LBL-33960
UC-401
Preprint

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHEMICAL SCIENCES DIVISION

Submitted to Macromolecules

Liquid-Liquid Equilibria for Solutions of Polydisperse Polymers. Continuous Thermodynamics for the Close-Packed Lattice Model

Y. Hu, X. Ying, D.T. Wu, and J.M. Prausnitz

April 1993

LOAN COPY
Circulates
for 4 weeks
Bldg. 50 Library.
Copy 2
LBL-33960

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract Number DE-AC03-76SF00098

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

LBL-33960

UC-401

Liquid-Liquid Equilibria for Solutions of Polydisperse Polymers. Continuous Thermodynamics for the Close-Packed Lattice Model

Ying Hu and Xugen Ying

Thermodynamics Research Laboratory
East China University of Chemical Technology
Shanghai 200237, China

D. T. Wu

Marshall Laboratory
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.
Philadelphia, PA 19146, U.S.A.

J. M. Prausnitz

Department of Chemical Engineering
University of California
and
Chemical Sciences Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720, U.S.A.

April 1993

This work was supported by the Chinese National Science Foundation and the Marshall Laboratory, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company. Additional support was provided by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Chemical Sciences Division of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract Number DE-AC03-76SF00098.

LIQUID-LIQUID EQUILIBRIA FOR SOLUTIONS OF POLYDISPERSE POLYMERS. CONTINUOUS THERMODYNAMICS FOR THE CLOSE-PACKED LATTICE MODEL

Ying Hu and Xugen Ying

Thermodynamics Research Laboratory
East China University of Chemical Technology
Shanghai 200237, China

D. T. Wu

Marshall Laboratory
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company
Philadelphia, PA 19146, USA

J. M. Prausnitz

Department of Chemical Engineering
University of California, Berkeley
and
Chemical Science Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

ABSTRACT

A continuous thermodynamic framework is presented for phase-equilibrium calculations for solutions of polydisperse polymers. An expression for the Helmholtz function of mixing is based on a mathematically simplified Freed model developed previously. A binary mixture requires a size parameter c_r and an energy parameter ε; the former can be temperature dependent, while the latter can depend on temperature and chain-length. The functional approach is adopted to define thermodynamic functions and to derive expressions for chemical potentials, spinodals and critical points. Computation programs are established for cloud-point-curve, shadow-curve, spinodal and critical-point calculations for polymer solutions where the molecular-mass distribution of the polymer is specified. Examples for phase-equilibrium calculations are shown for cyclohexane-polydisperse polystyrene systems. Satisfactory results indicate the utility of the proposed framework and the computation procedures.

1. INTRODUCTION

The phase behavior of binary polymer solutions and blends differs appreciably from that of ordinary liquid mixtures not only because of the large molecular-size difference between different solute and solvent, but also because the polymer solute is likely to be polydisperse. As indicated in a typical textbook [1], the phase diagram shown in Figure 1(b) for a polydisperse solute is qualitatively different from that for a monodisperse sample, shown in Figure 1(a). In the latter case, an open circle represents the principal phase and the corresponding filled circle represents the conjugate phase; they are located on the same coexistence (or cloud-point) curve. The maximum of that curve is the critical point. However, in the former case [Figure 1(b)], the cloud-point curve for principal phases does not coincide with the corresponding plot for conjugate phases. The latter plot is called the shadow curve. The molar-mass (or chain-length) distribution for the principal phase is usually different from that of the conjugate phase as shown in the upper part of the figure. In some cases, the content of the polymer is higher in the conjugate phase than that in the principal phase with a wider distribution shifted to the higher molar-mass region, while in other cases, the content of the polymer is lower in the conjugate phase than that in the principal phase with a narrower distribution shifted to the lower molar-mass region. Of particular interest is the point of intersection of the cloud-point curve and the shadow curve, where the principal phase and the conjugate phase have the same composition, i.e., the same total polymer content and the same polymer molecular-mass distribution. This is the critical point of the polydisperse polymer solution.

For development, production and processing of advanced polymer materials, it is necessary to have a satisfacory understanding of the phase behavior of polydisperse polymer solutions and polydisperse polymer blends.

Although basic thermodynamic relations for polymer-solution phase equilibria are well-known, application to polydisperse polymer systems is not trivial because for a solution containing a polydisperse solute, a "binary" solution is, in fact, a multicomponent system with very many components. Instead of using two equations for equating chemical potentials of the solute and the solvent for a binary, we now have to use a huge number of equations corresponding to polymer molecules with different molar masses or chain lengths. Polymer molecules with different molar masses should be considered as different components. Expressions for spinodals and critical points are then determinants of large capacity with a great number of second-order derivatives and third-order derivatives as their elements. For a true binary, only a simple second-order derivative and a simple third-order derivative are needed [2], but for a solution containing many components, the mathematical problem becomes prohibitive.

