



Cite this: *Soft Matter*, 2020,
16, 7789

A unified understanding of the cononsolvency of polymers in binary solvent mixtures

Xiangyu Zhang, Jing Zong and Dong Meng *

The standard random phase approximation (RPA) model is applied to investigate the cononsolvency of polymers in mixtures of two good solvents. It is shown that in the RPA framework, the two types of cononsolvency behaviors reported in previous theoretical studies can be unified under the same concept of mean-field density correlations. The two types of cononsolvency are distinguished by the solvent composition at which maximum immiscibility is predicted to occur. The maximum immiscibility occurs with the cosolvent being the minor solvent if the driving mechanism is the preferential solvation of polymers. For the cononsolvency driven by the preferential mixing of solvents, the maximum immiscibility is predicted at a symmetric solvent composition. An interplay of the two driving forces gives rise to a reentrant behavior in which the cononsolvency of the two types switches from one to the other, through a “conventional” region where the overall solvent quality varies monotonically with the solvent composition. The RPA model developed in this work provides a unified analytical framework for understanding the conformational and solubility transition of polymers in multi-solvent mixtures. Such findings highlight the complex role played by the solvents in polymer solutions, a problem of fundamental and practical interest in diverse applications of materials science.

Received 5th May 2020,
Accepted 9th July 2020

DOI: 10.1039/d0sm00811g

rsc.li/soft-matter-journal

1. Introduction

Polymer solutions of mixed solvents are often encountered in experiments, as a means of tuning miscibility and manipulating polymer assemblies, or simply as the byproducts of processing history. The effects of having mixed solvents in polymer solutions are, however, far from trivial. An exemplary situation is the so-called cononsolvency, in which polymers dissolved in a mixture of good solvents show a puzzling reentrant collapse and swelling transition.^{1–4} A theoretical understanding of cononsolvency first arrived from chemistry-specific computer simulations of thermo-sensitive polymers in solvent mixtures.^{3,5–8} Later on, Tanaka *et al.*⁹ showed that cononsolvency of temperature-sensitive polymers can be explained based on the competition between the two solvents in forming hydrogen bonds with the polymers. They found that the total coverage of the polymer chain by the bound solvent molecules is not a monotonic function but passes through a minimum at the composition where the competition is the strongest. However, it has long been known that polymers with an upper critical solution temperature (UCST), and even standard polymers, such as polystyrene,^{10–12} also display the cononsolvency behavior, pointing to the possible generic origin of this enigmatic phenomenon.

Computer simulations based on the generic bead-spring model were performed by Mukherji *et al.*¹³ to understand the coil-globule-coil transition of polymers in mixtures of two good solvents.

They attribute the initial collapse to the formation of bridges that the cosolvent molecules form by binding two monomers far apart along the polymer backbone, and the reopening at higher cosolvent concentrations is due to the increased decoration of the polymer by cosolvent molecules. Their study shows that chemistry-specific details are indeed unnecessary for a system to display cononsolvency in computer simulations; on the other hand, the discrete nature of the proposed mechanism—preferential solute-(co)solvent coordination – implies that Flory-Huggins type mean-field theories may not be sufficient to describe such a behavior. Simulations using a similar bead-spring model have also been reported in a number of other contexts.^{14–17} In addition to the bead-spring model, Zhang *et al.* showed that computer simulations employing the mesoscopic hybrid model can also reproduce the cononsolvency behavior.¹⁸ The non-bonded interactions in the hybrid model are templated by functionals of local order parameters that are similar to free energies in classical density functional theory. Conceptually different from conventional microscopic descriptions, the success of the mesoscopic hybrid model in capturing the cononsolvency effect further indicates the universality of this phenomenon.

General analytical theories have played an especially important role in interpreting cononsolvency from a generic perspective. Using the standard Flory-Huggins theory, Dudowicz *et al.*¹⁹ found that polymer miscibility patterns in solvent mixtures are largely controlled by the solvent-(co)solvent interaction energies. In particular, when the solvent-(co)solvent interaction parameter is negative and exceeds in magnitude the polymer-solvent interactions (for instance, when the solvent and cosolvent molecules contain

