Acrylamide-*b*-N-Isopropylacrylamide Block Copolymers: Synthesis by Atomic Transfer Radical Polymerization in Water and the Effect of the Hydrophilic–Hydrophobic Ratio on the Solution Properties

Diego Armando Z. Wever,[1,2] Graham Ramalho,[1] Francesco Picchioni,[1] Antonius Augustinus Broekhuis[1]

[1]Department of Chemical Engineering - Product Technology, Nijenborgh 4, 9747 AG, The Netherlands
[2]Dutch Polymer Institute (DPI), P.O. box 902, 5600 AX Eindhoven, The Netherlands
Correspondence to: A. A. Broekhuis (E-mail: a.a.broekhuis@rug.nl)

ABSTRACT: A series of block copolymers of acrylamide and *N*-isopropylacrylamide (NIPAM) characterized by different ratios between the length of the two blocks have been prepared through atomic transfer radical polymerization in water at room temperature. The solution properties of the block copolymers were correlated to their chemical structure. The effect of the hydrophilic/hydrophobic balance on the critical micelle concentration (CMC) was investigated. The CMC increases at higher values for the solubility parameter, thus indicating a clear relationship between these two variables. In addition, the solution rheology (in water) of the block copolymers was studied to identify the effect of the chemical structure on the thermo-responsiveness of the solutions. An increase in the length of the PNIPAM block leads to a more pronounced increase in the solution viscosity. This is discussed in the general frame of hydrophobic interactions strength. The prepared polymers are in principle suitable for applications in many fields, particularly in enhanced oil recovery. © 2013 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. J. Appl. Polym. Sci. **2014**, *131*, 39785.

INTRODUCTION

Acrylamide-based polymers have been extensively studied and applied in many different application fields such as, waste water treatment, cosmetics, and oil recovery.[1,2] Poly[*N*-isopropylacryl-amide] (PNIPAM) and copolymers containing NIPAM have been extensively studied.[3] The unique property of PNIPAM in water, i.e. a transition from hydrophilic to partially hydrophobic character[4] with increasing temperature, can be utilized to prepare "smart" (responsive to external stimuli, in this case temperature) polymeric materials. Possible applications include among others, controlled drug delivery[5,6] and gene therapy.[7–9]

Controlled polymerization of NIPAM has been accomplished in water,[10] different alcohols,[11] and different mixtures of organic solvents and water.[12–14] Homopolymers of NIPAM will aggregate and form globules, which precipitate completely out of an aqueous solution if the temperature is increased above the lower critical solution temperature (LCST).[15] This can be a desired property in an application such as drug delivery. However, as temperature sensitive rheological modifiers, this is generally an undesired property as it leads to precipitation from the solution with loss of any thickening effect. To mitigate this problem, a more hydrophilic monomer can be copolymerized with NIPAM.[3] At temperatures higher than the LCST of the PNIPAM, the latter will induce association of copolymers chains, whereas the hydrophilic segment of the copolymer will prevent (if it is long enough) the copolymer from precipitating out of the solution. According to this hydrophilic/hydrophobic balance, the incorporation of acrylamide, as the hydrophilic moiety, leads to an increase of the LCST, depending on the amount of acrylamide up to 100°C.[16,17]

In addition, given the hydrophobic character of NIPAM, a reduction of the surface tension of the solution is observed when the polymer is dissolved in water.[18] The incorporation of acrylamide, a more hydrophilic moiety, in the polymer will on the other hand dampen this effect.[16] The higher the fraction of acrylamide in the copolymer the higher the surface tension of the corresponding water solution is (closer to the value measured when only pure PAM is used).[16] The combination of surface activity and rheology properties renders these polymers very attractive as thermosensitive polymeric surfactants at both academic and industrial level. However, the copolymers are usually synthesized by free radical polymerization and thus random

Table I. Synthesis of the PAM Macroinitiators

Entry	$[M]_0 : [I]_0$	M/water (wt:vol); T (°C); Time (min)[a]	Conv (%)	$M_{n,th}$[b] (g/mol)	DP
PAM200	300 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	68	14,450	200
PAM235	300 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	78	16,660	235
PAM530	680 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 90	78	37,750	530

[a] M, monomer; wt, weight in g; vol, volume in mL; T, temperature.
[b] Theoretical molecular weight = $[M]_0/[I]_0$ (conv./100).

