, India

Abstract - Reducing structural weight has become central to automotive design, driven by tightening emissions regulations, fuel economy standards, and the rapid growth of electric vehicles. In battery-electric vehicles especially, added structural weight forces manufacturers to fit larger battery packs to maintain driving range, making lightweighting even more critical than in conventional vehicles. This paper reviews the shift from mild steel and advanced high-strength steel to aluminum alloys, magnesium, and carbon fiber reinforced polymers (CFRPs) in vehicle structures. CFRPs can cut component weight by up to 50% compared to steel, but high material costs and slow curing processes have kept them largely confined to premium and performance vehicles. This paper examines manufacturing innovations aimed at closing that gap, including faster-curing resin systems, automated fiber placement, and chemical recycling methods such as pyrolysis and solvolysis that allow reuse of carbon fiber. It also reviews emerging alternatives, including natural fiber hybrid composites and aluminum-lithium alloys, as lower-cost, more sustainable options. Based on this comparison, the paper argues that the future of automotive body-in-white design will likely depend not on one dominant material, but on multi-material structures that combine steel, aluminum, and composites, paired with faster, more scalable manufacturing methods.

Keywords - lightweighting; automotive materials; carbon fiber reinforced polymer; advanced high-strength steel; aluminum alloys; scalable manufacturing

I. INTRODUCTION

The transportation sector accounts for a significant share of global carbon emissions, and vehicle weight is one of the most direct levers manufacturers have to address this. Reducing a vehicle's mass improves fuel economy in conventional vehicles and extends driving range in electric vehicles, which is why lightweighting has moved from a secondary design consideration to a core engineering priority over the past two decades.

Regulatory pressure has driven much of this shift. The European Union has set a target to cut CO_2 emissions from new passenger cars by 37.5% by 2030 [4] compared to 2021 levels, the US Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards have pushed automakers [5] toward increasingly strict fleet-wide efficiency targets, and India's own CAFE norms have followed a similar trajectory, tightening from 130 g CO_2/km in the first phase to 113 g CO_2/km currently, with a further cut to around 91.7 g CO_2/km proposed for 2027 [6]. Meeting these targets without sacrificing vehicle size, safety, or performance has pushed manufacturers worldwide to look beyond traditional steel-based construction.

Historically, automotive structures have relied almost entirely on steel due to its low cost [16], [21], established manufacturing infrastructure, and predictable mechanical behavior. Over the past thirty years, however, aluminum alloys, magnesium, and carbon fiber reinforced polymers (CFRPs) have steadily gained ground in structural and semi-structural applications. Each offers a different trade-off between weight savings, cost, and manufacturability. Aluminum, for instance, offers a good balance of weight reduction and established manufacturing processes; the Ford F-150's shift to an aluminum-intensive body in 2015 cut roughly 700 pounds [7] compared to its steel predecessor. CFRPs go further still: BMW's i3 achieved a 250 to 350 kg weight reduction [8] using a carbon fiber passenger cell, though at a materials cost that has largely confined this approach to premium vehicles. Even mass-market-focused manufacturers have found meaningful gains without composites — Mahindra, for example, cut roughly 110 kg from its XUV700 [3] through design optimization and the use of high-tensile steel and plastic composites, showing that steel- and aluminum-based approaches still have real headroom before composites become necessary.

This cost and manufacturing barrier is the central tension this paper explores. CFRPs offer the best strength-to-weight

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

performance of any material discussed here, but their adoption has largely been limited to premium and performance vehicles. For lightweighting to meaningfully scale across the mass market, and particularly to support the growing electric vehicle segment where reducing structural weight directly offsets battery mass, manufacturing costs and cycle times for advanced composites need to come down significantly.

This paper takes a comparative approach to this problem. Rather than treating any single material as the default solution, it examines steel, aluminum, magnesium, and CFRPs side by side across key criteria: strength-to-weight ratio, cost per kilogram of weight saved, manufacturability, crashworthiness, and recyclability. It then looks specifically at manufacturing innovations aimed at closing the cost and scalability gap for composites, before reviewing emerging alternatives that may offer a more affordable middle ground between traditional metals and high-performance composites. The goal of this review is not to identify a single "winning" material, but to build a clearer picture of how these materials compare today and where the manufacturing landscape is realistically heading.

