Published in final edited form as:

Macromolecules. 2011 May 24; 44(10): 3910–3915. doi:10.1021/ma1025847.

Double-Gyroid Network Morphology in Tapered Diblock Copolymers

Raghuunath Roy⁺, Jong Keun Park⁺, Wen-Shiue Young, Sarah E. Mastroianni, Maëva S. Tureau, and Thomas H. Epps III^{*}

Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716

Abstract

We report the formation of a double-gyroid network morphology in normal-tapered poly(isoprene-*b*-isoprene/styrene-*b*-styrene) [P(I-IS-S)] and inverse-tapered poly(isoprene-*b*-styrene/isoprene-*b*-styrene) [P(I-SI-S)] diblock copolymers. Our tapered diblock copolymers with overall poly(styrene) volume fractions of 0.65 (normal-tapered) and 0.67 (inverse-tapered), and tapered regions comprising 30 volume percent of the total polymer, were shown to self-assemble into the double-gyroid network morphology through a combination of small angle X-ray scattering (SAXS) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). The block copolymers were synthesized by anionic polymerization, where the tapered region between the pure poly(isoprene) and poly(styrene) blocks was generated using a semi-batch feed with programmed syringe pumps. The overall composition of these tapered copolymers lies within the expected network-forming region for conventional poly(isoprene-*b*-styrene) [P(I-S)] diblock copolymers. Dynamic mechanical analysis (DMA) clearly demonstrated that the order-disorder transition temperatures (T_{ODT} 's) of the network-forming tapered block copolymers were depressed when compared to the T_{ODT} of their non-tapered counterpart, with the P(I-SI-S) showing the greater drop in T_{ODT} . These results indicate that it is possible to manipulate the copolymer composition profile between blocks in a diblock copolymer, allowing significant control over the T_{ODT} , while maintaining the ability to form complex network structures.

Keywords

self-assembly; network; gyroid; block copolymer; tapered copolymer; tapered block copolymer; anionic polymerization; order-disorder transition; nanostructure

1. Introduction

Block copolymers are an exciting class of materials due to their ability to self-assemble into periodic nanoscale structures.^{1–3} The tendency for diblock copolymers to phase separate into various nanostructures can generally be characterized by the parameters $\chi_{AB}N$ and f_A . Here, χ_{AB} is the Flory-Huggins interaction parameter between *A* and *B* segments, *N* is the overall degree of polymerization, and f_A is the volume fraction of block *A*. According to the poly(isoprene-*b*-styrene) P(I-S) phase diagram,⁴ a variety of ordered structures such as body-centered cubic spheres, hexagonally-packed cylinders, double-gyroid, and lamellae

^{*}To whom correspondence should be addressed. thepps@udel.edu.

⁺These authors contributed equally to this work.

Supporting Information Available: GPC and ¹H NMR analysis for the tapered block copolymers, as well as the complete DMA profiles for the non-tapered P(I-S)-OH block copolymer. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

can be formed in the P(I-S) system when the product, $\chi_{AB}N$ is greater than a critical value, $(\chi_{AB}N)_{ODT}$ (ODT = order-disorder transition).

Literature reports have shown that three-dimensional network morphologies, such as the double-gyroid with $Ia\bar{3}d$ symmetry,^{5–8} may offer superior mechanical attributes relative to their one- and two-dimensional counterparts (e.g., lamellar and cylinder).⁹ These networks are ideally suited for membrane and ion-conducting applications due to their well-defined diffusion pathways.⁸ Furthermore, block copolymer network structures offer opportunities to improve transport in organic conducting systems, such as organic solar cells by facilitating the separation and extraction of free charges due to their co-continuity and large internal interfacial area, along with controlled domain sizes on the order of exciton diffusion lengths.^{8, 10, 11} Thus, a detailed understanding of the influence of interfacial structure on gyroid-forming materials is warranted. Although limited studies have commented on the formation of network structures in interfacially manipulated block copolymers, the ability to form these materials as a function of taper compositions (and the composition effect on T_{ODT}) has not been explored experimentally.^{12,13}