copolymers, rather than block (for which these effects are expected to be more relevant), are often obtained. In addition, the uncontrolled nature of the polymerization leads to a broad range of molecular weights and dispersities. These factors might hinder a deeper understanding of the relationship between the polymer structure and its solution properties. As a consequence and in order to widen the range of possible applications, it is crucial that the synthesis of the copolymers is controlled and that new synthetic strategies are developed for the synthesis of block-like structures. However, to date the copolymerization of NIPAM with acrylamide has been reported through the use of free radical polymerization[16,17] or the coupling, i.e. grafting onto or grafting through, of separately prepared polyacrylamide and PNIPAM.[19,20]

The controlled polymerization of acrylamide has been published recently, both in an alcohol–water mixture[21] and, as reported recently by our group, in water.[22,23] In addition the synthesis of the block copolymer poly(acrylamide-b-N-isopropylacrylamide) in water was also accomplished.[22]

In this paper, the controlled synthesis of the block copolymers PAM-b-PNIPAM with varying length of the blocks is reported. First the PAM macroinitiators are prepared and subsequently NIPAM is polymerized on the macroinitiator as blocks (demonstrating the living character of the polymerization). To the best of our knowledge, this has not been accomplished before. The solution properties, i.e. CMC and solution viscosity as a function of shear rate and temperature, have been measured. Correlations between the chemical structure and the solution properties are provided.

EXPERIMENTAL

Chemicals
Acrylamide (AM, electrophoresis grade, ≥99%), N-isopropylacrylamide (NIPAM, 97%), tris[2-(dimethylamino)ethyl]amine (Me$_6$TREN) copper(I) bromide (CuBr, 98%), copper(I) chloride (CuCl, 98%), glacial acetic acid, ethanol, diethyl ether, and methyl 2-chloropropionate (MeClPr, 97%) were purchased from Sigma Aldrich. CuBr and CuCl were purified by stirring in glacial acetic acid for at least 5 hours, filtering, and washing with glacial acetic acid, ethanol, and diethyl ether (in that order) and then dried at reduced pressure.[24] All the other chemicals were reagent grade and used without further purification.

PAM Macroinitiator
The synthesis of the PAM macroinitiator was performed according to the literature method.[22] Detailed reaction conditions are

summarized in Table I. The volume of water used was kept constant at 1: 6 (w: v) monomer to water ratio. The amount of catalyst used was 1 : 1.5 (mol : mol) initiator to CuCl and the same applied for the ligand ratio (Me$_6$TREN). The reaction temperature was set at 25°C and the reaction time was kept constant at 1 hour (except for the PAM530). The degree of polymerization (DP) of the macroinitiators was calculated by using the conversion [measured by Gas Chromatography (GC)] and the initial ratio between the monomer and initiator. The codes for the macroinitiators are defined as PAMX with X designating the number of AM units.

Block Copolymerization, Synthesis of PAM-b-PNIPAM
The macroinitiator PAM-Cl was synthesized according to the aforementioned procedure. An example of a block copolymerization is reported in the following. About 0.5063 g (0.039 mmol) of the macroinitiator was added to a 100 mL round-bottomed flask along with NIPAM (2.1267 g, 18.8 mmol). Thirteen mL of deionized water was added and the system stirred until the contents were dissolved. The mixture was degassed by three freeze–pump–thaw cycles followed by the addition of 5.8 mg (0.058 mmol) CuCl. The flask was placed in a thermostated oil bath at 25°C. To start the reaction, 13.4 mg (0.058 mmol) Me$_6$TREN was added. All operations were carried out under nitrogen. After 60 minutes, the reaction was stopped by quenching with 87 mL of deionized water ($\approx$ 1/3 of the reaction volume or more if the reaction mixture is viscous). The contents were then purified via dialysis using membrane tubing Spectra/Por® Dialysis Membrane (molecular weight cut off [MWCO] = 2000 g/mol). The product was then dried in an oven at 65°C until constant weight and then grounded. The codes for the block-copolymers are defined as PAMX-b-PNIPAMY with X and Y designation the number of AM and NIPAM units, respectively.

The DP of NIPAM and the conversion of NIPAM is calculated using the following equation:

$$DPy = \frac{3 \cdot DPx}{\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1}\right) - 9} \tag{1}$$

$$Conversion = \frac{DPy}{\frac{[M]_0}{[I]_0}} \times 100 \tag{2}$$

DPx is the number of monomeric units in the PAM macroinitiator and is obtained from Table I. A_2 and A_1 are the areas of the peaks defined in Figure 1. DPy corresponds to the number of monomeric units in the PNIPAM that is attached to the PAM macroinitiator. $[M]_0/[I]_0$ corresponds to the experimental initial monomer/initiator ratio.

