

Preparation and Characterization of Polystyrene–Poly(ethylene oxide) Amphiphilic Block Copolymers via Atom Transfer Radical Polymerization: Potential Application as Paper Coating Materials

Khalid Ibrahim,¹ Arto Salminen,¹ Susanna Holappa,² Kirsi Kataja,³ Henna Lampinen,⁴ Barbro Löfgren,¹ Janne Laine,² Jukka Seppälä¹

¹Laboratory of Polymer Technology, Department of Chemical Technology, Helsinki University of Technology, FIN-02015 TKK, Finland

²Laboratory of Forest Products Chemistry, Department of Forest Products Technology, Helsinki University of Technology, FIN-02015 TKK, Finland

³VTT Processes, P.O. Box 1602, FIN-02044 VTT, Finland

⁴VTT Processes, P.O. Box 1603, FIN-02044 VTT, Finland

Received 7 December 2005; accepted 28 May 2006

DOI 10.1002/app.24886

Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com).

ABSTRACT: Poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO) monochloro macroinitiators or PEO telechelic macroinitiators (Cl-PEO-Cl) were prepared from monohydroxyfunctional or dihydroxyfunctional PEO and 2-chloro propionyl chloride. These macroinitiators were applied to the atom transfer radical polymerization of styrene (S). The polymerization was carried out in bulk at 140°C and catalyzed by Copper(I) chloride (CuCl) in the presence of 2,2'-bipyridine (bipy) ligand (CuCl/bipy). The amphiphilic copolymers were either A-B diblock or A-B-A triblock type, where A block is polystyrene (PS) and B block is PEO. The living nature of the polymerizations leads to block copolymers with narrow molecular weight distribution ($1.072 < M_w/M_n < 1.392$) for most of the macroinitiators synthesized. The macroinitiator itself and the corresponding block copolymers were characterized by FTIR, ¹H NMR, and SEC analysis. By adjusting the content of the PEO blocks it was possible to prepare water-soluble/dispersible block copolymers. The obtained block copoly-

mers were used to control paper surface characteristics by surface treatment with small amount of chemicals. The printability of the treated paper was evaluated with polarity factors, liquid absorption measurements, and felt pen tests. The adsorption of such copolymers at the solid/liquid interface is relevant to the wetting and spreading of liquids on hydrophobic/hydrophilic surfaces. From our study, it is observed that the chain length of the hydrophilic block and the amount of hydrophobic block play an important role in modification of the paper surface. Among all of block copolymers synthesized, the PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS containing 10 wt % PS was found to retard water absorption considerably. © 2006 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. *J Appl Polym Sci* 102: 4304–4313, 2006

Key words: amphiphilic block copolymers; atom transfer radical polymerization; poly(ethylene oxide)chloro telechelic macroinitiator; contact angle; felt pen

INTRODUCTION

Amphiphilic block copolymers are of interest because of their natural tendency to self-assemble into aggregates and micelles when dissolved or dispersed in selective solvents. These micelles may adsorb on solid surface, therefore these polymers have great industrial potential concerning surface modification. The increasing interest in hydrophilic–hydrophobic block copolymers is due to the improvement of the synthesis techniques and to their application possibilities as

biomaterials, drug carriers, stabilizers in suspensions or emulsions, surface modifying agents, adhesives and coatings, etc.¹ Most of the amphiphilic block copolymers of this type comprise poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO) as hydrophilic blocks, whereas the hydrophobic blocks are poly(methyl methacrylate) (PMMA), polystyrene (PS), etc.^{2–6} PEO, in addition to its adjustable water solubility, has the advantage of being biocompatible.

Atom transfer radical polymerization (ATRP) has provided a powerful tool for macromolecular design since it was first reported by Matyjaszewski utilizing copper(I) halide catalyst,^{7,8} Sawamoto using Ru(II)Cl₂(PPh₃)₂,⁹ and other catalysts,¹⁰ and by many others.^{11,12} This technique offers a convenient method for the preparation of A-B and A-B-A block copolymers by using either sequential monomer addition or a macroinitiator.^{2,3,13–15} In the macroinitiator tech-

Correspondence to: K. Ibrahim (kibrahim@cc.hut.fi) or J. Seppälä (jukka.seppala@hut.fi).