For the majority of *AB* diblock copolymers, the composition profile along the polymer backbone changes abruptly at the junction between *A* and *B* copolymer segments. This standard composition profile in block copolymers can be easily modified by introducing a transition region between the pure *A* and *B* blocks that tapers from *A* to *B* units (referred to as normal-tapered) or from *B* to *A* units (referred to as inverse-tapered).^{14–18} *AB* diblock copolymers containing a random A/B transition region also can be considered a subset of tapered block copolymers for smaller random A/B region volume fractions.¹³

Although they are not the focus of this investigation, a brief comment should be made regarding gradient copolymers to distinguish them from tapered block copolymers in regards to the length of the compositional transition region. Gradient copolymers employ a change in composition from mostly *A*-monomer to mostly *B*-monomer along much or all of the copolymer chain length while tapered block copolymers have a distinct gradient region along only part of the polymer chain.^{16, 19–22} Furthermore, in melt-state gradient copolymers, structural evidence of phase segregation has been limited to lamellar morphologies as theoretically suggested by Jiang et al.²¹

From a synthetic point of view, interfacial modification through tapering constitutes an additional design parameter that permits both further manipulation of interfacial structure and greater understanding of that interfacial structure on bulk copolymer self-assembly. In previous literature, tapered block copolymers were prepared by taking advantage of the greater reactivity ratio of isoprene versus styrene in hydrocarbon solutions of an alkylolithium, which leads to the propagating polymer chain initially being rich in isoprene and then gradually tapering to chain segments rich in styrene.^{17, 23} For example, Hodorokoukes et al. synthesized a normal-tapered poly(isoprene-*b*-isoprene/styrene-*b*-styrene) by starting the reaction with the addition of isoprene to *sec*-butyllithium (*s*-BuLi), followed by the addition of a mixture of the isoprene and styrene monomers, and finally the addition of styrene. To synthesize an inverse-tapered poly(isoprene-*b*-styrene/isoprene-*b*-styrene), the reaction was started with the addition of styrene, followed by a mixture of the isoprene and styrene monomers, and finally the addition of isoprene.

Previously, our group demonstrated the incorporation of tapered regions between pure poly(isoprene) and poly(styrene) blocks using a combination of a semi-batch feed and anionic polymerization techniques.¹⁸ Automated syringe pumps were employed to inject predetermined amounts of monomers into a reactor at varying flow rates to achieve precise control over the desired composition of the tapered segment. The incorporation of tapered

regions between pure blocks has been shown to increase block miscibility, which is manifested in the widening of the interphase region in self-assembled systems.¹⁷

Related to the current investigation, the work by Hashimoto and co-workers to create tapered diblock copolymers deserves attention.^{12, 14} The authors copolymerized a mixture of styrene and isoprene monomers in the presence of a trace amount of tetrahydrofuran (THF, ca. 1 vol% of the polymerization solvent) using benzene as a polymerization solvent. The THF was added with the intent of increasing mixing between the two monomers in the copolymer chain, thus reducing the “blockiness” of the sequence distribution. Based on the TEM result, the morphology of the final polymer (styrene 42 vol %, and $M_n = 1.06 \times 10^5$ g/mol) was suggestive of a network structure. While pyrolysis gas chromatography and ¹H NMR indicated mixing of isoprene and styrene monomers along the block copolymer chain, the authors were unclear about whether the monomer distribution led to a tapered or random copolymer.¹⁴ Further, the authors indicated that the copolymerization exhibited a tenuous reddish yellow color throughout the polymerization reaction, hinting that controlled tapering may not have been achieved.¹⁴

While tapered block copolymers afford the ability to manipulate the interfacial composition profile, to the authors’ knowledge, no systematic attempts to generate network-forming tapered block copolymers have been reported in the literature. Additionally, the majority of previous reports on tapered block copolymers have focused on polymers with symmetric compositions, which have led to the formation of self-assembled lamellar morphologies,^{15, 17, 18, 24} with a notable exception.²⁴ By introducing a tapered middle region which allows controlled interfacial width and tunability of order-disorder transition temperature (T_{ODT}), we report on the self-assembly and thermal characterization of double-gyroid network-forming tapered block copolymers, using a poly(isoprene-*b*-styrene) [P(I-*b*-S)] base system.