Characterization
Acrylamide conversion was measured using GC. Hundred microliters of the sample taken from the acrylamide polymerization flask was dissolved in 17 mL of acetone (polymer precipitated) and injected on a Hewlett Packard 5890 GC with an Elite-Wax ETR column.

Proton Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (^{1}H NMR) spectra were recorded on a Varian Mercury Plus 400 MHz spectrometer using D$_2$O as the solvent. The NIPAM conversion was calculated

**Figure 1.** ^{1}H-NMR spectra of the block copolymers PAM200-*b*-PNIP-AM(Y) and the parent macroinitiator.

by determining the ratio of the peak areas of AM units and the NIPAM units.

Surface tension was measured using the pendant drop method on a LAUDA drop volume tensiometer TVT 1. A glass micro-syringe was attached to a needle with a capillary radius of 1.055 mm. The temperature of the water bath was set to 25°C and the density difference between air and water was set to 0.997 g/mL. Two sets of three measurements were taken and averaged.

Viscosity measurements were performed on a HAAKE Mars molecular advanced rheometer. The software program used was the HAAKE Rheowin Job manager. The amount of sample used for each measurement was 2 mL. Solution viscosity was measured as a function of the shear rate (0.075–1750 s^{-1}, $T = 20$°C) and as a function of temperature (shear rate 1.0 s^{-1}, $T = 20$–80°C, 4°C/min).

The cloud point of the different copolymers was determined by UV-Vis analysis. A Jasco V-630 UV-Vis spectrophotometer equipped with a temperature controlled six-position sample holder was used. The transmittance of the polymer solutions ($[p] = 2$ wt %) was recorded at 500 nm at a heating rate of 0.2°C/min from 20°C to 70°C against a reference sample containing deionized water.

The hydrodynamic radius was measured through Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS). A Brookhaven ZetaPALS Zeta Potential Analyzer was used with a 659-nm solid-state laser. DLS was performed in dilute aqueous solution at 20°C and a scattering angle of 90°. In total 10 runs were performed for each sample (at equal polymer concentration, 0.0005 wt %, i.e. below the CMC) and the mean and standard deviation are calculated for size distribution by weight assuming a lognormal distribution using the Mas Option software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Synthesis of the Macroinitiators
The synthesis of the PAM macroinitiators was performed according to Scheme 1A and Table I using different molar ratios between the initiator and AM.

As can be observed in Table I, three different macroinitiators were prepared with molecular weights varying between 14,000 and 38,000 g/mol. The controlled nature of the polymerization has been reported already.[22,23] Further evidence for the living/controlled character of the polymerization is provided by the ability to prepare block copolymers with NIPAM.

Synthesis of the Block Copolymers PAM-*b*-PNIPAM
The acrylamide macroinitiators synthesized in Table I were used as the initiators in the copolymerization with NIPAM. A summary of the experimental conditions applied to synthesize the different copolymers is given in Table II. Besides the monomer to initiator ratio, in one case also the reaction-scale of the preparation has been varied (important for further up-scaling).

The largest block copolymer made was PAM200-*b*-PNIPAM650 and the smallest was that of PAM200-*b*-PNIPAM30. PAM530-*b*-PNIPAM10 was synthesized to have roughly the same total molecular weight as PAM235-*b*-PNIPAM125, even though it

Scheme 1. (A) Synthesis of the PAM macroinitiators (MI) and (B) synthesis of the block-copolymers PAM-*b*-PNIPAM.

Table II. Synthesis of the Different PAM-b-PNIPAM Block Copolymers

Entry	$[M]_0 : [I]_0$	M/water (wt : vol); T (°C); Time (min)	Conv (%)[a]	$M_{n, ^1H-NMR}$	DP NIPAM	DP PAM	δ[b] $(J^{1/2} \cdot cm^{-3/2})$
PAM200-b-PNIPAM30	55 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	57	17 600	30	200	28.2
PAM200-b-PNIPAM70	140 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	50	22 150	70	200	27.4
PAM200-b-PNIPAM70[c]	275 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	26[d]	22 150	70	200	27.4
PAM200-b-PNIPAM90	140 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	66	24 400	90	200	27.0
PAM200-b-PNIPAM155	270 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	57	31 750	155	200	26.1
PAM200-b-PNIPAM185	550 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	34	35 150	185	200	25.8
PAM200-b-PNIPAM650	1115 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	59	87 750	650	200	23.8
PAM235-b-PNIPAM125	2495 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 160	5	30 850	125	235	26.8
PAM530-b-PNIPAM10	750 : 1	1 : 6; 25; 60	1	38 900	10	530	29.0

[a] The conversion was determined by ^{1}H-NMR.
[b] Solubility parameter.
[c] The amount of monomer is 10 times larger than entry PAM200-b-PNIPAM155.
[d] The conversion is low, which might be due to the larger scale of the reaction.

displays a different hydrophobic/hydrophilic ratio. These two polymers are compared to investigate whether the effects observed arise from an increase in molecular weight or from the increase in NIPAM content (i.e. hydrophobic/hydrophilic ratio).