Contract grant sponsor: National Technology Agency (TEKES); contract grant number: 40513/0.

nique an oligomer is transformed into a macroinitiator by an organic reaction (first block (A)). The second block (B) is then formed by living ATRP and lead to the formation of a wide range of block copolymers of well-defined structure.

Several publications have appeared in the last years dealing with synthesis of PS-PEO di or triblock copolymers (PS-*b*-PEO, PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS) with well-defined molecular structures.¹⁶⁻²² The synthesis methods reported are mostly anionic polymerization processes including coupling reactions and sequential polymerization techniques. Recently, Jankova et al.,² and many others²³⁻²⁵ have reported the synthesis of well-defined PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS triblock copolymer by ATRP.

Recently, studies in the field of water-based coatings have showed a considerable increase.²⁶⁻²⁸ Compared to conventional solvent-based coatings, the water-based coatings present a variety of advantages such as nonflammability, nontoxicity, and low cost. Furthermore, this kind of coating will cause less air pollution compared to the case when volatile solvents are used.

To the best of our knowledge, none of the above-mentioned articles have studied the possibilities of applying these synthetic block copolymers as coating materials on paper surface or model surfaces. It is our interest to tailor the surface properties of paper by chemical treatment to control and adjust the absorption and smoothness of coated papers and coated base papers enabling low and even absorption of printing ink and to control dimensional stability of copy papers using cheaper raw materials. It is possible to tailor polymer characteristics, like hydrophobicity, hydrophilicity, adsorption, and penetration by combining different ways of modifications i.e., varying chain length of blocks in the block copolymers.

This article aims at two objectives: first to prepare a well-defined water-soluble/water-dispersible amphiphilic triblock copolymer (PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS), and secondly to study the influence of the polymer on the paper surface or model surfaces.

EXPERIMENTAL

Materials

Styrene (S) (Aldrich, Germany, 99%) was purified by passing it through a column of activated basic alumina to remove inhibitor. It was then stored under nitrogen at -15°C . 2,2'-Bipyridine (bipy) 99% (Aldrich, Germany) and Copper(I) chloride (CuCl) 98% (Aldrich, Germany) were used without purification. PEO [2000 (2 k), 5000 (5 k), 6000 (6 k), 10,000 (10 k), 20,000 (20 k) g/mol] (Aldrich) was dried in vacuum for 24 h before use. 4-Dimethyl amino pyridine (DMAP) 99% (Fluka) was recrystallized from toluene. Triethyl amine (TEA)

99% (Acros) was refluxed with *p*-toluene sulfonyl chloride, distilled and stored over CaH_2 . 2-Chloro propionyl chloride 97% (Fluka) was used without further purification. All other reagents were used as received.

Polymerization

Polymerization of block copolymers was carried out under dry nitrogen in a dried Schlenk tube equipped with a magnetic stirring bar. The tube was charged with the required amount of macroinitiator and catalyst (1M equiv. of CuCl and 3M equiv. of bipy), sealed with a rubber septum, and then degassed under vacuum to remove oxygen and then purged with dry nitrogen. Degassed styrene monomer was added using a nitrogen-purged syringe, and the tube was degassed and back-filled with nitrogen three times. The content was stirred for 5 min. Finally, the tube was immersed in an oil bath preheated to 140°C for 16 h. After the specified time, the reaction was stopped by withdrawing and cooling the reaction mixture to room temperature, and the crude products were dissolved in dichloromethane. The obtained polymer solution was passed over alumina to remove the catalyst, and the polymer was precipitated with an excess amount of hexane. The precipitated polymer was immersed in cold diethyl ether and then dried in vacuum at room temperature to a stable weight. The separation of the block copolymers from possible homo PS and PEO macroinitiator was carried out as follows: the crude product was extracted three times with cyclohexane at room temperature for 3 days (one extraction/day) to remove possible PS homopolymer or unreacted styrene present. The residue was purified (after drying and weighing) by washing twice with distilled water at room temperature to remove possible unreacted PEO macroinitiator.

