Polymer Bulletin 54, 101–107 (2005) DOI 10.1007/s00289-005-0359-4

Study of the interactions between hydrophobically modified polyacrylamide and poly(*N*-isopropylacrylamide) in water by polymer solvent method

Ming Duan^{1,2}, Dong mei Ren³, Xing qi Hu¹ (⊠)

¹State Key Laboratory of Oil/Gas Reservoir Geology and Exploitation, Southwest Petroleum Institute, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610500, China

²Department of Material Science and Technology, Southwest Petroleum Institute, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610500, China

³Department of Computer Science, Southwest Petroleum Institute, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610500, China

E-mail: mduan@swpi.edu.cn; Fax: 86-28-8303-2852

Received: 22 November 2004 / Revised version: 6 February 2005 / Accepted: 17 February 2005 Published online: 6 April 2005 – © Springer-Verlag 2005

Summary

The hydrophobic interactions between poly(*N*-isopropylacrylamide), PNIPAM, and hydrophobically modified polyacrylamide, HMPAM, have been investigated by means of the polymer solvent viscometry method in dilute solutions. When HMPAM aqueous solution is used as a solvent, a divergence from linearity between the reduced viscosities of PNIPAM (as a solute) and C_{PNIPAM} is observed. While PNIPAM aqueous solution is used as a solvent, the linearity is better and the intrinsic viscosity of HMPAM is higher than that in 0.1 M NaCl. The magnitude of mutual interaction parameter K_{AB} suggests the presence of the hydrophobic interaction between HMPAM and PNIPAM, which is dependent on the hydrophobic groups content of HMPAM and temperature. Especially, as temperature increases from 25 to 30 °C, the degree of hydrophobic interactions is enhanced, as is reflected in the Huggins coefficient K_{H} of HMPAM increase from 1.954 to 7.987.

Introduction

Over the past two decades, interactions between heterogeneous macromolecules and formation of polymer-polymer complexes have attracted much attention [1]. They possess unique properties that are essentially different from those of the initial components and were applied in mobility control, enhanced oil recovery and other fields. Most of past studies were focused on such complex systems as Coulomb attraction [2], hydrogen bond attraction [3], Van der Waals attraction [4], antigenantibody interaction [5] and ion interaction [6]. Only a few literatures [7-9] reported that the hydrophobic interactions between hydrophobically modified water-soluble polymer and poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) (PNIPAM) in aqueous solution existed and the two polymer mixed solutions exhibited a thermothickening behavior, which could solve a major drawback of thickener, a loss of viscosity under heating.

Many experimental methods have been used to investigate polymer-polymer interactions in solution [10]. Among these experimental methodologies, viscometry has proved to be a simple and reliable technique [11-16].

In general, for ternary system formed by polymer A/polymer B/solvent, two experimental methods have been followed: (1) measurement of the reduced viscosity of a mixture of two polymers A and B as a solute in a single solvent $((A+B)_{solute}/solvent)$. (2) measurement of the reduced viscosity of a mixture of polymer A as a solute in solution containing a constant concentration of polymer B $(A_{solute}/(B+solvent))$, which is the "polymer solvent" method[11]. The latter is more reliable as it reflects changes in the molecular dimensions of polymer A at a constant concentration of polymer B. H.Y. Yang details the advantages of the method [17].

The present paper, a continuation of our previous investigations [9], attempts to investigate the hydrophobic interactions between hydrophobically modified polyacrylamide (HMPAM) and PNIPAM by the polymer solvent viscometry method, and further reveal the thermothickening mechanism.

Experimental

Materials

HMPAM, which was previously reported [18], was prepared by radical copolymerization of acrylamide (AM), *p*-vinylbenzyldimethyloctadecylammonium chloride (VBDMOAC) and acrylic acid (AA). For comparison, AM-AA copolymer (PAM) was prepared under identical experimental condition.

PNIPAM was prepared by a homopolymerization process, which has been described in detail in another paper [9].

The characteristics of the model polymer are given in Table 1.