As mentioned before, the conversions provided in Table II were determined using ^{1}H NMR. The conversion can be calculated by comparing the ratio of the areas of resonances belonging to the protons of the first carbon of the isopropyl moieties of the polymer (labelled 1) and the ones for the rest of the protons labelled 2 (Figure 1). The ^{1}H-NMR spectra of the block copolymers (prepared with the macroinitiator PAM200) are provided in Figure 1.

The resonance labelled as 1 ($\delta = 3.9$ ppm) represent the hydrogen atom of the CH group of the isopropyl group of PNIPAM and therefore the intensity of this resonance (in relation to the resonances labelled 2, δ in the range 1.2–2.5 ppm) corresponds to the amount of PNIPAM polymerized on the PAM macroinitiator. The total area of the resonances labelled 2 correspond to the protons from the backbone of both the PAM and PNIPAM along with the six methyl protons of PNIPAM ($2x$ CH$_3$). This

area represents a total of 12 protons (nine from PNIPAM and three from PAM).

Solution Properties of PAM-b-PNIPAM

Solution Viscosity as a Function of Shear. In Figure 2 the viscosity of the polymer solution (4 wt % in deionized water) as a function of the shear rate is displayed. The polymers used are characterized by different hydrophilic (AM)/hydrophobic (NIPAM) ratios. All polymers consisted of a hydrophilic block of polyacrylamide (200 acrylamide units) and a hydrophobic block of PNIPAM of different lengths (and thus different total molecular weight).

At low shear rates a Newtonian plateau is observed, irrelevant of the length of the polymer or the number of NIPAM units. As the shear rate is increased (>100 s^{-1}) shear thinning is observed (for PAM200-b-PNIPAM185 and PAM200-b-PNIPAM650), which is related to the disruption of the entanglements,[25] given that the solutions are above the overlap concentration (Table III). At higher shear rates (>500 s^{-1}) shear thickening is visible for the block copolymers containing PNIPAM block below 100 units. Given the low number of NIPAM units, the copolymer will behave more like polyacrylamide. Polyacrylamides are known to display shear thickening behavior, related to structure formations (associations because of collision of chains arise[26]) and chain stretching, above a critical shear rate.[26,27]


Figure 2. Viscosity vs shear rate of the PAMX-b-PNIPAMY series at a polymer concentration of 4 wt %.

Table III. Properties of the Different Block Copolymers

| Entry	$R_{h, DLS}$ (nm)	$c^*_{equation\ 4}$ (wt %)	$5 \cdot c^*$ (wt %)
PAM530	57	0.0100	0.0500
PAM530-b-PNIPAM10	116	0.0010	0.0050
PAM235-b-PNIPAM125	99	0.0013	0.0065
PAM200-b-PNIPAM185	130	0.0006	0.0030

Figure 3. Solution viscosity vs shear rate for block copolymers of similar $M_{n,tot}$ but different PAM-PNIPAM ratios (polymer concentration is 4 wt %).

Figure 2 also shows that larger total molecular weights or larger NIPAM contents of the polymers result in higher starting viscosities of the solutions. It is unclear, however, from the results if this is because of the increase in molecular weight or from the increase in the NIPAM content. As the PNIPAM blocks increase in length so does the solution viscosity. The bulky isopropyl group of the NIPAM units inhibits the PNIPAM blocks to coil up as much as the AM units. Therefore as the PNIPAM blocks increase in length the polymeric chain will be more extended. This leads to a higher hydrodynamic volume and thus a higher extent of overlapping results in a higher solution viscosity. Four different polymers are compared (Figure 3) in order to elucidate which parameter, molecular weight, or NIPAM content, has a more pronounced effect on the solution viscosity. The PAM-PNIPAM ratio is different for three of the polymers used in the comparison; however, the molecular weights are similar.

