Entropy-induced M icrophase Separation in H ard D iblock C opolymers

Paul P.F.W essels and Bela M.Mulder FOM Institute for Atomic and Molecular Physics, Kruislaan 407, 1098 SJ Am sterdam, The Netherlands (Dated:March 22, 2022)

W hereas entropy can induce phase behavior that is as rich as seen in energetic systems, microphase separation remains a very rare phenom enon in entropic system s. In this paper, we present a density functional approach to study the possibility of entropy-driven m icrophase separation in diblock copolymers. Our model system consists of copolymers composed of freely-pinted slender hard rods. The two types of monom eric seem ents have comparable lengths, but a signi cantly di erent diam eter, the latter di erence providing the driving force for the phase separation. At the same time these systems can also exhibit liquid crystalline phases. We treat this system in the appropriate generalization of the Onsager approximation to chain-like particles. Using a linear stability (bifurcation) analysis, we analytically determ ine the onset of the m icroseparated and the nem atic phases for long chains. We nd that for very long chains the microseparated phase always preem pts the nem atic. In the lim it of in nitely long chains, the correlations within the chain become Gaussian and the approach becomes exact. This allows us to de ne a Gaussian limit in which the theory strongly simplies and the competition between microphase separation and liquid crystal form ation can be studied essentially analytically. Ourm ain results are phase diagram s as a function of the e ective diam eter di erence, the segm ent com position and the length ratio of the segm ents. We also determ ine the amplitude of the positional order as a function of position along the chain at the onset of the microphase separation instability. Finally, we give suggestions as to how this type of entropy-induced m icrophase separation could be observed experim entally.

I. IN TRODUCTION

Microphase separation (MPS) is the phenomenon where an initially hom ogeneous phase develops an inhom ogeneous spatial structure on a m icroscopic scale. U sually such system s consist in part of therm odynam ically incom patible com ponents that left by them selves would tend to (m acroscopically) phase separate. How ever, due to additional constraints of a physical or chem ical nature the spatial separation between the components is prevented from increasing beyond a microscopic length scale. This leads to phases in which the components can dem ix only locally. There are a few archetypical examples of system s showing MPS: (i) Two (usually exible) polym ers species that have an unfavourable mutual interaction energy which are joined together by a chem icalbond. This type of block copolymers [1, 2, 3] shows a wealth of m icrophases. (ii) Side-chain liquid crystalline polymers (LCPs). Here, liquid crystal-form ing groups are linked to polymer backbones through exible spacers. The most prom inent phase of these system s is the smectic, where the LC groups form orientationally ordered layers separated by disordered lam ellae containing the poym eric backbones [4, 5]. (iii) Temary system s consisting of water, oil and an amphiphilic surfactant. These systems can show a variety of m icrostructured phases, with the am phiphilic surfactant stabilizing the oil-water interfaces and thus preventing $\mbox{macrophase separation" [6, 7]. A ll three of the cases above are examples of them otropic system s, i.e. system s in which the phase behavior is governed by tem perature as a controlling variable, re ecting the dom inance of energetic e ects.$

Recently, MPS was observed in an entirely new class of system s. B inary m ixtures of bacteriophage viruses and (sm all) latex spheres with varying size ratios showed a surprisingly rich phase behaviour, including a lam ellar phase [8]. In this phase, the lam ellae are de ned by a \sm ectic" arrangem ent of the rodlike virus particles in layers with the spherical latex particles in between the layers [8, 9]. These results are remarkable for two reasons. First, unlike the previous archetypal cases of MPS, we are dealing with a binary mixture which phase separates on a microscopic scale. There is no \hard" constraint like a chem ical bond that prevents the two species from phase separating on a macroscopic scale, and both species remain in a uid state within the layers. Second, it was argued that the virus particles as well as the latex spheres can be modeled to a good extent to interact as hard bodies. Consequently, the driving force causing this MPS must be of an entropic nature. This is also in stark contrast with MPS in block copolymers, LCP's and am phiphiles where the dependence on tem perature is strong and hence indicates a predom inantly energetic e ect. The possibility of this type of MPS was already explored in computer simulations [10] and found to be qualitatively well described within the so-called second virial approximation [10, 11], the validity of which can only be guaranteed at low densities. However, as the experim ental system s are far from dilute this last treatment m ay not capture all the essential ingredients. It has been argued that MPS in binary mixtures may be caused by

E lectronic address: wessels@ thphy.uni-duesseldorf.nl; P resent address: H einrich-H eine-U niversitat D usseldorf, Institut für T heoretische Physik II U niversitatsstra e 1, G ebaude 25.32, D -40225 D usseldorf, G em any

the so-called depletion e ect [8, 9], which is generically a many-body interaction e ect and is not well described with a second-virial theory. Consequently, a more accurate approach would be required, certainly in order to resolve in detail what prevents the system from demixing m acroscopically.

That entropy per se can be the driving force for phase transitions has by now been well established. There are many examples ranging from ordering in monodisperse system s like the liquid-to-crystal transition in hard spheres [12] and the isotropic-to-nem atic transition in slender hard rods [13], to dem ixing in binary m ixtures, like e.g. the Asakura-Oosawa (AO) mixture of hard spheres and ideal spheres, which is used as a model for colloid-polymer mixtures [14, 15, 16]. In essence, the physicalm echanism in all these systems is the same; the gain in e ective \free volum e" available to the particles upon ordering o sets the loss of entropy of disorder or m ixing respectively. For the AO m ixture this is usually referred to as the previously mentioned depletion e ect; the ideal polymers are depleted from a shell around the in penetrable colloids. Overlap of these depletion shells increases the free volum e available to the polymers and hence this system phase separates into a colloid-rich and a colloid-poor uid [17]. However, whereas entropy can induce phase behaviour that is at least as rich as seen in energetic system s, M P S rem ains a very rare phenom enon in entropic system s [18].

A variant of the depletion e ect was also recently discovered in theoretical treatments of binary mixtures of thin and thick hard rods [19, 20]. These systems are seen to be able to phase separate in two isotropic uid phases due to depletion. Here, however, the depletion interaction appears as a genuine two-body e ect [20], in contrast to the AO system, in which it is predom inantly a three-body e ect. Consequently, this form of depletion e ect survives the Onsager lim it (length width) applied to both species of rods, and for su ciently asymmetric rods, preem pts the usual transition to the orientationally ordered nem atic phase [19, 20, 21, 22]. These predictions have since been corroborated by simulations [23, 24]. In the present paper, we propose to use the two-body depletion e ects between slender rods of di erent diam eters to construct a system which shows entropy-induced MPS. Taking our cue from the concepts developed in the eld of therm otropic block copolymers, we connect a chain of freely rotating \thick" hard rods to a chain of freely rotating \thin" hard rods. The above-mentioned unfavourable depletion interaction between these two types of rods provides the tendency to fully dem ix, whereas the jpint (connecting the two strands) prevents this. The soconstructed system of freely jointed hard diblock copolymers (HDC) is in our view one of the most simple systems conceivable showing entropy-induced MPS.Furtherm ore, and contrary to the case of MPS in the binary rod-sphere mixtures, the physical mechanism is both clear and robust. Of course, there is as yet no direct candidate for an experim ental system well described. However, it may

certainly be possible for experim entalists to connect (possibly long and exible) chem ically inert polymers to the ends of virus particles like TMV [25, 26]. Together with an appropriate solvent this may m in ick an elective rodcoil system with only hard body interactions. In this system, the polymer tails are likely to stabilize the smectic phase of the virus particles and this could be viewed as a m icroseparated phase.