II. Experimental Section

Synthesis of Tapered Diblock Copolymers

The semi-batch synthesis of normal-tapered and inverse-tapered diblock copolymers was achieved following a previously published procedure.¹⁸ In summary, *sec*-butyllithium was used as the initiator for the sequential living anionic polymerization of a poly(isoprene) block, followed by a tapered region of isoprene and styrene, and finally a poly(styrene) block. The tapered region was targeted to 30 % of the total copolymer volume. During the tapering step of the polymerization, the required amounts of monomers were injected into the reactor using programmable syringe pumps at predetermined flow rates over 5 h to obtain the desired linear composition profile (from pure A to pure B for the normal-tapered region, and from pure B to pure A for the inverse-tapered region). Following completion of the PS-block, the living P(I-IS-S) and P(I-SI-S) were end-capped with an ethylene oxide (EO) repeat unit, and the polymerizations were terminated with degassed methanolic HCl to obtain P(I-IS-S)-OH and P(I-SI-S)-OH, respectively. A non-tapered P(I-S)-OH diblock copolymer was synthesized in similar fashion except for the absence of the tapering step. The hydroxyl-end groups in all three copolymers can be utilized in further polymerization or functionalization steps.^{25–27}

Chemical Characterization

The number average molecular weights and polydispersity indices of the non-tapered, normal-tapered, and inverse-tapered block copolymers were determined by gel permeation chromatography (GPC) using a Viscotek 270max[®] instrument fitted with Waters Styragel HR1 and HR4 columns in series, operated with THF as the mobile phase, and calibrated with poly(styrene) standards (GPC traces can be found in the supporting information).

Details on the taper composition profile can be found elsewhere.¹⁸ The overall polymer compositions for P(I-S)-OH, P(I-IS-S)-OH, and P(I-SI-S)-OH were calculated from integrated ¹H NMR peak intensities obtained using a Bruker AV-400, which were converted to volume fractions using homopolymer densities at 140 °C ($\rho_{PI} = 0.83$ g/mL, $\rho_{PS} = 0.97$ g/mL).²⁸

Small Angle X-ray Scattering (SAXS)

To investigate the morphology of the normal-tapered block copolymer, synchrotron SAXS experiments were conducted on the DND-CAT of the Advanced Photon Source (APS) at the Argonne National Laboratory and on the X27C beam line of the National Synchrotron Light Source (NSLS) at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. In this work, the SAXS patterns obtained at the APS and NSLS facilities are referred to as “APS-SAXS” and “NSLS-SAXS” data, respectively. The APS-SAXS experiments were performed using an incident beam wavelength, $\lambda = 0.729$ Å and a sample-to-detector distance of 4,035 mm, and the NSLS-SAXS experiments were conducted using an incident beam wavelength, $\lambda = 1.371$ Å and a sample-to-detector distance of 1,803 mm. Both APS and NSLS data were acquired on a Mar CCD area detector. SAXS data were plotted as azimuthally averaged scattering intensity versus scattering vector modulus, $q = |\mathbf{q}| = 4\pi\lambda^{-1} \sin(\theta/2)$, where θ is the scattering angle. The following annealing protocol was employed during data acquisition to investigate any morphological variations as a function of annealing temperature: (i) The temperature was initially ramped to 150 °C and held for 25 min, (ii) further increased to 200 °C and held for 20 min, and finally (iii) cooled to room temperature (~30 °C). SAXS data were acquired during each step of the annealing process.

Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM)

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) was conducted using a JEOL JEM-2000FX microscope operating at 200 kV. The following annealing protocol was employed for the normal-tapered and inverse-tapered block copolymers: (i) the temperature was initially ramped to 180 °C and held for 1 h, (ii) decreased to 150 °C and held for 8 h, (iii) decreased to 100 °C and held for 2 h, and finally (iv) cooled to room temperature (~30 °C). For the non-tapered block copolymer: (i) the temperature was initially ramped to 220 °C and held for 1 h, (ii) decreased to 200 °C and held for 1 h, (iii) decreased to 150 °C and held for 5 h, and finally (iv) cooled to room temperature (~30 °C). The specimens were then cut at -70 °C on a Leica Reichart Ultracut cryo-microtome using a Diatome diamond knife. The sliced samples were placed on 400 mesh copper grids and stained with OsO₄ vapor for ~10 min, which preferentially stained the I-domains of the copolymer.

Dynamic Mechanical Analysis (DMA)

Powder samples were hot-pressed into ~1 mm thickness disks at 110 °C for 20 min. Dynamic mechanical experiments were conducted on a TA Instruments ARES-G2 strain-controlled rheometer in a 25 mm parallel plate geometry under a nitrogen atmosphere. Isochronal storage (G') and loss (G'') modulus measurements were collected on heating and cooling at 1 °C/min at a strain amplitude of 1% and a frequency of 0.5 Hz. Temperature sweeps on the tapered block copolymers were performed between 110 °C and several degrees above order-disorder transition temperatures (T_{ODT}) for 2 cycles. Temperature sweeps on the non-tapered block copolymer were performed as follows: (first heating) the sample was heated from 110 °C to 220 °C and held for 1 h, (second heating) the sample was heated from 110 °C to several degrees above T_{ODT} . The complete DMA profile for P(I-S)-OH can be found in the Supporting Information. The T_{ODT} values obtained on second heating are reported for all samples.

III. Results

The tapered volume percents, number average molecular weights (M_n), polydispersity indices ($PDI = M_w/M_n$), and isoprene volume fractions (f_I) of the block copolymers are reported in Table 1. Isoprene volume fractions of P(I-IS-S)-OH ($f_I = 0.35$), P(I-SI-S)-OH ($f_I = 0.33$), and P(I-S)-OH ($f_I = 0.36$) were deliberately targeted because non-tapered poly(isoprene-*b*-styrene) diblock copolymers with the comparable compositions and molecular weights were previously shown to exhibit a bicontinuous gyroid morphology.^{5, 6} Thus, the effect of the tapered interface on the overall morphological behavior may be studied.

Figure 1a shows APS-SAXS profile for the normal-tapered P(I-IS-IS-S)-OH obtained at 30 °C after thermal annealing. We note that the first and second reflections in the SAXS data are strong, and all other peaks have relatively low intensities as shown experimentally and theoretically by Hajduk *et al.* for the double-gyroid morphology.⁶ Additionally, the intensity ratio between the first and second peaks is $\sim 10:1$, similar to that previously reported for the bicontinuous double-gyroid morphology.³⁰ Furthermore, examination of the SAXS profile reveals that the diffraction pattern is consistent with relative peak assignments of $q/q^* = \sqrt{6}, \sqrt{8}, \sqrt{14}, \sqrt{20}, \sqrt{20}, \sqrt{22}, \sqrt{24}, \sqrt{26}, \sqrt{22}, \sqrt{30}, \sqrt{32}, \sqrt{34}, \sqrt{38}, \sqrt{42}, \sqrt{46}$ and $\sqrt{50}$ (The principal peak corresponds to $q^*\sqrt{6}$, where $q^* = q_{112}$), which supports a double-gyroid assignment.^{5, 31} Though the expected scattering peaks at $q/q^* = \sqrt{16}, \sqrt{34}, \sqrt{40}$, and $\sqrt{48}$ are not distinguishable in the SAXS data, their expected positions have been indicated by dashed arrows in Figure 1a. From the primary peak position, the domain spacing was 54 nm (using $d_{112} = 2\pi/q^*$).