The Swalm School of Chemical Engineering, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS 39762, USA. E-mail: dm2596@msstate.edu

polar groups or form a weak hydrogen bond), cononsolvency arises with the maximum immiscibility being predicted at an equal solvent–cosolvent fraction. On the other hand, a Langmuir-like thermodynamic treatment was devised by Mukherji *et al.*²⁰ to account for solvent-mediated bridging and the competitive displacement of different solvent components onto the polymer. In the model, cosolvent adsorptions are categorized into two different modes: bridge-forming and non-bridge-forming, and a free energy density is prescribed to account for the difference. Collapse and swelling transitions result from changes in the relative fraction of the two adsorption modes that minimizes the free energy density. In the same vein, Sommers^{21,22} proposed the adsorption-attraction model, which simplifies the free energy model in ref. 20 by introducing a free energy term to account for the mean-field attraction between monomers due to the “bridging effect” mediated by adsorbed cosolvents. In contrast to ref. 19, the driving force of polymer cononsolvency in ref. 20 and 21 is the difference in the affinity between the polymer and the two solvents, with solvents and cosolvents forming ideal mixtures with each other with zero enthalpy/entropy of mixing. Furthermore, ref. 20 and 21 predict that polymers possess the most collapsed conformations when the cosolvent (the better solvent for the polymers) is the minor solvent as opposed to the equal fraction predicted in ref. 19.

In this study, we aim to explore the common generic cause underlying the two types of cononsolvency behaviors reported in the literature.^{13,18–21} By calculating the partial structure factors of ternary polymer solutions using the random phase approximation (RPA) approach, we show that both types of polymer cononsolvency can be rationalized through the lens of mean-field density correlations, without the need to introduce *ad hoc* topological correlations (such as solvent-mediated bridging) and the corresponding energetic parameters. The manuscript is organized as follows: the RPA model of ternary polymer solutions is briefly discussed in Section II. Two special cases are then employed for illustrating two different mechanisms that lead to polymer cononsolvency in ternary solutions. In Section III, calculations are carried out to quantitatively describe the dependence of overall solvent quality and the phase behavior of polymer solutions on the solvent composition under the two types of cononsolvency effects. In Section IV, discussions are extended to general situations where cononsolvency behavior is controlled by the interplay/interference of the two identified mechanisms.

II. Random phase approximation model of ternary polymer solutions

The ternary RPA model is applied here to the mixture of homopolymer P and two solvents—solvent S and cosolvent C.^{23–25} In particular, the polymer–polymer partial structure factor is given by

$$\frac{1}{S_{PP}(q)} = \frac{1}{S_{PP}^0(q)} + \frac{1 - 2\chi_{PS}\phi_S - 2\chi_{PC}\phi_C}{[c - 2\chi_{SC}\phi_S\phi_C]} - \frac{\phi_S\phi_C[(\chi_{PS} - \chi_{PC})^2 + \chi_{SC}^2 - 2\chi_{SC}(\chi_{PS} + \chi_{PC})]}{[c - 2\chi_{SC}\phi_S\phi_C]} \quad (1)$$

where $S_{PP}^0(q)$ is the non-interacting single chain structure factor, the total solvent volume fraction $c \equiv \phi_S + \phi_C = 1 - \phi_P$ with ϕ_i being the volume fraction of component i , and χ_{ij} is the Flory–Huggins immiscibility parameter between components i and j . In eqn (1), for simplicity, the specific volumes of all components have been assumed to be identical and unity. A systematic study on the effects of asymmetric specific volumes on polymer cononsolvency behavior will be reported in future work. For a single-solvent system ($\phi_C = 0$), the above equation reduces to the known result:

$$\frac{1}{S_{PP}(q)} = \frac{1}{S_{PP}^0(q)} + \frac{1}{\phi_S} - 2\chi_{PS}. \quad (2)$$

The last two terms, $\frac{1}{\phi_S} - 2\chi_{PS}$, determine the solvent quality for polymers in a single-solvent polymer solution. $\frac{1}{\phi_S} - 2\chi_{PS} > 0$ and < 0 distinguish the good and bad solvent conditions, respectively, and $\frac{1}{\phi_S} - 2\chi_{PS} = 0$ defines the θ -solvent condition at which the excluded volume and immiscibility effects offset each other.

