entry	Target degree of	M _n	M _n	M _n	
no.	polymerization	(theory)	(¹ H NMR)	(GPC)	$M_w\!/M_n$
1	BrB-HEMA ₃₀	4100	4264	12792	1.13
2	HEMA8-AMBEP-HEMA8	2700	3689	9881	1.13
3	HEMA ₁₂ -AMBEP-HEMA ₁₂	3700	4447	11420	1.15
4	HEMA ₁₅ -AMBEP-HEMA ₁₅	4500	5267	16237	1.17
5	HEMA ₃₀ -AMBEP-HEMA ₃₀	8400	9519	19505	1.15

Table 2.1. Summary of synthesis parameters, molecular weight data, and cloud points for HEMA homopolymers. (prepared via ATRP in methanol at 25 °C)

Table 2.2. Summary of molecular weight date and cloud points for HEMA and NVP diblock copolymers. (prepared via conventional radical polymerization at 70 $^{\circ}$ C)

entry	copolymer	M_n	$\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{n}}$	M_n	
no.	composition	(theory)	(¹ H NMR)	(GPC)	$M_{\rm w}\!/M_n$
1	HEMA ₃₄ -b-NVP ₃₀	8000	8234	16051	1.25
2	HEMA ₃₄ -b-NVP ₄₀	9100	9233	26540	1.26
3	HEMA ₃₄ -b-NVP ₅₀	10200	10454	27894	1.25
4	HEMA ₃₄ -b-NVP ₇₀	12400	12452	31568	1.27
5	HEMA ₃₄ -b-NVP ₈₀	13500	14006	35432	1.32

Table 2.3. Carbonyl group curve-fitting results of the (a) blends and (b) diblock copolymers.

Samples(wt%)	Free C=0		H-bonded C=O		fb ^a (%)
	$\nu_{\rm f}(\rm cm^{-1})$	$A_{f}(\%)$	$\nu_{\rm b}(\rm cm^{-1})$	$A_b(\%)$	_
(a)PHEMA/PVP					
90 /10	1686.7	6.34	1665.2	93.66	91.9
70 /30	1685.3	18.06	1666.8	81.94	77.7
50 /50	1687.9	24.56	1665.2	75.44	70.2
30 /70	1686.5	29.73	1671.4	70.27.	64.5
10 /90	1683.1	32.87	1669.8	67.13.	61.1
(b) PHEMA-b-PVP					
56 /44	1693.5	3.18	1672.2	96.82	95.9
50 /50	1689.3	7.47	1674.3	92.53	90.5
44 /56	1691.3	11.58	1678.9	88.42	85.4
37 /63	1689.7	19.18	1673.5	80.82	76.4
33 /67	1685.6	31.94	1670.7	68.06.	62.1

 $\nu_{\rm f}$: wavenumber of free C=O of PVP; $\nu_{\rm b}$: wavenumber of hydrogen bonded carbonyl of PVP; A_f: fress C=O area fraction of PVP; A_b: C=O area fraction of hydrogen bonded PVP. fb^a: fraction of hydrogen bonded PVP=(A_b/1.3)/(A_b/1.3+A_f).

at the magnetization intensities of 60 ppm.						
Samples(wt%)	T ^H (ms)	Domain	Samples(wt%)	$T^{H}_{1\rho}$ (ms)	Domain	
	$I_{1\rho}$ (IIIS)	size (nm)			size (nm)	
(a)PHEMA/PVP			(b)PHEMA-b-PVP			
90 /10	7.63	1.51	56 /44	6.81	1.42	
70/30	7.46	1.49	50 / 50	5.43	1.27	
50 / 50	7.18	1.46	44 /56	4.46	1.15	
30 /70	6.06	1.34	37 /63	3.25	0.98	
10 /90	5.71	1.30	33 /67	3.10	0.96	

Table 2.4. Relaxation times, $T_{1\rho}^{H}$, and domain size for (a) blends and (b) diblock copolymers

Pure PHEMA: $T_{1\rho}^{H} = 5.59$ ms; domain size = 1.29 nm. Pure PVP: $T_{1\rho}^{H} = 8.28$ ms; domain size = 1.57 nm.

(a)



Scheme 2.1. The synthesis of homopolymer and diblock copolymer.