Figures 1b and 1c show NSLS-SAXS profiles for the inverse-tapered P(I-SI-S)-OH, and the non-tapered P(I-S)-OH, respectively, obtained at 30 °C after thermal annealing. Interestingly, the overall SAXS patterns for P(I-IS-S)-OH, and P(I-SI-S)-OH are very similar to that for P(I-S)-OH, which indicates the incorporation of tapered regions up to 30% of the total copolymer volume did not extinguish the double-gyroid morphology. We also note that the scattering intensities around $\sqrt{38}$ and $\sqrt{50}$ in the P(I-IS-S)-OH and P(I-SI-S)-OH are relatively low compared to those in the P(I-S)-OH, which could be ascribed to changes in scattering behavior due to the slight differences in composition and density profiles of the tapered interfaces. From the primary peak positions, the domain spacings were 64 nm and 62 nm for the P(I-SI-S)-OH and P(I-S)-OH, respectively.

TEM analysis provides further support for the $Ia\bar{3}d$ space group indexing of the SAXS profiles. TEM micrographs of P(I-IS-S)-OH (Figure 2a), P(I-SI-S)-OH (Figure 2c) and P(I-S)-OH (Figure 2d) show the distinctive “wagon-wheel” pattern indicative of the double-gyroid morphology,^{7, 32, 33} characteristic of the [111] projection. The TEM micrograph of P(I-IS-S)-OH in Figure 2b shows a different projection from the same specimen that closely resembles the [125] projection for double-gyroid morphology.⁵

Dynamic mechanical analysis (DMA) experiments were performed to determine the T_{ODT} 's of the tapered and non-tapered block copolymers. Figure 3 shows the isochronal storage modulus (G') of all three gyroid-forming materials as a function of temperature (plotted as $\log G'$ vs. temperature). The sudden drop in G' (marked by arrows) is indicative of the T_{ODT} and correspond to the T_{ODT} 's of P(I-IS-S)-OH, P(I-SI-S)-OH and P(I-S)-OH, which are 195 °C, 174 °C, and 282 °C, respectively.³⁴ Analysis of the T_{ODT} data for the tapered and non-tapered block copolymers clearly suggests that the introduction of the tapering between blocks (30 vol %) significantly influenced segmental interactions at the interface in the self-assembled network structures, and this influence was manifested by measurable decreases in

order-disorder transition temperatures of the tapered materials when compared to a similar non-tapered specimen.

IV. Discussion

Our approach for creating tapered regions using automated syringe pumps allows us to maintain precise control over the desired length and composition of the tapered segments. In addition to using ^1H NMR and GPC to monitor our tapers,¹⁸ progress of tapering was visually confirmed by monitoring the color change of the reaction mixture throughout the copolymerization. For example, the normal tapering polymerization (from pure isoprene segments to pure styrene segments) exhibited a gradual color change from colorless to orange as the tapering was achieved. On the other hand, during the inverse tapering polymerization (from pure styrene segments to pure isoprene segments), the solution color changed gradually from orange to colorless as tapering proceeded.¹⁸

Both SAXS and TEM results are consistent with double-gyroid assignments for the normal-tapered, inverse-tapered, and non-tapered block copolymers. For the non-tapered materials Förster et al.⁵ and Hajduk et al.⁶ prepared poly(isoprene-*b*-styrene) diblock copolymers with comparable composition and molecular weight (M_n) to our tapered copolymers and showed their non-tapered morphology to be double-gyroid. Thus, it could be inferred that modification of the interface by introducing a tapered region (30 vol % of the overall copolymer) did not significantly influence the overall morphological behavior. It is also worth noting that the terminal hydroxyl groups on the tapered and non-tapered block copolymers did not significantly affect the phase behavior near the network phase window most likely due to the small volume fraction of hydroxyl groups in the overall polymer.^{35,36} We suspect that the $-\text{OH}$ groups may affect T_{ODT} relative to non-hydroxyl terminated materials; however, given that all of our materials have the same terminus, we do not expect these end-groups to influence our reported trends in thermal behavior (see below).

