

Polymer Chemistry

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



Polymer Chemistry

Comment

Comment on “Aqueous SET-LRP catalyzed with *in situ* generated Cu(0) demonstrates surface mediated activation and bimolecular termination” by S. Samanta *et al.*, *Polym. Chem.* 2015, 6, 2084†

Received 00th January 20xx,
Accepted 00th January 20xx

S. Harrisson^a

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/

In a recent paper,¹ Samanta *et al.* investigated the kinetics of the SET-LRP polymerization of oligoethylene oxide methyl ether acrylate (OEOMEA) in aqueous solution, and proposed that bimolecular termination in this reaction is suppressed due to adsorption of the propagating radicals on the surface of the catalyst. A key piece of evidence for this claim was the observation that the high residual chain end functionality of the polymer could not be explained using reasonable values of k_p . The measured values of chain end functionality, and the predictions of a simple model using k_t of 1×10^8 L·mol⁻¹·s⁻¹ and k_p of 1×10^4 , 3×10^4 and 5×10^4 L·mol⁻¹·s⁻¹ were displayed separately in ref. 1, but are superimposed here (Fig. 1a). In ref. 1 it is implied that none of the k_p values considered explain the observed residual chain end functionality at 100% conversion, as the highest k_p considered gives only about 68% residual functionality at 100% conversion. In fact, the model used breaks down at 100% conversion for all values of k_p and k_t , giving a residual functionality of $-\infty$. Furthermore, if the residual functionality measured at intermediate conversions is taken into account, it is evident from Fig. 1 that a k_p of 5×10^4 L·mol⁻¹·s⁻¹ fits the data reasonably well.

The model used to predict the residual functionality assumes that dead polymer is produced at a constant rate:

$$[\text{dead polymer}]_t = k_t \cdot [P^*]^2 \cdot t \quad (1)$$

This assumes that k_t is independent of chain length and the radical concentration is constant throughout the reaction. The reaction is first order in monomer concentration, such that conversion increases with time according to equation 2.

$$\text{conv} = 1 - e^{-k_p^{\text{app}} \cdot t} \quad (2)$$

In this equation, k_p^{app} is the apparent rate constant of propagation, equal to 4.61 min⁻¹, or 0.0768 s⁻¹, at 0°C. The radical concentration, $[P^*]$, is given by equation 3.

$$[P^*] = \frac{k_p^{\text{app}}}{k_p} \quad (3)$$

Finally, the residual chain end functionality, f_{PBr} , is given by equation 4 ($[I]_0$ is the initiator concentration at time 0, equal to 0.09 M):

$$f_{\text{PBr}} = 1 - \frac{[\text{dead polymer}]_t}{[I]_0} \quad (4)$$

Combining these equations gives f_{PBr} as a function of conversion:

$$f_{\text{PBr}} = 1 + \frac{k_t \cdot k_p^{\text{app}}}{k_p^2 \cdot [I]_0} \ln(1 - \text{conv}) \quad (5)$$

Fitting equation 5 to the measured conversion and residual functionality data gives k_t/k_p^2 of 0.047 ± 0.013 s·mol⁻¹·L⁻¹ (Figure 1b). As both conversion and residual functionality were measured by NMR, it was assumed that each parameter would be subject to errors of similar magnitude. A nonlinear least squares fitting algorithm assuming errors in both variables was used to fit the data. The maximum distance between a data point and the curve of best fit is less than 4%.

Using the proposed value of k_t , 1×10^8 L·mol⁻¹·s⁻¹, this corresponds to a k_p of 4.6×10^4 L·mol⁻¹·s⁻¹ and a radical concentration of 1.7×10^{-6} M. If k_p is taken to be 1×10^4 L·mol⁻¹·s⁻¹, then a value for k_t of 4.7×10^6 L·mol⁻¹·s⁻¹ is obtained, with a radical concentration of 7.7×10^{-6} M (not 7.7×10^{-5} M as was stated in ref. 1).[‡] The radical concentrations are higher than typical values of 10^{-7} - 10^{-9} M obtained in controlled radical polymerizations, but still physically realistic. As neither k_p nor k_t data are available for OEOMEA in water, it is impossible to say which pair of values more closely resembles the true situation.

^a Laboratoire des Interactions Moléculaires et Réactivité Chimique et Photochimique, CNRS UMR5623, Université Paul Sabatier Toulouse III, 118 route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse, France..

† Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: details of NLLS fitting procedure. See DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x




Fig. 1. (a) Measured residual functionality as a function of conversion superimposed on model predictions using $k_t = 10^8 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ and $k_p = 1 \times 10^4$, 3×10^4 , or $5 \times 10^4 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (combination of Fig. 8b and Fig. 10 from reference 1). (b) Nonlinear least squares fit to the data assuming errors in both variables. Open squares show the closest approach of the curve of best fit to the data points. The curve shown corresponds to k_t/k_p^2 of $0.047 \text{ s}\cdot\text{mol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, with standard error of $0.013 \text{ s}\cdot\text{mol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$.