For binary-solvent polymer solutions, we restrict our attention to solutions with the two solvents being perfectly miscible, *i.e.*, $\chi_{SC} \leq 0$, and, without losing generality, we designate cosolvent C as the better solvent for polymers, *i.e.*, $\chi_{PC} \leq \chi_{PS}$. In analogy to eqn (2), the overall solvent quality can be defined as

$$\Gamma = \frac{1 - 2\chi_{PS}\phi_S - 2\chi_{PC}\phi_C}{[c - 2\chi_{SC}\phi_S\phi_C]} - \frac{\phi_S\phi_C[(\chi_{PS} - \chi_{PC})^2 + \chi_{SC}^2 - 2\chi_{SC}(\chi_{PS} + \chi_{PC})]}{[c - 2\chi_{SC}\phi_S\phi_C]} = \frac{1 - \chi_{SC}^2\phi_S\phi_C}{c'} - 2\left[\frac{(1 - x_C' + x_S')}{2}\chi_{PS} + \frac{(1 - x_S' + x_C')}{2}\chi_{PC} + \frac{c'}{2}x_S'x_C'\Delta\chi^2\right], \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta\chi \equiv (\chi_{PS} - \chi_{PC}) > 0$ and $c' \equiv c - 2\chi_{SC}\phi_S\phi_C$, and $x_C' \equiv \frac{\phi_S}{c'}$ and $x_S' \equiv \frac{\phi_C}{c'}$ are the effective solvent volume fraction and solvent compositional fraction, respectively. The first term in eqn (3) accounts for the effective excluded volume effect that takes into consideration the less extent of mixing between polymers and solvent molecules due to the preferential mixing by the two solvents. The three terms inside the square brackets represent the overall immiscibility between the polymer and the solvent mixture. The first two terms correspond to a mixing rule by a weighted average. The term $\frac{c'}{2}x_S'x_C'\Delta\chi^2 > 0$ (if χ_{PS} and χ_{PC} are different) always contributes to reducing the overall solvent quality. The effects of varying solvent composition (*i.e.*, varying ϕ_S and ϕ_C at constant ϕ_P) on Γ can be better illustrated by considering two special cases: (1) the ideal-mixing binary solvent mixture, *i.e.*, $\chi_{SC} = 0$; and (2) the equal-quality binary solvent mixture, *i.e.*, $\Delta\chi = 0$. In the following, we will discuss the two cases separately to elucidate the respective mechanisms that are responsible for the polymer cononsolvency behavior.

II.1 Ideal-mixing binary solvent mixture ($\chi_{SC} = 0$)

With $\chi_{SC} = 0$, $c' = c$, and $x_S' = \frac{\phi_S}{c} \equiv x_S$ and $x_C' = \frac{\phi_C}{c} \equiv x_C$ recover the physical meaning of the true solvent compositional fractions of S and C, respectively. Eqn (3) becomes

$$\Gamma = \frac{1}{c} - 2 \left[(x_S \chi_{PS} + x_C \chi_{PC}) + \frac{c}{2} x_S x_C \Delta \chi^2 \right]. \quad (4)$$

In this case, the excluded volume effect, $\frac{1}{c} = \frac{1}{1 - \phi_P}$, is the same as that in the single-solvent system due to the ideal mixing of the two solvents. The mixing rule contributes a linear change to Γ with x_C being varied, while the term $\frac{c}{2} x_S x_C \Delta \chi^2$ possesses a maximum at $x_S = x_C = 0.5$ that gives rise to a minimum in Γ . The location of the minimum can be determined by solving $\left. \frac{d\Gamma}{dx_C} \right|_{x_C=x_C^*} = 0$ that gives

$$x_C^* = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{c \Delta \chi}. \quad (5)$$

The condition for the minimum $\Gamma_{\min}$ to occur between $0 < x_C^* < 1$ is then given by

$$\Delta \chi > \frac{2}{c} \equiv \Delta \chi^{\text{conon}}. \quad (6)$$

The presence of a minimum in Γ implies that the overall solvent quality for polymers deteriorates upon the addition of cosolvents of a better quality, which serves as the definition of cononsolvency in this study. Eqn (6) suggests that cononsolvency is a generic effect that is expected to occur for many polymers as long as one of the solvents is significantly better than the other. Moreover, $\Gamma_{\min}$ is predicted to occur at a non-equal fraction, i.e., $0 < x_C^* < 0.5$, a net outcome under the combined effect of the mixing rule and the term $\frac{c}{2} x_S x_C \Delta \chi^2$. The critical value of $\Delta \chi$ for the ternary polymer solution falling into the bad-solution condition can be determined from the equation $\Gamma_{\min}(\Delta \chi = \Delta \chi^0) = 0$, i.e.,

$$-c x_S^* x_C^* \Delta \chi^2 + 1/c - 2(x_S^* \chi_{PS} + x_C^* \chi_{PC}) = 0, \quad (7)$$

where $\Delta \chi^0$ is the positive root. The critical value of $\Delta \chi$ for the ternary polymer solution to undergo a phase transition can be determined from the spinodal instability criterion by requiring

$$\frac{1}{S_{PP}(0)} = \frac{1}{S_{PP}^0(0)} + \Gamma_{\min}(\Delta \chi = \Delta \chi^{\text{demix}}) = 0 \text{ that gives}$$

$$\Delta \chi^{\text{demix}} = \left[\frac{1}{c x_C^* x_S^* S_{PP}^0(0)} + \frac{1}{c^2 x_C^* x_S^*} - \frac{2}{c} \left(\frac{\chi_{PS}}{x_C^*} + \frac{\chi_{PC}}{x_S^*} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (8)$$

