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ABSTRACT: The temperature–concentration behavior of solutions of atactic poly(methyl methacrylate) in 1-butanol and cyclohexanol was investigated. A liquid–liquid demixing interferes with a glass transition. In the high-concentration region, outside the demixing region, $T_g$ decreases with decreasing polymer concentration. For concentrations in the demixing region, a slight increase of $T_g$ with decreasing polymer concentration is observed. This is ascribed to the influence of the polymer polydispersity on the concentration of the coexisting phases. The extent of this increase depends strongly on the polydispersity of the polymer and on the nature of the solvent. The combination of these two thermal transitions leads to the formation of amorphous, glassy gels at room temperature. After elimination of the solvent, different morphologies can be obtained. They range from glassy particle dispersions to porous, glassy materials. The morphology can be controlled by overall polymer concentration and cooling rate.

Introduction

Liquid–Liquid phase separation in polymer solutions has been used for many years in the preparation of crystalline microporous materials. Later on it has also been applied to the preparation of amorphous materials such as atactic poly(methyl methacrylate) (a-PMMA) and atactic polystyrene. Recently, the solution behavior responsible for this process has been analyzed in detail for the atactic polystyrene–decalin system. The solidification of the solution on cooling is caused by the combination of a liquid–liquid (L–L) demixing and a glass transition ($T_g$). The product is a brittle material, composed of a porous, glassy phase in which the dilute phase is dispersed. Because these structures do not flow and are moderately resistant to deformation, they are called amorphous gels. Of course, they do not show the same elastic characteristics as do biopolymer gels obtained from, e.g., gelatin solutions.

This interference of a L–L demixing and a glass transition has already been suggested as a plausible mechanism for the gelation of solutions of noncrystallizable polymers. This gelation mechanism is rather simple. When a solution is cooled, the liquid–liquid demixing causes the formation of two solutions of different concentration in equilibrium. Because of the importance of the kinetic aspect of the demixing, a finely dispersed, multiphase system of the two solutions is obtained. At a certain temperature, the demixing curve intersects the glass transition–concentration ($T_g$–$c$) curve and the concentrated phases vitrify. An amorphous gel is obtained if material continuity is realized throughout the solution by these glassy phases. This process can lead to the formation of a variety of microporous structures. The morphology and the size of the phases depend strongly on the overall starting concentration and the cooling procedure. The structures obtained by binodal and spinodal demixing show important differences.
to identify the mechanism of this transition, a detailed consideration of the different atactic polystyrene in decalin. In order to study the temperature-concentration behavior, the technique has been applied to the different a-PMMA samples in both solvents, solidification of the solution occurs before room temperature is reached and it is accompanied by a whitening of the solution. The phenomenon is analogous to that observed with solutions of atactic polystyrene in decalin. In order to identify the mechanism of this transition, a detailed study of the temperature-concentration behavior and its relation to the morphology of the gels was undertaken.

II. Calorimetric Study of the Temperature-Concentration Behavior. 1. a-PMMA1 in 1-Butanol. It has been shown that liquid-liquid demixing can easily be observed by differential scanning calorimetry. This technique has been applied to the different a-PMMA samples. Two different concentration regions have to be considered.

A typical cooling and heating scan of a solution of a-PMMA1 in 1-butanol with $\phi_2 < 0.85$ is given in Figure 1. A broad exothermic signal is observed on cooling (Figure 1A) due to the demixing of the system into two liquid solutions. For high concentrations the two solutions will be dispersed and a multiphase system is obtained. The onset temperature ($T_d$) of this exotherm is 63 °C. The exotherm is followed by a change in specific heat caused by the glass transition of the polymer-rich phases.

On heating, two different phenomena are observed (Figure 1B). At 41 °C an increase of $C_p$, representing the onset of the glass transition, sets in. It is followed by a broad endothermic signal, which represents the remixing of the different liquid phases and extends to 70 °C.

When the same experiments are carried out with solutions of $\phi_2 > 0.85$, only a glass transition is observed.

The values of $T_d$ and $T_g$ are plotted as a function of $\phi_2$ in Figure 2, which shows an interference of the liquid-liquid demixing with the $T_g-\phi_2$ curve. It can be subdivided into two regions.