In order to describe this system we employ a density functional theory in the second-virial or Onsager approximation starting from rst principles. We assume that multiple overlaps between two chains as well as selfoverlaps of the chains are unim portant. All three of the above approxim ations, com m on in theoretical treatm ents ofLCPs [27, 28, 29, 30], should become exact in the Onsager lim it where the lengths of the rods involved is much larger than their widths. The stationarity equations that determ ine the stable phases in our theory are solved locally by means of a bifurcation (or, equivalently, linear stability) analysis of the isotropic uid phase [31, 32]. A part from uctuations with a nonzero wave vector corresponding to a m icroseparated phase, we also consider spatially hom ogeneous uctuations with nem atic symmetry, in order to study the competition between these two types of ordering. For both phases, we obtain closed analytical expressions for the spinodal density. We nd that for long chains and nonzero di erence in the widths, the m icroseparated phase always preem pts the nem atic.

Naturally we want to make contact with the vast am ount of literature on therm otropic block copolym ers in the weak segregation lim it. Most of these follow the original treatment proposed in the seminal paper by Leibler [33]. Leibler considered diblock copolymers interacting via the heuristic Flory parameter and constructed a Landau expansion in the average com position uctuations. By applying the \random phase approximation" and retaining only leading orders of the Fourier modes, he was able to map out more or less the complete phase diagram. Subsequent re nem ents extended the theory to the strong segregation regime [34], added uctuations [35] and included extra phases [36], but did not change the essence of the approach. Leibler's results have been con med qualitatively by experiments (Ref. [1] and Refs. therein) and, for nite chains lengths [35], by sim ulations (Refs. [37, 38] and Refs. therein). The Leibler approach treats the correlations within the polymers on the Gaussian level [1]. We can therefore connect to this approach by applying the Gaussian lim it to our model of freely jointed HDC's. W ithin this lim it our theory becom es equivalent to that of Leibler as far as the treatment of the intrachain interactions is concerned. However, the interchain interactions between the polymers are essentially di erent in the present case, as they are of a geom etric nature, i.e. totally xed by the dim ensions of the composing hard rods. In the Leibler theory, these interactions are described generically by means of the freely adjustable Flory parameter. A full exploration of the parallels between the two approaches, however, was

beyond the scope of this work.

Another class of systems, that appears as a special case of our model are the well-studied rod-coil diblock copolymers. These consist of one sti (rodlike) block and a much more exible part. In such systems, liguid crystalline ordering competes with MPS and a num ber of theoretical studies have been devoted to the subject. Most of these combine the Leibler approach with an additional Maier-Saupe an isotropic orientational interaction resulting in the appearance of a nem atic phase (and sometimes an additional smectic phase) in the phase diagram, besides the various m icroseparated phases [39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45]. However, the ratio of the F lory and the M aier-Saupe interaction param eters in these approaches is rather arbitrary, whereas in the present approach m icroseparated and nem atic ordering both result from the same geometric origin with no room for additional tuning.

F inally, there has been som e related work on m ore idealized but conceptually sim pler system s in the context of entropic liquid crystals. Holyst considered parallel nailshaped particles which showed a nem atic-to-sm ectic Ad transition [46]. As a model for surfactants, Bolhuis and Frenkel studied non-additive complexes of hard spheres and ideal spherocylinder-tails [47] where Schmidt and von Ferber used hard slender rods for the tails [48] Of particular relevance to the present work is R ef. [49] where Duchs and Sullivan investigate the phase behavior of hard worm like diblock copolymers. However, in this latter work only di erences in persistence length are considered and not in thickness between the two components. Consequently they only nd competition between a nematic and a (orientationally ordered) smectic phase, instead of the (orientationally disordered) lam ellar phase. M oreover, only num erical solutions to the stationarity equations are presented, whereas we are able to obtain additional analytical insight through the stability analysis of the isotropic uid phase. Lastly, van Duijneveldt and A llen used M onte C arlo sim ulations to study the effect of exible tails on the phase behavior of spherocy linders [50]. This was later extended by Casey and Harrow ell to rod-coilm olecules of which the isolated rods do not posses a sm ectic phase [51].

A lthough our theory is form ulated for chains with a nite num ber of rodlike segments, we devote the major part of this paper to chains with an in nite number of segments in which the correlations between the segments are G aussian. We form ulate a consistent G aussian limit, in which the number of model parameters reduces to just three. The limit is chosen in such a way that we can still consider the competition between MPS and nem atic ordering. This is achieved by letting the di erence in thickness between the two types of rods to become innitesim ally small. The limit moreover is such that most of the assumptions in the original derivation of the model are fully satis ed. The most prominent results are phase diagram s as a function of the microseparated or nem atic



FIG.1: An example of a hard diblock copolymer. A freelyjointed chain of M_A hard rods with dimensions l_A and d_A (left side) are connected to a freely-jointed chain of M_B hard rods with dimensions l_B and d_B (right side).

phases. Furtherm ore, exploiting the features of the bifurcation analysis, we are able to calculate the relative order along the polym er in the m icroseparated phase at the bifurcation point. The outline of the paper is as follows: in Sec. II we de ne the m odel and develop the form alism. In Sec. III we brie y discuss the sym m etry of the phases involved. The bifurcation analysis is the topic of Sec. IV and the G aussian limit is applied in Sec.V.Sec.VI is the results section and we end with a discussion in Sec.VII.

II. MODEL AND FORM ALISM

We consider a monodisperse uid of N diblock copolymers in a volume V. Each polymer is a chain of freelyjpinted cylindrical rods connected end-to-end where the rst M_A rods are of type = A having length $\frac{1}{A}$ and width d_A and the last M $_B$ rods are of type B with dimensions l_{B} and d_{B} (see Fig. 1). We assume that both types of rods are very slender, 1 d,with 2 fA;Bg, hard bodies, i.e. in penetrable to other rods. The total number of segments in a chain is $M = M_A + M_B$ and every segment has a labelm 2 f1; :::; M g specifying its position in the chain. The state of a segment is described by the position r_m of its center of mass and an orientation, being a unit vector \mathbf{M}_m pointing along its long axis in the direction of increasing m . The con guration of a whole chain is fully characterized by the position of one of its segments (say the rst; r_1) and the orientations of all of them, $= f_1^{:}; :::; M_M g$, so = fr_1 ; g. The position of a segment m is then given by $r_m = r_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{P} (l_k \cdot k + l_{k+1} \cdot k_{k+1})$ where $l_k = l_k$ if $k \quad M_A \text{ and } \mathbf{k} \quad M_A + 1.$

In density functional theory (DFT) the free energy of a (possibly inhom ogeneous) uid of m olecules is expressed as a functional of the single-m olecule con guration distribution function, $^{(1)}$ () [52]. Using the second-virial (or Onsager) approximation it is formulated as follows [53]

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccc} h & i & Z & h & i \\ F & {}^{(1)} &= & d & {}^{(1)} () & \log V_{T} & {}^{(1)} () & 1 \\ & & & Z & Z \\ & & & \frac{1}{2} & d d & {}^{0} & {}^{(1)} () & {}^{(1)} (& {}^{0}) & (; & {}^{0}) ; \end{array}$$

The integrals are over single modecule con_R quation space where $d = dr_0 d$ and $d = \int_m d!_m$ and
$$(; ^{0}) = \exp v(; ^{0}) 1 = 1 \text{ if overlap} :$$

0 if no overlap :
(2)

The congurations of both chains involved can be highly irregular and the dependence of very complicated. Therefore we approximate the chain-chain M ayer function by the sum of all the segment-segment M ayer functions m_{m} °,

$$(; {}^{0}) = \frac{X^{n}}{m \, m^{0} = 1} (\mathbf{r}_{m} \, \mathbf{r}_{m} \circ; \mathbf{r}_{m}; \mathbf{r}_{m} \circ): \quad (3)$$

This expression, to which only individual pairs of seqments contribute, is actually the st term in a system atic expansion of the M ayer function. Higher order term s involve interactions between more than two segments simultaneously [30]. At this point we note that apart from (i) the second virial approximation and (ii) the above expression for the chain-chain M ayer function, another (iii) approximation has been made. In this formalism the chains are allowed to self overlap, i.e. other than the spatial constraint that successive segments are connected to each other there are no interactions within the chain. All three of these approximations are com monly used and corrections to the rst two are small when l d [27, 28, 29]. The neglect of the e ects of self-overlap is assumed to be reasonable in a dense polymer melt [55] where screening e ectively compensates the intram olecular interactions and as a result interactions between distant parts of the same chain are indistinguishable from interactions with the average environm ent because of loss of intrachain correlations.