II.2 Equal-quality binary solvent mixture ($\Delta \chi = 0$)

On the other hand, with $\Delta \chi = 0$, eqn (3) becomes

$$\Gamma = \frac{1 - \chi_{SC}^2 \phi_S \phi_C}{c - 2 \chi_{SC} \phi_S \phi_C} - 2 \chi_{PS}. \quad (9)$$

In this case, the effect of polymer-solvent immiscibility is identical to that in a single-solvent system, as expected since

the two solvents behave identically from the perspective of the polymers. At a given polymer volume fraction ϕ_P , the effective excluded volume effect exhibits a minimum at $x_S = x_C = 0.5$, giving rise to a minimum in Γ at the same solvent composition. Note that the presence of a minimum in Γ occurs as long as $\chi_{SC} < 0$ and is independent of χ_{PS} or χ_{PC} . On the other hand, the exact value of the minimum, $\Gamma_{\min}$, depends on c , χ_{SC} , and χ_{PS} . Similar to the “ideal-mixing” case, the critical value of χ_{SC} for the ternary solution being in the bad-solution condition can be solved using the equation $\Gamma_{\min}(\chi_{SC} = \chi_{SC}^0) = 0$:

$$\frac{1 - \frac{\chi_{SC}^2}{c}}{c - \frac{\chi_{SC}}{2}} - 2 \chi_{PS} = 0, \quad (10)$$

and the critical value of χ_{SC} for the ternary solution to undergo a phase transition can be solved using the equation $\frac{1}{S_{PP}^0(0)} +$

$$\Gamma_{\min}(\chi_{SC} = \chi_{SC}^{\text{demix}}) = 0:$$

$$\frac{1}{S_{PP}(0)} = \frac{1}{S_{PP}^0(0)} + \frac{1 - \frac{\chi_{SC}^{\text{demix}^2}}{c}}{c - \frac{\chi_{SC}^{\text{demix}}}{2}} - 2 \chi_{PS} = 0 \quad (11)$$

III. RPA calculations

In this section, calculations based on the RPA model are carried out to quantitatively describe the effect of varying solvent composition on the overall solvent quality and the phase behavior of ternary polymer solutions. For simplicity, we set $\chi_{PS} = 0$ and adopt the continuum Gaussian chain model for the non-interacting single chain structure factor, i.e., $S_{PP}^0(q) = N \phi_{PD}(x)$, where N is the degree of polymerization, ϕ_P is the polymer volume fraction, and $g_D \left(x \equiv \frac{N}{6} (bq)^2 \right)$ is the Debye function with b and q being the statistical segment length and the magnitude of the wave vector, respectively.

III.1 Ideal-mixing binary solvent mixture ($\chi_{SC} = 0$).

Fig. 1(a) shows the overall solvent quality Γ as a function of the cosolvent fraction x_C at $\phi_P = 0.1$. With $\Delta \chi < \frac{2}{1 - \phi_P} \sim 2.2$, the overall solvent quality monotonically improves with increasing x_C . Beyond this value, a minimum in Γ starts to develop with larger $\Delta \chi$ values producing greater reductions in Γ . As x_C further increases, the overall solvent quality starts to recover, and the rate of recovery is faster with a greater $\Delta \chi$. For $\Delta \chi \gtrsim 4.4$, Γ becomes negative in a certain range of x_C , indicating that the solution falls into the bad-solvent condition. For a given $\Delta \chi$ ($\Delta \chi = 5$), Fig. 1(b) shows that the cononsolvency effect becomes abated with increasing polymer concentration. Both the range of x_C in which Γ decreases and the degree of reduction shrink at higher ϕ_P . With $\phi_P > 1 - \frac{2}{\Delta \chi} = 0.6$, the curves become strictly monotonic, with Γ increasing gradually with increasing x_C .