Table 1.	Details on	chemical	composition	of polymers
	Betano en	enenieur	composition	or polymons

Polymer Code	Feed ratio	^a Product's composition	^b [η]	
i orynner Code	AM/AA/V	BDMOAC (mol%)	$(dL g^{-1})$	
PAM	85:15:0	84.09:15.91:0	10.859	
HMPAM-0.25	84.75:15:0.25	86.54:13.07:0.39	11.604	
HMPAM-0.75	84.25:15:0.75	86.93:12.15:0.92	8.657	
^a Elemental analysis	^b in 0.1 M NaCl	at 25 °C		

Sample Preparation and Viscosity Measurements

HMPAM and PNIPAM stock solutions were prepared by dissolving the proper amount of polymer in distilled water, respectively. HMPAM solutions should be neutralized with NaOH (final pH = 7-8). The final solutions of desired concentration were prepared by diluting the stock solutions with distilled water and mixing in a thermostatic waterbath shaker(25 °C) for about 12 h. Before measurements, polymer solutions were left without agitation for at least one day to reach equilibrium.

Their viscosities were measured by a Ubbelohde dilution viscometer at 25 ± 0.1 °C. The capillary diameter is 0.57 mm. Four successive dilutions of the polymer solution were made by use of various solvents, respectively. Intrinsic viscosities ([η]) were obtained from the Huggins equation [19] as shown below.

102

$$\frac{\eta_{\rm sp}}{c} = [\eta] + K_{\rm H}[\eta]^2 c \tag{1}$$

where η_{sp} refers to the specific viscosity and $K_{\rm H}$ is the Huggins coefficient.

Results and discussion

For the "polymer solvent" method, namely, $A_{solute}/(B+solvent)$, the intrinsic viscosity $[\eta_A]_B$ was obtained from Eq.(2)[14].

$$[\eta_{A}]_{B} = \lim_{C_{A} \to 0} \frac{\eta_{sp}(C_{A}, C_{B})}{C_{A}} = \lim_{C_{A} \to 0} \frac{\frac{\eta(C_{A}, C_{B}) - \eta(C_{B})}{\eta(C_{B})}}{C_{A}}$$

$$= \lim_{C_{A} \to 0} \frac{\frac{t(C_{A}, C_{B}) - t(C_{B})}{C_{A}}}{C_{A}}$$
(2)

where C_A , C_B refer to the concentration of polymer A and B in mixture, respectively, $t(C_A, C_B)$ and $t(C_B)$ are the flow time of a mixture of A_{solute}/(B+solvent) and (B+solvent).

The Huggins mutual interaction parameter K_{AB} was obtained from Eq. (3)[14].

$$K_{AB} = \frac{\frac{[\eta_{A}]_{B}(1 + [\eta_{B}]C_{B} + K_{B}[\eta_{B}]^{2}C_{B}^{2})}{[\eta_{A}]} - 1}{2[\eta_{B}]C_{B}}$$
(3)

where $[\eta_A]_B$ is the intrinsic viscosity of polymer A in solution containing a constant concentration of polymer B, $[\eta_A]$, $[\eta_B]$ are the intrinsic viscosity of polymer A and B in a pure solvent, and K_B is the Huggins coefficient of polymer B in a pure solvent. K_{AB} can be applied to estimate the intensity of interaction between polymer A and B.

Viscosity behavior of PNIPAM in various solvents

The variation of the reduced viscosity (η_{sp}/c) of PNIPAM (solute) in various solvents versus PNIPAM concentration (C_{PNIPAM}) is presented in Figure 1. The results obtained from Eq. (2) and (3) are tabulated in Table 2. The correlation coefficient R², obtained from linear match by the Huggins equation, shows the linear dependence. Combining Figure 1 and R² in Table 2, both in 0.1 M NaCl and in 0.025 g dL⁻¹ PAM/0.1 M NaCl mixed solution, the relations between η_{sp}/c and C_{PNIPAM} are linear because the R² values are close to 1. For the latter, the intrinsic viscosity [η] of PNIPAM is lower due to excluded volume effect between unlike polymers. While in all HMPAM-0.75/0.1 M NaCl mixed solution, an unexpected result is obtained that the linearity between η_{sp}/c and C_{PNIPAM} is too bad to calculate [η] of PNIPAM. The plausible value of K_{AB} , 0.872, indicates the presence of a specific interaction between PNIPAM and HMPAM, since it significantly higher than the common value of 0.2 to 0.3 for those general unlike polymers system [20].