II. MATERIALS OVERVIEW

Before comparing these materials head-to-head, it's worth establishing what specifically separates them at a materials-science level, since the differences go well beyond "some are lighter than others."

The property that matters most for lightweighting isn't raw strength or raw weight in isolation, but specific strength, the ratio of strength to density. A material can be strong and still be a poor lightweighting choice if it's too dense; equally, a material can be light and useless if it's too weak to bear structural loads. This is why steel, despite having a higher absolute tensile strength than aluminum in many grades, still loses the lightweighting battle: its density (~7,850 kg/m³) is nearly three times that of aluminum (~2,700 kg/m³), so the weight penalty outweighs the strength advantage in most structural applications.

TABLE I. MATERIAL PROPERTIES OVERVIEW

Material	Density (kg/m³)	Tensile strength (MPa)	Relative cost/kg	Primary structural role
Mild steel	~7,850	270–500	1x (baseline)	Floor pan, body panels
AHSS/UHSS	~7,850	600–1,500+	~1.2x	Crash structures, pillars
Aluminum alloy	~2,700	200–500	~3x	Body panels, engine blocks
Magnesium alloy	~1,800	160–365	~5x	Steering frames, cross-beams
CFRP	~1,600	600–1,500+ (fiber-direction)	~15–20x	Monocoques, passenger cells

What this table makes obvious is that CFRP isn't winning on strength alone; AHSS actually matches or exceeds it in raw tensile strength. CFRP wins because it delivers that strength at roughly a fifth the density of steel, which is why a CFRP passenger cell can cut hundreds of kilograms compared to an equivalent steel structure. The catch, unsurprisingly, is the last column: CFRP can cost 15 to 20 times more per kilogram than steel, which is the real reason it hasn't taken over the industry despite being mechanically superior on paper.

Advanced High-Strength Steel deserves particular attention here because it's the quiet workhorse of modern lightweighting, and the one story most lightweighting papers skip in favor of flashier composites. By reengineering steel's microstructure (through processes like quenching and partitioning, or adding elements like boron), manufacturers have pushed tensile strengths past 1,500 MPa [17], nearly triple that of standard mild steel, while using the exact same stamping and welding infrastructure that's been in place for decades. This means AHSS delivers meaningful weight savings (thinner gauges doing the same structural job) at close to zero additional manufacturing cost, which is precisely why it, not aluminum or CFRP, is still the single most widely deployed lightweighting material in the industry today.

Aluminum sits in the uncomfortable middle: light enough to matter, but different enough from steel to require real manufacturing changes. Aluminum can't simply be spot-welded the way steel can, because the oxide layer on its surface interferes with the weld, so manufacturers rely on self-piercing rivets, adhesive bonding, or laser welding instead. It also needs dedicated corrosion-proofing, especially in regions using road salt, since aluminum corrodes differently than steel and can suffer galvanic corrosion if it's in direct contact with untreated

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

steel fasteners. None of this is a dealbreaker — Ford's aluminum-bodied F-150 proves it's entirely viable at scale [7] — but it does mean aluminum adoption is a genuine engineering commitment, not a drop-in material swap.

Magnesium is the material most people don't realize is already in their car. At roughly two-thirds the density of aluminum, it's the lightest metal used structurally in production vehicles, but its use is deliberately restricted to smaller, non-crash-critical parts, like steering wheel frames and cross-car beams, because magnesium is notably more brittle and far more reactive/corrosion-prone than aluminum. It's a material used surgically, not broadly.

CFRP, finally, is less a single material than a manufacturing philosophy. Unlike metals, which are formed into shape, CFRP is built up, layer by layer, from fiber and resin, which means its strength can be directionally engineered: fibers can be oriented precisely along the load paths a component will experience, extracting more strength per gram than an isotropic metal ever could. This is also exactly why CFRP is slow and expensive to produce: that directional precision has to be done by hand or by expensive automated equipment, and the resin needs time (often 30 minutes to several hours) to cure properly, compared to seconds for stamping a steel panel.

III. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

With the basic material properties established, this section compares steel, aluminum, magnesium, and CFRP directly across the five criteria that actually drive material selection decisions in industry: strength-to-weight ratio, cost per kilogram of weight saved, manufacturability, crashworthiness, and recyclability.