Characterization

The dried product was characterized by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR), proton nuclear magnetic resonance (^1H NMR), and size exclusion chromatography (SEC) techniques and the conversion was determined by gravimetry. For the determination of the Cu content, samples (~ 0.5 g) were weighed into cleaned, acid-washed flasks. Sulfuric acid (H_2SO_4 , 4 mL, Merck) was added. The flasks were heated over a hot plate (at $\sim 300^{\circ}\text{C}$) for 2 h, after which they were left to cool. Nitric acid ($\text{HNO}_3(\text{conc})$) and hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2 , 35%) were added gradually to the cooled suspensions. The additions were done in 0.5 mL increments under slight warming until the suspensions were transformed into clear light brown solutions. Then the

flasks were filled up to the mark and the copper contents of the solutions were determined with GF-AAS (Varian 220Z). Wavelength was 324.8 nm.

FTIR spectra of the macroinitiator and block copolymers were recorded on a Nicolet Magna FTIR spectrometer, using the KBr pellet technique.

The molecular weights were determined by a room temperature SEC (Waters System Interface model, Waters 510 HPLC Pumps, Waters Differential Refractometer, Waters 700 satellite Wisp, and four linear PL gel columns: 10^4 , 10^5 , 10^3 , and 10^2 Å connected in series). Chloroform was used as solvent and eluent. The samples were filtered through a 0.5 µm Millex SR filter. Injected volume was 200 µL and the flow rate was 1 mL/min. Nearly monodisperse polystyrene standards in the range 2×10^6 –150 g/mol were used for primary calibration.

The ^1H NMR spectra of the polymer were recorded using a Varian (Palo Alto, CA) Gemini 2000XL NMR spectrometer operated at 300 MHz. The polymer solution was prepared by dissolving about 50 mg of polymer in 3 mL of deuterated chloroform (CDCl_3) and in deuterium oxide (D_2O) solvents.

Polymers (diblock copolymer sample 11 and triblock copolymer sample 8, see Table I) were applied on a model silicon surface and characterized by optical microscopy and contact angle measurements. The optical images were recorded with a digital camera combined to Leica MZ6 stereomicroscope. The static contact angles of water (distilled and deionized) were measured using a CAM 200 computer-controlled video-based instrument (KSV Instruments, Finland), and was analyzed with software based on Young–Laplace equation.

Preparation of model surfaces

Silicon wafers were used as model surfaces. The silicon wafers were cleaned by a RCA cleaning

sequence. The wafers were immersed into a $\text{NH}_4\text{OH}:\text{H}_2\text{O}_2:\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (2 mL NH_4OH (25%) : 4 mL H_2O_2 (35%): 14 mL H_2O) mixture at 75° – 85° for 10–20 min, and then rinsed with water. Subsequently, they were immersed into a $\text{HCl}:\text{H}_2\text{O}_2:\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (2 mL HCl (37%): 4 mL H_2O_2 (35%) : 16 mL H_2O) mixture at 75° – 85° for 10–20 min, and then rinsed with water. The wafers were dried with nitrogen and stored under isopropanol until used. Contact angle of water on pure hydrophilic wafer was $(15 \pm 5)^\circ$. The solutions were prepared by dissolving the polymers in water under magnetic stirring overnight. Polymers were applied on silicon wafers by spin coating from 3 wt % aqueous solutions.

Paper surface characterization

Chemical treatments of base papers were done by laboratory bar coater (K Control Coater). Used paper substrates were wood-free base paper and wood containing base paper without mineral coating.

Polarity factor of polymer-coated paper sample was determined by measuring contact angles with five model liquids (water, ethylene glycol, tricresyl phosphate, formamide, and diiodomethane).

