The glass transition

Simulation settings

Confinement effects

Conclusions

Facoltà di Fisica, scuola di dottorato A.A. 2014-2015



Università di Pisa

Confinement effect on the dynamics of polymeric liquids above the glass transition

Candidate Andrea Giuntoli Supervisor Prof. Dino Leporini

Glass transition

- Simulation of supercooled liquids
 - Polymer model
 - MD algorithms
 - Dynamical properties
- Confinement
 - Thin films preparation
 - Confinement effects
- Conclusion and future goals



- Glass transition
- Simulation of supercooled liquids
 - Polymer model
 - MD algorithms
 - Dynamical properties
- 3 Confinement
 - Thin films preparation
 - Confinement effects
- Conclusion and future goals



- Glass transition
- Simulation of supercooled liquids
 - Polymer model
 - MD algorithms
 - Dynamical properties
- Onfinement
 - Thin films preparation
 - Confinement effects
- Onclusion and future goals



- Glass transition
- Simulation of supercooled liquids
 - Polymer model
 - MD algorithms
 - Dynamical properties
- Onfinement
 - Thin films preparation
 - Confinement effects
- Onclusion and future goals



Conclusions

Supercooled liquids cooling below the melting point

Supercooled liquid: metastable state below the melting temperature T_{melt}

Slowing down of the dynamics

Structural relaxation time longer then experimental time-scales

 $au_lpha > 100\,s
ightarrow$ a glass is formed





Conclusions

Supercooled liquids cooling below the melting point

- Supercooled liquid: metastable state below the melting temperature T_{melt}
- Slowing down of the dynamics
- Structural relaxation time longer then experimental time-scales

$$au_lpha > 100 \, s
ightarrow$$
 a glass is formed





Conclusions

Supercooled liquids cooling below the melting point

- Supercooled liquid: metastable state below the melting temperature T_{melt}
- Slowing down of the dynamics
- Structural relaxation time longer then experimental time-scales

$$au_lpha > 100 \, s
ightarrow$$
 a glass is formed

Solid

 $T = T_{rr}$

Liquid

Solid



Conclusions

Supercooled liquids cooling below the melting point

- Supercooled liquid: metastable state below the melting temperature T_{melt}
- Slowing down of the dynamics
- Structural relaxation time longer then experimental time-scales

$$au_lpha > 100 \, s
ightarrow$$
 a glass is formed

Solid

 $T = T_{M}$

Liquid

Solid



Conclusions

Molecular Dynamics Model resolution and classical MD algorithms

Polymers: good glass formers

No internal structure: universal properties of the liquid

- Number of atoms, chain length
- Interaction potentials
- Temperature, pressure, density



Conclusions

Molecular Dynamics Model resolution and classical MD algorithms

Polymers: good glass formers No internal structure: universal properties of the liquid

- Number of atoms, chain length
- Interaction potentials
- Temperature, pressure, density



Conclusions

Molecular Dynamics Model resolution and classical MD algorithms

Polymers: good glass formers No internal structure: universal properties of the liquid



- Number of atoms, chain length
- Interaction potentials
- Temperature, pressure, density



Conclusions

Molecular Dynamics Model resolution and classical MD algorithms

Polymers: good glass formers No internal structure: universal properties of the liquid



- Number of atoms, chain length
- Interaction potentials
- Temperature, pressure, density



Conclusions

Molecular Dynamics Model interactions

Harmonic bond interaction

$$U_{bond}\left(l
ight)=k_{b}\left(l-l_{b}
ight)^{2}$$

Lennard-Jones interaction between non-bonded monomers

$$U_{LJ}(r) = 4\varepsilon \left[\left(\frac{\sigma}{r}\right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r}\right)^{6} \right] - C$$



Molecular Dynamics

$$U_{LJ}(r) = 4\varepsilon \left[\left(\frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^{6} \right] + C \qquad r \leq r_c$$

Physical quantity	Unit	Value for <i>Ar</i>
length	σ	$3.4 \cdot 10^{-10} m$
energy	ε	$1.65 \cdot 10^{-21} J$
mass	т	$6.69 \cdot 10^{-26} \; Kg$
time	$\left(\sigma^2 m/\varepsilon\right)^{1/2}$	$2.17 \cdot 10^{-12} s$
velocity	(ε/m)	$1.57 \cdot 10^2 \ m/s$
force	ε/σ	$4.85 \cdot 10^{-12} N$
pressure	$arepsilon/\sigma^3$	$4.20 \cdot 10^7 \ N/m^2$
temperature	ε/k_B	120 <i>K</i>