Figure 1. Reduced viscosity of PNIPAM(solute) η_{SP}/c in various solvents as a function of C_{PNIPAM} at 25 °C. (\blacklozenge) 0.1 M NaCl, (\blacktriangle) 0.025 g dL⁻¹ PAM/0.1 M NaCl, (\bigcirc) 0.025 g dL⁻¹ HMPAM-0.75/0.1 M NaCl, (\bigcirc) 0.075 g dL⁻¹ HMPAM-0.75/0.1 M NaCl, (\bigcirc) 0.075 g dL⁻¹ HMPAM-0.75/0.1 M NaCl, (\bigcirc) 0.075 g dL⁻¹

|--|

Solute	Solvent	R^2	$[\eta] (dL g^{-1})$	$K_{\rm H}$	$K_{\rm AB}$
PNIPAM	0.1 M NaCl	0.989	2.551	0.778	_
	0.025 g dL ⁻¹ PAM/0.1 M NaCl	0.985	1.583	4.053	-0.364
	0.025 g dL ⁻¹ HMPAM/0.1 M NaCl	0.721	2.020	1.329	0.872
	0.05 g dL ⁻¹ HMPAM/0.1 M NaCl	0.852	-1.254	_	—
	0.075 g dL ⁻¹ HMPAM/0.1 M NaCl	0.797	-4.987	_	

Viscosity behavior of HMPAM in various solvents

When PNIPAM/0.1 M NaCl mixed solution is used as a solvent, all the relations between the reduced viscosities and the polymer (solute) concentrations are linear and follow the Huggins equation. The results are presented in Table 3.

Effect of the hydrophobic groups content of HMPAM on viscosity behavior

As seen from Table 3, when PNIPAM/0.1M NaCl mixed solution is used as a solvent, all HMPAM samples show a higher [η] than that in 0.1 M NaCl. However, for PAM, which is not hydrophobically modified, a slight decrease in [η] is observed in PNIPAM/0.1M NaCl mixed solution, compared to that in 0.1 M NaCl. This trend is similar to that observed for PNIPAM in PAM/0.1 M NaCl mixed solution, which indicates the excluded volume effect between PAM and PNIPAM is dominant.

Polymer Code	$C_{\rm PNIPAM}$ (g dL ⁻¹)	$\begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ (dL g^{-1}) \end{bmatrix}$	$K_{ m H}$	R ²	$K_{ m AB}$	$\Delta[\eta] (dL g^{-1})$
	0.075	17.320	1.954	0.989	3.764	8.663
HMPAM-075	0.050	16.367	2.244	0.991	4.530	7.710
11111111111010.75	0.025	17.522	1.868	0.990	9.089	8.865
	0	8.657	11.175	0.981		
	0.075	11.715	0.557	0.996	0.605	0.111
HMPAM_0 25	0.050	12.719	0.468	0.991	0.979	1.115
111011 / 1101-0.23	0.025	13.257	0.455	0.987	1.716	1.653
	0	11.604	0.818	0.995		
	0.075	9.528	0.389	0.993	0.184	-1.331
ΡΛΜ	0.050	10.014	0.380	0.999	0.202	-0.845
IAN	0.025	10.041	0.366	0.997	-0.105	-0.818
	0	10.859	0.293	0.992		

Table 3. Viscometric data for HMPAM in various solvents (T=25 $^{\circ}$ C)

Why do the two polymers exhibit opposite behaviors in the same solvent? Many literatures [14,17,21] have reported that an increase in [η] generally arises from the attractive interaction between two polymers, for the case between HMPAM and PNIPAM can be the hydrophobic interaction. Many investigations [7,24,25] had demonstrated that the molecules of PNIPAM have moderate hydrophobic character. As PNIPAM adding to the HMPAM aqueous solution, the hydrophobic interactions between HMPAM and PNIPAM in water spontaneously occur and result in the attachment of PNIPAM molecule to the hydrophobic groups on HMPAM chain.