According to mean-field theories, the order-disorder transition temperature can be estimated with knowledge of $\chi_{AB}N$ and f_A . The Flory-Huggins interaction parameter (χ_{AB}) between *A* and *B* segments becomes smaller when the penalty for mixing is reduced, which subsequently decreases the order-disorder transition temperature. In our case, the non-tapered polymer showed a T_{ODT} of 282 °C, while the inverse-tapered material of nearly identical molecular weight and composition exhibited a T_{ODT} of 174 °C. Thus, it is clear that incorporating a relatively modest inverse taper (30 vol % of the overall polymer chain) can significantly increase block compatibility leading to a self-assembled double-gyroid network with similar shear modulus but a substantially reduced melt processing temperature (108 °C lower for the inverse-tapered material). Additionally, though the molecular weight for the normal-tapered material is somewhat lower than that of the comparable non-tapered copolymer, we can still conclude that normal tapering significantly influences block compatibility as expressed by a drop in T_{ODT} . In this case, we find that the difference in T_{ODT} between P(I-S)-OH and P(I-IS-S)-OH is 87 °C. A rough estimate of the effect of molecular weight on T_{ODT} allows us to postulate that ~25 °C of the difference between the normal and non-tapered materials can be ascribed to the change in molecular weight;¹⁸ thus, the remainder of the difference (~62 °C) is likely related to the incorporation of the taper. The greater drop in T_{ODT} from inverse-tapered P(I-SI-S)-OH to normal-tapered P(I-IS-S)-OH is attributable to long sequences of opposite chemistry (as opposed to the same chemistry in case of normal-tapered materials) next to pure isoprene and styrene blocks, which leads to greater interfacial mixing.¹⁸ These results indicate that we retain the ability to design materials that self-assemble into complex structures in narrow regions of the phase diagram, while exhibiting substantial and systematic control over thermodynamic interactions between blocks as measured by order-disorder transition temperatures.

Although the present investigation does not calculate the interfacial thickness in tapered and non-tapered block copolymers, it will be valuable to make a correlation between the polymer chain composition profile and the self-assembled material's interfacial thickness, interfacial composition profile, and the order-disorder transition temperature. These studies are currently in progress.

V. Conclusions

In this work we report the successful synthesis of tapered block copolymers that self-assemble into double-gyroid network structures with well-defined interfacial modifications between blocks, and we demonstrate the effect of normal and inverse tapering on the thermal transitions in our self-assembled materials. Synchrotron small angle X-ray scattering and transmission electron microscopy analyses show that the incorporation of tapered regions up to 30% of the total copolymer volume does not extinguish the double-gyroid network. Subsequent thermal studies, through dynamic mechanical analysis, indicate that the normal and inverse tapered regions allow us to manipulate the order-disorder transition temperatures of our materials while retaining the desired network morphologies. We believe that these studies provide insight into methods for generating complex self-assembled structures that occur in relatively narrow regions of the phase diagram, while gaining greater systematic control over soft materials processability.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This manuscript was prepared under cooperative agreement 70NANB7H6178 from NIST, U.S. Department of Commerce. The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of NIST or the U.S. Department of Commerce. We gratefully acknowledge NSF-NER (CBET-0707507), NSF-CAREER (DMR-0645586), AFOSR-PECASE (FA9550-09-1-0706), and ACS PRF Grant (PRF-46864-67) for financial support. R. Roy acknowledges funding from NIH NCRR COBRE (NIH-2P20RR017716-06A1), and M. S. Tureau acknowledges an Air Products fellowship. We thank the W. M. Keck Electron Microscopy Facility for use of their TEM facilities. Portions of this work also were performed at the DuPont-Northwestern-Dow Collaborative Access Team (DND-CAT) located at Sector 5 of the Advanced Photon Source (APS). DND-CAT is supported by E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., The Dow Chemical Company, and the State of Illinois. Use of the APS was supported by the U. S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357. Use of the National Synchrotron Light Source, Brookhaven National Laboratory, was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, under Contract No. DE-AC02-98CH10886.