A polyacrylamide of similar molecular weight (PAM530) is also included in the comparison. If the viscosity was solely dependent on the molecular weight (and extent of entanglement), then the solution viscosity of the four different solutions should be similar (with a prerequisite that the Mark–Houwink–Sakurada constants are also similar). However, as can be observed in Figure 3, clear differences can be distinguished. Although the $M_{n,tot}$ of PAM530 is larger than that of PAM235-*b*-PNIPAM125, it displays a lower solution viscosity. This suggests that the presence of NIPAM in the polymer has a much greater effect on the viscosity than the molecular weight. The comparison between PAM235-*b*-PNIPAM125 and PAM530-*b*-PNIPAM10 further justifies this conclusion, given the lower amount of NIPAM in the latter polymer. Further evidence for the increase in viscosity with increase in the NIPAM content can be obtained from the intrinsic viscosity ([η]). The intrinsic viscosity of the four different samples has been determined by taking the limit ($c \rightarrow 0$) of the plots of the reduced viscosity as a function of the concentration (Figure 4).

As evident in Figure 4, the [η] increases with an increase in the NIPAM content of the copolymers. With these results it can be concluded that the differences observed in the solution properties of the four different samples (with similar $M_{n,tot}$ but different PAM/PNIPAM ratios) arise from the differences in the chemical structure.

The solution viscosity is also dependent on the hydrodynamic volume of the polymer chains in solution. DLS measurements demonstrate that the hydrodynamic volume is dependent on the hydrophobic–hydrophylic ratio (Table III).

However, in order to evaluate what is the effect of the chemical structure on the rheological properties the comparison of the solution viscosities is performed at equal excluded volume (ϕ_s).[28] The concentration at which the polymeric chains start to overlap is defined as c^*, and can be calculated [eq. (4)] if the hydrodynamic radius (R_h) is known[29,30]:

$$\varphi_s = \frac{c}{c^*} = \frac{4 \cdot \pi \cdot R_h^3 \cdot N_{av}}{3 \cdot M_w} \cdot c \tag{3}$$

$$c^* = \frac{M_w}{\frac{4}{3} \cdot \pi \cdot R_h^3 \cdot N_{av}} \tag{4}$$

with N_{av} being the Avogrado constant, and M_w is the weight average molecular weight of the polymer. The comparison between the four different polymers is also performed at a concentration of five times the critical overlap concentration ($5 \cdot c^*$) in order to have the same excluded volume, and the results are displayed in Figure 5.

The lower solution viscosity of the block copolymers at equal excluded volume demonstrates the effectiveness of hydrogen bonding to increase the solution viscosity. The solutions are well above the overlap concentration and thus entanglements are present. The shear thinning behavior observed (Figure 5) is related to the disentanglements of the chains and disruption of the weak hydrogen bonds. The hydrogen bonding capability of PAM is higher compared to PNIPAM. However, the hydrodynamic volume of a polymer chain increases (as evident from the R_h). Therefore the observed behavior is a balance between the reduction in hydrogen bonding interactions and the increase in hydrodynamic volume. To conclude, the differences observed in the solution viscosities (Figures 3 and 5) of the different


Figure 4. Reduced viscosity vs concentration for block copolymers of similar $M_{n,tot}$ but different PAM-PNIPAM ratios.

Figure 5. Solution viscosity vs shear rate for block copolymers of similar $M_{n,tot}$ but different PAM-PNIPAM ratios at the same excluded volume (polymer concentration is $5 \cdot c^*$).

polymers arise because of the differences in chemical structure (PAM / PNIPAM ratio).

To the best of our knowledge this constitutes a novel insight into the effect of different structural parameters (such as hydrophobic/hydrophilic balance and molecular weight) on the corresponding solution viscosity. Indeed, to date, a systematic study of the roles that molecular weight, hydrophobic groups content and distribution of the hydrophobic groups (within the copolymer sample) play in solution properties has not been performed.[31]

Solution Viscosity as a Function of Temperature. The viscosity was measured as a function of the temperature of the solution and the results are displayed in Figure 6. The polymer concentration of the solutions was set at 4 wt %. All polymers consisted of a hydrophilic block of polyacrylamide (roughly 14,000 g/mol or 200 acrylamide units) and a hydrophobic block of PNIPAM of differing length, resulting in polymers with different total molecular weights. The shear rate during the temperature sweep was fixed at a value of 1.0 s^{-1}. To illustrate the effect of NIPAM on the behaviour of the block-copolymers in solution as a function of temperature, the homopolymer PAM530 is also displayed in Figure 6.