On the other hand, as for HMPAM, below the critical aggregation concentration C^* , intramolecular hydrophobic associations lead to a collapse of the polymer chain [22,23]. In the case, all HMPAM concentration is lower than $C^*(C^*$ for HMPAM-0.25 ≈ 0.35 g dL⁻¹, C^* for HMPAM-0.75 ≈ 0.15 g dL⁻¹). Therefore, the intramolecular associations can be present, and lead to the intrinsic viscosity decrease with increasing the hydrophobe content (as shown in Table 3). The aforementioned attachment of PNIPAM can break the original intramolecular associations of HMPAM and make the polymer chain extended, leading to an increase in $[\eta]$. Therefore, the higher the hydrophobic groups content of HMPAM, the larger the increment $\Delta[\eta]$ (= $[\eta_A]_B - [\eta_A]$), at the same time, the larger the intensity of interaction between HMPAM and PNIPAM from the magnitude of the mutual interaction parameter K_{AB} .

Effect of the concentration of polymer solvent on viscosity behavior

As shown in Table 3, the decrement $\Delta[\eta]$ of PAM gradually increases with increasing PNIPAM concentration C_{PNIPAM} , which is due to the excluded volume effects between the two polymers. This effect should be enhanced with increasing polymer concentration. As a result, $[\eta]$ of PAM becomes much lower at the higher concentration of PNIPAM. By contrast the results in Table 3 show that although there is a small difference in the variation of the increment $\Delta[\eta]$ versus C_{PNIPAM} between HMPAM-0.25 and HMPAM-0.75 ($\Delta[\eta]$ for HMPAM-0.25 decreases with increasing PNIPAM concentration, while that for HMPAM-0.75 have an upturn at $C_{\text{PNIPAM}}=0.075 \text{ g dL}^{-1}$.), all K_{AB} decrease with increasing PNIPAM concentration. This can be explained that the combined effects of hydrophobic interaction (attractive) and excluded volume (repulsive). With C_{PNIPAM} increasing, the repulsive interaction is

enhanced, leads to a decrease of the attractive interaction, reflected in the decrease of K_{AB} .

Effect of temperature on viscosity behavior

25

30

25

30

25

30

Solute	Temperature (°C)	Solvent	$\begin{bmatrix} \eta \\ (dL g^{-1}) \end{bmatrix}$	$K_{\rm H}$
	25	0.1 M NaCl	8.658	11.176
HMPAM-0.75	30	0.1 M NaCl	9.292	9.034

0.075 g dL⁻¹ PNIPAM/0.1 M NaCl

0.075 g dL⁻¹ PNIPAM/0.1 M NaCl

0.1 M NaCl

0.1 M NaCl

0.075 g dL⁻¹ PNIPAM/0.1 M NaCl

 0.075 g dL^{-1} PNIPAM/0.1 M NaCl

17.320

8.290

2.551

1.355

9.528

10.172

1.954

7.587

0.778

5.023

0.389

0.325

Table 4. Viscometric data for HMPAM-0.75, PNIPAM, PAM at 25 $^\circ\!\mathrm{C}$ and 30 $^\circ\!\mathrm{C}$

The influence of temperature on the intrinsic viscosity and the Huggins coefficient is listed in Table 4. In general, the intrinsic viscosities of most polymers slightly increase with increasing temperature, as shown for instance for the case of HMPAM-0.75 in 0.1 M NaCl or PAM in 0.075 g dL⁻¹ PNIPAM/0.1 M NaCl. However, both for PNIPAM in 0.1 M NaCl and for HMPAM-0.75 in 0.075 g dL⁻¹ PNIPAM/0.1 M NaCl, a decrease in $[\eta]$ is observed while temperature increases from 25 to 30 °C. Besides, the Huggins coefficient $K_{\rm H}$ becomes greater, indicating a lowering of the solvent quality, in good agreement with the temperature-sensitive property of PNIPAM, which has been attributed to the disruption of hydrogen bonds between water molecules and the amide groups on PNIPAM chain by an increase in solution temperature and the enhancement of the hydrophobicity of PNIPAM [25]. As for HMPAM-0.75, $[\eta]$ decreases from 17.320 to 8.290 dL g⁻¹, indicating the polymer chain contracts. On the other hand, $K_{\rm H}$ dramatically increases from 1.954 to 7.587, meaning an increasing of the degree of hydrophobic interaction because the magnitude of the Huggins coefficient can be used to assess the degree of hydrophobic interaction. One explanation for these is that PNIPAM molecules absorbed on HMPAM become hydrophobic groups, leading to an increase of the hydrophobe content of HMPAM. Thus, the degree of intramolecular associations is enhanced and $[\eta]$ is even lower than that in 0.1 M NaCl.