In region 1 ($0 < \phi_2 < 0.85$), $T_d$ as a function of the concentration represents the flocculation curve of the polymer-solvent system. In this demixing region $T_g$ decreases with increasing polymer content from 46 °C ($\phi_2 = 0.1$) to 39 °C ($\phi_2 = 0.85$). On the contrary, $T_g$ increases with increasing polymer content in region 2 ($0.85 < \phi_2 > 1$).

The intersection point of the demixing curve and the glass transition-concentration curve is situated at $\phi_2 = 0.85$ and $T = 39$ °C.

The shape of the glass transition curve in region 2 can easily be understood in the frame of the general principles of polymer physical chemistry. Addition of a low molecular weight substance to a polymer decreases its $T_g$ (region 2). The $T_g-\phi_2$ curve can be calculated theoretically with a very good agreement between theory and experiment.

The increase of $T_g$ with decreasing polymer concentration in region 2 is therefore less straightforward. It can be understood, however, when considering the mechanism of demixing of a polydisperse polymer.

The liquid-liquid demixing of a polymer solution results in the formation of two liquid solutions of different concentrations in equilibrium. In the case of a monodisperse polymer, the flocculation curve corresponds to the binodal and all the solutions with different initial concentrations follow the same binodal on cooling. The concentration of the different liquid phases obtained by demixing at a certain temperature is independent of the initial concentration. When the temperature at the intersection is reached, the concentrated phases vitrify. Because of the constancy of the concentration of the concentrated phases, this temperature is independent of the initial concentration. Therefore, the $T_g$ of the solution is constant over the whole concentration range in the demixing region. This was observed with monodisperse atactic polystyrene, dissolved in trans-decalin.

A different situation is encountered when a polydisperse sample is used. The concentration of the two liquid phases obtained by demixing depends on the initial concentration. The flocculation curve no longer represents the binodal, and each concentration has its own coexisting lines.

The concentration of the polymer-rich phases, obtained by demixing, is higher than that represented by the flocculation curve. The concentration of the polymer-poor phases is also higher than expected from the flocculation curve. The difference between the flocculation curve and the coexisting lines decreases with increasing overall concentration for the polymer-rich phases. Calculations also have shown that this difference decreases with decreasing temperature and becomes negligible at lower temperatures. The flocculation curve in the polymer-rich region therefore represents the binodal at these lower temperatures. The temperature and concentration at the intersection with the $T_g-\phi_2$ curve are then also independent of the initial concentration. Solutions of a polydisperse polymer will show a constant $T_g$ in region 1 as can be seen from the results with polydisperse atactic polystyrene dissolved in trans-decalin.

When the difference between the flocculation curve and the coexisting lines is not negligible at lower temperatures, $T_g$ will no longer be constant in region 1. A lower initial concentration will result in a more concentrated polymer-rich phase, and the intersection with the $T_g-\phi_2$ curve will occur at higher temperature. Consequently, $T_g$ will increase with decreasing polymer content. These intersection points can be localized by drawing a horizontal line from the $T_g$ at different concentrations to the $T_g-\phi_2$ curve. The concentration at this intersection point corresponds to that of the concentrated domains when vitrification sets in. This is shown for two different overall concentrations in Figure 2 (dotted lines).

From these observations it is clear that the difference between the flocculation curve and the coexisting lines for solutions of a-PMMA in 1-butanol is not negligible at lower temperature.

This point of view is supported by observations with a sample of narrow molecular weight distribution like a-PMMA2, which gives a similar phase diagram (Figure 3). The difference in molecular weight distribution does not influence the glass transition-concentration curve in region 2 ($\phi_2 > 0.85$), but a different behavior is observed in region 1. The decrease of $T_g$ with increasing concentration is less pronounced for a-PMMA2. A decrease of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$M_n \times 10^4$</th>
<th>$M_i \times 10^4$</th>
<th>$M_i/M_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-PMMA1</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-PMMA2</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-PMMA3</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tacticity of a-PMMA Samples</th>
<th>1H NMR</th>
<th>13C NMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-PMMA1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-PMMA2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-PMMA3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fraction of triads.

