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## Synopsis

In the present paper we have analytically derived a single-point equation for determining the intrinsic viscosity of a polymer. It is observed that the proposed equation gives a much better agreement with the extrapolated value of $[\eta$ ] over a wide range of concentration for good as well as poor polymer-solvent systems.

## INTRODUCTION

It is convenient to determine the intrinsic viscosity [ $\eta$ ] of a polymer by measurement of its viscosity in solution at a single concentration. Solomon and Ciuta ${ }^{1}$ proposed the use of the following equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\eta]=\frac{1}{c}\left[2\left(\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}\right)\right]^{1 / 2} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Narr et al. ${ }^{2}$ have deduced this equation from the viscosity equation of Huggins ${ }^{3}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\eta_{s p}}{c}=[\eta]+K^{\prime}[\eta]^{2} c \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Solomon and Gotesman ${ }^{4}$ analytically derived another single-point equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\eta]=\frac{\eta_{s p}}{c}\left[1+1 / 3 \eta_{s p}\right]^{-1} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The remarkably simple equations of Solomon and Ciuta and Solomon and Gotesman which contain no constant characteristic of polymer solvent system give fairly accurate values of [ $\eta$ ] at low concentrations. Shroff ${ }^{5}$ and Pechoc ${ }^{6}$ have shown that the Solomon-Ciuta equation is valid for good polymer solvent systems where $K^{\prime}$ of eq. (2) is $0.3 \leqslant K^{\prime} \leqslant 0.4$. However, when $K^{\prime}$ is significantly out of this range, as is the case with poor solvents, these equations give $[\eta]$ values that differ considerably from the extrapolated value of $[\eta]$.

Deb and Chatterjee ${ }^{7}$ derived another single-point equation by eliminating $K^{\prime}$ from the Schulz-Blaschke ${ }^{8}$ equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\eta_{s p}}{c}=[\eta]+K^{\prime}[\eta] \eta_{s p} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Their equation is

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\eta]=\frac{1}{c}\left[3\left(\ln \eta_{\Gamma}-\eta_{s p}+1 / 2 \eta^{2}{ }_{8 p}\right)\right]^{1 / 3} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The above equation was also derived by Palit and $\mathrm{Kar}^{9}$ by assuming $K^{\prime}=0$ and including higher-order terms in the polynomial expansion of $\ln \eta_{7}$.

In the present paper we have derived a single-point equation by using the empirical viscosity relation of Schramek. ${ }^{10}$ Our equation gives accurate results for good as well as poor polymer solvent systems.

## THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

We start from the empirical viscosity relation of Schramek ${ }^{10}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\eta_{s p}}{c}=f(c)=[\eta]\left[1+\frac{\left.K^{\prime}[\eta] c\right]}{m}\right]^{m} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

This equation has two parameters, $K^{\prime}$ and $m$, and is quite general. In fact, it reduces to the Huggins equation when $m=1$, to the Schulz-Blaschke equation and Martin ${ }^{10}$ equation when $m=-1$ and $\infty$, respectively.

The function $\ln \eta_{r} / c$ is denoted by $\Phi(c)$. By the definition of intrinsic viscosity, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& {[\eta]=\operatorname{Lim}_{c \rightarrow 0} \frac{\eta_{s p}}{c}=f(0)} \\
& {[\eta]=\operatorname{Lim}_{c \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln \eta_{\tau}}{c}=\Phi(0)} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

Functions $f(c)$ and $\Phi(c)$ can be expanded in Taylor-Maclaurin form,

$$
\begin{gather*}
f(c)=f(0)+c f^{\prime}(0)+\frac{c^{2}}{2!} f^{\prime \prime}(0)+\ldots  \tag{8}\\
\Phi(c)=\Phi(0)+c \Phi^{\prime}(0)+\frac{c^{2}}{2!} \Phi^{\prime \prime}(0)+\ldots \tag{9}
\end{gather*}
$$

Since $\eta_{r}=1+\eta_{s p}$, $\ln \eta_{r}$ can be expanded in the following form (for $\eta_{s p}<1$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \eta_{r}=\eta_{s p}-\frac{\eta^{2} s p}{2}+\frac{\eta^{3} s p}{3}-\ldots \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

which gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi(c)=\frac{\ln \eta_{r}}{c}=\frac{\eta_{s p}}{c}-\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{\eta_{s p}}{c}\right)^{2}+\frac{c^{2}}{3}\left(\frac{\eta_{s p}}{c}\right)^{3}-\ldots \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

This can be written in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(c)-\Phi(c)=\sum_{j=2} \frac{(-1)^{i}}{j} f^{j}(c) c^{j-1} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

From eqs. (8) and (9) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}=c[f(c)-\Phi(c)]=\sum_{n=0} \frac{f^{(n)}(0)-\Phi^{(n)}(0)}{n!} c^{n+1} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f^{(n)}(0)$ and $\Phi^{(n)}(0)$ denote the $n$th derivatives of $f$ and $\Phi$ with respect to $c$ at $c=0$.