Conclusions

Markers of the dynamics cage rattling



Diffusion



Mean Squared Displacement:

$$\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} (r_i(t) - r_i(0))^2$$

Conclusions

Markers of the dynamics





Mean Squared Displacement:

$$\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} (r_i(t) - r_i(0))^2$$

Conclusions

Markers of the dynamics





Mean Squared Displacement:

$$\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} (r_i(t) - r_i(0))^2$$

Conclusions

Markers of the dynamics





Mean Squared Displacement:

$$\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} (r_i(t) - r_i(0))^2$$

Conclusions

Markers of the dynamics





Mean Squared Displacement:

$$\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} (r_i(t) - r_i(0))^2$$

Conclusions

Markers of the dynamics





Mean Squared Displacement:

$$\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} (r_i(t) - r_i(0))^2$$

Conclusions

Markers of the dynamics





Mean Squared Displacement:

$$\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} (r_i(t) - r_i(0))^2$$

Conclusions

Markers of the dynamics structural relaxation





Intermediate Scattering Function

$$F_s(q,t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_i(t) - \mathbf{r}_i(0))}$$

 au_lpha structural relaxation time

Conclusions

A universal master curve

From MD simulations...



$$\log \tau_{\alpha} = \alpha + \beta \frac{1}{\langle u^2 \rangle} + \gamma \frac{1}{\langle u^2 \rangle^2}$$

Larini et. al. Nat. Phys. (2008) Puosi et. al. J. Phys. Chem. B (2011) Puosi et. al. J. Chem. Phys. (2013)

. to experiments

$$\text{og } \tau_{\alpha} = \alpha + \tilde{\beta} \left(\frac{\langle u_g^2 \rangle}{\langle u^2 \rangle} \right) + \tilde{\gamma} \left(\frac{\langle u_g^2 \rangle}{\langle u^2 \rangle} \right)^2$$

Conclusions

A universal master curve

From MD simulations...





Larini et. al. Nat. Phys. (2008) Puosi et. al. J. Phys. Chem. B (2011) Puosi et. al. J. Chem. Phys. (2013)

... to experiments



$$\log \tau_{\alpha} = \alpha + \tilde{\beta} \left(\frac{\langle u_{g}^{2} \rangle}{\langle u^{2} \rangle} \right) + \tilde{\gamma} \left(\frac{\langle u_{g}^{2} \rangle}{\langle u^{2} \rangle} \right)^{2}$$

Thin films Simulation of the substrate

- Confinement: new length scales and border effects \rightarrow new physics to explore!
- Thin films $(1 \sim 10 \text{ nm})$: many experimental results \rightarrow time to simulate!



Conclusions

Thin films Simulation of the substrate

- Confinement: new length scales and border effects \rightarrow new physics to explore!
- Thin films $(1 \sim 10 \text{ nm})$: many experimental results \rightarrow time to simulate!

Simulation must address:

- boundary conditions
- Iilm-substrate interactions
 - Rough substrate
 - Smooth substrate



Thin films Simulation of the substrate

- Confinement: new length scales and border effects \rightarrow new physics to explore!
- Thin films $(1 \sim 10 \text{ nm})$: many experimental results \rightarrow time to simulate!

Simulation must address:

- boundary conditions
- e film-substrate interactions
 - Rough substrate
 - Smooth substrate



Confinement effects

Conclusions

Thin films density structure





- Layered structure near the wall
- Bulk-like region in the middle
- Sharp density drop at the free surface

Confinement effects

Conclusions

Thin films density structure

Simulation of films of different thickness

 $P_z = 0$ due to mechanical equilibrium

Films with less atoms N are thinner and thinner and thinner...



- Layered structure near the wall
- Ø Bulk-like region in the middle
- Sharp density drop at the free surface

Confinement effects

Conclusions

Thin films density structure

Simulation of films of different thickness

 $P_z = 0$ due to mechanical equilibrium

Films with less atoms N are thinner and thinner

and thinner..



- Layered structure near the wall
- Ø Bulk-like region in the middle
- Sharp density drop at the free surface

Confinement effects

Conclusions

Thin films density structure

Simulation of films of different thickness

 $P_z = 0$ due to mechanical equilibrium

Films with less atoms N are thinner and thinner and thinner...



- Layered structure near the wall
- Ø Bulk-like region in the middle
- Sharp density drop at the free surface

Confinement effects

Conclusions

Thin films density structure

Simulation of films of different thickness

 $P_z = 0$ due to mechanical equilibrium

Films with less atoms N are thinner and thinner and thinner...



- Layered structure near the wall
- Ø Bulk-like region in the middle
- Sharp density drop at the free surface

Confinement effects

Conclusions

Thin films density structure

Simulation of films of different thickness

 $P_z = 0$ due to mechanical equilibrium

Films with less atoms N are thinner and thinner and thinner...