Fig. 1 Overall solvent quality Γ as a function of cosolvent composition x_C calculated with $N = 50$ at (a) varying $\Delta\chi$ and $\phi_P = 0.1$; and (b) varying ϕ_P and $\Delta\chi = 5$.

It is worth mentioning that the predicted dependence of Γ on x_C does not depend on the form of S_{PP}^0 assumed by the RPA model.

At $\Delta\chi = 5$, Fig. 2(a) and (b) show the evolution of the partial structure factor $S_{PP}(q)$ with solvent composition x_C at $\phi_P = 0.1$ and $\phi_P = 0.3$, respectively. At $\phi_P = 0.1$, Fig. 2(a) shows a diverging trend for $S_{PP}(q = 0)$ as x_C approaches 0.4152 (from above) and 0.1403 (from below), signaling phase instability in this range of solvent composition. At a higher polymer concentration of $\phi_P = 0.3$, $S_{PP}(q = 0)$ stays finite for all solvent compositions with $S_{PP}(q)$ obtained at $x_C = 0.2143$ lying above all other curves. In the meantime, the corresponding behaviors of S_{PC} and S_{PS} shown in Fig. 3(c) and (d) indicate the relative enrichment of cosolvents and depletion of solvents around polymers. At an even higher polymer concentration of $\phi_P = 0.7$, the cononsolvency effect is no longer observable and $S_{PP}(q)$ flattens gradually with increasing x_C (data not shown).

Fig. 3(a) shows the dependence of the critical values $\Delta\chi^{\text{conon}}$, $\Delta\chi^0$ and $\Delta\chi^{\text{demix}}$ on the polymer concentration. While $\Delta\chi^{\text{conon}}$ and $\Delta\chi^0$ monotonically increase with ϕ_P , $\Delta\chi^{\text{demix}}$ shows an increase approaching the dilute limit due to the enhanced translational entropy. The effect of chain length on $\Delta\chi^{\text{demix}}$ is only appreciable at low polymer concentrations. Furthermore, at a given ϕ_P and $\Delta\chi$, the respective range of x_C within which cononsolvency, the bad-solution condition, and phase instability occur can be determined using eqn (6)–(8). Fig. 3(b) and (c) show such phase diagrams for two polymer concentrations, $\phi_P = 0.01$ and 0.1 , respectively. When $\Delta\chi^{\text{conon}} < \Delta\chi < \Delta\chi^0$, the ternary solution exhibits a deterioration in the overall solvent quality as x_C increases and then recovers, but it remains in the good-solution condition (*i.e.*, $\Gamma > 0$) for all x_C values. When $\Delta\chi^0 < \Delta\chi$, the solution will fall into the bad-solution condition with increasing x_C . Fig. 3(b) suggests that the polymers may undergo a reentrant coil-globule-coil




Fig. 2 Evolution of the partial structure factors with changing cosolvent composition x_C calculated with $N = 50$ at (a) $\phi_P = 0.1$ and (b)–(d) $\phi_P = 0.3$.




Fig. 3 (a) Critical values $\Delta\chi^{\text{con}}$, $\Delta\chi^{\theta}$, and $\Delta\chi^{\text{demix}}$ as a function of ϕ_P . (b and c) Boundaries of cononsolvency, bad-solution condition, and phase instability in the $\Delta\chi$ - x_C plane for $\phi_P = 0.01$ and 0.1 .

transition without experiencing phase instability, consistent with findings from ref. 20 that polymer conformational changes under the cononsolvency effect may not correspond to a phase transition. However, such behavior may no longer be possible at higher polymer concentrations or higher molecular weights, as the boundaries for the bad-solution condition and phase instability almost overlap with each other (Fig. 3(c)).

III.2 Equal-quality binary solvent mixture ($\Delta\chi = 0$).

Fig. 4(a) and (b) show the overall solvent quality as a function of x_C at $\phi_P = 0.1$ and $\chi_{\text{SC}} = -4$, respectively. The minimum in Γ is always observed at $x_C = 0.5$ as long as $\chi_{\text{SC}} < 0$, with smaller χ_{SC} and ϕ_P values producing greater drops in Γ . The dependences of the critical values $\chi_{\text{SC}}^{\text{conon}}$, $\chi_{\text{SC}}^{\theta}$ and $\chi_{\text{SC}}^{\text{demix}}$ on polymer concentration are shown in Fig. 5(a), and Fig. 5(b) and (c) show the

phase diagrams of the ternary solution at two polymer concentrations, $\phi_P = 0.01$ and 0.1 , respectively. Similar to the ideal-mixing case, at low polymer concentrations, the polymers may undergo a reentrant coil-globule-coil transition without demixing. In contrast to the ideal-mixing system, the overall solvent quality and the phase diagrams of equal-quality mixing systems are symmetric about $x_C = 0.5$, as suggested by eqn (9), which agrees with the findings from ref. 19 that the ternary solution behaves identically with $\frac{x_C}{x_S} = r$ or $\frac{x_S}{x_C} = r$.