As can be observed in Figure 6, a clear peak in the viscosity near 32°C can be distinguished, except for the homopolymer (PAM530). The temperature at which an increase in viscosity is observed does not change with the NIPAM content, and corresponds to the LCST of PNIPAM. As the temperature increases from 20°C the viscosity slowly decreases (because of the reduction of the water viscosity) before it significantly increases to a peak near 32°C. After the peak, the viscosity decreases rapidly as the temperatures further increases, stabilizing near the initial viscosities measured before the peak. The same behavior in the solution viscosity at temperatures below and near the LCST is also observed for the homopolymer of N-isopropylacrylamide.[32–34] When the temperature of the polymer solution

reaches the LCST, the isopropyl groups of the PNIPAM blocks become hydrophobic and strong interaction between the PNIPAM blocks arises.[34] The increase in viscosity in that region indicated that some of this association is intermolecular, leading to the observed increase in solution viscosity. The decrease in viscosity when above the LCST is a result of the majority of the chains precipitating into macromolecular aggregates[32,34] and the decreased viscosity of the solvent. However, the peaks displayed in Figure 5 signify a response of the polymer to changes in temperature. When comparing PNIPAM to anionic polyacrylamide (HPAM), which has a similar structure,[33] the HPAM follows the well-known trend of decreasing viscosity as a function of temperature. Therefore the peak exhibited for the PAM-b-PNIPAM block-copolymers is attributed solely to the presence of NIPAM moieties.

Looking more closely to the peaks it is clear that decreasing the NIPAM content (from 185 to 155 units) resulted in a decrease in the peak viscosity from > 700 to 275 mPa.s, respectively. The peak viscosity reduces further with smaller PNIPAM blocks. In general, the smaller the PNIPAM blocks are, the weaker the hydrophobic interactions are. The significant increase in the solution viscosity for hydrophobically associating polymers results from the intermolecular aggregation between the hydrophobic groups.[1] The aggregation results in larger hydrodynamic volumes (and thus a higher extent of overlapping), which in turn, increase the viscosity of the solution. By increasing the shear rate, these intermolecular associations are disrupted resulting in the decrease of the hydrodynamic volume and therefore the solution viscosity.[1]

Critical Micelle Concentration. The critical micelle concentrations (CMC) were measured by plotting the surface tension (against air) of a polymer at different concentrations. As can be observed in Figure 7, S-shaped curves are obtained, which correspond to those expected.[35] For low polymer concentrations the solutions move towards the surface tension of deionized water (measured to be 70.47 mN/m). As the concentration increases, the surface tension reaches a region where it decreases dramatically. Then at a specific concentration, the surface


**Figure 6.** Solution viscosity of 4 wt % polymers solutions vs temperature.

Figure 7. Surface tension against the polymer concentration of five different copolymers.

Figure 9. LCST determination by UV-Vis light transmittance ($[p] = 2$ wt %).

tension stops decreasing with a minimum value near 41.5 mN/m. This specific concentration is known as the CMC. Remarkably, all the samples display a surface tension close to the value of pure PNIPAM, albeit with different CMCs (as will be evident later on). This is in stark contrast to random copolymers of AM and NIPAM, where the final surface tension is a function of the composition of the copolymer.[16,36] The surface tension for a 50–50 (mol ratio) random copolymer is 51.0 mN/m, compared to 41.5 mN/m for PAM200-b-PNIPAM185.

Graphically the CMC can be obtained from the plot in Figure 7 by taking the line of best fit in two places and noting the concentration at the intersection[37] (not shown for brevity). As the PNIPAM block length increases the concentration needed for micelle formation decreases. This is expected as the larger the PNIPAM blocks are, the larger the effect of its lower hydrophilicity.[16] The order of magnitudes 10^{-6} and 10^{-7} M coincide with that given in literature for amphiphilic block copolymers.[38] The formation of micelles is a result of the concentration of polymer being high enough that interaction between the PNI-

PAM blocks is beneficial. The aggregation of less hydrophilic blocks result in the formation of a micelle with a hydrophobic core (PNIPAM) and a hydrophilic corona (PAM) keeping the micelles stable in the water solution.[38]

To justify the correlation between the CMC and the PNIPAM content, the solubility parameter (δ) was plotted as a function of the CMC (Figure 8). The solubility parameter was calculated using group contribution theory,[39] which takes into account the structure of the polymer and the molar percentage of each block. This is similar to the hydrophilic–lipophilic balance (HLB), which calculates the balance based on molecular weight percentage of each block. For an acrylamide homopolymer the solubility parameter is 29.14 $J^{1/2} \cdot cm^{-3/2}$. For a pure PNIPAM polymer the solubility parameter is 22.07 $J^{1/2} \cdot cm^{-3/2}$. Therefore the copolymers should have decreasing solubility parameters as the PNIPAM block increases in length.