The literature contains several methods for describing the thermodynamics of polydisperse polymer systems. The essential goal is to obtain the partition coefficient K_i for the polymer species i with relative molar mass M_i or chain length r_i; the latter is defined as the number of fundamental segments of a chain molecule, or the number of sites occupied by a molecule if the system is treated as a lattice. K_i is defined as

$$K_i = \Phi_i^{(\alpha)} / \Phi_i^{(\beta)} \tag{1}$$

where $\Phi_i^{(\alpha)}$ and $\Phi_i^{(\beta)}$ are volume fractions of polymer species i in coexisting phases α and β, respectively. Schultz [3] in 1939 was the first to carry out such calculations by suggesting that partitioning is governed by energy differences only and is independent of concentration. Later, Scott [4] used an improved method to calculate K_i by introducing two assumptions: a

negligible concentration of polymer in the dilute phase and omitting the term $1/r_n$ (where r_n is the number-average chain length in the Flory-Huggins equation). Some other authors [5,6,7,8,9] adopted the empirical expression for K_i,

$$K_i = \exp(\sigma r_i) \tag{2}$$

where σ is a parameter obtained by fitting experimental data. The most rigorous method was developed by Koningsveld [10] and by Solc [11] based on Tompa's work [12]. Koningsveld adopted a generalized Flory-Huggins model for the Helmholtz function of mixing by introducing a concentration-dependent polynomial for the Flory parameter g,

$$g = \sum_k g_k \Phi_s^k \tag{3}$$

where coefficients g_k may be functions of temperature and where Φ_s is the total volume fraction of the polymer solute. With this model, Koningsveld was able to express σ as an analytical function of g and Φ_s, and to derive closed-form expressions for spinodals and critical points from corresponding determinants. An algorithm for calculations of the cloud-point curve and the shadow-curve was also presented. In Koningsveld's work, the importance of the chain-length dependence of the Flory-Huggins parameter g has been noted, and a priliminary derivation for the spinodal criterion was given. However, no further details were presented for a critical-point criterion and phase-equilibrium calculations.

The references cited above are based on discrete multicomponent thermodynamics. During the last 10 years, Rätzsch, Kehlen and coworkers [13,14,15], and Cotterman and Prausnitz [16,17] developed a functional approach, where chemical potentials are defined using functionals to incorporate the molar-mass distribution or the chain-length distribution of a polymer solute. The functional form of partial derivatives and higher-order variations of functionals are also defined to derive thermodynamic relations for chemical potentials, spinodals and critical points. For the original Flory-Huggins model, Rätzsch et al were able to prove the consistency between the functional approach and the classical discrete-multicomponent approach. In this work, we use the functional approach for a lattice model based on the work of Freed and coworkers (21,22,23).

For a solution containing a polydisperse polymer, the composition is usually characterized by a continuous molar-mass (or chain-length) distribution. Phase-equilibrium thermodynamics, where discrete compositions have been replaced by continuous distribution, is often called continuous thermodynamics. The primary merit of the continuous-thermodynamic method is convenience: integration replaces summation over components. For an arbitrary distribution, Ying, Ye and Hu [18] developed a derivative method based on spline functions, which can be used for phase-equilibrium calculations.

The next section presents a thermodynamic framework for phase-equilibrium calculations for mixtures containing a polydisperse polymer solute. The model used is a generalized expression for the Helmholtz function of mixing presented previously [19,20], based on the lattice theory of Freed et al [21,22,23]. Two parameters are used: the size parameter c_r which is temperature dependent, and the energy parameter ε/k which can depend on both temperature and chain length. Expressions for chemical potentials, spinodals and critical points are derived. For illustration, calculated results are given later for polystyrene-cyclohexane systems.

2. THERMODYNAMIC FRAMEWORK

2.1. Helmholtz Function of Mixing

Polymer solutions are often described by a lattice theory. For a binary, the mathematically simplified Freed model [19,20] can accurately duplicate the phase behavior of an Ising lattice and can obtain almost the same critical coordinates for cases with r_1=1 and r_2=1–10,000 as those from the original Freed theory. The mathematically-simplified model gives a convenient and brief Helmholtz function of mixing:

$$\frac{\Delta_{mix}A}{N_r kT} = \frac{\Phi_1}{r_1}\ln\Phi_1 + \frac{\Phi_2}{r_2}\ln\Phi_2 + g\,\Phi_1\Phi_2 \tag{4}$$

$$g = \frac{1.2}{9}\left(\frac{1}{r_1}-\frac{1}{r_2}\right)^2 + 2\tilde{\varepsilon} + \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{r_1}\Phi_2 + \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{r_2}\Phi_1 - \frac{3}{2}1.074\,\tilde{\varepsilon}^2\Phi_1\Phi_2 \tag{5}$$

where N_r is the total number of sites in the lattice, r_1 and r_2 are numbers of sites occupied by one molecule of component 1 and one molecule of component 2, respectively, and

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon/kT \tag{6}$$

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{11} + \varepsilon_{22} - 2\varepsilon_{12} \quad . \tag{7}$$

Here ε_{ij} is the (positive) energy for each i–j pair, ε is the interaction energy parameter for the binary, while $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ is the corresponding reduced energy parameter. Eq.(5) is derived for a cubic lattice. Here, subscripts i and j refer to nonbonded polymer segments or to solvent monomers.

For a binary polymer solution with a polydisperse polymer solute, with a slight change of notation, the Helmholtz function of mixing can be expressed as

$$\frac{\Delta_{mix}A}{N_r kT} = \frac{\Phi_o}{r_o}\ln\Phi_o + \sum_i \frac{\Phi_i}{r_i}\ln\Phi_i + \Phi_o\sum_i \Phi_i g_i \tag{8}$$

where subscript o stands for solvent. The corresponding chain length r_o is usually taken to be unity. Subscript i stands for polymer species i; the corresponding chain length r_i can be estimated by

$$r_i = c_r V_{mi}/V_{mo} = c_r v_s M_i/v_o M_o \tag{9}$$

where V_{mo}, v_o, M_o and V_{mi}, v_s, M_i are molar volumes, specific volumes, molar masses for solvent and polymer species i, respectively. Subscript s (solute) stands for polymer; c_r is a binary size parameter. Flory parameter g_i is given by eq.(5), which is now chain-length and composition dependent. The summation is over all polymer species with different molar masses.