- Layered structure near the wall
- Ø Bulk-like region in the middle
- Sharp density drop at the free surface

Thin films density structure

- Simulation of films of different thickness
- $P_z = 0$ due to mechanical equilibrium
- Films with less atoms N are thinner and thinner and thinner...
- Non-homogeneous density structure: wall and free surface enhanced dynamics



- Layered structure near the wall
- Ø Bulk-like region in the middle
- Sharp density drop at the free surface

Confinement effects

Conclusions

Film dynamics MSD and ISF



Same thermodynamic conditions, different film thickness Enhanced dynamics at both time scales



Same thermodynamic conditions, different film thickness Enhanced dynamics at both time scales



Same thermodynamic conditions, different film thickness Enhanced dynamics at both time scales



Same thermodynamic conditions, different film thickness Enhanced dynamics at both time scales



Same thermodynamic conditions, different film thickness Enhanced dynamics at both time scales



Same thermodynamic conditions, different film thickness Enhanced dynamics at both time scales



Same thermodynamic conditions, different film thickness Enhanced dynamics at both time scales

Conclusions

Arrhenius plots changing the temperature

- Temperature decrease \rightarrow the system slows down
- Arrhenius plots show the increase of the time scales

Due to confinement, each curve is shifted

 $\langle u^2
angle$ is more sensitive than au_lpha to film thickness



Conclusions

Arrhenius plots changing the temperature

- Temperature decrease \rightarrow the system slows down
- Arrhenius plots show the increase of the time scales

Due to confinement, each curve is shifted

 $\langle u^2
angle$ is more sensitive than au_lpha to film thickness



Conclusions

- Temperature decrease \rightarrow the system slows down
- Arrhenius plots show the increase of the time scales

- Due to confinement, each curve is shifted
- $\langle u^2 \rangle$ is more sensitive than τ_α to film thickness



Conclusions

- Temperature decrease \rightarrow the system slows down
- Arrhenius plots show the increase of the time scales

- Due to confinement, each curve is shifted
- $\langle u^2 \rangle$ is more sensitive than τ_α to film thickness



Conclusions

- Temperature decrease \rightarrow the system slows down
- Arrhenius plots show the increase of the time scales

- Due to confinement, each curve is shifted
- $\langle u^2 \rangle$ is more sensitive than τ_α to film thickness



Conclusions

- Temperature decrease \rightarrow the system slows down
- Arrhenius plots show the increase of the time scales

- Due to confinement, each curve is shifted
- $\langle u^2 \rangle$ is more sensitive than τ_α to film thickness



Conclusions

- Temperature decrease \rightarrow the system slows down
- Arrhenius plots show the increase of the time scales

- Due to confinement, each curve is shifted
- $\langle u^2 \rangle$ is more sensitive than τ_α to film thickness



Conclusions

- Temperature decrease \rightarrow the system slows down
- Arrhenius plots show the increase of the time scales

- Due to confinement, each curve is shifted
- $\langle u^2 \rangle$ is more sensitive than τ_α to film thickness



Conclusions

Confinement effect on the scaling scaling shift

Back to the scaling

- Scaling slightly modified, with a drift from the bulk
- Upward drift $\rightarrow \langle u^2 \rangle$ related to spatial scales bigger than the cage
- The drift starts earlier for thinner films
- Apparent saturation at low $T \rightarrow 2D$ limit?



Conclusions

Confinement effect on the scaling scaling shift

Back to the scaling

Scaling slightly modified, with a drift from the bulk

Upward drift $\rightarrow \langle u^2 \rangle$ related to spatial scales bigger than the cage

The drift starts earlier for thinner films

Apparent saturation at low $T \rightarrow 2D$ limit?



Conclusions

Confinement effect on the scaling $_{\mbox{scaling shift}}$

- Back to the scaling
- Scaling slightly modified, with a drift from the bulk
- Upward drift $\rightarrow \langle u^2 \rangle$ related to spatial scales bigger than the cage
- The drift starts earlier for thinner films
- Apparent saturation at low $T \rightarrow 2D$ limit?



Conclusions

Confinement effect on the scaling shift

- Back to the scaling
- Scaling slightly modified, with a drift from the bulk
- Upward drift $\rightarrow \langle u^2 \rangle$ related to spatial scales bigger than the cage
- The drift starts earlier for thinner films

Apparent saturation at low 7 ightarrow 2D limit?