We shall now discuss various approximations of eqs. (12) and (13):
(a) It will be observed from eqs. (12) and (13) that $f(c)=\Phi(c)$ when $c=0$, i.e., $f(0)=\Phi(0)$, which is the intrinsic viscosity by definition [eq. (7)]:

$$
f(0)=\Phi(0)=[\eta] .
$$

(b) Differentiating eq. (13) with respect to $c$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}(c)-\Phi^{\prime}(c)=\sum_{j=2} \frac{(-1)^{j}}{j}\left[(j-1) c^{j-2} f^{j}(c)+c^{j-1}\left\{f^{j}(c)\right\}^{\prime}\right] \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

when $c=0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}(0)-\Phi^{\prime}(0)=1 / 2 f^{2}(0)=1 / 2[\eta]^{2} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting in eq. (13), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}=1 / 2[\eta]^{2} c^{2} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the Solomon-Ciuta equation.
(c) Terms higher than $c^{2}$ can be included in eq. (16) for a better approximation. This is achieved by including $f^{\prime \prime}(c)-\Phi^{\prime \prime}(c)$ in eq. (13). Differentiating eq. (14) with respect to $c$,

$$
\begin{align*}
f^{\prime \prime}(c)-\Phi^{\prime \prime}(c)=\sum_{j=2} \frac{(-1)^{j}}{j} & {\left[(j-1)(j-2) c^{j-3} f^{j}(c)\right.} \\
& \left.+2(j-1) c^{j-2}\left\{f^{j}(c)\right\}^{\prime}+c^{j-1}\left\{f^{j}(c)\right\}^{\prime \prime}\right] \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $f^{\prime}(0)=K^{\prime}[\eta]^{2}$, from eq. (6), eq. (17) gives, for $c=0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime \prime}(0)-\Phi^{\prime \prime}(0)=2\left(K^{\prime}-1 / 3\right)[\eta]^{3} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting eqs. (15) and (18) in eq. (13) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{t}=1 / 2[\eta]^{2} c^{2}+\left(K^{\prime}-1 / 3\right)[\eta]^{3} c^{3} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

which can be reduced to the Solomon-Gotesman equation by eliminating $K^{\prime}$ from it with the help of the Huggins equation, eq. (2). For good polymer solvent systems, $K^{\prime} \sim 1 / 3$ and the second term on the right-hand side of eq. (19) is negligible in comparison with $1 / 2[\eta]^{2} c^{2}$. Equation (19) thus reduces to the Solomon-Ciuta equation.
(d) For a better approximation, we included terms higher than $[\eta]^{3} c^{3}$ in eq. (19). This is achieved by including $f^{\prime \prime \prime}(c)-\Phi^{\prime \prime \prime}(c)$ in eq. (13). Proceeding in the above manner, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime \prime \prime}(0)-\Phi^{\prime \prime \prime}(0)=3\left[\frac{1}{2}-2 K^{\prime}+\frac{2 m-1}{m} K^{\prime 2}\right] \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation (13) gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& \eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{T}=\frac{[\eta]^{2} c^{2}}{2}\left[1+2\left(K^{\prime}-\frac{1}{3}\right)[\eta] c\right. \\
&\left.+\left(\frac{1}{2}-2 K^{\prime}+\frac{2 m-1}{m} K^{\prime 2}\right)[\eta]^{2} c^{2}\right] \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

For $m=1$, the above equation reduces to the modified single-point equation of Shroff. ${ }^{5}$
With the help of eq. (6), eq. (21) can be reduced to the following form:

$$
\begin{align*}
{[\eta]=\frac{1}{c}\left[2\left(\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}\right)\right]^{1 / 2} } & {\left[1-\left(K^{\prime}-\frac{1}{3}\right) \eta_{s p}\right.} \\
& \left.+\left\{\left(\frac{3}{2}+\frac{1}{2 m}\right) K^{\prime 2}-\frac{1}{3}\left(K^{\prime}+\frac{1}{4}\right)\right\} \eta_{s p}^{2}\right] \tag{22}
\end{align*}
$$