Using continuous thermodynamics, eq.(8) is rewritten:

$$\frac{\Delta_{mix}A}{N_r kT} = \frac{\Phi_o}{r_o}\ln\Phi_o + \int_0^\infty \frac{\Phi_s W(I)}{r(I)}\ln[\Phi_s W(I)]dI + \Phi_o\int_0^\infty \Phi_s W(I) g(I) dI \tag{10}$$

where $W(I)$ is the distribution function for a polymer which satisfies the normalization constraint

$$\int_0^\infty W(I)dI = 1 \tag{11}$$

Here I is the distribution variable such as relative molar mass or chain length. Solvent o is a discrete component as usual, while the infinite number of polymer species is represented by

distribution function $W(I)$. In the functional approach, $\Phi_s W(I)$ is comparable to Φ_i in the discrete approach. In eq.(10), $\Delta_{mix}A$ is a functional.

Similar to eq.(5), $g(I)$ can be rewritten:

$$g(I) = \frac{1.2}{9}\left(\frac{1}{r_o} - \frac{1}{r(I)}\right)^2 + 2\mathfrak{E}(I) + \frac{\mathfrak{E}(I)}{r_o}\Phi_s + \frac{\mathfrak{E}(I)}{r(I)}(1-\Phi_s) - \frac{3}{2}1.074\,\mathfrak{E}^2(I)\Phi_s(1-\Phi_s) \tag{12}$$

where $\mathfrak{E}(I)$ depends on chain length. An empirical dependence is given by

$$\mathfrak{E}(I) = e_0 + e_r[r(I)]^{-n} \tag{13}$$

where n is a positive number and e_0 and e_r are adjustable parameters. The longer r, i.e., the larger the molar mass, the weaker is the chain-length dependence of $\mathfrak{E}$. In principle, parameters c_r, e_0 and e_r can be temperature-dependent.

2.2. Expressions for Chemical Potentials

For the discrete solvent component o, the chemical potential can be derived directly. It is

$$(\mu_o - \mu_o^*)/kT = \partial(\Delta_{mix}A/kT) \,/\, \partial N_o$$

$$= \ln(1-\Phi_s) + \Phi_s(1-r_o/r_n) + r_o\Phi_s^2\left[\int_0^\infty g(I)W(I)dI - (1-\Phi_s)\int_0^\infty g'(I)W(I)dI\right] \tag{14}$$

where $g'(I) = \partial g(I)/\partial\Phi_s$. Superscript * stands for the reference state, which is the close-packed pure component at system temperature. The number-average chain length is denoted by r_n.

For continuous components, the chemical potential of solute I is defined as:

$$\mu(I) = \partial A \,/\, \partial[N_r\Phi_s W(I)/r(I)] \tag{15}$$

where the denominator is physically comparable with ∂N_i in the discrete approach. But now it is a variation of a functional. When applying eq.(15) to eq.(10), we meet the problem of taking derivatives for an integral with respect to a functional. In the theory of functionals, for an integral $\Psi = \int f(N_I)dI$, the derivative of Ψ with respect to the functional N_I is defined by

$$\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial N_I} = \frac{\partial f(N_I)}{\partial N_I} \tag{16}$$

Taking the first integral on the right side of eq.(10) as an example, we first set $N_r\Phi_s W(I)/r(I) = N_I$ for abbreviation. The integral (times N_r) is then rearranged as $\int N_I[\ln N_I + \ln r(I) - \ln N_r]dI$. Applying eq.(16), we obtain $\ln[\Phi_s W(I)] + 1 - r(I)\int\Phi_s r^{-1}(I^+)W(I^+)dI^+$. Here we have used $\partial N_r/\partial N_I = r(I)$ and $\partial\Phi_s/\partial N_I = -\partial\Phi_o/\partial N_I = r(I)(1-\Phi_s)/N_r$.

An expression for the chemical potential of a continuous component I can then be derived. It is

$$[\mu(I) - \mu^*(I)]/kT = \partial(\Delta_{mix}A/kT) \,/\, \partial[N_r\Phi_s W(I)/r(I)]$$

$$= \ln[\Phi_s W(I)] + 1 - r(I)/r_o + r(I)\Phi_s(1-r_o/r_n)/r_o + (1-\Phi_s)r(I)g(I)$$

$$-r(I)\Phi_s(1-\Phi_s)\left[\int_0^\infty g(I^+)W(I^+)dI^+ - (1-\Phi_s)\int_0^\infty g'(I^+)W(I^+)dI^+\right] \tag{17}$$

2.3. Spinodal Criterion

From the theory of stability, the boundary between the metastable and unstable regions satisfies the condition that the second-order variation for the Gibbs function of mixing with composition equals zero. For a close-packed lattice, the Gibbs and Helmholtz functions are virtually the same. We define the reduced Gibbs function of mixing per site as:

$$\tilde{G}_v = \frac{\Delta_{mix} G}{N_r kT} = \frac{\Delta_{mix} A}{N_r kT} \tag{18}$$

where $\tilde{G}_v$ is a functional. We now need to derive an expression for $\delta^2\tilde{G}_v$ as the spinodal criterion.