In therm odynam ic equilibrium, the free energy reaches a m inim um and the functional is stationary. Therefore, we consider the variation of Eq.1 with respect to $^{(1)}$,

$$(1)$$
 () $F = 0$ (4)

with the chemical potential playing the role of Lagrange multiplier needed to enforce normalization. Eliminating

from Eq.4 yields the (selfconsistent) stationarity equation,

$$^{(1)}() = \frac{\Pr \exp \left[\frac{M}{R} \exp \left[\frac{M}{R}\right]^{0} \left(\frac{1}{R}\right) + \frac{M}{R} \exp \left[\frac{M}{R}\right]^{0} \left(\frac{1}{R}\right) + \frac{M}{R} \left(\frac{1}{R}\right) + \frac{M}{R} \exp \left[\frac{M}{R}\right]^{0} \left(\frac{1}{R}\right) + \frac{M}{R} \exp \left[\frac{M}{R}\right)^{0} \left(\frac{M}{R}\right)^{0} \left(\frac{M}{R}\right)^{0} \left(\frac{M}{R}\right)^{0} \left(\frac{M}{R}$$

In order to proceed, we de ne the single-segment distribution function (SDF) (of segment m), $_m$ (r_m ; \uparrow_m), in the following way

m

Ζ

$$(\mathbf{r}_{m}; \mathbf{f}_{m}) = \begin{array}{c} Z & Y \\ & d\mathbf{f}_{k} & ^{(1)}() \\ & & Z \\ & Z \\ & & Z \\ & & Z \\ & & d\mathbf{f}_{k} & ^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{m};););); \end{array}$$
(6)

in which r_1 is given by $r_m = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{p} (l_k \cdot k + l_{k+1} \cdot k_{k+1})$ and the product is over all segments k but the m th. Integrating Eq.5 over all \cdot_k except for \cdot_m as well and using Eq.3 we obtain a set of equations,

$$m(\mathbf{r}_{m}; \mathbf{\hat{r}}_{m}) = \frac{N}{Q} \sum_{\substack{k \in m \\ k \in m}}^{Z} d\mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k}$$

$$\exp \frac{2}{4} \sum_{\substack{k' \in M \\ k_{j}k^{0} = 1}}^{X^{I}} d\mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k^{0}}^{0} d\mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k^{0}}^{0} \mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k^{0}}^{0}; \mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k^{0}}^{0}) |_{k;k^{0}} (\mathbf{r}_{k} - \mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k^{0}}^{0}; \mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k}^{0}; \mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k}^{0})^{5};$$
(7)

where Q is the norm alization factor; i.e. the SDF's are norm alized in the same way as $^{(1)}:$ i.e. drd! _m (r;!) = N .

III. PHASE BEHAV IOUR AND ORDER PARAMETERS

A. Isotropic Phase

At low polymer number density, n = N = V, the system is in the isotropic uid phase, and $m(r_m; r_m)$ is a constant, so due to norm alization, $m^{(iso)} = n = 4$. Consequently,

$$d\mathbf{r}^{0} d\mathbf{\hat{r}}^{0} \stackrel{\text{(iso)}}{_{m}}{}_{\mathbf{k};\mathbf{k}^{0}} (\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}} \quad \mathbf{\hat{r}}^{0}; \mathbf{\hat{r}}_{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{\hat{r}}^{0})$$

$$= \frac{n}{4} \quad \mathbf{d}^{0} \mathbf{l}_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{l}_{\mathbf{k}^{0}} (\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{k}^{0}}) \sin (\mathbf{\hat{r}}_{\mathbf{k}} \quad \mathbf{\hat{q}})$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \quad n \mathbf{l}_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{l}_{\mathbf{k}^{0}} (\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{k}^{0}});$$
(8)

where (!) is the planar angle between ! and ! and one can recognize $l_k l_{k^0} (d_k + d_{k^0}) \sin (!;!^0)$ as the excluded volume of two rods k and k^0 with respective orientations ! and ! . This yields the following norm alization factor in the isotropic phase

$$Q_{iso} = (4)^{M_{A} + M_{B}} V$$

exp $\frac{1}{2}$ n $M_{A}^{2} l_{A}^{2} d_{A} + M_{A} M_{B} l_{A} l_{B} (d_{A} + d_{B}) + M_{B}^{2} l_{B}^{2} d_{B}$
(9)

Choosing the dimensions of rod A as units, we de ne

$$1 = l_{B} = l_{A}; \quad \tilde{a} = d_{B} = d_{A}; \quad M^{\sim} = M_{B} = M_{A}; \quad (10)$$

and a dim ensionless segm ent density in a sym m etric way,

$$n = 2n (M_A l_A^2 d_A + M_B l_B^2 d_B):$$
 (11)

Then, Eq. 9 becomes

$$Q_{iso} = (4)^{M} V \exp \left(\frac{1 + M' l}{4}\right) (1 + M' l)^{''}$$
;

(12)

#

where we have also used M = M $_{\rm A}$ + M $_{\rm B}$. We also note that the norm alization factor Q $_{\rm iso}$ is exactly the partition sum of the block copolymers in the isotropic phase.

B. Nem atic Phase

In the (uniaxial) nem atic phase, there is orientational order with respect to a direction f, however, the system is still spatially hom ogeneous. Therefore, the SDF can be expanded in Legendre polynom ials.

$$_{m}$$
 (r; \uparrow) = $_{m}$ (\uparrow) = $n \sum_{j=0}^{M} \frac{2j+1}{4} a_{m}^{(j)} P_{j}$ (\uparrow \hat{n}); (13)

with coe cients

$$na_{m}^{(j)} = d! P_{j} (!^{0} f)_{m} (!^{0}):$$
(14)

D ue to normalization, $a_m^{(0)} = 1$ as it is in the isotropic phase and due to up-down symmetry of the nematic, all $a_m^{(j)} = 0$ for odd j (in the isotropic uid, $a_m^{(j)} = 0$ for all $j \in 0$). The lowest-order coe cient di erent in the nematic and the isotropic phase is $a_m^{(2)}$ which is the usual M aier-Saupe order parameter. The physical incentive to form a nematic is that the average excluded volume between rods is smaller (and therefore the average free volum e available to the rods is larger) in the nematic phase [13].