Conclusions

The viscosity behavior of different polymer in a series of concentrated PNIPAM aqueous solution has demonstrated that the intrinsic viscosity $[\eta]$ of PAM slightly decreases with PNIPAM concentration (C_{PNIPAM}) increasing, which is a result of the polymer chain shrink by the excluded volume effect between PAM and PNIPAM. On the contrary, the intrinsic viscosity of HMPAM in the presence of PNIPAM is significantly higher than that in pure salt solution, which is a result of the formation of the complexes (in Scheme 1a) between the two polymers by the hydrophobic interactions and the disruption of the intramolecular associations of HMPAM. On the other hand, the intensity of this interaction is dependent on the hydrophobic groups

PNIPAM

PAM

content of HMPAM and temperature. The higher the hydrophobic groups content of HMPAM, the larger the intensity of the interaction, reflected in the increase of the mutual interaction parameter K_{AB} . With temperature increasing, the temperature-sensitive property of PNIPAM leads to an enhancement of the hydrophobicity of PNIPAM and a contraction of polymer chain [25,26]. This behavior can result in an increase of the hydrophobe content of HMPAM/PNIPAM complex and further enhance the intramolecular associations, as shown in Scheme 1b.



Scheme 1. Schematic representation of (a) the complexes formed between HMPAM and PNIPAM and (b) the intramolecular associations by an increase in temperature

Acknowledgements. The author is indebted to Dr Liu xin Fang for his help in correcting the manuscript and to the educational office of Sichuan province (NO.SDZ0413) in China for financial support.

References

- 1. Bekturov EA, Bimendina LA (1981) Adv Polym Sci 41:79
- 2. Michaels AS, Miekka RG (1961) J Phys Chem 65:1765
- 3. Qiu XP, Jiang M (1994) Polymer 35: 5084
- 4. Vorenkamp EJ, Bosscher F, Challa G (1979) Polymer 20:59
- 5. Mulvaney JE, Brand RA (1980) Macromolecules 13:244
- 6. Pan Y, Huang YH, Cong GM (1998) Eur Polym J 34:211
- 7. Bokias G, Hourdet D, Iliopoulos I (1997) Macromolecules 30:8293
- 8. Bokias G, Mylonas Y (2001) Macromolecules 34:885
- 9. Duan M, Hu XQ, Ren DM (2005) J Polym Sci Part B: Polym Phys 43:709
- Olabisi O, Robeson LM, Shaw MT (1979) Polymer-Polymer Miscibility. Academic Press, New York
- 11. Dondos A, Benoit H (1975) Makromol Chem 176:3441
- 12. Soria V, Gomez CM, Rodriguez P, Parets MJ (1994) Colloid Polym Sci 272:497
- 13. Chee KK (1990) Eur Polym J 26:423
- 14. Jiang WH, Han SJ (1998) J Polym Sci Part B: Polym Phys 36:1275
- 15. Garcia R, Gomez CM, Porcar I (1997) Eur Polym Sci 33:1723
- 16. Wanchoo RK, Sharma PK (2003) Eur Polym Sci 39:1481
- 17. Yang HY, Zhu PP, Huang MJ (2000) Eur Polym J 36: 949
- 18. Duan M, Hu XQ, Ren DM (2004) Colloid Polym Sci, 282:1292
- 19. Huggins ML (1942) J Am Chem Soc 64:2716
- 20. Moskowiez MJ, Rosen SL (1979) J Polym Sci Part B: Polym Phys 17:715
- 21. Tewari N, Srivastava AK (1992) Macromolecules 25:1013
- 22. Volpert E, Selb J, Candau F (1998) Polymer 39:1025
- 23. Volpert E, Selb J, Candau F (1996) Macromolecules 29:1452
- 24. Wu XY, Pelton RH, Tam KC (1993) J Polym Sci Part A: Polym Chem 31:957
- 25. Principi T, Ester Goh CC, Liu RC (2000) Macromolecules 33:2958
- 26. Schild HG, Tirrell DA (1991) Langmuir 7:1319