Absorption properties of polymer-coated paper samples were measured by a Fotocomp Print instrument with deionized water and mineral oil.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION


Synthesis of PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS triblock copolymers

In the synthesis of PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS triblock or PS-*b*-PEO diblock copolymers, the telechelic macroinitiator was prepared by an esterification reaction between PEO and 2-chloro propionyl chloride² (Scheme 1). By SEC analysis it was found that poly(ethylene oxide)chloro telechelic macroinitiator (Cl-

TABLE I
ATRP Polymerization of Styrene with Poly(ethylene oxide) Monochloro Macroinitiators and Poly(ethylene oxide) Telechelic Macroinitiator at 140°C^a

Sample	% Styrene	Block copolymer	$M_{n(\text{theo})}$	$M_{n(\text{GPC})}$	M_w/M_n	Solubility in water
1	5	PS-PEO(2 k)-PS	2100	5000	1.283	Soluble
2	7	PS-PEO(2 k)-PS	2200	4700	1.228	Soluble
3	7	PS-PEO(6 k)-PS	7200	7050	1.290	Soluble
4	9	PS-PEO(6 k)-PS	7600	7500	1.257	Soluble
5	5	PS-PEO(10 k)-PS	10650	18000	1.074	Soluble
6	7	PS-PEO(10 k)-PS	10750	18000	1.091	Soluble
7	10	PS-PEO(10 k)-PS	11000	19000	1.072	Milky dispersion
8	9	PS-PEO(10 k)-PS	11000	18000	1.172	Soluble/turbid
9	5	PS-PEO(20 k)-PS	23500	18400	1.392	Soluble
10	7	PS-PEO(20 k)-PS	25300	20500	1.351	Soluble
11	9	PS-PEO(5 k)	6000	6500	1.186	Soluble

^a The ratio of macroinitiator/CuCl/bipy = 1/1/3.



Scheme 1 Preparation of PEO macroinitiator and the corresponding triblock copolymer.

PEO-Cl) did not show any reduction in molecular weight, since narrow symmetrical peaks were observed at essentially the same position as for the starting PEO.

Representative FTIR spectra of Cl-PEO-Cl macroinitiator and PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS triblock copolymers are shown in Figure 1. After the esterification reaction, the —OH peaks disappeared and instead the absorption peak of C=O at 1740–1760 cm^{-1} was observed. Phenyl ring absorption peaks at 1596, 1490, 750, and 700 cm^{-1} were also observed in the block copolymers. The wide and strong absorption peak at

1100 cm^{-1} still remained for —C—O—C— in both structures.

From our earlier study,²⁹ it appears that as soon as the initial weight percentage of the hydrophobic comonomer becomes higher than 10 wt %, the corresponding copolymer is water-insoluble. By ATRP technique, a series of PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS triblock copolymers (Table I) with different molecular weights and compositions were synthesized. Molecular weight of PEO for samples 1 and 2 is 2000 g/mol (2 k); for samples 3 and 4 is 6000 g/mol (6 k); for samples 5, 6, and 7 is 10,000 g/mol (10 k); and for samples




Figure 1 FTIR spectrum of (a) poly(ethylene oxide)chloro telechelic macroinitiator and (b) PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS triblock copolymer.




Figure 2 The ^1H NMR spectra of macroinitiator (Cl-PEO (10 k)-Cl) in CDCl_3 (a) and triblock copolymer in CDCl_3 (b) and D_2O (c) solvents.