For deriving a high-order variation for functionals, Kehlen, Rätzsch, Bergmann and Beerbaum [14,15] suggested

$$\delta^k \tilde{G}_v = \partial^k \tilde{G}_v \{\Phi_o + t\,\delta\Phi_o,\ \Phi_s W(I) + t\,\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]\} \,/\, \delta t^k \,|_{t=0} \tag{19}$$

Then they used the Lagrange method of undetermined multipliers to determine the relation between the two dependent variations $\delta\Phi_o$ and $\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]$ in eq.(19). Finally, $\delta^k \tilde{G}_v \,/\, (\delta\Phi_o)^k$ can be obtained. Details are given in Appendix 1. For k=2, we obtain:

$$\frac{\delta^2\tilde{G}_v}{(\delta\Phi_o)^2} = \frac{1}{r_o\Phi_o} + \frac{1}{r_w\Phi_s} + \Phi_s\frac{(\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle)^2}{r_w} - 2\frac{\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle}{r_w}$$
$$- \Phi_s(\langle g^2 r\rangle - 2\Phi_o\langle gg'r\rangle + \Phi_o^2\langle g'^2 r\rangle) - 2\Phi_s(\langle g'\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g''\rangle/2) \tag{20}$$

where r_w is the weight average chain length.

$$\langle g^l g'^m g''^n r\rangle = \int_0^\infty g^l(I) g'^m(I) g''^n(I) r(I) W(I) dI \tag{21}$$

Here, $g'(I) = \partial g(I)/\partial\Phi_s$, $g''(I) = \partial^2 g(I)/\partial\Phi_s^2$. We then have the spinodal criterion,

$$F_{sp} = \frac{\delta^2\tilde{G}_v}{(\delta\Phi_o)^2} = 0 \tag{22}$$

The same results can be obtained from the discrete appoach, as shown in Appendix 3.

2.4. Critical-Point Criterion

For the critical point, it is necessary that the third-order variation of the Gibbs function of mixing equals zero. Using a procedure similar to that used for the derivation for the spinodal, we obtain $\frac{\delta^3\tilde{G}_v}{(\delta\Phi_o)^3}$. The lengthy expression is given in Appendix 2. We then have the critical-point criterion,

$$F_{cr} = \frac{\delta^3\tilde{G}_v}{(\delta\Phi_o)^3} = 0 \tag{23}$$

Again, the same results can be obtained from the discrete approach, as shown in Appendix 3.

3. PHASE-EQUILIBRIA

3.1. Fundamental Equations for Phase-Equilibrium Calculations

When phases α and β are at equilibrium,

$$\mu_o^{(\alpha)} = \mu_o^{(\beta)} \tag{24}$$

$$\mu^{(\alpha)}(I) = \mu^{(\beta)}(I) \tag{25}$$

To solve eqs.(24) and (25), we define

$$S_o = \int_0^\infty g(I)W(I)dI - (1-\Phi_s)\int_0^\infty g'(I)W(I)dI \tag{26}$$

$$\sigma_o = \ln(1-\Phi_s) + \Phi_s(1-r_o/r_n) + r_o\Phi_s^2 S_o \tag{27}$$

Substitution into eqs.(14) and (17) yields

$$(\mu_o-\mu_o^*)/kT = \sigma_o \tag{28}$$

$$[\mu(I)-\mu^*(I)]/kT = \ln[\Phi_s W(I)] + 1 - r(I)/r_o + (1-\Phi_s)r(I)g(I)$$
$$- r(I)\Phi_s S_o + r(I)(\sigma_o-\ln\Phi_o)/r_o \quad . \tag{29}$$

Eqs.(24) and (25) become

$$\sigma_o^{(\alpha)} = \sigma_o^{(\beta)} \tag{30}$$

$$\ln K(I) = \ln\frac{\Phi_s^{(\beta)}W^{(\beta)}(I)}{\Phi_s^{(\alpha)}W^{(\alpha)}(I)}$$
$$= r(I)\{[(1-\Phi_s)g(I)-r_o^{-1}\ln(1-\Phi_s)-\Phi_s S_o]^{(\alpha)} - [(1-\Phi_s)g(I)-r_o^{-1}\ln(1-\Phi_s)-\Phi_s S_o]^{(\beta)}\} \quad . \tag{31}$$

We also define

$$M_0^* = \int_0^\infty K(I)W^{(\alpha)}(I)dI \tag{32}$$

Substituting $K(I) = \Phi_s^{(\beta)}W^{(\beta)}(I)/\Phi_s^{(\alpha)}W^{(\alpha)}(I)$ into eq.(32) and accounting for the normalization constraint, [eq.(11)], we have

$$M_0^*\Phi_s^{(\alpha)}/\Phi_s^{(\beta)} = 1 \tag{33}$$

Eqs.(30) and (33) permit us to establish two fundamental equations for phase-equilibrium calculations for binary polymer solutions with a polydisperse polymer.

$$F_o = 1 - \sigma_o^{(\alpha)}/\sigma_o^{(\beta)} = 0 \tag{34}$$

$$F_s = 1 - M_0^*\Phi_s^{(\alpha)}/\Phi_s^{(\beta)} = 0 \tag{35}$$

The former is for the solvent, while the latter is for the polymer. By solving these two equations, we can obtain cloud-point and shadow curves.

We can obtain spinodals and critical points by solving eq.(22) and eq. (23).

3.2. Derivative Method for Arbitrary Distribution

To use eqs.(34) and (35), we encounter several integrations with respect to the molar-mass or chain-length distribution, such as M_o^* of eq.(32) and various $\langle g^l g'^m g''^n r\rangle$ in eq.(21).

Because energy parameter $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ in g can be molar-mass or chain-length dependent, [see eq.(13)], in some integrations chain length r may rise to a power different from 1. Therefore, in general, we may need to calculate the following integral,

$$S = \int_0^\infty r^k(I)K(I)W(I)dI \tag{36}$$

where $W(I)$ is the distribution function.