C. M icroseparated Phase

M icroseparated phases consist of spatially distributed regions rich either in type-A or type-B rods and are typically governed by a single dom inant wavelength. These phases exist in a variety of types exhibiting various degrees of sym m etry, e.g. lam ellar, hexagonal, bcc and even m ore exotic m orphologies like the gyroid phase [1, 36]. In this paper we do not consider the various sym m etries of m icroseparated phases but focus on the m agnitude of the dom inant wavelength and the density for which it becom es unstable. To that end, we observe that the SDF can be expanded in term s of plane waves

$$_{m} (\mathbf{r}; \uparrow) = \overset{X}{\underset{q^{2L}}{\overset{\alpha}{\longrightarrow}}} (q; \uparrow) e^{iq r}$$
(15)

with L some set of wave vectors and the \coe cients" given by

77

$$_{m}^{(q;!)} = V^{1} dr^{0} e^{iq} r^{0} (r^{0};!):$$
 (16)

In general there will be orientational order within the dom ains and consequently the coe cients still depend on the orientation. If needed, one could proceed and expand these coe cients again in spherical harmonics. However, in order to simplify the analysis, this additional orientational order in them icroseparated phase is usually neglected which we will show in Sec. V is permitted for the case of in nitely long polymers. In hom ogeneous uid phases like the nem atic, the SDF is independent on the spatial coordinate and only the coe cient $^{m}(0; !)$ at zero wavenum ber survives.

IV. BIFURCATION ANALYSIS

A. The Bifurcation Equation

At low densities, the isotropic phase is the globally stable phase, but at higher densities it will become unstable with respect to lower symmetry phases exhibiting some form of ordering. Points where these lower-symmetry solutions branch o the isotropic solution are called bifurcation points and the densities at which this happens, bifurcation densities. D i erent solutionsm ay bifurcate at di erent densities from the isotropic phase. Generically the particular solution which bifurcates at the low est density, will give rise to the stordered phase that is also therm odynam ically stable with respect to the isotropic phase. In this section, we perform a linear stability (or bifurcation) analysis around the isotropic parent solution, along the lines of Refs. [30, 31, 32]. Consequently, we assume isotropic distributions with a perturbation of low er sym m etry,

$$_{m}(\mathbf{r}; \uparrow) = \frac{n}{4} + \mathbf{m}_{n;1}(\mathbf{r}; \uparrow);$$
 (17)

where the proper normalisation of the SDF requires drd! $m_{;1}(r; !) = 0$. Inserting this in the stationarity equations 7 we linearize the exponent with respect to the in nitesimal parameter ",

Equating orders in ", to zeroth order, we re-obtain the isotropic result, Eq. 9. To rst order this yields the so-called bifurcation equations,

$$m_{;1} (\mathbf{r}_{m} ; \mathbf{\dot{r}}_{m}) = \frac{n}{(4)^{M}} \sum_{\substack{k^{00} \in m \\ k^{00} \in m \\ k^{0} \in m \\ k^{00} \in m \\ k^{0} \in m \\$$

These can be interpreted a generalized linear eigenvalue problem with eigenfunctions $_{m;1}(r; :)$ and eigenvalue n, the bifurcation density. There is an in nite hierarchy of solutions to Eq. 19 for varying degrees of symmetry. However, we are only interested in the one (or the few) corresponding to the lowest bifurcation density. Note that the explicit dependence on the normalization factor Q has dropped out since integration over r_m and $!_m$ trivially yields zero on the left hand side by de nition and, after rearrangement of the integrals made possible by the nite range of the M ayer functions $_{k;k^0}$, also on the right hand side.

In order to make the bifurcation equation, Eq.19, more transparent we de ne for the moment as an auxiliary quantity, the elds,

$$H_{k}(\mathbf{r}_{k};\mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k}) = \frac{X}{k^{0}} d\mathbf{r}^{0} d\mathbf{\hat{r}}^{0}_{k^{0};1}(\mathbf{r}^{0};\mathbf{\hat{r}}^{0})_{k;k^{0}}(\mathbf{r}_{k} - \mathbf{r}^{0};\mathbf{\hat{r}}_{k};\mathbf{\hat{r}}^{0}):$$
(20)

in terms of which the bifurcation equation becomes

$$m; 1 (\mathbf{r}_{m}; \mathbf{\dot{r}}_{m}) = \frac{n}{(4)^{M}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^{\infty} \in \mathbb{M}}^{X} d\mathbf{\dot{r}}_{k} d\mathbf{\dot{r}}_{k}; \mathbf{\dot{r}}_{k})$$
(21)

However, this eld H $_k$ is a function of r_k and \ref{multi}_k whereas on the left of Eq. 21 we have a function of r_m and \ref{multi}_m . And these are not independent and as

$$\mathbf{r}_{\mathrm{m}} = \mathbf{r}_{\mathrm{k}} + \mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{k},\mathrm{m}} \tag{22}$$

where the vectorial \path" $P_{k,m}$ between k and m is given by

$$P_{k,m} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{k^{0}=k}}^{n_{X}-1} (l_{k^{0}} \uparrow_{k^{0}} + l_{k^{0}+1} \uparrow_{k^{0}+1}); \quad (23)$$

for k < m. Further, $P_{m\ m} = 0$ and the case of k > m can be obtained by realizing that $P_{km} = P_{m\ k}$. Consequently, the interlying orientional integrations in Eq. 21 have to make the connection and `transfer" the eld from segments k to m.

W e return to Eq. 19 and insert the constraint, Eq. 22 via a delta function

$$\begin{array}{c} \underset{k^{0}}{\overset{m}{}_{;1}}(\mathbf{r}_{m}; \mathbf{\dot{r}}_{m}) = \\ \underline{n} & X & Y & Z \\ \hline \underline{(4)^{M}} & & d\mathbf{\dot{r}}_{k^{00}} & d\mathbf{\dot{r}}_{k} & (\mathbf{\dot{r}}_{m} & \mathbf{r}_{k} + P_{m;k}) \\ X & Z & & \\ & & d\mathbf{r}^{0} d\mathbf{\dot{r}}^{0} & {_{k^{0};1}}(\mathbf{r}^{0}; \mathbf{\dot{r}}^{0}) & {_{k;k^{0}}}(\mathbf{r}_{k} & \mathbf{r}^{0}; \mathbf{\dot{r}}_{k}; \mathbf{\dot{r}}^{0}): \quad (24) \end{array}$$

Next, we observe that in Eq.24 there appear two spatial convolution integrals. Therefore, it makes sense to proceed with a Fourier transform (i.e. $\hat{g}(q) = V^{-1} dr_m e^{-iq} f(r_m)$), yielding

$$\gamma_{m;1}(q;\uparrow_{m}) = \frac{n}{(4)^{M}} X^{Z} Y d\uparrow_{k} e^{iq \cdot \mathbb{R}_{jm}} X^{Z} d\uparrow_{k} e^{iq \cdot \mathbb{R}_{jm}} d\downarrow_{k} e^{iq \cdot \mathbb{R}_{$$

This is the general form of the bifurcation equation for a lower-symmetry solution bifurcating of the isotropicuid parent solution. Note that the q-vector is the same for all segments. Furthermore, at this point, we have not yet specified the internal structure of the polymer, only that it is a chain of cylindrically-symmetric (rodlike) segments which contains no closed loops. Concerning the rodlike segments, the Fourier transformed M ayer function \hat{k}_{k} is calculated in Appendix A and is for very slender segments (l_k d_k) given by,

$$\hat{f}_{k;k^{0}}(q; \mathbf{i}_{k}; \mathbf{i}_{k^{0}}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{j}_{k^{0}}(\mathbf{d}_{k} + \mathbf{d}_{k^{0}}) \mathbf{j}_{k}^{0} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{i}_{k^{0}}^{0} \mathbf{j}$$
$$\mathbf{j}_{0} \quad \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{j}_{k} \mathbf{q} \quad \mathbf{k}^{1} \quad \mathbf{j}_{0} \quad \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{j}_{k^{0}} \mathbf{q} \quad \mathbf{k}^{0} \quad \mathbf{j} \quad (26)$$

where we have already discarded higher-order term s containing $(d_k + d_{k^0})q$ as the wave vector will be at most of order $1=l_{A,B}$ so these term s will be small. The function $j_0(x) = \sin x = x$ is the spherical Bessel function of zeroth order. We proceed by solving Eq. 25 to which we refer as the bifurcation equation from now on.