8 and 9 is 20,000 g/mol (20 k). Table I shows the molecular characteristics data of water-soluble/dispersible triblock copolymers of PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS. The Table reveals that controlled water-soluble (narrow molecular weight distribution, agreement between experimental and theoretical molecular weights ($M_{n(\text{theo})}$) has been estimated by ^1H NMR compositional analysis based on the total area of aromatic protons of PS block to the area of the ethylene protons of PEO block) copolymers have been synthesized by means of (CuCl/bipy) catalytic system. According to the results in Table I some $M_{n(\text{GPC})}$ values are higher than $M_{n(\text{theo})}$ ones especially for the first two samples. This may be attributed to two reasons: first the high molecular weight macroinitiator produced a low radical concentration in the polymerization system. This low radical concentration slowed the rate of polymerization and decreased the conversion of the styrene monomer (i.e., conversion of the 2 k macroinitiator is more than 90%, whereas conversion of the 10 k is about 50%) and therefore,

made the polymerization more controlled. Other reason is that GPC calibration was carried out with PS standards. Similar results were published by Haddleton and coworkers.³⁰

Confirmation of the aggregation behavior of PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS in aqueous solution by ^1H NMR

^1H NMR spectra of Cl-PEO-Cl macroinitiator and PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS (sample 6) in deuterated chloroform (CDCl_3) and deuterium oxide (D_2O) solvents are presented in Figure 2. The spectrum of the macroinitiator [Fig. 2 (a)] in CDCl_3 solvent shows a small signal at 4.30 ppm due to the substituted PEO and a signal at 3.64 ppm due to the $\text{CH}_2\text{—CH}_2\text{—O}$ resonance (peaks between $\delta = 1$ and $\delta = 2$ are due to methyl protons in the substituted PEO, the peak in $\delta = 7.26$ belongs to CDCl_3 solvent). When the CDCl_3 solvent [Fig. 2 (b)] was used for PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS (sample 6), $\delta = 3.64$ still appeared for methylene protons of PEO blocks, and $\delta = 6.5$ and 7.2 for the phenyl ring

protons of PS blocks. However, when D₂O solvent [Fig. 2 (c)] was used, $\delta = 3.64$ was seen for the methylene protons of PEO blocks ($\delta = 4.63$ belongs to D₂O solvent), but the peaks assigned to the phenyl ring protons of PS blocks completely disappeared.

The phenomena may be explained by the consideration that the amphiphilic block copolymer has a strong surfactant activity. The disappearance of the phenyl ring proton peaks indicates that aggregates were formed by the synthesized block copolymers when D₂O was used as solvent. D₂O is a good solvent for PEO blocks and a poor solvent for PS blocks, consequently, the chains of the triblock copolymers tended to self-assemble, and associated to form aggregates with inner insoluble PS blocks and outer PEO soluble blocks. Instead, CDCl₃ is good solvent for both PS and PEO blocks, so the block copolymer chains adopt an extended conformation in the solution. Therefore, the chemical shift of $\delta = 3.64$ for methylene protons and $\delta = 6.5$ and 7.2 for the phenyl ring protons appeared simultaneously.

Applying PEO-PS amphiphilic block copolymers as paper coating materials

The synthesized water soluble block copolymers (Table I) were used to tailor the surface properties of paper by chemical treatment to control and adjust the absorption and spreading of printing ink.

Atomic absorption spectrum (AAS) revealed that the Cu ion content in all samples did not exceed 20 ppm, which is so low that its contribution to the surface modification (if existing) is negligible.

Paper printability can be modified and improved not only by making the paper surface more hydrophobic, but also by adjusting the ratio of hydrophobic and hydrophilic parts. Carlmark and Malmström³¹ reported that modification of cellulose fibers, in the

form of a conventional filter paper, was possible by grafting the paper with methyl acrylate under ATRP conditions. By adjusting the initiator-to-monomer ratio in the bulk they were able to make the paper surface very hydrophobic.

Polymers on silicon model surfaces—Study of orientation and hydrophobicity

Diblock copolymer (sample 11) and triblock copolymer (sample 8) were applied on silicon surfaces as 3 wt % aqueous solutions by spin coating. Samples were examined by optical microscopy to get a coarse idea of the morphology of the polymer layer on the silicon surface, as well as, by contact angle measurements to get an idea about the hydrophobicity of the surface, and thus about the orientation of the polymers.