IV. Discussion

The results in Sections II and III describe the two situations where cononsolvency of polymers in ternary solutions is driven




Fig. 4 The overall solvent quality Γ as a function of solvent composition x_C calculated with $N = 50$ at (a) varying χ_{SC} and $\phi_P = 0.1$; and (b) varying ϕ_P and $\chi_{\text{SC}} = -4$.




Fig. 5 (a) $\chi_{SC}^{conon} = 0$, χ_{SC}^0 and χ_{SC}^{demix} as functions of ϕ_P , calculated using eqn (10) and (11) with $N = 10, 50$, and 100 . (b and c) Boundaries of cononsolvency, bad-solution condition, and phase instability in the χ_{SC} - χ_C plane for $\phi_P = 0.01$ and 0.1 .

by the preferential solvation of polymers (when $\chi_{SC} = 0$ and $\Delta\chi > 0$) and the preferential mixing of solvents (when $\chi_{SC} < 0$ and $\Delta\chi = 0$), respectively. In general situations where $\Delta\chi \geq 0$ and $\chi_{SC} \leq 0$, it is expected that both effects play a part in affecting the conformational and phase-behavior changes with varying solvent composition. Generally, with $\Delta\chi \geq 0$ and $\chi_{SC} \leq 0$, $\frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \phi_C} = 0$ becomes a quadratic equation in terms of $(2x_C - 1)$:

$$-\chi_{SC}\Delta\chi(2x_C - 1)^2 + \left(\Delta\chi^2 + \chi_{SC}^2 - \frac{2\chi_{SC}}{c}\right)(2x_C - 1) + \Delta\chi\left(\frac{2}{c} - \chi_{SC}\right) = 0 \quad (12)$$

that gives two roots

$$r_{1,2} = \frac{-\left(\Delta\chi^2 + \chi_{SC}^2 - \frac{2\chi_{SC}}{c}\right) \pm \sqrt{\left(\Delta\chi^2 - \chi_{SC}^2 + \frac{2\chi_{SC}}{c}\right)^2}}{-2\chi_{SC}\Delta\chi} \quad (13)$$

The physical constraint $-1 \leq r_1 < r_2 \leq 1$ determines the conditions under which an extremity in Γ can be observed. It can be proved that the two roots have the same sign. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 + r_2 &= \frac{\left(\Delta\chi^2 + \chi_{SC}^2 - \frac{2\chi_{SC}}{c}\right)}{\chi_{SC}\Delta\chi} > \frac{\left(-2\chi_{SC}\Delta\chi - \frac{2\chi_{SC}}{c}\right)}{\chi_{SC}\Delta\chi} \\ &= -2 - \frac{2}{c\Delta\chi} < -2 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which implies that it is only possible for the larger root r_2 (at which Γ is at its minimum) to satisfy the constraint $-1 < r_2 < 1$. For this to be the case, the following conditions need to be satisfied:

$$(\Delta\chi + \chi_{SC}) \geq \frac{2}{c}, \quad \text{when } \Delta\chi^2 - \chi_{SC}^2 + 2\chi_{SC}/c > 0$$

$$(\Delta\chi + \chi_{SC}) \leq 0, \quad \text{when } \Delta\chi^2 - \chi_{SC}^2 + 2\chi_{SC}/c < 0.$$

This set of conditions gives rise to two separate regions in which cononsolvency will occur in the $\Delta\chi$ - χ_{SC} plane (the shaded area in Fig. 6(a)). In the lower region ($\Delta\chi \leq -\chi_{SC}$), cononsolvency is driven by the preferential mixing of the two solvents and is therefore independent of polymer volume fraction. In the upper region ($\Delta\chi \geq \frac{2}{c} - \chi_{SC}$), cononsolvency is driven by the preferential solvation of polymers. In between, cononsolvency is suppressed by the counter-action of the two effects (*i.e.*, the effect of $c' \neq c$ is felt by both the excluded volume and immiscibility terms in eqn (3)). By setting $\chi_{PS} = 0$ (for simplicity), Fig. 6(b) and (c) depict such “reentrant” behavior of cononsolvency, with $\Gamma(x_C)$ exhibiting nonmonotonic variations by either increasing or decreasing $\Delta\chi$ and χ_{SC} , respectively, suggesting the two effects switching their roles as the driving force behind the cononsolvency behavior.