Strength-to-weight ratio is the most commonly cited metric, but it can be misleading on its own. As shown in the previous section, CFRP and AHSS have comparable raw tensile strength, yet CFRP's much lower density gives it roughly triple the specific strength of AHSS. This is why a CFRP monocoque can match a steel safety cell's strength at a fraction of the weight, but it is also why comparing materials on strength alone, without factoring in density, produces misleading conclusions. Aluminum falls in between: its specific strength is typically 1.5 to 2 times that of mild steel, which explains why it has become the practical “next step” for manufacturers not ready to commit to composites.

Cost per kilogram of weight saved is arguably the more important metric for a manufacturer, since it directly answers the question that matters commercially: how much does it cost to remove one kilogram of mass from the vehicle? Industry lightweighting studies (notably work by Lotus Engineering [14] and similar consultancies) have estimated rough cost-per-kilogram-saved figures across material classes. AHSS typically costs very little, often under $1 per kilogram of weight saved, since it uses existing manufacturing infrastructure. Aluminum sits meaningfully higher, in the range of $2 to $6 per kilogram saved, reflecting both material cost and the need for different joining processes. Magnesium climbs further, often cited around $6 to $10 per kilogram saved, due to its lower production volumes and specialized handling requirements. CFRP is the most expensive by a wide margin, frequently estimated at $10 to $20 or more per kilogram saved, depending on the fiber grade and manufacturing process used. This single metric explains, more clearly than any other, why AHSS remains the default lightweighting choice for mass-market vehicles while CFRP stays confined to premium models.

TABLE II. COMPARATIVE CRITERIA ACROSS MATERIALS

Criterion	Steel/AHSS	Aluminum	Magnesium	CFRP
Specific strength	Baseline	1.5–2x steel	~2x steel	~3x AHSS
Cost per kg saved	<$1	$2–6	$6–10	$10–20+
Manufacturing change required	Minimal	Moderate	Significant	Extensive
Crash energy absorption	Excellent (ductile)	Good	Poor (brittle)	Excellent but brittle failure mode
Recyclability	Very high	High	Moderate	Low (thermoset), improving (thermoplastic)

Manufacturability is where steel's dominance becomes obvious. Stamping, spot welding, and painting infrastructure for steel has been refined over more than a century, and most factories worldwide are already built around it. Aluminum requires new joining methods (self-piercing rivets, structural adhesives, or laser welding) and separate paint-shop handling to avoid cross-contamination with steel dust, which causes corrosion. Magnesium requires specialized die-casting equipment and inert-atmosphere handling during certain processing stages due to its flammability in fine particulate

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

form. CFRP represents the largest manufacturing departure of all: instead of forming a part from a single sheet in seconds, CFRP components are built up layer by layer and then cured, a process that can take anywhere from 30 minutes to several hours depending on the resin system used. This is the single biggest reason CFRP has not scaled to mass production the way steel and aluminum have.

Crashworthiness is a more nuanced comparison than it first appears. Steel and aluminum are ductile materials, meaning they deform and absorb crash energy gradually, which is exactly the controlled, progressive deformation crash engineers want [23]. CFRP, while extremely strong, tends to fail in a more brittle manner, fracturing and absorbing energy through material breakage rather than bending. This isn't necessarily worse (CFRP structures can actually absorb more total energy per unit weight in a controlled crush scenario) but it does require fundamentally different crash-structure design philosophies, which adds engineering complexity when integrating CFRP components into a vehicle that also uses steel or aluminum elsewhere. Magnesium performs the worst of the four here, since its brittleness at typical operating temperatures makes it a poor choice for any crash-critical structure, which is exactly why its use is restricted to non-structural components.

Recyclability is where the gap between metals and composites is most stark. Steel and aluminum are both highly recyclable using well-established industrial processes, and recycled aluminum in particular requires roughly 95% less energy [18] to produce than virgin aluminum, making end-of-life recovery genuinely valuable both economically and environmentally. CFRP, by contrast, has historically been difficult to recycle because the cured resin matrix cannot simply be melted down and reformed the way a metal can. Thermoset CFRPs (the more common, higher-performance type) generally require energy-intensive processes [22] like pyrolysis to recover the fibers, and even then, the recovered fibers are typically shorter and lower-performing than virgin fiber. Thermoplastic composites are a partial exception, since their matrix can be reheated and reformed, but they remain less common in high-performance structural applications.