The optical microscope images of sample 11 and sample 8 on hydrophilic silicon surface are presented in Figure 3. Sample 11 [Fig. 3 (a)] forms a continuous layer, which shows a regular reflection pattern, whereas sample 8 [Fig. 3 (b)] forms a more heterogeneous layer consisting of a macroscopic precipitate and of thin adsorbed polymer layer with lamellar crystal patterns. Aqueous solutions of the polymers differ as well. Three weight percent solution of sample 11 is clear and the solution of sample 8 is turbid. These differences originate from a different block structure of the polymers. Sample 11 and sample 8 are chemically similar, but the former is a diblock copolymer and the latter is a triblock copolymer. The diblock structure allows the formation of more ordered micelle-like particles that are solubilized by hydrophilic PEO blocks, while the hydrophobic PS end groups on the triblock copolymer instead induce bridging between the micellar subunits leading to the formation of larger and less




Figure 3 The optical microscope images of (a) polymer sample 11 and (b) polymer sample 8, on silicon surface. [Color figure can be viewed in the online issue, which is available at www.interscience.wiley.com.]

ordered aggregates. Accordingly, during the drying phase in spin coating, the increasing concentration leads to the formation of a macroscopic precipitate in the case of sample 8, whereas in the case of sample 11, the particles are better sterically stabilized and a continuous layer is formed.

On model surfaces, both samples 11 and 8 exhibit hydrophilic properties, as shown in Figure 4. At time $t = 0$, the contact angles are 35° and 45° from which they decrease to the level of 10° within 3 s. We suspect that on a solid silicon model surface, the water soluble PEO segments are exposed to air and once in contact with water they induce fast dissolution of the polymers, which leads to fast wetting of the surface.

Contact angle of water and surface polarity of coated papers

The series of synthesized triblock PEO-PS copolymers and PEO references were dissolved in deionized water and then applied as 9 wt % polymer solutions on paper, using laboratory bar coater equipment. The series included samples 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 (Table I). The coating amount was $1\text{--}2\text{ g/m}^2$.

From Figures 5 and 6, it can be seen that pure PEO polymers (2 k, 10 k, and 20 k) make the base papers more hydrophilic. The contact angle of water is lower and the polarity component is higher than that for untreated reference papers. When the amount of PS is 5 wt % in the triblock copolymer (sample 5), the coated surface is still as hydrophilic as that with pure PEO polymer. However, when the




Figure 4 Contact angle of water of polymer sample 11 (black squares) and polymer sample 8 (white squares) spin-coated at a concentration of 3 wt % on silicon stripes.




Figure 5 The polarity component of surface energy and the contact angle of water on polymer-coated FP base paper.

amount of PS in PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS is 7 wt % (sample 6), the coated wood-free paper surface becomes less hydrophilic compared to pure PEO (10 k) and PEO (20 k) or to PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS with PS amount of 5 wt % (sample 5). On the other hand, PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS with 7 wt % (sample 6) does not have an effect on hydrophobicity/hydrophilicity of wood-containing paper compared to untreated reference paper.

Apparently, when the polymers are applied on paper, they penetrate into the porous structure of fibers, and hydrogen bonding between the hydroxyl groups of cellulose and ether oxygens of PEO may take place.³² Consequently, the particles may disaggregate to some extent, which exposes the hydrophobic PS to higher extent. Hydrogen bonding between cellulose and PEO also decreases the solubility of the polymer. Thus, the hydrophobic effect of the block copolymers is not interfered by dissolution of the polymers. Further investigations are carried out and will be published later.

Felt pen test*

The optical images of samples on fine papers[†] are presented in Figures 7 and 8. When the paper was treated with PEO homopolymer, the ink penetration was stronger in the treated zone [Fig. 7(a)] than in the untreated zone [Fig. 7(b)]. It is clear that treatment with hydrophilic PEO homopolymer makes the paper surface even more hydrophilic than the untreated paper, as was also seen in contact angle measurements.

*The ink penetration was investigated with an Olympus BH2-HLSH optical microscope. The micrographs were taken from the coated side of the paper and using tenfold magnification.

