



This is a repository copy of *Tuning the hydroxyl functionality of block copolymer worm gels modulates their thermoresponsive behavior*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/168813/>

Version: Supplemental Material

Article:

Romero-Azogil, L., Penfold, N.J.W. and Armes, S.P. orcid.org/0000-0002-8289-6351
(2020) Tuning the hydroxyl functionality of block copolymer worm gels modulates their thermoresponsive behavior. *Polymer Chemistry*, 11 (31). pp. 5040-5050. ISSN 1759-9954

<https://doi.org/10.1039/d0py00834f>

© 2020 Royal Society of Chemistry. This is an author-produced version of a paper subsequently published in *Polymer Chemistry*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Electronic Supporting Information for:

Tuning the hydroxyl functionality of block copolymer worm gels modulates their thermoresponsive behavior

Lucia Romero-Azogil¹, Nicholas J. W. Penfold^{2,*} and Steven. P. Armes^{2,*}




Figure S1. (A) Chemical structure and ¹H NMR spectrum for the PGMA₅₉ precursor. A mean DP of 59 was calculated by comparing the integrated aromatic signals at 7.2–7.4 ppm to that of the methacrylic backbone at 0.0–2.5 ppm. (B) DMF GPC curve obtained for this PGMA₅₉ precursor. Molecular weight data are expressed relative to poly(methyl methacrylate) calibration standards




Figure S2. (A) Fully assigned ^1H NMR spectra recorded in CD_2Cl_2 at 298 K for the PEG_{45} precursor. A mean degree of esterification of 94% was calculated by comparing the integrated aromatic proton signals (a) at 7.2–7.4 ppm against the PEG backbone (c, h-k) at 3.3–3.9 ppm. (B) THF GPC curve recorded for this PEG_{45} precursor. Molecular weight data are expressed relative to PMMA calibration standards.




Figure S3. (A) Fully assigned ^1H NMR spectra recorded in CD_2Cl_2 at 298 K for the PEG_{113} precursor. A mean degree of esterification of 95% was calculated by comparing the integrated aromatic proton signals (a) at 7.2–7.4 ppm against the PEG backbone (c, h-k) at 3.3–3.9 ppm. (B) THF GPC curve recorded for this PEG_{113} precursor. Molecular weight data are expressed relative to PMMA calibration standards.




Figure S4. Digital photograph recorded after the attempted PISA synthesis of PEG₄₅-PHPMA₁₃₀ diblock copolymer nanoparticles at 50 °C targeting 10% w/w solids. Both a yellow PEG₄₅-PHPMA_n precipitate and a white precipitate of PHPMA homopolymer are formed owing to colloidal instability and conventional free radical polymerization respectively.

Table S1. Summary of the target diblock copolymer compositions, GPC molecular weight data and copolymer morphologies for $[x \text{ PEG}_{45} + y \text{ PGMA}_{59}]$ -PHPMA $_n$. ^a Calculated by ¹H NMR spectroscopy. ^b Molecular weight data were determined by DMF GPC analysis and are expressed relative to PMMA standards. ^c Determined by TEM analysis. [Abbreviations: S = spheres, W = worms, V = vesicles, P = precipitate].

Mol fraction of PEG ₄₅ (x)	Target PHPMA DP (n)	Conversion ^a (%)	M_n (kg mol ⁻¹) ^b	M_w / M_n ^b	Morphology ^c
0.20	90	> 99	30.9	1.12	S
0.40	90	> 99	29.4	1.15	S
0.60	90	> 99	24.9	1.14	S
0.80	90	> 99	21.9	1.18	S
1.00	90	> 99	25.3	1.91	P
0.00	110	> 99	33.3	1.12	S
0.20	110	> 99	31.3	1.14	S
0.40	110	> 99	31.1	1.15	S
0.60	110	> 99	30.9	1.12	S&W
0.80	110	> 99	28.3	1.11	V
1.00	110	> 99	23.1	1.61	P
0.00	130	> 99	36.8	1.14	S&W
0.20	130	> 99	33.6	1.13	S&W
0.40	130	> 99	33.3	1.13	S&W
0.60	130	> 99	33.0	1.12	V
0.80	130	> 99	31.6	1.10	V
1.00	130	> 99	29.4	2.14	P
0.00	140	> 99	37.4	1.13	S&W
0.00	150	> 99	43.6	1.15	W
0.20	150	> 99	38.4	1.14	W&V
0.40	150	> 99	36.7	1.15	V
0.60	150	> 99	34.5	1.13	V
0.80	150	> 99	36.6	1.50	V
1.00	150	> 99	37.1	6.97	P
0.00	160	> 99	40.0	1.10	W
0.00	170	> 99	46.0	1.18	W&V
0.20	170	> 99	45.7	1.14	W&V
0.40	170	> 99	43.7	1.20	V
0.60	170	> 99	34.4	1.16	V
0.80	170	> 99	35.6	1.52	V
1.00	170	> 99	27.2	1.40	P