B. Nem atic Solution

We rst consider the nem atic solution, which is also the simplest. In the nem atic phase, q = 0 and the orientational integrals in the bifurcation equation are trivial and it reduces to

$$\hat{m}_{;1}(!m) = \frac{n}{4} \sum_{k^{0}}^{X} d! \hat{n}_{k^{0};1}(!n) \hat{m}_{;k^{0}}(!m;!n); \quad (27)$$

where $\hat{m}_{;1}$ (\hat{m}) = $\hat{m}_{;1}$ (0; \hat{m}) and

$$\hat{f}_{m}^{\circ}, k^{\circ} (\mathbf{f}_{m}; \mathbf{f}_{k}^{\circ}) = \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}_{k^{\circ}} (\mathbf{d}_{m} + \mathbf{d}_{k^{\circ}}) \mathbf{j}_{m}^{\circ} \mathbf{f}_{k^{\circ}}^{0} \mathbf{j}_{m}^{\circ}$$
(28)

is simply m inus the excluded volume of two rods with xed orientations, $\[mathbb{t}_m\]$ and $\[mathbb{t}_{k^0}\]$. This bifurcation equation is the same as that of a m ixture disconnected rods [20], so for orientational ordering the connectivity of the rods within the chains does not play a role. The kernel $\[mathbb{m}_m, k^0\]$ is now only a function of the planar angle between the orientations of the rods, $\[mathbb{j}_m\]$, $\[mathbb{t}_{k^0}\]$ = jsin ($\[mathbb{t}_m\]$, $\[mathbb{t}_{k^0}\]$) = jsin ($\[mathbb{t}_m\]$), $\[mathbb{t}_m\]$), $\[mathbb{t}_{k^0}\]$) = jsin ($\[mathbb{t}_m\]$), $\[mathbb{t}_m\]$) =

$$d! {}^{0}{}^{n}_{m;k^{0}}(!;!^{0})P_{j}(!^{0} \hat{n}) = {}_{m} \mathbb{I}_{k^{0}}(d_{m} + d_{k^{0}})s_{j}P_{j}(! \hat{n});$$
(29)

with s_j the Legendre coe cients of jsin j. In case of the new atic phase, it is well known that this becomes rst unstable with respect to the mode j = 2, so $\uparrow_m ;_1 (!_m) = (5=4) n q_n^{(2)} P_2 (!_m f) w ith_m^{(2)}$ the Legendre coe cients. Then, the bifurcation equation becomes

$$c_{m}^{(2)} = \frac{n}{4} \sum_{k^{0}}^{X} l_{m} l_{k^{0}} (d_{m} + d_{k^{0}}) s_{2} c_{k^{0}}^{(2)}$$
(30)

with $s_2 = {}^2=8$. This is an M M matrix eigenvalue equation and therefore in principle much too large to solve. However, by observing that the geometric factor on the right hand side does not so much depend on the segments m; k^0 but on whether they belong to A or B, we can split the sum mation, $k^0 = {}_{k^02}$ with

= A;B. Then, we can de ne the \type-average" coe cients, c $^{(2)}$ = (1=M $\,$) $_{\rm m\ 2}^{\rm P}$ $\,$ cm $^{(2)}$ and Eq. 30 becomes,

$$c^{(2)} = \frac{n}{32} \sum_{0=A,B}^{X} M \quad oll \circ (d + d \circ) c^{(2)} : \quad (31)$$

Rewriting this in terms of dimensionless quantities,

$$c_2 = \frac{n}{32(1 + M^{*} l^2 d)} G_2 c_2$$
 (32)

w ith

$$G_{2} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}} \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}}{M} \underbrace{1(1+d)}_{A} \text{ and } c_{2} = \underbrace{\frac{C_{A}^{(2)}}{C_{B}^{(2)}}}_{C_{B}^{(2)}}$$
(33)

we now have reduced the problem to a simple 2 2 m atrix eigenvalue equation. There are two solutions for the density,

$$\mathbf{m} = \frac{32 (1 + M^{2} \hat{\mathbf{d}})}{\operatorname{tr} G_{2}} \frac{p}{\operatorname{tr}^{2} G_{2}} \frac{4 \operatorname{det} G_{2}}{4 \operatorname{det} G_{2}} = (2 \operatorname{det} G_{2}); \quad (34)$$

with det and tr denoting the determ inant and trace respectively. A sthe determ inant of G $_2$ is negative, only the m inus sign in Eq.34 yields a positive bifurcation density n_{nem} , so

$$n_{\text{nem}} = \frac{32(1 + M' l^2 d)}{\text{tr}G_2} \frac{p}{\text{tr}^2 G_2} = (2 \text{ det } G_2): (35)$$

N ote that, within the context of the model as introduced in Sec. II, this analytic expression for the nem atic bifurcation is an exact result. In the wider context of liquid crystalline polymers, a more general derivation of the nem atic bifurcation density can be found in Ref. [32].

C. M icroseparated Solution

In a microseparated phase, the wave vector q is nonzero and the orientational integrals in the bifurcation equation have to be performed explicitly. However, we can make much progress by observing that most of the integrals are still trivial, i.e. if segment k⁰ does not lie between k and m it does not help to \pass on" the in nitesimal eld H_k or equivalently, there is no dependence in the factor exp(iq $_{p_m}^{p_m}$). Consequently, these M jn kj 1 integrations each contribute a factor d? = 4 which is in total (4)^M jn kj 1. On the other hand, concerning the interm ediate segments k⁰ between k and m; the only dependence on $\uparrow_{k^{00}}$ is in the path P_{km}. Therefore, suppose for a moment that k + 1 < m,

$$Z = {}^{mY 1} d!_{k^{0}e} {}^{iq - B_{k,m}} = {}^{k^{00}=k+1} e^{\frac{1}{2}iq {}_{k}l!_{k}} d! e^{iq {}_{k^{00}}!} e^{\frac{1}{2}iq {}_{m}l!_{m}}; (36)$$
$$e^{\frac{1}{2}iq {}_{k}l!_{k}} d! e^{iq {}_{k^{00}}!} e^{\frac{1}{2}iq {}_{m}l!_{m}}; (36)$$

and it is easy to show that

Ζ

dle
$$\overset{\text{iq}}{=} k^{\text{lo}} = 4 \frac{\sin q l_{k^{\infty}}}{q l_{k^{\infty}}} = 4 \text{ j}(q l_{k^{\infty}});$$
 (37)

where we have used $q = q\hat{q}$ with q being the length and the unit vector \hat{q} the direction of the wave vector. W hen m + 1 < k, there is an extra m inus sign as $P_{m,k} = P_{k,m}$ but this does not change the result 37, only the end factors in Eq. 36. C onsequently, we de no the factor

$$F_{k,m}(q) = \begin{cases} Q_{m-1} & j_0(ql_{k^{\infty}}) \text{ for } k < m & 1\\ 1 & \text{ for } k = m & 1;m \end{cases}$$
(38)

which is symmetric so $F_{k,m}(q) = F_{m,k}(q)$. Inserting this in the bifurcation equation yields,

where $_{k,m} = \text{sign}(m - k)$ is the sign of m - k. Instead of the other \end factor" exp $_{m,k}\frac{1}{2}$ ig $_{k}\mathbf{\Gamma}$ we have used $\cos \frac{1}{2}q _{k}\mathbf{\Gamma}$ as within the integral only the even part in q survives. The rst term on the right hand side is due to the in nitesimal eld H $_{m}$ directly on segment m; the second term contains the contributions H $_{k}$ on segments k \in m which are being transferred to segment m via F $_{m,k}$. At this point we note that it is im possible to solve Eq. 39 analytically for general q and we will introduce an approximation justi ed for very long polymers, M_{A} ; M_{B} 1. In this case the relevant wave vector is expected to be small in m agnitude and consequently, the \end factors" as well as the wave dependence of \hat{k}_{k} , are negligible. Therefore, we replace them by their zeroth order approximations in q,

$$\hat{k}_{k,k^{0}} = \frac{1}{2} \underline{l}_{k^{0}} (d_{k} + d_{k^{0}}) \dot{j}_{k} \qquad (40)$$

and

$$\exp \max_{m,k} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{iq} \operatorname{ml} \mathbf{r}_{m} = 1$$

$$\cos \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{iq} \operatorname{k} \mathbf{r}_{k} = 1$$
(41)