Sometimes we can use a standard distribution function such as a gamma distribution or a log-normal distribution. The advantage of using a standard distribution comes from simplified computation. In some fortunate cases, we can obtain analytically the distribution parameters for a conjugate phase from the corresponding parameters for the principal phase [16].

However, when the polymer chain length has an arbitrary distribution, or when the energy parameter is molar-mass dependent, this advantage disappears. In that more general case, the previously presented derivative method [18] should be used.

The derivative method represents distribution data by an interpolation polynomial with derivatives, i.e., a Hermite polynomial,

$$y(x) = [\frac{3}{h_j^2}(x_{j+1}-x)^2-\frac{2}{h_j^3}(x_{j+1}-x)^3]\, y_j + [\frac{3}{h_j^2}(x-x_j)^2-\frac{2}{h_j^3}(x-x_j)^3]\, y_{j+1}$$
$$+ h_j[\frac{1}{h_j^2}(x_{j+1}-x)^2-\frac{1}{h_j^3}(x_{j+1}-x)^3]\, y_j' - h_j[\frac{1}{h_j^2}(x-x_j)^2-\frac{1}{h_j^3}(x-x_j)^3]\, y_{j+1}' \tag{37}$$

where

$$h_j = x_{j+1}-x_j \quad . \tag{38}$$

In eq.(37), x_j, y_j and y_j' are, respectively, the independent variable, the value of the function and the corresponding first-order derivative with respect to x at data point j. A third-order spline function is always used to obtain those derivatives from the scattered data of x_j and y_j. The integral of eq.(37) can be obtained by

$$S = \int_{x_1}^{x_n} y(x)dx = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} [\frac{1}{2}h_j(y_{j+1}+y_j)-\frac{1}{12}h_j^2(y_{j+1}'-y_j')] \tag{39}$$

Applying to eq.(36), $x \rightarrow r(I)$,

$$y(I) = r^k(I)K(I)W(I) \tag{40}$$

$$y'(I) = y(I)[\frac{k}{r(I)}+\frac{K'(I)}{K(I)}+\frac{W'(I)}{W(I)}] \tag{41}$$

where $K'(I)$ and $W'(I)$ are corresponding derivatives for $K(I)$ [defined by eq.(31)] and $W(I)$ with respect to $r(I)$.

3.3. Illustration: Liquid-Liquid Equilibria for Cyclohexane-Polystyrene Systems

Koningsveld, Kleintjens and Shultz [24] reported high-quality experimental liquid-liquid-equilibrium data for cyclohexane-polydisperse polystyrene systems. Data reported by Koningsveld et al include critical coordinates for nine samples with different number-average, weight-average and z-average molar masses, M_n, M_w and M_z shown in Table 1.

We use two parameters in our lattice model, a temperature-dependent size parameter c_r in eq.(9), and in eq.(4), an energy parameter ε which depends on temperature and chain length by eq.(13), where $n = 1/3$. They can be expressed as:

$$c_r = c_{r0} + c_{r1}T^{-1} \tag{42}$$

$$\varepsilon/k = e_0 + e_1T^{-1} + e_r r^{-1/3} \tag{43}$$

Using eqs.(22) and (23) for each pair of critical coordinates T_c and Φ_{sc},

$$F_{sp} = 0 \ , \qquad F_{cr} = 0 \ .$$

We can then obtain c_r and ε/k for each sample. For altogether nine samples, we then estimate all model parameters. For cyclohexane-polystyrene systems, results are:

$$c_{r0} = -1.51890 \ , \qquad c_{r1} = 61.4300\text{K}$$
$$e_0 = 44.5297 \ , \qquad e_1 = 1074.88\text{K} \ , \qquad e_r = 9.84750$$

Standard deviations of fitting for critical temperatures and critical volume fractions, respectively, are:

$$\text{RMS}(T_c) = 0.44 \text{ K} \ , \qquad \text{RMS}(\Phi_c) = 0.0016$$

For details, see Table 1.

Using these parameters, we can calculate spinodals using eq.(22). Figure 2 shows calculated spinodals for samples 1,3,5,7 and 9. Cloud-point curves and shadow curves are obtained by solving eqs.(34) and (35). An arbitrary example with M_n=209kg/mol, M_w=346kg/mol and M_z=482kg/mol is chosen. Rehage et al [25] have reported experimental cloud-point and shadow curves for a similar sample. Figure 3 shows calculated cloud-point and shadow curves and the spinodal curve for that sample. Figure 4 shows Rehage's experimental results for comparison. In view of the uncertainties in parameter estimation, and the subtle difference between the M_z of the calculated sample and that of Rehage, general agreement with experiment is satisfactory. Figure 5 shows typical distributions for a principal phase and an equilibrated conjugate phase. These two distributions differ markedly from each other.

The preceeding calculations only serve as an example. For that example, a chain-length-dependent parameter is not needed. Similar good results can be obtained when the energy parameter ε/k is only temperature-dependent. Chain-length dependence, however, will play a vital role when the chain-length distribution of the polymer includes short chains.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Although continuous thermodynamics has been widely accepted for phase-equilibrium calculations for systems with very many components, some computational problems remain, especially for systems containing polymers. One of those problems is how to obtain analytical expressions for spinodals and critical points, which are often more important in phase equilibria for polymer systems than for ordinary systems. These problems are minimal for simple Flory-Huggins theory, but these problems are not trivial when we choose a better model, such as the Freed model, especially when we account for the molar-mass dependence of the parameters.