The k_p value of $1 \times 10^4 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ is that of dodecyl acrylate (DA) in bulk at 100 bar (published value: $9.97 \times 10^3 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$),²⁹ and may not be applicable to OEOMEA in water at atmospheric pressure. In alkyl methacrylates, higher propagation rate coefficients are observed for bulkier side chains.³ The same trend is believed to occur in acrylates,⁴ and the oligoethylene oxide group of OEOMEA is twice as long as the dodecyl group of DA. Strong solvent effects on propagation rate coefficients have been observed in water for monomers that, like OEOMEA, are capable of forming hydrogen bonds, such as *N*-vinyl pyrrolidone (20-fold increase in k_p)^{5,6} methacrylic acid (5-fold increase in k_p)⁷ and *N*-isopropyl acrylamide (3-fold increase in k_p).⁸ Thus, a k_p of $4.6 \times 10^4 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ appears possible.

Similarly, the true value of k_t is unknown and may be significantly lower than the value of $10^8 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ used in reference 1. While no source is given for this value, it corresponds to the k_t of methyl acrylate as measured by multiple groups.^{9–11} For the polymerization of DA, a much lower value of around $10^7 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ has been reported^{12, 13}. In this context, a value of k_t for OEOMA in water of $4.6 \times 10^6 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ does not seem impossible. Termination rate constants in radical polymerizations are sensitive to many factors including chain length^{9–14} and viscosity,^{15,16} and can be as low as $10^3 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ in extreme cases.^{16, 17}

In summary, the residual functionality vs conversion data presented in ref. 1 are consistent with a conventional radical termination mechanism involving diffusion-controlled bimolecular termination, with physically realistic values of k_t ($0.5\text{--}10 \times 10^7 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$), k_p ($1\text{--}5 \times 10^4 \text{ L}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$), and $[P^*]$ ($2\text{--}8 \times 10^{-6} \text{ M}$). Superimposing the experimental data on the model

predictions reveals reasonable agreement between theory and data, confirmed by nonlinear least squares fitting. While the data do not rule out a mechanism involving adsorbed radicals which are capable of reacting with monomer and CuBr_2 but not with each other, further evidence would be required to support this hypothesis.

Notes and references

‡ The full range of values of k_p and k_t that are consistent with the experimental data is shown in Figure S3 of the ESI.

§ Reference 98 cited in ref. 1 (reference 8 in this Comment) does not provide a value for k_p of DA.

- 1 S. R. Samanta, V. Nikolaou, S. Keller, M. J. Monteiro, D. A. Wilson, D. M. Haddleton and V. Percec, *Polymer Chem.*, 2015, **6**, 2084–2097.
- 2 M. Buback, C. H. Kurz and C. Schmalz, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, 1998, **199**, 1721–1727.
- 3 S. Beuermann, M. Buback, T. P. Davis, R. G. Gilbert, R. A. Hutchinson, A. Kajiwarra, B. Klumperman and G. T. Russell, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, 2000, **201**, 1355–1364.
- 4 J. M. Asua, S. Beuermann, M. Buback, P. Castignolles, B. Charleux, R. G. Gilbert, R. A. Hutchinson, J. R. Leiza, A. N. Nikitin, J.-P. Vairon and A. M. van Herk, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **205**, 2151–2160.
- 5 M. Stach, I. Lacík, D. Chorvát, M. Buback, P. Hesse, R. A. Hutchinson and L. Tang, *Macromolecules*, 2008, **41**, 5174–5185.
- 6 N. Bartoszek, P. Sawicki, S. Kadłubowski, P. Ulański and J. M. Rosiak, *ACS Macro Lett.*, 2014, **3**, 639–642.
- 7 I. Lacík, L. Učňová, S. Kukučková, M. Buback, P. Hesse and S. Beuermann, *Macromolecules*, 2009, **42**, 7753–7761.
- 8 F. Ganachaud, R. Balic, M. J. Monteiro and R. G. Gilbert, *Macromolecules*, 2000, **33**, 8589–8596.
- 9 G. Johnston-Hall and M. J. Monteiro, *J. Polym. Sci. Part A: Polym. Chem.*, 2008, **46**, 3155–3173.
- 10 A. Theis, T. P. Davis, M. H. Stenzel and C. Barner-Kowollik, *Macromolecules*, 2005, **38**, 10323–10327.
- 11 M. Buback, P. Hesse, T. Junkers, T. Theis and P. Vana, *Aust. J. Chem.*, 2007, **60**, 779–787.
- 12 A. Theis, A. Feldermann, N. Charton, T. P. Davis, M. H. Stenzel and C. Barner-Kowollik, *Polymer*, 2005, **46**, 6797–6809.
- 13 M. Buback, A. Kuelpmann and C. Kurz, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, 2002, **203**, 1065–1070.
- 14 S. Harrisson and J. Nicolas, *ACS Macro Letters*, 2014, **3**, 643–647.
- 15 S. Harrisson, S. R. Mackenzie and D. M. Haddleton, *Macromolecules*, 2003, **36**, 5072–5075.
- 16 P. Vana, L. H. Yee and T. P. Davis, *Macromolecules*, 2002, **35**, 3008–3016.
- 17 T. Otsu, K. Yamagishi and M. Yoshioka, *Macromolecules*, 1992, **25**, 2713–2716.