Then the bifurcation equation becomes

where again as in the case of the nem atic solutions, $\hat{k}_{k,k^{0}}(\mathbf{f};\mathbf{f}^{0})$ has the convenient property that it maps P_{j} on P_{j} . Then the only mode for which the second term on the right hand side of Eq. 42 survives (and we have wave dependence) is for P_{0} . (For $j \in 0$ we simply re-obtain the nem atic bifurcation equation, Eq. 30.) Consequently, integrating both sides over \mathbf{f}_{m} , we obtain

$$c_{m}^{(0)}(q) = \frac{n}{4} \sum_{k}^{X} F_{m,k}(q) \sum_{k^{0}}^{X} l_{k} l_{k^{0}}(d_{k} + d_{k^{0}}) s_{0} c_{k^{0}}^{(0)}(q)$$

$$- (43)$$

where we have de ned $c_m^{(0)}(q) = {R \atop m} d!_m \uparrow_m ;_1(q;!_m)$ and where

7.

$$d \uparrow \hat{k}_{k}^{*} (\uparrow;\uparrow^{0}) = \frac{1}{k} \lg_{k^{0}} (d_{k} + d_{k^{0}}) \operatorname{s}_{0}; \qquad (44)$$

with $s_0 = {}^2$. The rest of the analysis is similar to the nem atic case: again we have an M M eigenvalue equation and we make use of the property of the geometric factor that it depends on the types provided and not on the segment labels, hence $k^0 = {}^0 {}^{0} {}^{k_0} {}^2 {}^0$ with ${}^0 = A$; B. Dening $c^{(0)}(q) = (1=M) {}^{P}_{k_2} {}^{c_0} {}^{(0)}(q)$ and F; ${}^0 = (1=M M {}^0) {}^{m_2} {}^{k_0} {}^2 {}^0$ Fm; k, Eq. 43 becomes

$$c^{(0)}(q) = \frac{n}{4} \sum_{\sigma}^{X} F_{\sigma}(q) \sum_{\sigma}^{X} M_{\sigma} M_{\sigma} \log \sigma \log \sigma (d_{\sigma} + d_{\sigma}) c^{(0)}_{\infty}(q)$$

$$(45)$$

Rewriting in term s of dimensionless quantities, we obtain

$$c_{0}(q) = \frac{nM}{4(1 + M^{*})(1 + M^{*})^{2}d}F(q)G_{0}c_{0}(q) \quad (46)$$

with

$$G_{0} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}M^{c}I(1 + d) \\ \frac{1}{2}M^{c}I(1 + d) M^{c}I^{2}d^{d} \\ and C_{0}(q) = \frac{C_{A}^{(0)}}{C_{B}^{(0)}} (q): (47)$$

The elements of F (q) are

$$F_{A;A} = \frac{1}{M_{A}^{2}} (M_{A} + \frac{2}{1 \text{ j}(qA)} (M_{A} - 1) \frac{j_{0}(qA)}{1 \text{ j}(qA)} (j_{0}(qA))^{M_{A}} ;$$

$$F_{A;B} = F_{B;A} = \frac{1}{M_{A}} \frac{1}{1} \frac{(j (ql_{A}))^{M_{A}}}{j (ql_{A})} \frac{1}{M_{B}} \frac{1}{1} \frac{(j (ql_{B}))^{M_{B}}}{j (ql_{B})}$$
(48)

and

$$\begin{split} F_{B,B} &= \frac{1}{M_{B}^{2}} (M_{B} + \\ \frac{2}{1 j_{B}(ql_{B})} (M_{B} - 1) \frac{j_{0}(ql_{B}) (j_{B}(ql_{B}))^{M_{B}}}{1 j_{B}(ql_{B})} \end{split} ;$$

A gain there are two solutions for this 2 2 eigenvalue problem but this time the plus sign (see again Eq. 34) yields the physical bifurcation density, $n_{m\,ps}$, for the microseparated phase (mps),

$$n_{m ps} = \frac{4 (1 + M^{\circ}) (1 + M^{\circ})^{2} d}{q} \frac{M}{tr(F(q)G_{0}) + tr^{2}(F(q)G_{0}) - 4 \det F(q) \det G_{0}} = (2 \det F(q) \det G_{0}): (49)$$

A part from the approxim ations made in form ulating the model, Sec. II, Eqs. 40 and 41 constitute the only two further approximations. From Eq. 49 it is observed directly that the spinodal density of the microseparated phase scales with 1=M, contrary to the nem atic spinodal, Eq. 35 which does not depend on M in this representation. Consequently, for long enough polymers the system will always become unstable with respect to the m icroseparated phase. Furtherm ore, we note that for in nitely long chains (M ! 1) the approximations becom e exact (and the density needs to be rescaled, rM). If the chains are not long, the approximations, Eqs. 40 and 41 will not be valid. An interesting case are e.g. rod-coil copolym ers where $M_A = 1$ and M_B is large. The type-A rods will tend to form a sm ectic which the type-B tails are likely to stabilize [50, 51]. In this case, Eq. 39 has to be solved num erically or in some other (approxim ate) way. M oreover, the ordering of the type-A rods is then likely to be dom instead by an orientationally ordered density uctuation, e.g. possibly $\exp [iq \ r]P(q \ r)$, instead of the simple $\exp [iq \ r]$ which we have in the present case. Finally, we note that the speci cation of the geom – etry is contained in the matrix F (q). Using other geom etries, e.g. ABABAB... repeating multiblock copolymers or branched geom etries, do not change Eqs. 39 or 49 but only the form of F (q) (the only requirement is that there are no closed boops within the polymers [32]).

