

# Heterogeneous diffusion in a reversible gel

Pablo I. Hurtado,<sup>1,2</sup> Ludovic Berthier,<sup>1</sup> and Walter Kob<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Laboratoire des Colloïdes, Verres et Nanomatériaux, UMR 5587, Université Montpellier II and CNRS, Montpellier 34095, France*

<sup>2</sup>*Departamento de Electromagnetismo y Física de la Materia, and Instituto Carlos I de Física Teórica y Computacional, Universidad de Granada, Granada 18071, Spain*

(Dated: December 2, 2024)

We introduce a microscopically realistic model of a physical gel and use computer simulations to study its static and dynamic properties at thermal equilibrium. The phase diagram comprises a sol phase, a coexistence region ending at a critical point, a gelation line determined by geometric percolation, and an equilibrium gel phase unrelated to phase separation. The global structure of the gel is homogeneous, but the stress is supported by a fractal network. The gel dynamics is highly heterogeneous and we propose a theoretical model to quantitatively describe dynamic heterogeneity in gels. We elucidate several differences between the dynamics of gels and that of glass-formers.

PACS numbers: 61.43.Bn, 82.70.Gg, 61.20.Lc

Although gels are commonly used in everyday life they continue to offer fundamental challenges to research. Their physics is determined by a wide window of length-scales, from the molecular size of particles in the solvent to macroscopic structures, and by a similarly broad range of timescales: Gels are “complex” fluids [1]. Of particular interest are physical gels which are typically made of molecules forming a stress-sustaining network, with links that have a finite lifetime, as opposed to chemical gels where junctions are permanent and properties follow directly from geometry. The transient character of the network in physical gels results in a complex interplay between structure and dynamics, leading to non-trivial flow properties. Here we propose a model of a reversible physical gel which is microscopically realistic (we are in fact inspired by one particular material), and specifically design a hybrid Monte Carlo / molecular dynamics numerical approach to successfully bridge the gap between microscopic details and macroscopic observations, while offering deep insight on the nature of physical gels.

Inspired by recent experimental work on gelation, a variety of “minimal” models were recently studied to elucidate the connection between gelation and seemingly related phenomena: Geometric percolation [2], glass transition [3, 4, 5], kinetics of phase separation [6, 7]. Detailed experiments performed with colloidal particles with tunable interactions [8] revealed that a non-trivial interplay between phase separation and kinetic arrest may produce gel-like structures. Associating polymers constitute another well-studied example of reversible gels [1]. In that case, gels can be obtained far from phase separation, producing viscoelastic materials with highly non-linear rheological properties that are not well understood [9, 10]. In many cases, a close similarity between gelation and glass formation is reported [1]. We explain below this similarity but discuss also important differences.

Our model is inspired by a material described in Ref. [10]. It is an oil-in-water microemulsion mixed with

telechelic polymers, i.e. long hydrophilic chains with hydrophobic end caps. A polymer can form a loop around a single oil droplet, or, more interestingly, a bridge between two droplets. Figure 1 is a snapshot taken from our simulations showing droplets connected by polymers. For sufficiently high polymer concentrations, a percolating network can be formed (shown in light gray) and the system becomes a soft solid. However, thermally activated extraction of the hydrophobic heads leads to a slow reorganization of the network structure, and the material eventually flows at long times [11]. This material is interesting because functionality, lifetime of the bonds, volume fraction, strength of the networks can all be adjusted independently, which is not always possible in attractive colloids [8], or in previous model systems, unless specific adhoc assumptions are made [3, 4, 5, 6]. Modeling such a complicated self-assembly is, however, a challenge because of the wide range of scales involved. In our model we neglect the solvent and include polymers and droplets as the elementary objects. Moreover, since the internal dynamics of the polymers is much faster than the gel dynamics, we coarse-grain the polymer description and




FIG. 1: (a) Structure of the physical gel for  $\phi = 0.2$ ,  $r = 2$  and  $N = 10^4$ . A percolating (light gray) cluster of particles connected by telechelic (red) polymers, through which the remaining (dark blue) particles can diffuse, see zoom in (b). Molecular dynamics simulation for the droplets is combined to Monte Carlo relaxation of the polymers.

only retain their effect as links inducing an effective entropic interaction between the two droplets they connect. Coarse-graining is a crucial step for efficient large scale simulations, not used in previous models [12].