(a) Free carbonyl at 1730 cm^{-1}





(b) Hydrogen-bonded carbonyl at 1710 cm^{-1}

(c) Free PVP carbonyl in pure PVP
 (d) Hydrogen-bonded carbonyl homopolymer at 1680 cm⁻¹
 of PHEMA/PVP at 1665 cm⁻¹
 Scheme 2.2. Schematic representation of hydrogen bonding.



Figure 2.1. The DSC curves of the (a) blends and (b) diblock copolymers with different compositions (weight ratio).

27



Figure 2.2. The T_g vs. composition curves based on (a) the Gordon-Taylor equation, (b) the Kwei equation for blends system, (c) the Kwei equation for diblock copolymers system, (\blacksquare) experimental date of the blends, and (\bigcirc) experimental date of the diblock copolymers system.



Figure 2.3. FTIR spectra at room temperature in the 2700-3900 cm^{-1} region for (a) blends and (b) diblock copolymers with different compositions (weight ratio).



Figure 2.4. FTIR spectra at room temperature in the 1620-1780 cm^{-1} region for (a) blends and (b) diblock copolymers with different compositions (weight ratio).



Figure 2.5. The fraction of hydrogen bonded carbonyl vs. PHEMA content for (a) blends (\blacksquare) and (b) diblock copolymers (\circ) from FTIR spectra.



Figure 2.6. ¹³*C CP/MAS NMR for (a) blends and (b) diblock copolymers with different compositions (weight ratio).*



Figure 2.7. Logarithmic plots of the intensities of 60 ppm vs. delay time for (a) blends and (b) diblock copolymers with different compositions (weight ratio).

References

- [1] *Hydrogel in Medicine and Pharmacy*; Peppas, N. A., Ed.; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, 1987, Vol. 2.
- [2] Nagaoka, S.; Mori, Y.; Tanzawa, H.; Kikuchi, Y.; Inagaki, F.; Yokota, Y.; Noishiki, Y. *Trans. ASAIO* 1987, 10, 76.
- [3] Yagci, Y.; Duz, A. B.; Onen, A. Polymer 1997, 38, 2861.
- [4] Coca, S.; Paik, H. j.; Matyjaszewski, K. Macromolecules 1997, 30, 6513.
- [5] Gaynor, S. G.; Matyjaszewski, K. Macromolecules 1997, 30, 4241.
- [6] Yoshida, E.; Tanimoto, S. *Macromolecules* 1997, 30, 4018.
- [7] Li, I. Q.; Howell, B. A.; Dineen, M. T.; Kastl, P. E.; Lyons, J. W.; Meunier, D. M.;
 Smith, P. B.; Priddy, D. B. *Macromolecules* 1997, *30*, 5195.
- [8] Destarac, M.; Boutevin, B. Polym. Prepr. (Am. Chem. Soc., Div. Polym. Chem.) 1998, 39
 (2), 568.
- [9] Paik, H. J.; Teodorescu, M.; Xia, J.; Matyjaszewski, K. Macromolecules 1999, 32, 7031.
- [10] Menace, R.; Skorpik, C.; Juchem, M.; Scheidel, W.; Schranz, R. J. J. Cataract Refract. Surg. 1989, 15, 264.
- [11] Seifert, L. M.; Green, R. T. J. Biomed. Mater. Res. 1985, 19, 1043.
- [12] Bennet, H. S.; Wyricks, A. D.; Lee, S. W.; McNeil, H. J. Stain Technol. 1976, 51, 71.
- [13] Canal, T.; Peppas, N. A. J. Biomed. Mater. Res. 1989, 23, 1183.
- [14] Weaver, J. V. M.; Bannister, I.; Robinson, K. L.; Bories-Azeau, X.; Armes, S. P. Macromolecules 2004, 32, 7031
- [15] Moskala, E. J.; Varnell, D. F.; Coleman, M. M. Polymer 1985, 26, 228.
- [16] Kuo, S. W.; Chang, F. C. Macromolecules 2001, 34, 5224.
- [17] Coleman, M. M.; Graf, J. F.; Painter, P. C.; Specific interaction and the miscibility of polymer blends. Lancaster: Technomic Publishing; **1991**.