V. THE GAUSSIAN LIM IT

In this section we will construct a consistent lim it for in nitely long chains of our model. There are several reasons for this approach. First of all, there is a large body of literature dealing with so-called Gaussian chains, i.e. polymers which are coarse-grained on the level of the radius of gyration, and we want to make contact with those treatments [1, 33]. Secondly, we do not fully control the quality of the approxim ations, Eqs. 40 and 41, made for chains of nite length. It is clear, how ever, that these approximations become exact for in nitely long polymers. Finally, by introducing this limiting case the num ber of e ective m odel param eters is reduced, resulting in a conceptually simpler system. The limit of M_A ; M_B ! 1 does require that som e of the other param eters be rescaled as well. A dditionally, we want to take this lim it in such a way that the nem atic and m icroseparated bifurcation densities remain of the same order of magnitude so that we can compare them. This extra requirement is non-trivial as can be seen from Eqs. 35 and 49 because n_{mps} scales with 1=M and thus vanishes for long polymers. We can cure this divergence in a som ew hat unconventional way by letting the di erence in thickness of the A and B segments vanish, $\tilde{\alpha}$! 1. In this way, the incentive for MPS is much reduced and n_{mps} \pulled up" to nonzero densities comparable to n_{nem} . Summarizing, we take the lim its

$$M_{A} ! 1 ; l_{A} ! 0 and \tilde{\alpha} ! 1$$
 (50)

whilst $M_A l_A^2$ and $M_A (1 \quad d)^2$ remain nite. Furthermore, we keep the ratios M' and I xed, such that the type-B segments are subject to the same limit. Next, in order for the Onsager approximation to still be valid, d_A needs to remain much smaller than l_A and therefore needs to go to zero even faster. This is corrected by letting the number density of chains go to in nity in order to keep total strength of the interaction, i.e. the total excluded volum e constant. So additionally we have

$$d_{A} ! 0 and n ! 1$$
(51)

with $2nM_A l_A^2 d_A$ and therefore also $r_P = 2n (M_A l_A^2 d_A + M_B l_B^2 d_B)$ nite.

In the Gaussian lim it, the relevant length scale is the radius of gyration or equivalently, the mean-square end-to-end distance. The mean-square end-to-end distance is

de ned as

$$\mathbf{x}^{2} = \sum_{k,k^{0}}^{\mathsf{X}} \langle \mathbf{l}_{k} \uparrow_{k} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{l} \uparrow_{k^{0}} \rangle; \qquad (52)$$

where <> denotes the average over a single chain [55]. In a freely-jointed chain there is no orientational correlation between the segments so for our block copoly-mers, the mean-square end-to-end distance is simply $x^2 = M_A l_A^2 + M_B l_B^2$. This allows us to de ne the dimensionless wavenum ber as q = qx.

O ur reduced m odel has three param eters, M', igovening the composition and the relative size of the copolymetric blocks and $\sim M_A (1 - d)^2$ describing the remaining di erence in thickness between the two components and hence electively setting the incentive for dem ixing.

In the Gaussian lim it, the determ inant of G₂ goes to zero, det G₂ = $\frac{1}{4}$ M² (1 d)² ! 0. Consequently, we can expand Eq 35 for sm all det G₂ and we obtain for the nem atic bifurcation density in the Gaussian lim it,

$$n_{nem} = \frac{32(1 + M^{2})}{\operatorname{tr} G_{2}(\tilde{a} = 1)} = \frac{32}{32}; \quad (53)$$

which, conveniently, is a constant independent on the model parameters. Setting the rst element of the eigenvector to one, $c_{nem} = (1; c_{nem})$, this is very simple in the Gaussian limit, $c_{nem} = 1$. Therefore, at the nem atic bifurcation the B segments are 1 times more strongly orientationally ordered than the A segments.

Concerning MPS, we rst calculate the elements of F in the Gaussian limit,

$$F_{A;A} = \frac{12}{q_{A}^{2}} \quad 1 \quad \frac{6}{q_{A}^{2}} \quad 1 \quad e^{q_{A}^{2}=6}$$

$$F_{A;B} = F_{B;A} = \frac{6}{q_A^2} \quad 1 \quad e^{q_A^2 = 6} \quad \frac{6}{q_B^2} \quad 1 \quad e^{q_B^2 = 6} \quad (54)$$

$$F_{B,B} = \frac{12}{q_B^2} \quad 1 \quad \frac{6}{q_B^2} \quad 1 \quad e^{q_B^2 = 6}$$

with

$$q_{\rm A}^2 = \frac{q^2}{1 + M^{\prime} l^2} \text{ and } q_{\rm B}^2 = \frac{q^2 M^{\prime} l^2}{1 + M^{\prime} l^2}$$
 (55)

The determ inant of G₀ also goes to zero, detG₀ = $\frac{1}{4}M^{2}l^{2}(1 \quad d)^{2}$! 0. Next, expanding Eq.49 for sm all detG₀ as well, we obtain for the bifurcation density of MPS in the Gaussian limit,

$$\kappa_{\rm m \, ps} = \lim_{d! \ 1} \frac{4 \,(1 + M^{\circ}) \,(1 + M^{\circ})^2 d}{M} \frac{\text{tr}(\text{F} \,\text{G}_{\,0})}{\text{det} \text{F} \, \text{det} \,\text{G}_{\,0}}$$
$$= \frac{16 \,(1 + M^{\circ}) \,(1 + M^{\circ})^2}{^{\sim}2 M^{\circ} ^2 \,t^2} \frac{\text{tr}(\text{F} \,\text{G}_{\,0})}{\text{det} \,\text{F}}; \quad (56)$$



FIG.2: B ifurcation density for the m icroseparated phase vs. the m agnitude of the wave vector for 1 = 1 and $\sim = 4$ and M' = f5;4;3;2;1g (from top to bottom). The nem atic bifurcation density $n_{nem} = 32 = 10$ and has no wave dependence but is drawn as a straight line for com parison. Due to sym - m etry (fM';1g ! f1=M';1=1g) the curves of M' are the same for 1=M'.

with $G_0 = \lim_{\sigma < 1} G_0$,

$$G_{0} = \frac{1}{M^{2} M^{2} f^{2}} :$$
 (57)

Additionally, we note the symmetry in the A and B types, i.e. the following transformation $f^{,}M'$; Ig ! f ~;1= M ;1= Ig leaves the results unchanged. A gain, w riting the eigenvector as follows $c_{m ps} = (1; c_{m ps})$ we obtain a simple expression in the G aussian lim it $c_{mps} =$ 1**₩**~Ĩ. This is the relative order of component B over A at bifurcation. The minus sign is due to the dierence of in phase between the density waves of A and B, i.e. where the density of A is enhanced the density of B is depressed (e^{i} = 1). The absolute value 1 ₱ ĩ is ratio of amplitudes of the two waves. The matrix F contains the correlations within the polymer and is seen to feature the so-called D ebije functions, $g_D(x) =$ (1=x) (1 exp[x])) re ecting the Gaussian (2=x) (1 character of the correlations. In the Leibler approach [33] these appear in a similar way and therefore, the correlations are treated on the sam e level.

VI. RESULTS

A. B ifurcation D ensity

In Fig. 2, we have plotted the analytical bifurcation density of the m icroseparated phase, Eq. (56) as a function of the wave vector for various values of M. Most in – portantly, all curves have a m inimum for a certain wave vector. Interpreting the bifurcation point as the spinodal, where the isotropic uid phase changes from being stable to unstable, the system becomes rst unstable for uctuations with a wave length corresponding to the m inimum



FIG.3: The m inim um bifurcation density for the m icroseparated phase vs. $\log M^{-}$ for ~= 4 and 1 = f0.25;0:5;1;2;4g (right to left). The nem atic bifurcation density n_{nem} = 32= 10 is constant and draw n as a straight line for com parison. Inset: the wave length for which the bifurcation density of them icroseparated phase is a m inim um , m_{in} = 2 = $q_{n in}$ vs. M⁻ for the same parameters; ~= 4 and 1 = f0.25;0:5;1;2;4g (right to left).

density. We have also plotted the nem atic bifurcation density, being a constant independent of the wavenum berg, in Fig.2. For the curves which lie totally above the horizontal line, the system becom es unstable with respect to the nem atic phase at the density $n = n_{nem} = 32 = .$ For a curve of which the minimum reaches below the horizontalline, the system becom es unstable with respect to a m icroseparated phase with wave length $\tilde{m}_{min} = 2 = g_{min}$ at the minimum density $n = n_{mps}^{(min)}$. In Fig. 2, we have set the A and B segments to equal length, 1 = 1 and the dem ixing parameter is $\sim = 4$. Starting with an asymmetric polymer, M = 5, MPS only occurs for high densities. Making the polymermore symmetric and decreasing M~ to one, the curves shift to low erdensities until at $M^{\sim} = 1$ it is at its lowest position. Upon a further decrease M[°] following the sequence M[°] = $f_1; \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{4}; \frac{1}{5}; \frac{1}{5};$ again follow the same curves in Fig. 2 due to the symmetry f^{*}; M^{*}; Ig ! f^{*}; $1 = M^*$; 1 = Ig and the choice I = 1, but now from the bottom to the top.