As shown by Figure 8 the CMC increases linearly as a function of the solubility parameter. This confirms the general trend for nonionic surfactants[40] where the CMC increases as the hydrophilic content increases. In literature, however, the hydrophilic/hydrophobic balances are depicted by the HLB number and not the solubility parameter.[38] The result of each gives the same structure property relationship indicated in Figure 8, only the method of calculation differs. The solubility parameter takes into account the structure of the each block and their molar ratios and the HLB number only looks at the molecular mass ratio of each block. As a result, comparing the solubility parameter with the CMC illustrates a structure–property relationship for the CMC and surface activity. This enables the design of block copolymers with predictable surface properties.

Effect of the Chemical Structure on the Cloud Point. The cloud point of four different block copolymers was determined with UV-Vis. The results of the UV-Vis are displayed in Figure 9.

The comparison of the different block copolymers demonstrates that by decreasing the length of the PNIPAM block an increase

Figure 8. The solubility parameters vs. the CMC.

in the cloud point can be obtained. Similar results were observed for random copolymers of AM and NIPAM.[16] Random copolymers of AM and NIPAM of higher molecular weights display cloud points that are dependent on the ratio between the two moieties.[41] A decrease in the NIPAM content from 85 to 55 mol % leads to an increase in the cloud point from $42°C$ to $74°C$.[41] As can be observed in Figure 8, a decrease in the NIPAM content from 48 to 13 mol % leads to an increase in the cloud point from 32 to $34°C$. Copolymers of NIPAM and AM with 50^{16} mol% of AM (or 40 mol %[41]) display a cloud point above $100°C$. Of all the samples tested (AM content varies between 52 and 87 mol %), the cloud points were all below $35°C$. This significant difference (compared to the literature) is attributed to the fact that the NIPAM units in the block copolymers can form a globule more easily compared to that of a random copolymer. Therefore, the block copolymers can precipitate out of the solution much easier compared to random copolymers.

CONCLUSION

Block copolymers of AM and NIPAM have been prepared by ATRP in water at room temperature. The controlled nature of the polymerization allowed for the synthesis of block copolymers with varying block lengths of both monomers. The aqueous solution properties of the block copolymers were correlated to their chemical structure. The effect of the hydrophobic–hydrophilic ratio on the LCST, CMC, and solution rheology was investigated. A clear correlation exists between the solubility parameter and the CMC, the latter decreasing with the former. The LCST of the block copolymers is dependent on the balance between the two moieties. The longer the PNIPAM block length, the closer the LCST is to the one of the NIPAM homopolymer. The solution viscosity is also dependent on the chemical structure. Longer blocks of PNIPAM lead to a higher solution viscosity, which is related to the more extended nature of the PNIPAM blocks (compared to AM ones).

The correlation between the solubility parameters and the surface properties of the copolymers offers the possibility of predicting the surface properties of block copolymers without the need to measure them. These new insights, coupled with the novelty of the synthetic strategy, pave the way for application of these materials in e.g. EOR, drug delivery, and cosmetics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Wever, D. A. Z.; Picchioni, F.; Broekhuis, A. A. *Prog. Polym. Sci.* **2011**, *36*, 1558.

2. Shalaby, S. W.; McCormick, C. L.; Butler, G. B. Water-Soluble Polymers: Synthesis, Solution Properties, and Applications; American Chemical Society: Washington DC, **1991**.

3. Liu, R.; Fraylich, M.; Saunders, B. R. *Colloid Polym. Sci.* **2009**, *287*, 627.

4. Pelton, R. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **2010**, 348.

5. Galaev, I. Y.; Mattiasson, B. *Trends Biotechnol.* **1999**, 17.

6. Dilgimen, A. S.; Mustafaeva, Z.; Demchenko, M.; Kaneko, T.; Osada, Y.; Mustafaev, M. *Biomaterials* **2001**, 22.

7. Hinrichs, W. L. J.; Schuurmans-Nieuwenbroek, N. M. E.; van de Wetering, P.; Hennink, W. E. *J Control. Release* **1999**, 60.

8. Bulmus, V.; Patir, S.; Tuncel, S. A.; Piskin, E. *J Control. Release* **2001**, 76.

9. Dincer, S.; Tuncel, A.; Piskin, E. *Macromol. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, 203.

10. Millard, P.; Mougin, N. C.; Boker, A.; Muller, A. H. E. In Controlled/Living Radical Polymerization: Progress in ATRP, Matyjaszewski, K. Ed.; American Chemical Society, **2009**, 127.