We consider an assembly of  $N$  droplets of diameter  $\sigma$  and mass  $m$ , interacting, in the absence of polymers, with a pair potential typical of soft spheres,  $V_1(r_{ij}) = \epsilon_1 (\sigma/r_{ij})^{14}$ , where  $r_{ij}$  is the distance between droplets  $i$  and  $j$ , and  $\epsilon_1$  an energy scale. The potential is cut off and regularized at a finite distance,  $2.5\sigma$ . In addition,  $N_p$  polymers of maximal extension  $\ell$  can form bridges between particles, or loops. Polymer loops have an energy cost  $\epsilon_0$ , but no effect on particle dynamics. On the other hand, bridging polymers induce an entropic attraction between connected particles, which we model using the classic FENE form,  $V_2(r_{ij}) = -\epsilon_2 \ln [1 - (r_{ij} - \sigma)^2/\ell^2]$ , so that polymers act as springs at small elongation, but cannot become longer than  $\ell$ . A configuration is specified by the particles positions and velocities,  $\{\mathbf{r}_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i(t)\}$ , and by the polymer  $N \times N$  connectivity matrix,  $\{C_{ij}\}$ , where  $C_{ij}$  is the number of polymers connecting particles  $i$  and  $j$ . Summarizing, the Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{m}{2} \mathbf{v}_i^2 + C_{ii} \epsilon_0 + \sum_{j>i} [V_1(r_{ij}) + C_{ij} V_2(r_{ij})] \right). \quad (1)$$

Simulation proceeds by solving Newton's equations for the droplets. Lengthscales are given in units of  $\sigma$ , energy in units of  $\epsilon_1$ , and times in units of  $\sqrt{m\sigma^2/\epsilon_1}$ . We use the velocity Verlet algorithm with discretization  $h = 0.005$ . Simultaneously, we use Monte Carlo dynamics to evolve polymers. In an elementary move, a polymer is chosen at random, and one of its end caps is moved to a randomly chosen neighboring droplet. This proposed move is accepted with rate  $\tau_{\text{link}}^{-1} \min[1, \exp(-\Delta V_2/T)]$ , where  $\Delta V_2$  is the potential energy change during the move,  $T$  is the temperature, and  $\tau_{\text{link}}$  controls the timescale for polymer rearrangements. In experiments  $\tau_{\text{link}}$  has an Arrhenius behavior associated to the excitation cost for polymer extraction. We set  $\ell = 3.5\sigma$  [10],  $T = 1$  and  $\epsilon_2 = 50$ . We found little influence of  $\epsilon_2$  on the phase diagram. The relevant control parameters are the particle volume fraction,  $\phi = \pi N/(6V)$ , where  $V$  is the volume, the number of polymer heads per particle,  $r = 2N_p/N$ , and  $\tau_{\text{link}}$ , which has no influence on static properties. We performed simulations for a wide range of parameters,  $r \in [0, 18]$ ,  $\phi \in [0.01, 0.3]$ ,  $\tau_{\text{link}} \in [1, 10^4]$ ,  $N \in [10^3, 10^4]$ .

The phase diagram, as obtained after a systematic exploration of the control parameter space, is shown in Fig. 2. Its topology is in excellent agreement with experiments [10]. In the low- $\phi$ , low- $r$  region, the system resembles a dilute assembly of soft spheres, and has simple-liquid properties: This is the sol phase. Increasing  $r$  increases the effective attraction between droplets, so that phase separation occurs at large  $r$  between a low- $\phi$ , low- $r$  phase and a large- $\phi$ , large- $r$  phase [13].




FIG. 2: Phase diagram for a wide range of volume fraction,  $\phi$ , and number of polymer heads per droplet,  $r$ . Symbols are the investigated state points in the sol ( $\circ$ ), gel ( $\square$ ), and phase separated ( $\diamond$ ) regions, the yellow point is the approximate location of the critical point. Transition lines are sketched.

We detect phase coexistence from direct visualisation and by measuring the static structure factor,  $S(q) = \langle N^{-1} \sum_{jk} \exp[i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k)] \rangle$ , which exhibits the typical  $q^{-4}$  behavior at small  $q$ . We observe both nucleation or spinodal regimes depending on the quench depth. Interestingly we find that the kinetics of the phase separation is extremely slow, and that the obtained patterns are very similar to the ones observed experimentally in short-range attractive colloidal suspensions [8].