References

1. Kim HC, Park SM, Hinsberg WD. Chem Rev. 2010; 110:146–177. [PubMed: 19950962]
2. Bates FS, Schulz MF, Khandpur AK, Förster S, Rosedale JH, Almdal K, Mortensen K. Faraday Discuss. 1994; 98:7–18.
3. Bates FS, Fredrickson GH. Annu Rev Phys Chem. 1990; 41:525–557. [PubMed: 20462355]
4. Khandpur AK, Förster S, Bates FS, Hamley IW, Ryan AJ, Bras W, Almdal K, Mortensen K. Macromolecules. 1995; 28:8796–8806.
5. Förster S, Khandpur AK, Zhao J, Bates FS, Hamley IW, Ryan AJ, Bras W. Macromolecules. 1994; 27:6922–6935.
6. Hajduk DA, Harper PE, Gruner SM, Honeker CC, Kim G, Thomas EL, Fetters LJ. Macromolecules. 1994; 27:4063–4075.
7. Epps TH, Cochran EW, Bailey TS, Waletzko RS, Hardy CM, Bates FS. Macromolecules. 2004; 37:8325–8341.
8. Meuler AJ, Hillmyer MA, Bates FS. Macromolecules. 2009; 42:7221–7250.

9. Potschke P, Paul DR. *J Macromol Sci, Polym Rev*. 2003; C43:87–141.
10. Crossland EJW, Kamperman M, Nedelcu M, Ducati C, Wiesner U, Smilgies DM, Toombes GES, Hillmyer MA, Ludwigs S, Steiner U, Snaith HJ. *Nano Lett*. 2009; 9:2807–2812. [PubMed: 19007289]
11. Darling SB. *Energy & Environmental Science*. 2009; 2(12):1266–1273.
12. Hasegawa H, Hashimoto T, Hyde ST. *Polymer*. 1996; 37:3825–3833.
13. Zielinski JM, Spontak RJ. *Macromolecules*. 1992; 25(22):5957–5964.
14. Tsukahara Y, Nakamura N, Hashimoto T, Kawai H. *Polym J*. 1980; 12:455–466.
15. Hashimoto T, Tsukahara Y, Kawai H. *Polym J*. 1983; 15:699–711.
16. Pakula T, Matyjaszewski K. *Macromol Theory Simul*. 1996; 5:987–1006.
17. Hodrokoukes P, Floudas G, Pispas S, Hadjichristidis N. *Macromolecules*. 2001; 34:650–657.
18. Singh N, Tureau MS, Epps TH. *Soft Matter*. 2009; 5:4757–4762.
19. Mok MM, Kim J, Wong CLH, Marrou SR, Woo DJ, Dettmer CM, Nguyen ST, Ellison CJ, Shull KR, Torkelson JM. *Macromolecules*. 2009; 42:7863–7876.
20. Mok MM, Kim J, Torkelson JM. *J Polym Sci Part B: Polym Phys*. 2008; 46:48–58.
21. Jiang R, Jin Q, Li B, Ding D, Wickham RA, Shi AC. *Macromolecules*. 2008; 41:5457–5465.
22. Shull KR. *Macromolecules*. 2002; 35:8631–8639.
23. Hodrokoukes P, Pispas S, Hadjichristidis N. *Macromolecules*. 2002; 35:834–840.
24. Samseth J, Spontak RJ, Smith SD, Ashraf A, Mortensen K. *Journal De Physique IV*. 1993; 3:59–62.
25. Mahajan S, Renker S, Simon PFW, Gutmann JS, Jain A, Gruner SM, Fetters LJ, Coates GW, Wiesner U. *Macromol Chem Phys*. 2003; 204:1047–1055.
26. Acar MH, Matyjaszewski K. *Macromol Chem Phys*. 1999; 200:1094–1100.
27. Epps TH, Chatterjee J, Bates FS. *Macromolecules*. 2005; 38:8775–8784.
28. Fetters LJ, Lohse DJ, Richter D, Witten TA, Zirkel A. *Macromolecules*. 1994; 27:4639–4647.
29. Tureau MS, Rong L, Hsiao B, Epps TH III. *Macromolecules*. 2010; 43(21):9039–9048.
30. Luzzati V, Spegt PA. *Nature*. 1967; 215:701–704.
31. Vigild ME, Almdal K, Mortensen K. *Macromolecules*. 1998; 31:5702–5716.
32. Shefelbine TA, Vigild ME, Matsen MW, Hajduk DA, Hillmyer MA, Cussler EL, Bates FS. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1999; 121:8457–8465.
33. Bailey TS, Pham HD, Bates FS. *Macromolecules*. 2001; 34:6994–7008.
34. We expect that the order-disorder transition temperature of the non-tapered material will be slightly affected by the PI homopolymer content; however, this will not significantly influence our results.
35. Lee KM, Han CD. *Macromolecules*. 2002; 35:760–769.
36. Kim JK, Kim MI, Kim HJ, Lee DH. *Macromolecules*. 2007; 40:7590–7593.