11. Xia, Y.; Yin, X. C.; Burke, N. A. D.; Stover, H. D. H. *Macromolecules* **2005**, *38*, 5937.

12. Hu, H.; Du, J.; Meng, Q.; Li, Z.; Zhu, X. *Chin. J. Polym. Sci.* **2008**, 26.

13. Masci, G.; Giacomelli, L.; Crescenzi, V. *Macromol. Rapid Commun.* **2004**, 25.

14. Ye, J.; Narain, R. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2009**, 113.

15. Dimitrov, I.; Trzebicka, B.; Muller, A. H. E.; Dworak, A.; Tsvetanov, C. B. *Prog. Polym. Sci.* **2007**, *32*, 1275.

16. Zhang, J.; Pelton, R. *J. Polym. Sci. A Polym. Chem.* **1999**, 37.

17. Chiklis, C.; Grasshof, J. *J. Polym. Sci. A-2 Polym. Phys.* **1970**, *8*, 1617.

18. Zhang, J.; Pelton, R. *Langmuir* **1996**, *12*, 2611.

19. Petit, L.; Karakasyan, C.; Pantoustier, N.; Hourdet, D. *Polymer* **2007**, 48.

20. Portehault, D.; Petit, L.; Hourdet, D. *Soft Matter.* **2010**, 6.

21. Appel, E. A.; del Barrio, J.; Loh, X. J.; Dyson, J.; Scherman, O. A. *J. Polym. Sci. A Polym. Chem.* **2012**, 50.

22. Wever, D. A. Z.; Raffa, P.; Picchioni, F.; Broekhuis, A. A. *Macromolecules* **2012**, *45*, 4040.

23. Wever, D. A. Z.; Picchioni, F.; Broekhuis, A. A. *Eur. Polym. J.* **2013**, DOI: 10.1016/j.eurpolymj.2013.06.036.

24. Neugebauer, D.; Matyjaszewski, K. *Macromolecules* **2003**, *36*, 2598.

25. Ferry, J. D. Viscoelastic Properties of Polymers; Wiley: New York, **1980**.

26. Dupuis, D.; Lewandowski, F. Y.; Steiert, P.; Wolff, C. *J Non-Newton Fluid* **1994**, *54*, 11.

27. Hu, Y.; Wang, S.; Jamieson, A. *Macromolecules* **1995**, *28*, 1847.

28. Daoud, M.; Cotton, J. P. *J. Phys.* **1982**, *43*, 531.

29. Burchard, W. *Branched Polym. II* **1999**, *143*, 113.

30. Coviello, T.; Burchard, W.; Dentini, M.; Crescenzi, V. *Macromolecules* **1987**, *20*, 1102.

31. Biggs, S.; Selb, J.; Candau, F. *Langmuir* **1992**, *8*, 838.

32. Monteux, C.; Mangeret, R.; Laibe, G.; Freyssingeas, E.; Bergeron, V.; Fuller, G. *Macromolecules* **2006**, *39*, 3408.

33. Tam, K.; Wu, X.; Pelton, R. *J. Polym. Sci. A Polym. Chem.* **1993**, *31*, 963.

34. Tam, K.; Wu, X.; Pelton, R. *Polymer* **1992**, *33*, 436.

35. Zhang, J.; Pelton, R. *Colloids Surf. A Physicochem. Eng. Aspects* **1999**, *156*, 111.

36. Wever, D. A. Z.; Riemsma, E.; Picchioni, F.; Broekhuis, A. A. *Polymer* **2013**, DOI: 10.1016/j.polymer.2013.07.039.

37. Egan, R.; Jones, M.; Lehninger, A. *J. Biol. Chem.* **1976**, *251*, 4442.

38. Miao, Q.; Jin, Y.; Dong, Y.; Cao, Z.; Zhang, B. *Polym. Int.* **2010**, *59*, 1116.

39. van Krevelen, D. W.; te Nijenhuis, K. Propeties of Polymers. Their Correlation with Chemical Structure; their Numerical Estimation and Prediction from Additive Group Contributions; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, **2009**.

40. Barakat, Y.; Gendy, T.; Basily, I.; Mohamad, A. *Br. Polym. J.* **1989**, *21*, 451.

41. Mumick, P. S.; Mccormick, C. L. *Polym. Eng. Sci.* **1994**, *34*, 1419.