For  $\phi > 0.05$ , a broad gel region exists at thermal equilibrium between the sol phase at low- $r$  and phase separation at large- $r$ , see Fig. 2. In the gel phase, a system-spanning cluster of polymer-connected particles emerges, which endows the fluid with viscoelastic properties. A typical snapshot is shown in Fig. 1, where particles belonging to the largest cluster are highlighted. The sol-gel transition coincides with geometric percolation of polymer-connected clusters. Our gels are homogeneous, i.e.  $S(q)$  remains typical of a simple fluid, as seen in experiments [10]. However, the spanning cluster is highly fractal near percolation, and becomes thicker deeper in the gel phase. At percolation we find a distribution of cluster sizes  $P(n) \sim n^{-\gamma}$ , with  $\gamma \approx 2.2$  compatible with random bond percolation, as seen in other systems [2, 3, 5, 6]. Finally the structure of the system becomes nontrivial when approaching the critical point, where  $S(q)$  develops a power law behavior with an exponent close to -1.5 at small  $q$  for  $\phi_c \approx 0.05$ ,  $r_c \approx 3.5$ .

We now show that the gel phase indeed behaves dynamically as a soft viscoelastic fluid. We have investigated dynamics by measuring the self-intermediate scattering function,  $F_s(q, t) = \langle N^{-1} \sum_j \exp[i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_j(t) - \mathbf{r}_j(0))] \rangle$ , and the mean-squared displacement,  $\Delta^2(t) = \langle N^{-1} \sum_j |\mathbf{r}_j(t) - \mathbf{r}_j(0)|^2 \rangle$ . Figure 3-a shows the evolution of  $F_s(q, t)$  from the sol to the gel phase. While relaxation is fast and exponential in the sol phase, a slow secondary relaxation emerges at percolation. The final




FIG. 3: Self-intermediate scattering function for  $q = 0.46$  (a, b) and mean-squared displacement (c, d) for  $N = 10^3$ ,  $\phi = 0.2$ . (a, c) present the dynamics for  $\tau_{\text{link}} = 10^3$  and several values of  $r$  across percolation ( $r_p \approx 1.85$ ). Viscoelasticity continuously emerges at percolation. (b, d) are for  $r = 4$  and different values of  $\tau_{\text{link}}$ , which directly controls the long-time decay of  $F_s(q, t)$ , while  $\Delta^2(t)$  remains essentially unchanged.

decay time varies little in the gel phase, but the height of the plateau at intermediate times evolves dramatically. A similar behavior is found for the coherent scattering function, as in experiments [10]. Physically the plateau reflects the thermal vibrations of an elastic solid on intermediate timescale, while long-time decay reflects the flow of the system: The system is viscoelastic. In Fig. 3-b we show that viscous flow is mostly controlled by  $\tau_{\text{link}}$ , the rate for polymer extraction. Flow in this system occurs when the percolating network slowly rearranges through polymer moves [11]. Therefore, gelation corresponds to the continuous emergence, for increasing polymer concentration, of a plateau in dynamic functions, with an almost constant relaxation timescale, controlled by the polymer dynamics. Gelation is thus qualitatively different from a glass transition where the plateau height remains constant with a dramatic increase of relaxation timescales [14]. Coincidence of gelation and percolation, put forward [2] or dispelled [6] in previous work, happens whenever long-lived bonds make cluster restructuration very slow, but does not occur in systems where the bond lifetime is short at percolation [3].

Surprisingly, the mean-squared displacements shown in Fig. 3-c-d appear as poor indicators of the dynamics. The comparison between Figs. 3-b-d is in fact quite striking. While the final relaxation timescale,  $\tau$ , in  $F_s(q, t)$  scales roughly as  $\tau_{\text{link}}$ , the diffusivity,  $D_s$ , extracted from the long-time behavior of  $\Delta^2(t) \sim 6D_s t$  is almost constant. This is reminiscent of the “decoupling” phenomenon, or “breakdown” of the Stokes-Einstein relation, reported in supercooled fluids [14]. While “fractional” breakdown is reported in liquids,  $D_s \sim \tau^{-\zeta}$ , with  $\zeta$  in the range 0.7-0.9 instead of the normal value  $\zeta = 1$  [15], we find here




FIG. 4: Distribution of particle displacements for  $\phi = 0.2$ ,  $r = 4$ ,  $\tau_{\text{link}} = 100$  and different times for all particles ( $\circ$ ), and its decomposition over particles that are initially free ( $\diamond$ ) or arrested ( $\square$ ). Lines are from our model, Eq. (3).

$\zeta \approx 0$ , quite an extreme case of decoupling. Decoupling in gels was reported in different systems [16].