Table S2. Summary of the target diblock copolymer compositions, GPC molecular weights and copolymer morphologies for $[z \text{ PEG}_{113} + y \text{ PGMA}_{59}]$ -PHPMA $_n$. ^a Calculated by ¹H NMR spectroscopy. ^b Molecular weight data were determined by DMF GPC analysis and are expressed relative to PMMA standards. ^c Determined by TEM analysis.

Mol fraction of PEG ₁₁₃ (z)	Target PHPMA DP (n)	Conversion ^a (%)	M_n (kg mol ⁻¹) ^b	M_w / M_n	Morphology ^c
0.00	140	> 99	35.4	1.13	W&S
0.20	140	>99	34.8	1.15	W&S
0.40	140	>99	34.6	1.14	W&S
0.60	140	>99	34.1	1.15	S
0.80	140	>99	33.6	1.14	S
1.00	140	>99	33.4	1.12	S
0.00	160	> 99	39.2	1.15	W
0.10	160	> 99	42.5	1.12	W
0.20	160	> 99	34.5	1.17	W
0.30	160	> 99	39.8	1.12	W&S
0.40	160	> 99	32.8	1.19	W&S
0.50	160	> 99	40.3	1.12	W&S
0.60	160	> 99	33.5	1.18	W&S
0.70	160	> 99	40.0	1.13	W&S
0.80	160	> 99	33.2	1.16	W&S
0.90	160	> 99	39.0	1.10	S
1.00	160	> 99	37.5	1.11	S
0.00	180	> 99	46.9	1.25	W&V
0.10	180	> 99	39.0	1.17	W
0.20	180	> 99	32.0	1.24	W
0.30	180	> 99	37.4	1.16	W
0.40	180	> 99	34.7	1.17	W
0.50	180	> 99	42.2	1.13	W
0.60	180	> 99	36.8	1.17	W
0.70	180	> 99	39.0	1.14	W&S
0.80	180	> 99	36.0	1.17	W&S
0.90	180	> 99	38.6	1.13	W&S
1.00	180	> 99	42.6	1.12	W&S
0.00	200	> 99	40.1	1.20	V
0.10	200	> 99	37.9	1.27	V
0.20	200	> 99	32.6	1.23	V
0.30	200	> 99	45.4	1.16	V
0.40	200	> 99	39.9	1.20	M
0.50	200	> 99	45.0	1.16	M
0.60	200	> 99	45.9	1.14	M
0.70	200	> 99	32.3	1.42	W
0.80	200	> 99	29.6	1.19	W
0.90	200	> 99	29.5	1.23	W
1.00	200	> 99	28.7	1.18	W
0.00	220	> 99	49.3	1.21	V
0.10	220	> 99	44.2	1.20	V
0.20	220	> 99	45.8	1.18	V
0.30	220	> 99	46.8	1.16	V
0.40	220	> 99	40.6	1.21	V
0.50	220	> 99	47.0	1.17	M
0.60	220	> 99	38.8	1.16	W

0.70	220	> 99	48.4	1.14	W
0.80	220	> 99	42.2	1.17	W
0.90	220	> 99	54.5	1.12	W
1.00	220	> 99	42.5	1.15	W
0.00	240	> 99	52.8	1.17	V
0.10	240	> 99	51.5	1.18	V
0.20	240	> 99	53.3	1.21	V
0.30	240	> 99	44.6	1.19	V
0.40	240	> 99	43.8	1.22	V
0.50	240	> 99	43.9	1.22	M
0.60	240	> 99	52.1	1.14	M
0.70	240	> 99	40.9	1.21	M
0.80	240	> 99	44.9	1.18	W
0.90	240	> 99	44.1	1.19	W
1.00	240	> 99	42.2	1.13	W