[†]Fine paper sheets were spray-coated with 1–3 wt % polymer solutions for the ink penetration study. Nontreated areas were left on the sheets to observe the difference. Lines were drawn on both areas with a water-based felt pen to observe the penetration.




Figure 6 The polarity component of surface energy and the contact angle of water on polymer-coated LWC base paper.

When the paper was treated with sample 6, the penetration of the water-based ink in both coated and noncoated areas is not clear (as can be followed




Figure 7 Optical microscope images of felt pen-treated paper samples (a) PEO (20 k) (coated) and (b) PEO (non-coated) at 2 wt % concentration. [Color figure can be viewed in the online issue, which is available at www.interscience.wiley.com.]




Figure 8 Optical microscope images of felt pen-treated paper samples (a) sample 7 (coated) and (b) sample 7 (noncoated) at 2 wt % concentration. [Color figure can be viewed in the online issue, which is available at www.interscience.wiley.com.]

by the darkness of the area) even when the concentration of the polymer solution was increased from 1 to 2 wt %. To study this effect (ink penetration) in more detail we used instead a water-dispersible polymer (sample 7), in which the PS amount is 10 wt % and, hence, it is even more hydrophobic than the other samples. Figure 8 shows that penetration of water-based ink is higher in the uncoated area [Fig. 8(b)] than in the coated one (cellulose fibers of the paper can still be seen) [Fig. 8(a)]. It is clear that the penetration of the ink molecules into the paper structure is weakened by the addition of this type of polymers.

Absorption measurements

A clear indication of the effect of different chemicals on paper surface can be obtained by absorption measurements. From Figure 9, it can be seen that

pure PEO (10 k) polymer increases water absorption; the surface of PEO-treated paper wets faster than noncoated base paper does as detected by the parameter AWR, which characterizes the absorption speed in the z-direction. When the amount of PS is 5 wt % in the triblock copolymer (sample 5), the coated surface is still wetting as fast as in the case of pure PEO. However, the block copolymer with a higher amount of PS (7 wt %) (sample 6) decreases water absorption to the same level as that with the original wood-containing (LWC) base paper.

A dramatic change in the water absorption behavior can be seen when the block copolymer containing 10 wt % PS (sample 7) is used. Figure 10 demonstrates that treating LWC base paper with the polymer PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS containing 10 wt % PS delayed water absorption significantly.

CONCLUSIONS

Polymerization of styrene initiated with poly(ethylene oxide)chloro telechelic macroinitiator and catalyzed by CuCl/bipy proceeds in a controlled manner in accordance to the ATRP mechanism, leading to A-B-A triblock and A-B diblock copolymers. These block copolymers were aggregated in aqueous solution. These water soluble polymers show possible applicability as coating materials on paper surfaces. The diblock structure allows the formation of more ordered micelle-like particles in comparison to the less ordered aggregates formed by triblock copolymers. On hydrophilic silicon surface, this is seen as different surface morphology of polymer layers.

Among all synthesized polymers, the PS-*b*-PEO-*b*-PS (sample 6 in Table I) that contains 7 wt % PS seems to act as the most efficient modifier of the




Figure 9 Absorption speed of water in z-direction of polymer-coated LWC base papers as a function of time. Reference samples are untreated LWC base and LWC base treated with pure water.




Figure 10 Absorption speed of water in z-direction of polymer-coated LWC base papers as a function of time (sample 7 Table I).

paper surface. By changing the PEO/PS ratio in the triblock copolymers, the coating hydrophilicity/hydrophobicity can be influenced. It appears that hydrophobicity of the base paper surface can be increased when the molecular weight of PEO block is about 10,000 g/mol and the amount of PS exceeds 7 wt % (10 wt % PS showed positive results concerning water absorption). This is going to be tested in further work.