In supercooled fluids, decoupling phenomena are commonly attributed to the existence of dynamic heterogeneity, that is, the existence of non-trivial spatio-temporal distributions of mobilities. The analogy is confirmed in Fig. 4 where we show distributions of particle displacements,  $G_s(r, t) = \langle N^{-1} \sum_i \delta(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i(t) + \mathbf{r}_i(0)|) \rangle$ . Clearly,  $G_s$  exhibits a bimodal character suggesting coexistence of slow arrested particles and fast diffusing particles. Qualitatively similar distributions were reported in gels [4, 8] and glasses [15, 17]. Here, the snapshot in Fig. 1 suggests an obvious explanation for dynamic heterogeneity. At any given time coexist in the system a system-spanning cluster of particles which behaves as a solid on timescales smaller than  $\tau_{\text{link}}$ , and particles which can more freely diffuse through this arrested structure. We quantitatively confirm this interpretation in Fig. 4 where  $G_s$  is decomposed over two families of particles:  $G_s = c_A G_A + (1 - c_A) G_M$ , where  $A$  ( $M$ ) stands for particles that are arrested (mobile) at time  $t = 0$ ,  $c_A$  being the fraction of particles belonging to the percolating cluster. While the central peak in  $G_s$  is dominated by  $G_A$ , the large “non-Gaussian” tails are dominated by  $G_M$ .

We now propose an analytic model to describe the dynamic heterogeneity of the gel, which incorporates the physical idea of a coexistence of a slow, percolating cluster of connected particles and fast, more freely diffusing particles, with a dynamic exchange between the two families set by polymer moves. Similar physical ideas were qualitatively discussed earlier [8, 16, 18], but were however not exploited within a quantitative model. We define  $g_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t)$ , the probability that a particle travels a distance  $\mathbf{r}$  in a time  $t$  provided it belongs to family  $\alpha$  during the whole time interval  $[0, t]$ ,  $\alpha = A, M$ . Let  $p_\alpha(t)$  be the probability that a particle in family  $\alpha$  switches for the

first time to the complementary family,  $\bar{\alpha}$ , at time  $t$ , and define  $P_\alpha(t) \equiv \int_t^\infty p_\alpha(t')dt'$ . Then we have

$$G_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t) = P_\alpha(t)g_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t) + \int_0^t dt' [\Delta_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t') \circ G_{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}, t - t')], \quad (2)$$

where  $\Delta_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t) \equiv p_\alpha(t)g_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t)$ , and  $\circ$  stands for spatial convolution. The first term describes particles which persist in the same family between 0 and  $t$ , while the second term captures family exchanges. To keep the model simple, we assume the exchange dynamics to be homogeneous, with constant transition rates  $\tau_\alpha^{-1}$ , so  $p_\alpha(t) = \exp(-t/\tau_\alpha)/\tau_\alpha$ . In addition, stationarity implies that  $c_A/\tau_A = (1 - c_A)/\tau_M$ . The model can be solved analytically in the Fourier-Laplace domain:

$$G_\alpha(\mathbf{q}, s) = \frac{\tau_\alpha \Delta_\alpha(\mathbf{q}, s) + \tau_{\bar{\alpha}} \Delta_\alpha(\mathbf{q}, s) \Delta_{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbf{q}, s)}{1 - \Delta_\alpha(\mathbf{q}, s) \Delta_{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbf{q}, s)}. \quad (3)$$

To obtain analytic fits to the data we assume a Gaussian propagator for mobile particles,  $g_M(\mathbf{r}, t) = (4\pi D_M t)^{-3/2} \exp[-r^2/(4D_M t)]$ , where  $D_M$  is an effective diffusivity. We treat the particles attached to the cluster as localized in a bounded region of space of linear size  $a$ , which reflects the thermal vibrations of the elastic solid,  $g_A(\mathbf{r}) = (\pi a^2)^{-3/2} \exp[-r^2/a^2]$ . From Eq. (3) we obtain a simple (but lengthy) analytic expression for the self-intermediate scattering function  $F_s(q, t)$  by inverse Laplace transform. We numerically invert the Fourier transform to get the displacement distributions. The free parameters of the model are  $\{c_A, D_M, a, \tau_A\}$ , but the first three parameters can be fixed by numerical observations. The concentration of particles connected to the percolating cluster,  $c_A \approx 0.94$ , is directly measured. The value  $D_M \approx 0.3$  is evaluated from an intermediate-time fit of  $\Delta_M^2(t)$  restricted to initially mobile particles. The localization length,  $a \approx 1.79$ , is similarly estimated from the plateau in  $\Delta_A^2(t)$  restricted to particles initially belonging to the percolating cluster. To get the excellent fits shown in Fig. 4, we adjust  $\tau_A = 2 \cdot 10^4$ , which coincides well with the timescale at which  $\Delta_A^2(t)$  becomes diffusive, a physically sound definition for the average exchange time.