Taken together, this comparison makes clear why there is no single “best” material. AHSS wins decisively on cost and manufacturability, aluminum offers a reasonable middle ground, magnesium remains a niche solution for specific components, and CFRP wins on pure performance but loses heavily on cost, processing time, and end-of-life recovery.

IV. CASE STUDIES

Numbers from the comparison table only tell part of the story. Looking at how these trade-offs played out in real vehicle programs shows where the theory held up, and where it didn't.

The Ford F-150's 2015 switch to an aluminum-intensive body is often cited as lightweighting's biggest commercial success story, and largely deserves that reputation. Ford cut roughly 700 pounds (approximately 317 kg) from the truck [7] while keeping its steel frame underneath, a deliberate hybrid strategy that captured aluminum's weight savings on body panels without betting the entire structure on a new material. What's less discussed is that this wasn't a clean win: early F-150 aluminum bodies saw a rise in repair costs and longer body-shop turnaround times, since aluminum panel repair requires different tools, training, and dedicated, contamination-free workspaces that most collision-repair shops didn't have in 2015. This is a useful reminder that a lightweighting decision doesn't end at the factory gate; it has downstream costs in repairability and insurance that rarely show up in the headline weight-saving figure.

BMW's i3, by contrast, represents the opposite bet: an almost all-in commitment to CFRP for the passenger cell, achieving a 250–350 kg reduction over an equivalent steel structure. Mechanically, this was a genuine achievement, and it proved CFRP could be used in a series-production vehicle rather than a low-volume supercar. But the i3 also illustrates CFRP's core limitation rather than disproving it: BMW built an entirely dedicated carbon-fiber production facility [8] to support the car, and the i3 itself sold in modest numbers over its production life compared to BMW's mainstream models. The i3 demonstrates that CFRP works. It does not demonstrate that CFRP scales economically, which is precisely the gap the next section addresses.

The Audi A8's multi-material space frame offers a more balanced case, and arguably a better model for where the industry is heading. Rather than picking one lightweight material, Audi combined aluminum, high-strength steel, magnesium, and CFRP [9] in different parts of the structure, using each material where its specific properties mattered most: aluminum for the bulk of the frame, steel where crash-critical stiffness was needed, CFRP in the rear bulkhead for torsional rigidity. This approach avoids the F-150's repair-complexity problem and the i3's all-in cost problem, but introduces a different challenge: joining dissimilar materials reliably, particularly avoiding galvanic corrosion between aluminum and steel components in contact, which requires isolating layers, specialized adhesives, or coated fasteners that add their own cost and design complexity.

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

A fourth case, less globally known but arguably more representative of how most of the world's automakers actually approach this problem, is Mahindra & Mahindra, India's largest SUV manufacturer and one of the country's major automotive OEMs. Mahindra's XUV700 achieved a roughly 110 kg weight reduction [3] not through composites or exotic alloys, but through design optimization and the use of high-tensile steel and plastic composites, with the tailgate alone contributing 15–20 kg of that saving. This matters as a case study precisely because it shows the other end of the spectrum from BMW: meaningful, commercially viable lightweighting achieved with none of the CFRP cost or repair-infrastructure problems the other three cases had to work around. For a manufacturer serving a price-sensitive, high-volume market, this incremental approach isn't a compromise forced by lesser technology — it's the more rational engineering choice given the constraints.

What these four cases collectively suggest is that the “right” lightweighting strategy isn't really a materials question in isolation; it's a question of what a manufacturer's specific constraints (price point, production volume, repair infrastructure, target market) can actually support. That framing sets up the next section directly: what needs to change, technically and economically, for CFRP's advantages to become accessible outside the premium segment it's currently confined to.

V. PATH TO SCALABLE MANUFACTURING

The previous sections established that CFRP's main obstacle isn't performance — it's cost and cycle time. This section examines specific technologies closing that gap, using real production examples rather than generic industry averages.

Curing time is the single biggest bottleneck in traditional CFRP manufacturing. Autoclave curing, the older, higher-precision method still used for aerospace-grade parts, can take up to 24 hours for a large structural component. Audi's own manufacturing history illustrates this shift well: the Audi R8 GT used prepreg layup with a production time of around 4 hours [1] per part, suitable only for small-series production, while the later R8 Spyder switched to a Resin Transfer Molding (RTM) process and cut that same part's cycle time to roughly 30 minutes. High-Pressure RTM (HP-RTM) pushes this further still. BMW's i3, the clearest real-world proof point for this technology, uses HP-RTM [2] to mold its carbon-fiber passenger cell components, and the process is reported to bring cycle times for large structural parts down from as long as 24 hours (via older autoclave methods) to a “low single-digit number of minutes.” This is still slower than stamping steel, but it moves CFRP from “only viable for a few thousand units per year” into a range where genuinely higher-volume production becomes realistic, which is exactly why BMW chose it for a series-production vehicle rather than a low-volume supercar.