Another aspect of generalizing the current RPA analysis concerns the specific volumes. Although in the current RPA calculations, the specific volume of each component is assumed to be identical, an extension to the treatment of asymmetric specific




Fig. 6 (a) The parameter region in the $\Delta\chi$ - χ_{sc} plane where cononsolvency will (the shaded area) and will not (the blank area) occur with $\phi_P = 0.1$. The overall solvent quality Γ as a function of solvent composition x_c calculated (by setting $\chi_{PS} = 0$) at (b) varying $\Delta\chi$ with $\phi_P = 0.1$ and $\chi_{sc} = -3$; and (c) varying χ_{sc} with $\phi_P = 0.1$ and $\Delta\chi = 4$.

volumes in the RPA framework should be straightforward. The effects of asymmetric specific volumes between the solvent and cosolvent on the RPA predictions can, nevertheless, be estimated based on the consideration of mixing entropy. In general, asymmetry in the specific volumes will lead to a lower degree of mixing between the solvents and cosolvents. For the cononsolvency driven by the “preferential solvation of polymers”, this will promote the mixing between polymers and cosolvents. As a result, the predicted values of $\Delta\chi^{\text{conon}}$, $\Delta\chi^\theta$ and $\Delta\chi^{\text{demix}}$ will be smaller and Γ_{min} will move to smaller x_c values. For the cononsolvency driven by the “preferential mixing of solvents”, asymmetry in the specific volumes will move the maximum mixing away from $x_c = 0.5$ and render the phase diagrams shown in Fig. 5 asymmetric about $x_c = 0.5$.

In accounting for the cononsolvency effect due to the preferential solvation of polymers, previous theoretical studies^{20,21} often rely on introducing the concept of “mediated bridging” between monomers. In the meantime, the fundamental role played by the mean-field density correlations in the cononsolvency effect has been largely overlooked. To the best of our knowledge, the RPA model of ternary polymer solutions applied in this study represents the first attempt to highlight this point. In the RPA framework, the two types of cononsolvency effects can be unified under the same concept of mean-field density correlations (polymer-cosolvent and solvent-cosolvent correlations, respectively). On the other hand, the current RPA model predicts unusually large values of $\Delta\chi$ for the polymer cononsolvency to occur. From a mean-field point of view,

large values of the Flory-Huggins parameter often indicate the presence of strong associative interactions (such as polymer solutions with hydrogen bonding). It is also possible that $\Delta\chi$ has been overestimated in the current RPA calculations. One reason may come from assuming the continuum Gaussian chain model for the single-chain structure factor, $S_{PP}^0(q)$. A more rigorous treatment would be to calculate it in a self-consistent manner. Another plausible cause for the overestimation of $\Delta\chi$ is the mean-field nature of the RPA approach, in which the possibly strong topological correlations between the polymer segments (such as the “mediated bridging” effect) are not accounted for.²² Further studies will be required to allow the clarification of the source of the overestimate.

In summary, the RPA model offers a clear picture of the generic origin(s) of polymer cononsolvency in solvent mixtures. The study reveals the complex roles played by solvents in determining the conformational and solubility transitions of polymers in multi-solvent mixtures. Theoretical understandings as such offer rational guidelines for the potential use of solvent composition as an extra degree of freedom for controlling and modulating polymer self-assemblies in solutions (*e.g.* polymer brushes and micellar solutions, *etc.*). Studies along this line are underway.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