Figure 1. Synchrotron small angle X-ray scattering (SAXS) data at 30 °C for (a) P(I-IS-S)-OH, (b) P(I-SI-S)-OH, and (c) P(I-S)-OH. In all SAXS profiles, peaks are indexed according to the *Ia3d* space group, characteristic of the double-gyroid morphology; solid (clearly observed) and dashed (expected) lines indicate the peak locations.

Figure 2.

TEM micrographs for P(I-IS-S)-OH (**a** and **b**), P(I-SI-S)-OH (**c**) and P(I-S)-OH (**d**) representative of the double-gyroid network morphology. The TEM images in (**a**, **c**, and **d**) depict the “wagon-wheel pattern” previously reported in the literature,^{7, 32, 33} characteristic of the [111] double-gyroid projection. The TEM image for P(I-IS-S)-OH (**b**) obtained from the same specimen, displays an orientation that closely resembles the [125] double-gyroid projection. Scale bars represent 100 nm.

Figure 3.

Isochronal storage modulus (G') vs. temperature for P(I-IS-S)-OH (◆), P(I-SI-S)-OH (▲) and P(I-S)-OH (●). A frequency of 0.5 Hz and a heating rate of 1 °C/min were used for all samples. The order-disorder temperatures (T_{ODT} 's) are indicated by arrows. We note that the P(I-S)-OH sample showed an order-order transition (OOT), indicated by the ▼ prior to T_{ODT} . We suspect that this OOT delineates a transition between the gyroid and cylindrical phases; however, the details are not explored in this work.

Table 1

Molecular characteristics of the block copolymers

Polymer	Tapered (vol%)	M_n^a (g/mol)	Volume fraction (f_I)	PDI (M_w/M_n) ^a
P(I-IS-S)-OH	30	33,500	0.35	1.08
P(I-SI-S)-OH	30	38,900	0.33	1.10
P(I-S)-OH ^b	0	38,700	0.36	1.09

^a Number average molecular weights (M_n) and polydispersity indexes (PDI) were determined using gel permeation chromatography with poly(styrene) standards.

^b The P(I-S)-OH block copolymer contained $1.5\% \pm 1\%$ of PI homopolymer; however, we do not expect this small amount of homopolymer to significantly affect the morphology at constant composition (i.e. if the homopolymer fraction was replaced by block copolymer at constant composition).^{27, 29}