Automated Fiber Placement (AFP) addresses a different part of the cost problem: labor [15]. Traditional CFRP layup is done largely by hand, with skilled technicians placing each layer of fiber in a specific orientation — a slow, expensive, and difficult-to-scale process. AFP uses robotic heads to lay down fiber tow at controlled angles and speeds, reducing both labor cost and the material waste that comes from hand-trimming excess fiber. AFP was originally developed for aerospace, where production volumes are low and precision matters more than speed; automotive-specific variants have since been adapted for higher-speed, lower-precision applications where aerospace-grade tolerances aren't necessary. This is a useful pattern to notice: several of the technologies making CFRP more viable for cars are aerospace processes deliberately “de-tuned” for speed and cost rather than precision, which is a genuinely different design philosophy than simply inventing new processes from scratch.

Recycled and reclaimed carbon fiber addresses both cost and the recyclability weakness identified earlier in this paper. Two main recycling routes exist: pyrolysis, which heats scrap CFRP to break down the resin matrix and leave the carbon fibers largely intact, and solvolysis, which uses chemical solvents to achieve a similar result at lower temperatures. Both processes typically recover fibers with somewhat reduced mechanical performance [19], [20] compared to virgin fiber, since some fiber length and surface quality is lost, but recycled fiber can cost meaningfully less than virgin material. This makes it well suited for semi-structural or non-safety-critical components, where full virgin-fiber performance isn't necessary but weight savings still matter.

Thermoplastic composites represent a genuinely different approach rather than a faster version of existing methods. Unlike thermoset resins such as epoxy, which cure through an irreversible chemical reaction and can never be reshaped once cured, thermoplastic matrices such as polyamide (PA6) and polyphenylene sulfide (PPS) can be melted and reformed repeatedly, similar to how metals can be. This has two advantages for scalability: parts can be stamped or compression-molded in seconds rather than cured over minutes, and end-of-life components can be reheated and reprocessed rather than requiring pyrolysis or solvolysis. The trade-off is that thermoplastic composites generally have somewhat lower peak mechanical performance than the best thermoset systems, making them currently better suited to semi-structural

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

applications rather than full monocoque passenger cells.

Taken together, and grounded in what BMW and Audi have already demonstrated in real production lines rather than lab-scale projections, these developments suggest a realistic path forward. None of them make CFRP as cheap as steel, and none are likely to in the near future, but each chips away at a specific part of the cost and cycle-time gap that has kept CFRP confined to premium vehicles. HP-RTM addresses cycle time, AFP addresses labor cost, recycled fiber addresses raw material cost, and thermoplastics address both cycle time and end-of-life recovery simultaneously. The direction of travel is measurable, not speculative, which is exactly what makes it worth examining what comes after CFRP itself in the section that follows.

VI. EMERGING AND FUTURE MATERIALS

The previous section looked at how to manufacture existing composites more efficiently. This section looks at materials themselves that may reshape the field, some already proving out in vehicles, others still borrowed from adjacent industries.

Natural fiber composites are the most immediately relevant of these, since they're already in production rather than purely experimental. Mercedes-Benz replaced the wood-fiber material previously used in its E-Class door panels [10] with a flax and sisal fiber mat embedded in an epoxy matrix, achieving a 20% weight reduction while improving moldability into complex 3D shapes. More recent developments push this further: Bcomp's flax-fiber powerRib technology, used to reinforce thin composite panels [11], can reduce weight by 27% compared to an equivalent carbon fiber panel while cutting cost by 40%, or by over 40% compared to a pure glass fiber panel at 30% lower cost, for the same stiffness. This matters because it directly attacks CFRP's two weakest points — cost and recyclability — using a fundamentally different reinforcement source rather than trying to make carbon fiber itself cheaper. A 2025 concept vehicle developed by Mercedes-Benz Trucks and partners, the reECONIC [12], illustrates how far this has progressed: its interior components use flax fiber reinforcement in a bio-based PLA matrix, achieving a 45% weight reduction and a 75% lower carbon footprint compared to the standard production material used for the same part. Natural fiber composites are currently used mostly in non-structural interior applications — door panels, trim, seat backs — rather than crash-critical structures, since their mechanical performance still falls short of glass or carbon fiber. But as reinforcement and matrix technology improves, this gap is narrowing.