The functional approach gives us new impetus not only because of its theoretical integrity, and its consistent framework for multicomponent systems, but also because it requires a comparatively simple mathematical procedure in comparison with the tedious determinant derivations in the usual discrete approach when calculating the spinodal and the critical-point criteria. However, the functional approach is still in an early stage. Some

simplifications have been introduced, such as the suggested method of obtaining variations of functionals using Lagrange undetermined multipliers. In the present stage of development, everything obtained by the functional approach must be checked with calculations based on the discrete approach. The latter is rigorous. In this work, we have derived expressions for chemical potentials for the revised Freed model with a molar-mass-dependent energy parameter. The reliability of these equations follows because no approximation has been used. We have also derived expressions for spinodals and critical points; their reliability is subject to test. Fortunately, the result of the test is successful. Therefore, we can reach the conclusion that the thermodynamic framework developed here is a general one which can be used for other polymer-solution models.

Phase-equilibrium calculations for polydisperse polymer solutions requires a molar-mass or chain-length distribution for the polymer. Standard distributions such as the gamma distribution or the log-normal distribution are often used to approximate the chracteristics of polymer systems. We can now determine experimentally all the average molar masses, such as M_n, M_w and M_z. However, M_z predicted by those standard distributions with their parameters obtained by fitting M_n and M_w may differ appreciably from the experimental value. The derivative method used in this work does not have this deficiency. It offers a more accurate description of the distribution of polymer species at a reasonable cost of slightly longer computation time.

In this work, the model is limited to a close-packed lattice where r_o is arbitrarily set at unity. Therfore, it cannot be used for polymer blends. In a next article, the volume effect is taken into account with an equation of state and the restraint r_o=1 is eliminated.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the Chinese National Science Foundation and the Marshall Laboratory, E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company. Additional support was provided by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Science, Chemical Science Division of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF0098.

REFERENCES

1. Kurata, M., Thermodynamics of Polymer Solutions, Harwood Academic Publishers, 1982.
2. Modell, M., Reid, R. C., Thermodynamics and its Applications, 2nd ed.,Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1983.
3. Schultz, G. V., Die Physik der Hochpolymeren, V.2, Springer Verlag, 1953.
4. Scott, R. L., IEC., 45 2532 (1953).
5. Booth, C., Beason, L. R., J. Polymer Sci., 42 81, 93 (1960).
6. Booth, C., J. Polymer Sci., 45 443 (1960).
7. Kotliar, A. M., J. Polymer Sci., A2 3451 (1964).
8. Okamoto, H., Sekikawa, K., J. Polymer Sci., 55 597 (1961).
9. Okamoto, H., J. Polymer Sci., A2 3451 (1964).
10. Koningsveld, R., Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leiden, 1967.
11. Solc, K., Marcromolecules, 3 665 (1970); 8 819 (1975); J. Polymer Sci., Polymer Phys. Ed., 12 555, 865 (1974).
12. Tompa, H., Polymer Solutions, Butterworth, 1956.
13. Kehlen, H., Rätzsch, M. T., Bergmann, J., AIChE J., 31 1136 (1985).
14. Kehlen, H., Rätzsch, M. T., Bergmann, J., J. Macromol. Sci-Chem., A24 (1) 1 (1987).
15. Beerbaum, S., Bergmann, J., Kehlen, H., Rätzsch, M. T., J. Macromol. Sci-Chem., A24 (12) 1445 (1987).
16. Cotterman, R. L., Bender, R., Prausnitz, J. M., IECPDD., 24 194 (1985).
17. Cotterman, R. L., Prausnitz, J. M., IECPDD., 24 434 (1985).
18. Ying, X., Ye, R., Hu, Y., Fluid Phase Equilibria, 53 407 (1989).
19. Hu, Y., Lambert, S. M., Soane D. S., Prausnitz, J. M., Macromolecules, 24 4386 (1991).
20. Hu, Y., Ying, X., Wu, D. T., Prausnitz, J. M., Fluid Phase Equilibria, in press.
21. Freed, K. F., J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., 18 871 (1985).
22. Bawendi, M. G., Freed, K. F., Mohanty, U., J. Chem. Phys., 87 5534 (1987).
23. Bawendi, M. G., Freed, K. F., J. Chem. Phys., 88 2741 (1988).
24. Koningsveld, R., Kleintjens, L. A., Shultz, A. R., J. Polymer Sci., A28 1261 (1970).
25. Rehage, G., Moller, D., Ernst, O., Makromol. Chem., 85 232 (1965).

Appendix 1 : Derivation of the Spinodal Criterion

We first express eq.(18) or eq.(10) for the reduced Gibbs function of mixing per site as a functional of variations $\delta\Phi_o$, $\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]$ and variable t as follows:

$$\tilde{G}_v = \frac{\Phi_o + t\,\delta\Phi_o}{r_o}\ln(\Phi_o + t\,\delta\Phi_o)$$

$$+ \int_0^\infty \frac{\Phi_s W(I) + t\,\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]}{r(I)}\ln\{\Phi_s W(I) + t\,\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]\}dI$$

$$+ (\Phi_o + t\,\delta\Phi_o)\int_0^\infty \{\Phi_s W(I) + t\,\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]\}[g(I) + t\frac{\partial g(I)}{\partial\Phi_o}\delta\Phi_o + \frac{1}{2}t^2\frac{\partial^2 g(I)}{\partial\Phi_o^2}(\delta\Phi_o)^2]dI \quad . \qquad \text{(A1)}$$