**Figure 1.** DSC cooling (A) and heating (B) scan of a solution of a-PMMA1 in 1-butanol ($\phi_2 = 0.59$).

**Figure 2.** Temperature–concentration diagram for the system a-PMMA1/1-butanol: (△) $T_p$, region 1; (●) $T_p$, region 2; (○) $T_d$. (---) Coexisting lines derived from the $T_p-\phi_2$ relation at $\phi_2 < 0.85$, intersecting with the $T_p-\phi_2$ line at $\phi_2 > 0.85$.

only 3 °C is observed between $\phi_2 = 0.10$ and $\phi_2 = 0.85$. For a-PMMA1, this difference amounts to 7 °C. These data clearly reflect the influence of molecular weight distribution on the position of the coexisting lines.

The difference in distribution also influences the position of the demixing curve. In the low-concentration range, demixing of a-PMMA1 sets in at higher temperatures than those observed with a-PMMA2. At higher concentrations ($\phi_2 > 0.3$) the demixing curves of a-PMMA1 and a-PMMA2 are identical.

Increasing the average molecular weight (a-PMMA3) does not affect the position of the maximum of the demixing curve (Figure 4). For higher concentrations demixing occurs at higher temperatures.

**Figure 3.** Temperature–concentration diagram for the system a-PMMA2/1-butanol: (△) $T_p$, region 1; (●) $T_p$, region 2; (○) $T_d$. (---) Coexisting lines derived from the $T_p-\phi_2$ relation at $\phi_2 < 0.75$, intersecting with the $T_p-\phi_2$ line at $\phi_2 > 0.8$.

The intersection of the flocculation curve with the glass transition curve occurs at about 34 °C and $\phi_2 = 0.75$. This is 5 °C lower than that for a-PMMA1 and suggests a lower concentration in the polymer-rich phases. An important increase of $T_p$ with decreasing $\phi_2$ also occurs in the demixing region.

Consequently, the behavior of this polymer is very similar to that of a-PMMA1. The same conclusion can be drawn concerning the intersection of the coexisting curves and the $T_p-\phi_2$ curve. These intersection points are also represented in Figure 4 for two different overall concentrations.

**Figure 4.** Temperature–concentration diagram for the system a-PMMA3/1-butanol: (△) $T_p$, region 1; (●) $T_p$, region 2; (○) $T_d$. (---) Coexisting lines derived from the $T_p-\phi_2$ relation at $\phi_2 < 0.85$, intersecting with the $T_p-\phi_2$ line at $\phi_2 > 0.8$. The intersection of the flocculation curve with the glass transition curve occurs at about 34 °C and $\phi_2 = 0.75$. This is 5 °C lower than that for a-PMMA1 and suggests a lower concentration in the polymer-rich phases. An important increase of $T_p$ with decreasing $\phi_2$ also occurs in the demixing region.

Consequently, the behavior of this polymer is very similar to that of a-PMMA1. The same conclusion can be drawn concerning the intersection of the coexisting curves and the $T_p-\phi_2$ curve. These intersection points are also represented in Figure 4 for two different overall concentrations.
2. a-PMMA1 and a-PMMA2 in Cyclohexanol. The generality of the phenomena, reported in the previous paragraph, was further confirmed by observations made in cyclohexanol. The samples were studied in the same way, and the corresponding $T_\phi$-$\phi$ diagrams are represented in Figure 5 (a-PMMA1) and Figure 6 (a-PMMA2). A great similarity exists with the data obtained in 1-butanol. Some differences have to be stressed.

The liquid-liquid demixing occurs at lower temperature for both samples. This is the direct consequence of the better solvent quality of cyclohexanol for a-PMMA.

In region 2, the decrease of $T_\phi$ with decreasing concentration is less pronounced but is still independent of the molecular weight distribution.

The decrease of $T_\phi$ with increasing polymer concentration in region 1 is strongly reduced for a-PMMA1 and almost absent for a-PMMA2. This means that the dependence of the concentration of the polymer-rich phases on the initial polymer concentration is smaller in cyclohexanol than in 1-butanol. The difference between the flocculation curve and the coexisting lines at lower temperature is therefore less pronounced than that for the system a-PMMA/1-butanol.

III. Optical Observations. In order to control the validity of the data observed by calorimetry, the optical behavior of solutions of some of these samples was investigated. For practical reasons they were performed with solutions of rather low concentration of a-PMMA3 in 1-butanol and of a-PMMA1 in cyclohexanol. The corresponding data are represented by the Figures 7 and 8.