References

- Li, Z. C.; Liang, Y. Z.; Chen, G. Q.; Li, F. M. *Macromol Rapid Commun* 2000, 21, 375.
- Jankova, K.; Chen, X.; Kops, J.; Batsberg, W. *Macromolecules* 1998, 31, 538.
- Jankova, K.; Kops, J.; Chen, X.; Batsberg, W. *Macromol Rapid Commun* 1999, 20, 219.
- Boschet, F.; Branger, C.; Margaillan, A. *Eur Polym J* 2003, 39, 333.
- Bednarek, M.; Biedron, T.; Kubisa, P. *Macromol Rapid Commun* 1999, 20, 59.
- Reining, B.; Keul, H.; Hocker, H. *Polymer* 1999, 40, 3555.
- Wang, J. S.; Matyjaszewski, K. *J Am Chem Soc* 1995, 117, 5614.
- Matyjaszewski, K.; Xia, J. *Chem Rev* 2001, 101, 2921.
- Kato, M.; Kamigaito, M.; Sawamoto, M.; Higashimura, T. *Macromolecules* 1995, 28, 1721.
- Kamigaito, M.; Ando, T.; Sawamoto, M. *Chem Rev* 2001, 101, 3689.
- Percec, V.; Barboiu, B. *Macromolecules* 1995, 28, 2970.
- Granel, C.; Dubois, P.; Jermoe, R.; Teyssie, P. *Macromolecules* 1996, 29, 8576.
- Gynor, S. G.; Matyjaszewski, K. *Macromolecules* 1997, 30, 4241.
- Ranger, M.; Jones, M.-C.; Yessine, M.-A.; Leroux, J.-C. *J Polym Sci Part A: Polym Chem* 2001, 39, 3861.
- He, X.; Zhang, H.; Yan, D.; Wang, X. *J Polym Sci Part A: Polym Chem* 2003, 41, 2854.
- Xie, H. Q.; Liu, Z. S.; Guo, J. S. *Polymer* 1994, 35, 4914.
- Jialanella, G. L.; Firer, E. M.; Piirma, I. *J Polym Sci Part A: Polym Chem* 1992, 30, 1925.
- Berger, M.; Rechtering, W.; Mulhaupt, R. *Polym Bull* 1994, 33, 521.

19. Khan, T. N.; Mobbs, R. H.; Price, C.; Quintana, J. R.; Stubbersfield, R. B. *Eur Polym J* 1987, 23, 191.
20. Jada, A.; Siffert, B.; Riess, G. *Colloids Surf A* 75: 203 1993.
21. Dorgan, J. R.; Stamm, M.; Toprakcioglu, C.; Jerome, R.; Fetters, L. J. *Macromolecules* 1993, 26, 5321.
22. Hruska, Z.; Piton, M.; Yekta, A.; Duhamel, J.; Winnik, M. A.; Riess, G.; Croucher, M. D. *Macromolecules* 1993, 26, 1825.
23. Jianjun, Y.; Zushun, X.; Shiyuan, C.; Linxian, F. *Eur Polym J* 2002, 38, 1537.
24. Shiyuah, C.; Zushun Xu; Jianjun, Y.; Peijun, J.; Jian Xu; Meiling, Y.; Lianghe, S. *J Appl Polym Sci* 2000, 77, 2882.
25. Reining, B.; Keul, H.; Hocker, H. *Polymer* 2002, 43, 7145.
26. Schuman, T.; Wikström, M.; Rigdahl, M. *Surf Coat Technol* 2004, 183, 96.
27. Bremser, W.; Benedikt, R. *Prog Org Coat* 2002, 45, 95.
28. Bontemp, D.; Tirelli, N.; Masci, G.; Crescenzi, V.; Hubbell J. *Macromol Rapid Commun* 2002, 23, 417.
29. Ibrahim, K.; Starck, P.; Löfgren, B.; Jukka, S. *J Polym Sci Part A: Polym Chem* 2005, 43, 5049.
30. Even, M.; Haddleton, D.; Kukulj, D. *Eur Polym J* 2003, 39, 633.
31. Carlmark, A.; Malmström, E. *Biomacromolecules* 2003, 4, 1740.
32. Kondo, T.; Sawatari, C.; Manle, R. S. J.; Gray, D. G. *Macromolecules* 1994, 27, 210.