For good polymer-solvent systems, $K^{\prime} \simeq 1 / 3$, eq. (22) reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\eta]=\frac{1}{c}\left[2\left(\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}\left[1+\left(\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{\eta_{s p}^{2}}{18}\right] \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

At low concentrations, $\eta_{s p}^{2} \ll 1$, and our equation reduces to the SolomonCiuta equation. For higher concentrations or for the polymer-solvent systems where $K^{\prime}$ differs significantly from the value of $1 / 3$, the $\eta_{s p}$ and $\eta_{s p}^{2}$ terms in eq. (22) give a significant contribution and hence cannot be neglected. Assuming $K^{\prime}=1 / 2$ for poor solvents, eq. (22) reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\eta]=\frac{1}{c}\left[2\left(\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}\left[1-\frac{\eta_{s p}}{6}+\frac{\eta_{s p}^{2}}{8}\left(\frac{1}{m}-\frac{1}{2}\right)\right] . \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

## DISCUSSION

Viscosity data on some polymer-solvent systems are taken from the literature. Intrinsic viscosity calculated with our equation is compared with that obtained from the Solomon-Ciuta, Solomon-Gotesman, and DebChatterjee equations. The results for good and poor polymer-solvent systems are given in Tables I and II, respectively.

For good polymer-solvent systems, it is observed that the SolomonCiuta and Solomon-Gotesman equations give fairly accurate values of $[\eta]$ at low concentrations. At higher concentrations, however, the deviation from the extrapolated value of $[\eta]$ is considerable. This large error is due to neglect of higher-order terms in the derivation of these equations. However, the Solomon-Gotesman equation gives better results. The Deb-Chatterjee equation gives much higher values of $[\eta]$ even at low concentrations. This behavior of the Deb-Chatterjee equation is quite natural because in its derivation it was assumed that $K^{\prime}=0$. However, Gillispie and Hulme ${ }^{12}$ have shown that the results obtained from this equation
TABLE I
Comparison of [ $\eta$ ] Values for Good Polymer-Solvent Systems

| Polymer-solvent system | Conen., g/dl | [ $\eta$ ] Graph | ${ }_{[\eta]}$ Calculated |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | SolomonCiuta equation | SolomonGotesman equation | DebChatterjee equation | Our equation |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $m=-1$ | $m=1$ |
| Poly (methyl methacrylate)benzene ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.15 |  | 1.260 | 1.252 | 1.266 | 1.258 | 1.261 |
|  | 0.30 | 1.261 | 1.250 | 1.237 | 1.236 | 1.236 | 1.260 |
|  | 0.45 |  | 1.244 | 1.216 | 1.228 | 1.228 | 1.260 |
| Poly(vinyl acetate)chloroform ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0.15 |  | 1.002 | 0.998 | 0.992 | 0.999 | 1.002 |
|  | 0.30 | 1.000 | 0.998 | 0.991 | 1.023 | 0.992 | 1.002 |
|  | 0.45 |  | 0.994 | 0.981 | 1.038 | 0.989 | 1.002 |
| Cellulose acetateacetone ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.15 |  | 0.914 | 0.910 | 0.930 | 0.913 | 0.914 |
|  | 0.30 | 0.920 | 0.934 | 0.926 | 0.945 | 0.928 | 0.935 |
|  | 0.45 |  | 0.958 | 0.944 | 0.975 | 0.933 | 0.953 |
| Polystyrene-toluene ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 0.10 |  | 1.844 | 1.842 | 1.871 | 1.842 | 1.844 |
|  | 0.15 | 1.843 | 1.857 | 1.844 | 1.890 | 1.843 | 1.860 |
|  | 0.20 |  | 1.866 | 1.843 | 1.919 | 1.845 | 1.879 |