A typical flocculation curve of a polydisperse polymer is obtained for a-PMMA3 in 1-butanol. It shows a maximum around $\phi_\phi = 0.07$. The optical demixing curve is situated only $2^\circ$ above the demixing curve obtained from DSC experiments. This can easily be understood by the different cooling rates used in the different experiments. The same conclusions can be drawn from a-PMMA1 in cyclohexanol, although the maximum is situated at $\phi_\phi = 0.10$.

The excellent agreement between both observations confirms the validity of the DSC results for locating the
Temperature-Concentration Behavior of \( \alpha \)-PMMA

Figure 9. Scanning electron micrographs of demixed and vitrified solutions of \( \alpha \)-PMMA1-butanol: (a) \( \phi_2 = 0.05 \), (b) \( \phi_2 = 0.10 \), (c) \( \phi_2 = 0.15 \).

Figure 10. Scanning electron micrographs of demixed and vitrified solutions of \( \alpha \)-PMMA1 in 1-butanol, cooled against a cold glass wall: (a) \( \phi_2 = 0.10 \), (b) \( \phi_2 = 0.15 \).

Figure 11. Scanning electron micrographs of a demixed and vitrified solution of \( \alpha \)-PMMA3 in 1-butanol. Demixing was performed in two steps (see text).

demixing curve. But nevertheless DSC is not as accurate a measurement of the exact shape of the demixing curve or its maximum. This shortcoming can also be responsible for the difference between the optical and calorimetric results. Calorimetric observations constitute an easy method of detecting the occurrence of liquid-liquid demixing and of localizing its position on the temperature scale and are especially interesting at higher concentrations. Both methods are therefore complementary.

IV. Morphology. In order to produce the rigid, glassy, porous structures, mentioned previously, material continuity must be realized throughout the solution. The possibility of forming these structures and their relationship with the mechanism of demixing have been demonstrated recently.\textsuperscript{13,14} The present work is a qualitative approach for illustrating the possibilities of the system \( \alpha \)-PMMA/1-butanol. Consequently, no detailed discussion concerning the relationship between morphology and the mechanism of demixing will be given.

The process is based on the vitrification of a demixed solution that evolves toward a macroscopic, two-phase system. Because of the specific nature of the demixing process (binodal or spinodal), a large number of concentrated and diluted phases are formed in the early stages of the demixing. This corresponds to a metastable
vitrified solution of a-PMMA in 1-butanol. Demixing occurred during quenching of the sample.

The degree of material continuity depends on the initial situation that can be frozen by vitrification before the macroscopic, two-layer situation is reached. The final situation will also be affected by the type of demixing: spinodal or binodal demixing. This problem, however, will be treated quantitatively in a future paper.

9a). The rigidity of the solution mainly results from the results in the formation of spherical glassy particles (Figure 9). From a detailed examination of these pictures it became clear from these pictures that we can conclude that the bicontinuity is, at least partially, respected. It also became clear from these pictures that the morphology evolves toward a set of closed cells when the concentration is raised.

An asymmetric morphology can be obtained by cooling against a cold solid phase like a glass wall. From a solution with \( \phi_2 = 0.1 \), a porous morphology, covered by a compact skin, is obtained (Figure 10a). Although the skin is not yet continuous at \( \phi_2 = 0.1 \), it will be at higher overall concentration (\( \phi_2 = 0.15 \), Figure 10b).

With a-PMMA3 in 1-butanol, the same structures are obtained. A solution of \( \phi_2 = 0.15 \) was demixed in two steps. At higher temperatures, just below the flocculation curve, demixing seems to proceed by nucleation and growth (binodal demixing) and results in the formation of large spherical holes. On further cooling, bicontinuous porous structures probably originating from a spinodal process are formed (Figure 11).

Quenching of the samples in liquid nitrogen strongly reduces the pore size by an average factor of 8 (Figure 12). The overall shape of the morphology is not changed.

Conclusions

1) The temperature–concentration behavior of a-PMMA in 1-butanol and cyclohexanol is characterized by the combination of a liquid–liquid demixing and a Tg-concentration curve.

2) The intersection of these two curves indicates the formation of amorphous gels.

3) The location of the intersection point of both curves depends on the molecular weight and on the polydispersity of the polymer.

4) Porous membranelike morphologies can be obtained. The type of morphology and the average pore size depend on the initial concentration and the cooling conditions. The relationship with the binodal and/or spinodal demixing mechanism necessitates further investigations.

5) Asymmetric membranes can be obtained by preparing these samples in contact with a glass wall.
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