Substitution of this equation into eq.(19) for k=2, gives the second-order variation,

$$\delta^2\tilde{G}_v = \frac{(\delta\Phi_o)^2}{r_o\Phi_o} + \int_0^\infty \frac{\{\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]\}^2}{r(I)\Phi_s W(I)}dI$$

$$+ 2\int_0^\infty \delta\Phi_o\,\delta[\Phi_s W(I)][g(I) - \Phi_o g'(I)]dI - 2\int_0^\infty (\delta\Phi_o)^2\Phi s W(I)[g'(I) - \Phi_o g''(I)/2\,]dI \qquad \text{(A2)}$$

where $g''(I) = \partial^2 g(I)/\partial\Phi_s^2$. Variations $\delta\Phi_o$ and $\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]$ are not independent. For obtaining their relation, Kehlen et al [14,15] suggested that $\delta^2\tilde{G}_v$ should be a minimum when $\delta\Phi_o$ and $\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]$ are correctly related. On the other hand, they are also subjected to the following constraint,

$$\int_0^\infty \delta[\Phi_s W(I)]dI = \delta\Phi_s = -\delta\Phi_o \quad . \qquad \text{(A3)}$$

Using this equation as constraint, the relation between two variations can be obtained by seeking the conditional extremum for $\delta^2\tilde{G}_v$ by applying the Lagrange undetermined-multiplier method.

We first take derivative for $\delta^2\tilde{G}_v$ in eq.(A2) with respect to the variation $\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]$, according to eq.(16), keeping $\delta\Phi_o$ unchanged. We obtain

$$\frac{\partial\delta^2\tilde{G}_v}{\partial\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]} = \frac{2\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]}{r(I)\Phi_s W(I)} + 2\delta\Phi_o[g(I) - \Phi_o g'(I)] \qquad \text{(A4)}$$

We then introduce undetermined multiplier -2λ to eq.(A3). After taking the derivative and adding to eq.(A4), we set it equal to zero. We obtain

$$\lambda = \frac{\delta[\Phi_s W(I)]}{r(I)\Phi_s W(I)} + \delta\Phi_o[g(I) - \Phi_o g'(I)] \quad . \qquad \text{(A5)}$$

Substituting this equation into eq.(A3), we can solve for λ,

$$\lambda = \delta\Phi_o[\Phi_s(\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle) - 1]/\Phi_s r_w \qquad \text{(A6)}$$

where

$$\langle gr\rangle = \int_0^\infty g(I)r(I)W(I)dI \qquad \text{(A7)}$$

$$\langle g'r\rangle = \int_0^\infty g'(I)r(I)W(I)dI \qquad \text{(A8)}$$

$$r_w = \langle r \rangle = \int_0^\infty r(I)W(I)dI \tag{A9}$$

r_w is usually called the weight-average chain length. Combine eq.(A6) and eq.(A5). We obtain the relation between two variations,

$$\delta[\Phi_s W(I)] = (\delta\Phi_o)\Phi_s r(I)W(I)[\frac{\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle}{r_w} - \frac{1}{\Phi_s r_w} - g(I) + \phi_o g'(I)] \quad . \tag{A10}$$

Substituting this equation into eq.(A2), we have eq.(20).

Appendix 2 : Critical-Point Criterion

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\delta^3\bar{G}_v}{(\delta\Phi_o)^3} = & -\frac{1}{r_o\Phi_o^2} - \frac{\Phi_s\langle r^2\rangle}{\langle r\rangle^3}(\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle)^3 \\
& + \frac{\langle r^2\rangle}{\Phi_s^2\langle r\rangle^3} + (\langle g^3r^2\rangle - 3\Phi_o\langle g^2g'r^2\rangle + 3\Phi_o^2\langle gg'^2r^2\rangle - \Phi_o^3\langle g'^3r^2\rangle)\Phi_s \\
& + 3\frac{\langle r^2\rangle}{\langle r\rangle^3}(\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle)^2 + 3\Phi_s\frac{\langle gr^2\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r^2\rangle}{\langle r\rangle^2}(\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle)^2 \\
& - 3\frac{\langle r^2\rangle}{\langle r\rangle^3\Phi_s}(\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle) - 3\Phi_s\frac{\langle g^2r^2\rangle - 2\Phi_o\langle gg'r^2\rangle + \Phi_o^2\langle g'^2r^2\rangle}{\langle r\rangle}(\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle) \\
& + 3\frac{\langle gr^2\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r^2\rangle}{\langle r\rangle^2\Phi_s} + 3\frac{\langle g^2r^2\rangle - 2\Phi_o\langle gg'r^2\rangle + \Phi_o^2\langle g'^2r^2\rangle}{\langle r\rangle} - 6\frac{\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle}{\langle r\rangle^2}(\langle gr^2\rangle - \Phi_o g'r^2\rangle) \\
& - 6\Phi_s\langle g'r\rangle\frac{\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g''r\rangle}{\langle r\rangle} + 6\frac{\langle g'r\rangle}{\langle r\rangle} + 3\Phi_s\langle g''\rangle + 6\Phi_s(\langle gg'r\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'^2r\rangle) \\
& + 3\Phi_o\Phi_s\langle g''r\rangle\frac{\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle}{\langle r\rangle} - 3\Phi_o\frac{\langle g''r\rangle}{\langle r\rangle} - 3\Phi_o\Phi_s(\langle gg''r\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'g''r\rangle)
\end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

The meaning of terms <...> in this equation is similar to those in eq.(20) as defined by eq.(21).

Appendix 3 : Comparison with the results derived by discrete approach.