[^0]TABLE II
Comparison of [ $\eta$ ] Values for Poor Polymer-Solvent Systems

| Polymer-solvent system | Conen., g/dl | [ $\eta$ ] <br> Graph | [ $\eta$ ] Calculated |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | SolomonCiuta equation | Solomon-Gotesman equation | Deb- <br> Chatterjee equation | Our equation $m=\infty$ |
| Polyethylene- $p$ xylene ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.15 | 0.954 | 0.980 | 0.950 | 1.003 | 0.957 |
|  | 0.30 |  | 0.990 | 0.963 | 1.013 | 0.953 |
|  | 0.45 |  | 1.003 | 0.980 | 1.036 | 0.950 |
| Poly(methylmeth-acrylate)-acetone ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0.20 | 0.694 | 0.713 | 0.711 | 0.686 | 0.702 |
|  | 0.40 |  | 0.72 x | 0.722 | 0.740 | 0.700 |
|  | 0.60 |  | 0.738 | 0.727 | 0.785 | 0.698 |
| Poly(vinyl acetate)acetophenone ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.20 | 0.621 | 0.628 | 0.632 | 0.640 | 0.627 |
|  | 0.40 |  | 0.642 | 0.640 | 0.642 | 0.623 |
|  | 0.60 |  | 0.650 | 0.643 | 0.670 | 0.621 |
| Polystyrene-15:85 acetone:methyl cyclohexane ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 0.15 | $0.94{ }^{5}$ | 0.966 | 0.967 | 0.992 | 0.944 |
|  | 0.30 |  | 0.989 | 0.981 | 1.003 | 0.948 |
|  | 0.45 |  | 1.002 | 0.986 | 1.039 | 0.948 |

a Data of Trementozzi. ${ }^{17}$
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Data of Moore and Fort. ${ }^{13}$
c Data of Daoust and Rinfret. ${ }^{14}$
${ }^{d}$ Data of Palit, Colombo, and Mark. ${ }^{18}$
are identical with those obtained from the Huggins equation when $K^{\prime}=$ $1 / 4$.

It is observed that our eq. (23) gives very good agreement with the extrapolated values of $[\eta]$. In extremely good polymer-solvent systems, our eq. (23) with $m=-1$ gives accurate results, whereas for fairly good poly-mer-solvent systems eq. (23) with $m=+1$ gives fairly accurate values of [ $\eta$ ]. We can thus write our eq. (23) in the following form:
(i) For extremely good polymer-solvent systems:

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\eta]=\frac{1}{c}\left[2\left(\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}\left[1-\frac{\eta_{s p}^{2}}{12}\right] . \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

(ii) For fairly good polymer-solvent systems:

$$
[\eta]=\frac{1}{c}\left[2\left(\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}\left[1+\begin{array}{c}
\eta_{s p}^{2}  \tag{26}\\
18
\end{array}\right]
$$

For poor polymer-solvent systems, where $K^{\prime} \sim 1 / 2$, the existing singlepoint equations give a very high value of

$$
\Delta[\eta]=\frac{[\eta]_{\text {eale }}-[\eta]_{\text {expt }}}{[\eta]_{\text {expt }}} \times 100 \%
$$

at higher concentrations. Even here it is observed that the results obtained from the existing equations are in the following order:

$$
[\eta]_{\text {Deb-Chatterjee }}>[\eta]_{\text {Solomon-Gotesman }}>[\eta]_{\text {Solomon_Ciuta }}>[\eta]_{\text {graph h }} .
$$

Our eq. (24) for poor solvents with $m=\infty$ gives the best results. We can thus write the equation for poor polymer-solvent systems as

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\eta]=\frac{1}{c}\left[2\left(\eta_{s p}-\ln \eta_{r}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}\left[1-\frac{\eta_{s p}}{6}-\frac{\eta_{s p}^{2}}{16}\right] . \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

For some polymer-solvent systems, however, it is observed that the value of $K^{\prime}$ is very much different from its value of $1 / 3$ and $1 / 2$ for good and poor systems, respectively. In such cases more accurate values of [ $\eta$ ] may be obtained by using the general eq. (22) if $K^{\prime}$ for that particular polymersolvent system can be estimated.

## CONCLUSIONS

It is concluded, therefore, that the existing single-point equations are valid only for good polymer-solvent systems, where $K^{\prime} \sim 1 / 3$, at low concentrations. For poor polymer-solvent systems and also at higher concentrations, these equations gives a poor agreement with the extrapolated value of $[\eta]$. Our eqs. (25) and (26) for good polymer-solvent systems and eq. (27) for poor polymer-solvent systems give a fairly accurate value of [ $\eta$ ] over a wide range of concentrations.
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