Conclusions

Confinement effect on the scaling $_{\mbox{scaling shift}}$

- Back to the scaling
- Scaling slightly modified, with a drift from the bulk
- Upward drift $\rightarrow \langle u^2 \rangle$ related to spatial scales bigger than the cage
- The drift starts earlier for thinner films
- Apparent saturation at low $T \rightarrow 2D$ limit?



Conclusions

Confinement effect on the scaling $_{\mbox{scaling shift}}$

- Back to the scaling
- Scaling slightly modified, with a drift from the bulk
- Upward drift $\rightarrow \langle u^2 \rangle$ related to spatial scales bigger than the cage
- The drift starts earlier for thinner films
- Apparent saturation at low $T \rightarrow 2D$ limit?



Conclusions

Confinement effect on the scaling scaling shift

- Back to the scaling
- Scaling slightly modified, with a drift from the bulk
- Upward drift $\rightarrow \langle u^2 \rangle$ related to spatial scales bigger than the cage
- The drift starts earlier for thinner films
- Apparent saturation at low $T \rightarrow 2D$ limit?



Conclusions

Confinement effect on the scaling $_{\mbox{scaling shift}}$

- Back to the scaling
- Scaling slightly modified, with a drift from the bulk
- Upward drift $\rightarrow \langle u^2 \rangle$ related to spatial scales bigger than the cage
- The drift starts earlier for thinner films
- Apparent saturation at low $T \rightarrow 2D$ limit?



Main results

- New code to simulate confined liquids and films
- Small thickness effect on the universal scaling
- non-locality of fast dynamics (1ps)

What now

- Elastic scaling: confinement effects
- 2D simulations and interface contributions

Additional completed work

- Spontaneous crystallization of polymer melts
- Elastic properties under deformations

Thanks for your attention, any question is welcomed!

'So Long, and Thanks for All the Fish"

Main results

- New code to simulate confined liquids and films
- Small thickness effect on the universal scaling
- non-locality of fast dynamics (1ps)

What now

- Elastic scaling: confinement effects
- 2D simulations and interface contributions

Additional completed work

- Spontaneous crystallization of polymer melts
- Elastic properties under deformations

Thanks for your attention, any question is welcomed!

"So Long, and Thanks for All the Fish"

Main results

- New code to simulate confined liquids and films
- Small thickness effect on the universal scaling
- non-locality of fast dynamics (1ps)

What now

- Elastic scaling: confinement effects
- 2D simulations and interface contributions

Additional completed work

- Spontaneous crystallization of polymer melts
- Elastic properties under deformations

Thanks for your attention, any question is welcomed!

'So Long, and Thanks for All the Fish"

Main results

- New code to simulate confined liquids and films
- Small thickness effect on the universal scaling
- non-locality of fast dynamics (1ps)

What now

- Elastic scaling: confinement effects
- 2D simulations and interface contributions

Additional completed work

- Spontaneous crystallization of polymer melts
- Elastic properties under deformations

Thanks for your attention, any question is welcomed!

"So Long, and Thanks for All the Fish"

Additional equations

Hall-Walynes model

$$au_{lpha} = au_0 \exp(\Delta E/k_b T)$$
 $\Delta E = a^2/\langle u^2 \rangle$

quadratic term: $a^2
ightarrow P(a^2)$ with gaussian distribution

$$a^2/\langle u^2
angle
ightarrow a^2/\langle u^2
angle + \sigma_{a^2}/\langle u^2
angle^2$$

og
$$au_{lpha} = au_0 + rac{a^2}{\langle u^2
angle} + rac{\sigma_{a^2}^2}{\langle u^2
angle^2}$$

Lennard-Jones interaction between monomers and supporting smooth wall

$$U_{LJ}(r) = \varepsilon \left[\left(\frac{\sigma}{r}\right)^9 - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r}\right)^3 \right] - C$$

Additional equations

Hall-Walynes model

$$au_{lpha} = au_{0} \exp(\Delta E/k_{b}T) \qquad \Delta E = a^{2}/\langle u^{2}
angle$$

quadratic term: $a^2
ightarrow P(a^2)$ with gaussian distribution

$$a^2/\langle u^2
angle
ightarrow a^2/\langle u^2
angle + \sigma_{a^2}/\langle u^2
angle^2$$

og
$$au_{lpha} = au_0 + rac{a^2}{\langle u^2
angle} + rac{\sigma_{a^2}^2}{\langle u^2
angle^2}$$

Lennard-Jones interaction between monomers and supporting smooth wall

$$U_{LJ}(r) = \varepsilon \left[\left(\frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^9 - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^3 \right] - C$$

Simulation error on measures

The error on the measures is given by the statistical variance obtained averaging over many simulation runs



Elastic scaling

A scaling is also found with the Elastic modulus G_p measure from the stress tensor decorrelation



Still to study in films