We were able to fit data for a wide range of parameters and find that our model performs similarly well for other state points. From Eq. (3), it is easy to predict that  $\tau \propto \tau_A$ , while  $D_s = (1 - c_A)D_M + c_A a^2/(4\tau_A)$ , in quantitative agreement with the decoupling data reported in Fig. 3, leading to  $\zeta = 0$  for large  $\tau_{\text{link}}$ . The diffusion constant is in fact entirely dominated by those particles which do not contribute to viscoelasticity, and is therefore a poor indicator of the gel dynamics. These results show that dynamic heterogeneity in gels can be stronger than in supercooled fluids, but its origin is also much simpler: The system structure is heterogeneous, Fig. 1, while no such static structure exists in glasses.

Although motivated by a specific material, the new model for reversible gelation proposed in this work sheds

light on the microscopic aspects of gelation and the heterogeneous dynamics of gel-forming systems. Moreover, our numerical findings motivated a simple yet accurate analytic modeling of dynamic heterogeneity, which is generally applicable to gels. Although slow and heterogeneous dynamics are superficially reminiscent of the physics of supercooled fluids, we discussed several qualitative differences between gels and glasses.

Discussions with G. Porte, C. Ligoure, and S. Mora motivated this work. We thank T. Bickel and S. Kumar for discussions, DYGLAGEMEM, MEyC FIS2005-00791 and Universidad de Granada for financial support.

- 
- [1] R.G. Larson, *The structure and rheology of complex fluids* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999).
  - [2] E. Del Gado, A. Fierro, L. de Arcangelis, and A. Coniglio, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 051103 (2004).
  - [3] F. Sciortino, S. Mossa, E. Zaccarelli, and P. Tartaglia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 055701 (2004).
  - [4] A.M. Puertas, M. Fuchs, and M.E. Cates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 098301 (2002).
  - [5] E. Del Gado and W. Kob, *Europhys. Lett.* **72**, 1032 (2005).
  - [6] E. Zaccarelli, S.V. Buldyrev, E. La Nave, A.J. Moreno, I. Saika-Voivod, F. Sciortino, and P. Tartaglia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 218301 (2005).
  - [7] P. Charbonneau and D.R. Reichman, cond-mat/0604430.
  - [8] P.J. Lu, J.C. Conrad, H.M. Wyss, A.B. Schofield, and D.A. Weitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 028306 (2006); S. Manley, H.M. Wyss, K. Miyazaki, J.C. Conrad, V. Trappe, L.J. Kaufman, D.R. Reichman, and D.A. Weitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 238302 (2005); C.J. Dibble, M. Kogan, and M.J. Solomon, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 041403 (2006); A.I. Campbell, V.J. Anderson, J.S. van Duijneveldt, and P. Bartlett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 208301 (2005).
  - [9] T. Annable, R. Buscall, R. Ettelaie, D. Whittlestone, J. Rheology **37**, 695 (1993); Y. Serero, R. Aznar, G. Porte, J.F. Berret, D. Calvet, A. Collet, M. Viguier, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5584 (1998).
  - [10] E. Michel, M. Filali, R. Aznar, G. Porte, J. Appell, *Langmuir* **16**, 8702 (2000).
  - [11] F. Tanaka and S.F. Edwards, *Macromolecules* **25**, 1516 (1992).
  - [12] P.G. Khalatur, A.R. Khokhlov, J.N. Kovalenko, and D.A. Mologin, *J. Chem. Phys.* **110**, 6039 (1999); S.K. Kumar and J.F. Douglas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 188301 (2001); T. Koga and F. Tanaka, *Eur. Phys. J. E* **17**, 115 (2005).
  - [13] A. Zilman, J. Kieffer, F. Molino, G. Porte, and S.A. Safran, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 015901 (2003).
  - [14] P.G. Debenedetti and F.H. Stillinger, *Nature* **410**, 259 (2001).
  - [15] M.D. Ediger, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **51**, 99 (2000).
  - [16] D. Bedrov, G.D. Smith, and J.F. Douglas, *Europhys. Lett.* **59**, 384 (2002); L. Guo and E. Luijten, *J. Polym. Sci. Part B: Polym. Phys.* **43**, 959 (2005).
  - [17] E.R. Weeks, J.C. Crocker, A.C. Levitt, A. Schofield, and D.A. Weitz, *Science* **287**, 627 (2000).
  - [18] A.M. Puertas, M. Fuchs, and M.E. Cates, *J. Chem. Phys.* **121**, 2813 (2004).