Aluminum-lithium alloys represent a more speculative inclusion for an automotive paper, and it's worth being upfront about that. Adding lithium to aluminum reduces the alloy's density, roughly 3% density reduction for every 1% of lithium added, while simultaneously increasing stiffness, a combination that's genuinely difficult to achieve any other way in a metal. This has made Al-Li alloys valuable in aerospace — they're used in the wings of the Airbus A380 and in the fuel tanks of the Space Shuttle [13], where a 7 to 10% density reduction translates into significant fuel savings over an aircraft's operational life. However, Al-Li alloys have not seen meaningful adoption in automotive structures to date. Lithium is expensive and reactive, requiring careful, specialized processing, and the cost-per-kilogram-saved math that made AHSS the automotive industry's default has generally not favored Al-Li over more established aluminum alloys for cars. Its inclusion here is less a claim that it's already relevant to automotive design, and more a reasonable prediction: as aerospace-grade Al-Li processing techniques mature and costs fall, the same alloy family that already outperforms standard aluminum in aircraft could plausibly migrate toward high-end automotive applications the way carbon fiber did decades ago.

Taken together, these two material families point toward two different futures rather than one. Natural fiber composites offer a near-term, already-commercializing path to cutting cost and improving sustainability without needing dramatic new manufacturing infrastructure. Aluminum-lithium alloys represent a longer-term, less certain possibility — valuable to note as a genuine emerging option, but one that would require its own cost curve to fall significantly before it makes sense outside aerospace. Neither displaces the materials discussed earlier in this paper; both illustrate that the search for better lightweighting materials is still very much ongoing.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper set out to compare traditional and advanced materials used in automotive lightweighting, and to examine whether the barriers that have kept carbon fiber reinforced polymers confined to premium vehicles are genuinely closing. The comparison across strength-to-weight ratio, cost, manufacturability, crashworthiness, and recyclability makes clear that no single material wins outright. Advanced high-strength steel remains the most cost-effective lightweighting tool available today, aluminum offers a reasonable middle ground already proven at scale, and CFRP delivers unmatched performance but at a cost and cycle-time penalty that has limited its reach.

What has changed, and what this paper's manufacturing and future-materials sections both point to, is that this penalty is

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 15 Issue 09 , September - 2026

shrinking rather than static. Technologies like HP-RTM, already proven in BMW's i3, and automated fiber placement are cutting CFRP's cycle times from hours to minutes, while recycled carbon fiber and natural fiber composites are attacking its cost and sustainability weaknesses from different directions. None of these developments make CFRP as cheap as steel, and it would be inaccurate to claim they will in the near future. But they collectively suggest that the gap separating "premium-only" materials from mass-market-viable ones is narrower today than it was even a decade ago.