References

- 1 H. G. Schild, M. Muthukumar and D. A. Tirrell, Conon-solvency in mixed aqueous solutions of poly(*N*-isopropylacrylamide), *Macromolecules*, 1991, **24**, 948–952.
- 2 G. Zhang and C. Wu, Reentrant coil-to-globule-to-coil transition of a single linear homopolymer chain in a water/methanol mixture, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2001, **86**, 822.
- 3 J. Walter, J. Sehnert, J. Vrabec and H. Hasse, Molecular dynamics and experimental study of conformation change of poly(*N*-isopropylacrylamide) hydrogels in mixtures of water and methanol, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2012, **116**, 5251–5259.
- 4 H. Kojima, F. Tanaka, C. Scherzinger and W. Richtering, Temperature dependent phase behavior of PNIPAM microgels in mixed water/methanol solvents, *J. Polym. Sci., Part B: Polym. Phys.*, 2013, **51**, 1100–1111.
- 5 J. Walter, V. Ermatchkov, J. Vrabec and H. Hasse, Molecular dynamics and experimental study of conformation change of poly(*N*-isopropylacrylamide) hydrogels in water, *Fluid Phase Equilib.*, 2010, **296**, 164–172.
- 6 A. K. Tucker and M. J. Stevens, Study of the polymer length dependence of the single chain transition temperature in syndiotactic poly(*N*-isopropylacrylamide) oligomers in water, *Macromolecules*, 2012, **45**, 6697–6703.
- 7 D. Mukherji and K. Kremer, Coil–globule–coil transition of PNIPAm in aqueous methanol: coupling all-atom simulations to semi-grand canonical coarse-grained reservoir, *Macromolecules*, 2013, **46**, 9158–9163.
- 8 F. Rodriguez-Ropero and N. F. van der Vegt, Direct osmolyte–macromolecule interactions confer entropic stability to folded states, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2014, **118**, 7327–7334.
- 9 F. Tanaka, T. Koga and F. M. Winnik, Temperature-responsive polymers in mixed solvents: competitive hydrogen bonds cause cononsolvency, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2008, **101**, 028302.
- 10 A. Shultz and P. Flory, Polymer chain dimensions in mixed-solvent media, *J. Polym. Sci.*, 1955, **15**, 231–242.
- 11 B. Read, A light-scattering study of preferential adsorption in the system benzene + cyclohexane + polystyrene, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, 1960, **56**, 382–390.
- 12 B. Wolf and M. Willms, Measured and calculated solubility of polymers in mixed solvents: co-nonsolvency, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, 1978, **179**, 2265–2277.
- 13 D. Mukherji, C. M. Marques and K. Kremer, Polymer collapse in miscible good solvents is a generic phenomenon driven by preferential adsorption, *Nat. Commun.*, 2014, **5**, 1–6.
- 14 A. Galuschko and J.-U. Sommer, Co-nonsolvency response of a polymer brush: a molecular dynamics study, *Macromolecules*, 2019, **52**, 4120–4130.
- 15 J. Heyda, A. Muzdalo and J. Dzubiella, Rationalizing polymer swelling and collapse under attractive cosolvent conditions, *Macromolecules*, 2013, **46**, 1231–1238.
- 16 M. G. Opferman, R. D. Coalson, D. Jasnow and A. Zilman, Morphological control of grafted polymer films *via* attraction to small nanoparticle inclusions, *Phys. Rev. E: Stat., Non-linear, Soft Matter Phys.*, 2012, **86**, 031806.
- 17 M. G. Opferman, R. D. Coalson, D. Jasnow and A. Zilman, Morphology of polymer brushes infiltrated by attractive nanoinclusions of various sizes, *Langmuir*, 2013, **29**, 8584–8591.
- 18 J. Zhang, D. Mukherji, K. Kremer and K. C. Daoulas, Studying polymer solutions with particle-based models linked to classical density functionals: co-non-solvency, *Soft Matter*, 2018, **14**, 9282–9295.
- 19 J. Dudowicz, K. F. Freed and J. F. Douglas, Communication: cosolvency and cononsolvency explained in terms of a Flory–Huggins type theory, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, **143**, 131101.
- 20 D. Mukherji, C. M. Marques, T. Stuehn and K. Kremer, Co-non-solvency: mean-field polymer theory does not describe polymer collapse transition in a mixture of two competing good solvents, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, **142**, 114903.
- 21 J.-U. Sommer, Adsorption–Attraction Model for Co-Nonsolvency in Polymer Brushes, *Macromolecules*, 2017, **50**, 2219–2228.
- 22 J.-U. Sommer, Gluonic and regulatory solvents: a paradigm for tunable phase segregation in polymers, *Macromolecules*, 2018, **51**, 3066–3074.
- 23 M. J. Hore, B. Hammouda, Y. Li and H. Cheng, Co-nonsolvency of poly(*n*-isopropylacrylamide) in deuterated water/ethanol mixtures, *Macromolecules*, 2013, **46**, 7894–7901.
- 24 A. Z. Akcasu and M. Tombakoglu, Dynamics of copolymer and homopolymer mixtures in bulk and in solution *via* the random phase approximation, *Macromolecules*, 1990, **23**, 607–612.
- 25 B. Hammouda, SANS from homogeneous polymer mixtures: a unified overview, in *Polymer Characteristics*, Springer, 1993, pp. 87–133.