For testing the reliability of derivations for the spinodal and the critical-point criteria, we set relations between some terms and their corresponding terms in the discrete approach as follows:

$$r_o^{-1}\Phi_o^{-1} - 2\Phi_s\langle g'\rangle + \Phi_o\Phi_s\langle g''\rangle \rightarrow J \tag{C1}$$

$$-g(I) + \Phi_o g'(I) \rightarrow J_i \tag{C2}$$

$$1/[r(I)\Phi_s W(I)] \rightarrow \lambda_i \quad . \tag{C3}$$

Then we have

$$\Phi_s r_w = \int_0^\infty \Phi_s r(I)W(I)dI = \sum_i \lambda_i^{-1} \tag{C4}$$

$$-\Phi_s(\langle gr\rangle - \Phi_o\langle g'r\rangle) = \sum_i J_i\lambda_i^{-1} \tag{C5}$$

$$\Phi_s(\langle g_2r\rangle - 2\Phi_o\langle gg'r\rangle + \Phi_o^2\langle g'^2r\rangle) = \sum_i J_i^2\lambda_i^{-1} \quad . \tag{C6}$$

Substitution into eq.(20) and defining a new F_{sp},

$$F_{sp}\Phi_s^{-1}r_w^{-1} \rightarrow F_{sp} \quad . \tag{C7}$$

We have the spinodal criterion with a discrete version,

$$F_{sp} = 1 + J\sum_i \frac{1}{\lambda_i} + (\sum_i \frac{J_i}{\lambda_i})^2 - \sum_i \frac{1}{\lambda_i}\sum_i \frac{J_i J_i}{\lambda_i} + 2\sum_i \frac{J_i}{\lambda_i} \quad . \tag{C8}$$

This equation can be derived from the discrete approach.

For the critical point, we set two further relations as follows:

$$r_o^{-1}\Phi_o^{-2} - 3\Phi_s <g''> \rightarrow J' \tag{C9}$$

$$-2g'(I) + \Phi_o g''(I) \rightarrow J_i' \quad . \tag{C10}$$

Upon substitution of the above equations into eq.(B1), we have the critical-point criterion in a discrete version

$$F_{cr} = \sum_i J_i^3 r_i \lambda_i^{-1} + J' - 3\sum_i J_i J_i' \lambda_i^{-1} - 3(\sum_i J_i^2 r_i \lambda_i^{-1})\frac{1+\sum_i J_i \lambda_i^{-1}}{\sum_i \lambda_i^{-1}}$$

$$+ 3\sum_i J_i r_i \lambda_i^{-1}(\frac{1+\sum_i J_i \lambda_i^{-1}}{\sum_i \lambda_i^{-1}})^2 - \sum_i r_i \lambda_i^{-1}(\frac{1+\sum_i J_i \lambda_i^{-1}}{\sum_i \lambda_i^{-1}})^3 \quad . \tag{C11}$$

This equation can also be derived from the discrete approach.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Schematic phase diagram for liquid-liquid equilibria of a polymer solution with (a) monodisperse polymer sample and (b) polydisperse polymer sample. Small squares on upper part are corresponding distribution curves for polymers.

Figure 2. Spinodals calculated for the system cyclohexane-polystyrene, corresponding to sample numbers in Table 1.

Figure 3. Cloud-point curve, shadow curve and spinodal curve for system cyclohexane-polystyrene. M_n=209kg/mol, M_w=346kg/mol, M_z=482kg/mol.

Figure 4. Cloud-point curve and shadow curve for the system cyclohexane-polystyrene. Comparison with experimental results by Rehage et al.

calc. M_n=209kg/mol, M_w=346kg/mol, M_z=482kg/mol.

expt. M_n=210kg/mol, M_w=346kg/mol, M_z=550kg/mol.

Figure 5. Molar-mass distributions of conjugate phases in liquid-liquid equilibrium for the system cyclohexane-polystyrene.

Table 1. Critical coordinates for system cyclohexane-polystyrene

No.	M_n 10^3	M_w 10^3	M_z 10^3	T_c /K		Φ_{sc}	
				expt.	calc.	expt.	calc.
1	1250	1500	1700	303.20	303.87	0.0305	0.0293
2	490	527	593	301.15	301.32	0.0470	0.0464
3	375	394	423	300.70	300.36	0.0510	0.0515
4	200	286	438	298.70	298.90	0.0700	0.0673
5	154	166	181	296.60	296.58	0.0735	0.0731
6	91	93	96	293.65	293.15	0.0875	0.0884
7	55	61.5	70.5	290.45	290.07	0.1070	0.1062
8	49	51	55	287.85	288.57	0.1100	0.1102
9	27	35.4	45.5	284.60	285.04	0.1360	0.1325

RMS(T)=0.44K, RMS(Φ)=0.0016


(a)
W(I)
I
T
(b)
W(I)
I
1
2
3
4
cloud-point curve
tie line
shadow curve
critical point
principal phase
conjugate phase
Φ_S

Figure 1


T/K
310
300
290
280
0
0.1
0.2
0.3
Φ_s
critical point
spinodal
1
3
5
7
9

Figure 2


301
300
299
298
297
296
T/K
critical point
shadow curve
cloud-point curve
spinodal
0
0.05
0.10
0.15
W_S

Figure 3


T/K
301
300
299
298
297
296
0
0.05
0.10
0.15
W_S
calc.
expt.
(Rehage et al)

Figure 4


0.50
0.40
0.30
0.20
0.10
0
W(I)
*10^5
conjugate phase
principal phase
Ws = 0.155
0
20
40
60
80
100
I * 10^-4
(I = M)

Figure 5

LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

ABH546
LBL Libraries