The case studies examined here, from Ford's aluminum F-150 to Audi's multi-material space frame to Mahindra's steel-and-plastic-composite approach on the XUV700, point toward the same underlying conclusion: the future of automotive lightweighting is unlikely to be defined by any single material replacing steel outright. It will more likely be shaped by manufacturers combining materials strategically, using each where its strengths matter most, while manufacturing innovation continues to make advanced composites accessible to a wider range of vehicles than they are today.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Karas and M. Mayr, "HP-RTM on the Rise," CompositesWorld. Available: https://compositesworld.com/articles/the-rise-of-hp-rtm
[2] "More Details on Molding the BMW i3 Electric Car," Plastics Technology. Available: https://ptonline.com/articles/more-details-on-molding-the-bmw-i3-electric-car
[3] R. Sricharan, "Mahindra's R Velusamy: 'Once you decide on 5-star safety, there's no option but to reduce vehicle weight,'" Autocar Professional, Nov. 2021. Available: https://www.autocarpro.in/news-national/m&m-r-velusamy
[4] European Commission, "CO2 emission performance standards for cars and vans." Available: https://climate.ec.europa.eu/eu-action/transport/road-transport-reducing-co2-emissions-vehicles_en
[5] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency / National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, "Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) Standards." Available: https://www.nhtsa.gov/laws-regulations/corporate-average-fuel-economy
[6] Society of Indian Automobile Manufacturers (SIAM) / Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, "CAFE Norms Phase III, India." Available: https://www.autocarindia.com/industry/government-releases-revised-cafe-iii-draft-440244
[7] "Ford F-150 Will Go Aluminum in 2015," Engineering News-Record (ENR). Available: https://www.enr.com/articles/9530-ford-f-150-will-go-aluminum-in-2015
[8] BMW Group, "BMW i3 LifeDrive Architecture and CFRP Passenger Cell." Available: https://www.press.bmwgroup.com/global/article/detail/T0148284EN/the-bmw-i3?language=en
[9] "Audi Space Frame in Multimaterial Mixed Construction," Audi MediaCenter. Available: https://www.audi-mediacenter.com/en/the-fastest-production-audi-ever-the-new-audi-r8-4421/audi-space-frame-in-multimaterial-mixed-construction-4440
[10] "Natural Fiber Application in the Mercedes-Benz," Daffodil International University Forum. Available: https://forum.daffodilvarsity.edu.bd/index.php/topic,21552.0.html
[11] Bcomp, "powerRibs Technology Data Sheet." Available: https://www.bcomp.ch
[12] "Bpreg Composites natural fibers prove industrial readiness on reECONIC EV concept vehicle," CompositesWorld, 2025. Available: https://www.compositesworld.com/news/bpreg-composites-natural-fibers-prove-industrial-readiness-on-reeconic-ev-concept-vehicle
[13] "Aluminum-Lithium Alloys," Total Materia Articles. Available: https://www.totalmateria.com/articles/aluminum-lithium-alloys-2
[14] Lotus Engineering Inc., "An Assessment of Mass Reduction Opportunities for a 2017–2020 Model Year Vehicle Program," prepared for The International Council on Clean Transportation, March 2010. Available: https://theicct.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Mass_reduction_final_2010.pdf
[15] "Composites Europe 2011 highlights solutions for mass production of carbon fibre automotive components," Reinforced Plastics. Available: https://www.reinforcedplastics.com/content/features/composites-europe-2011-highlights-solutions-for-mass-production-of-carbon-fibre-automotive-components
[16] A. Taub, E. De Moor, A. Luo, D. K. Matlock, J. G. Speer, and U. Vaidya, "Materials for Automotive Lightweighting," Annual Review of Materials Research, vol. 49, pp. 327–359, 2019. doi: 10.1146/annurev-matsci-070218-010134
[17] S. Cecchel, "Materials and Technologies for Lightweighting of Structural Parts for Automotive Applications: A Review," SAE International Journal of Materials and Manufacturing, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 81–98, 2021. doi: 10.4271/05-14-01-0007
[18] W. Zhang and J. Xu, "Advanced lightweight materials for automobiles: a review," Materials & Design, vol. 221, Art. 110994, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.matdes.2022.110994
[19] M. Goncalves, H. Monteiro, and M. Iten, "Life Cycle Assessment studies on lightweight materials for automotive applications — An overview," Energy Reports, vol. 8, pp. 338–345, 2022.
[20] G. H. Okoth, R. Ndeda, P. Raghupatruni, and E. O. Olakanmi, "Trends in Lightweighting for Automotive Applications: A Case Study," Journal of Sustainable Research in Engineering.
[21] A. Candela, G. Sandrini, M. Gadola, D. Chindamo, and P. Magri, "Lightweighting in the automotive industry as a measure for energy efficiency: review of the main materials and methods," Heliyon, vol. 10, 2024. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29728
[22] R. A. Witik, J. Payet, V. Michaud, C. Ludwig, and J.-A. E. Manson, "Assessing the life cycle costs and environmental performance of lightweight materials in automobile applications," Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing, vol. 42, pp. 1694–1709, 2011. doi: 10.1016/j.compositesa.2011.07.024
[23] F. Khan, N. Hossain, J. J. Mim, S. M. Rahman, Md. J. Iqbal, M. Billah, and M. A. Chowdhury, "Advances of composite materials in automobile applications — a review," Journal of Engineering Research, 2024. doi: 10.1016/j.jer.2024.02.017