We have num erically determ ined the minimum of the M PS bifurcation density with respect to the wave vector, Eq. (56) and plotted that in Fig. 3 as a function of Mfor a few dierent 1. We observe the same trend we saw in Fig. 2: for very asymmetric polymers, M 1, the m in im um MPS bifurcation density is very high. Increasing M~, the bifurcation density goes down until a certain value M (depending on 1) after which it goes up again. As shown in Fig. 3 some of the curves reach below the horizontal line marking the stability lim it of the isotropic phase tow ards nem atic ordering. Consequently, in the interm ediate region the m icroseparated phase is probably the most stable phase, whereas for the more asymmetric polymers MPS is likely to be preempted by the nem atic phase. Furtherm ore, there is also a dependence on 1, i.e. increasing the asym m etry between the A and B segments,

the curves shift to higher densities. A gain, we note that the two curves for I = 0.5 and I = 2 can be mapped onto each other due to sym metry in the model parameters. In the inset of Fig. 3 we have plotted the value of the wave length $\sim = 2$ =q corresponding to $r_{mps}^{(min)}$ vs. M°. There is a rough correspondence as a function of M° in that the lower the MPS bifurcation densities in Fig. 3 connect to the higher wave lengths in Fig. 3 (inset). In general, we have observed that the wave length for which the MPS is the stable phase (over the nem atic) roughly lie between 1 and 1.5 times the mean end-to-end distance x, i.e. the polymers get som ewhat stretched at the phase transition.

B. Phase Diagram s

Figs. 4 and 5 present the phase diagram s. W e have num erically computed the model parameters for which the m in im um MPS bifurcation density equals the nem atic bifurcation density. In Fig. 4, the phase diagram is given in term s of M vs. \sim for equal length segments, 1 = 1. For low ~ the incentive for MPS is too weak and the MPS bifurcation densities are higher than the nem atic ones everywhere. Increasing ~, the MPS becom es stable for M = 1 (totally symmetric diblock copolymer) and increasing ~ further the range of M for stable M P S grows correspondingly. This is not surprising as the MPS bifurcation density scales simply with 1= ". The inset of Fig. 4 shows the vertical scale logarithm ically to show the sym metry with respect to M^{\sim} ! 1= M^{\sim} . In Fig. 5, the phase diagram is plotted for M vs. 1. The same observation as in Sec.VIA can be made: for asymmetric polymers, the nem atic phase is the most stable whereas for more symmetric ones the MPS can be stable. Of course the amount of area in Fig. 5 depends sensitively on ~. Note that I plays a very sim ilar role as M . Naively, one m ight expect that a di erence in lengths of the segm ents would also increase the tendency to m icrophase separate or at least not counteract to it. However, this is not the case, and only the di erence in thickness, even though only in nitesim ally sm all in the G aussian lim it, drives the occurence of MPS, in line with earlier work on binary mixtures of rods [20]. Potentially, length di erences between the component rods could drive MPS within the nem atic phase, but probing this would require the num erical solutions to the full self-consistency problem, currently beyond our scope.

C. The Density Shift along the Polymer

The elements of the eigenvectors at the bifurcation as discussed in Secs. IV B and IV C contain inform ation about the relative amplitude of the nascent ordering with respect to the the hom ogeneous and isotropic parent phase. However, by construction these quantities were averaged over all segments either of type A or B. In



FIG. 4: Phase diagram, M^{\sim} vs. ~ for 1 = 1. For the region marked with \N em ", the lowest bifurcation density is the nem atic and for the region marked with \M PS" this is the m icroseparated phase. The inset is the same phase diagram except that the vertical axis is logarithm ic to show the symmetry with respect to fM~; ig ! f1=M~;1=ig.



FIG.5: Phase diagram, M^{\sim} vs.1 for ~= 4. For the region marked with \N em ", the lowest bifurcation density is the nematic and for the region marked with \M PS" this is the microseparated phase. The inset is the same phase diagram except that the axes are logarithm ic to show the symmetry with respect to fM ; Ig ! f1=M^;1=Ig.

case of the nem atic ordering, this also coincides exactly with the order of each of the segments individually as there is no orientational coupling between the segments and these therefore behave as being independent. How ever, in case of MPS, there clearly is a spatial coupling between the segments and, consequently, one would expect a di erent degree of ordering e.g. for segm ents which are close to the free end and those which are close to the jpint. Those close the jpint are be subjected to two counteracting density waves and will order less than those at the free ends. In order to to quantify these e ects we have to compute the components of the M -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{g}_{n}^{(0)}$ (Eq. (43)). In appendix C , we explain how these are obtained from the type-averaged 2-dim ensional eigenvectors by m eans of an additional quantity: the half type-averaged m atrix F 0 . In the G aussian lim it, this M -



FIG. 6: Relative order along the polymer at bifurcation in the m icroseparated phase, $c_{\rm A}^{0(0)}$ (s) for s 2 [0;1=(1 + M^{~})] and $c_{\rm B}^{0(0)}$ (s) for s 2 [1=(1 + M^{~});1]. Parameters are ~= 4, 1= 1 and M^{~} = f1;1:5;2;3;4;5;7;10g (increasing in the direction of the arrow). The norm alization is such that the averages over $c_{\rm A}^{0(0)}$ (s 2 A) and $c_{\rm B}^{0(0)}$ (s 2 B) equal $c_{\rm A}^{(0)} = 1$ and $c_{\rm B}^{(0)} =$

1=(M^{\cdot}1) respectively. The full circles indicate the \pints" of the A and B parts at s = 1=(1 + M^{\cdot}).

dim ensional vector reduces to the follow ing 2-dim ensional eigenvector (w ith a prime),

$$c_{0}^{0}(s) = \begin{array}{c} c_{A}^{0(0)}(s \ 2 \ A) \\ c_{B}^{0(0)}(s \ 2 \ B) \end{array} ;$$
(58)

which now depends, on the continuous labels 2 [0;1], where s 2 $[0;\frac{1}{1+M^{-}}]$ im plies s 2 A and s 2 $[\frac{1}{1+M^{-}};1]$ im – plies s 2 B. In Figs. 6 and 7, we plot the components of c_{0}^{0} (s) along the polymer (as a function of s) for increasing M and I respectively. The demixing parameter is taken to be ~= 4.

In Fig.6, we start from the sym m etric case, M' = 1 and I = 1 where the prole is also sym m etric around s = 0.5. All A segments have positive order and all B segments have negative order and the average of A and B is + 1 and

1 respectively as expected. Increasing M, the B part of the polym er becom es larger than the A part and the pint shifts to the left. The norm alization remains such that average order of the A segments is still 1 and that of the B segments is $1 \neq 1$. However, it is remarkable that the B segments close to the pint obtain a positive order with increasing M , i.e. they order with respect to the density wave of A instead of that of B. This is due to the fact that in the polymer there is much more material from the B part. Consequently, this e ect becom es stronger for larger M . In Fig. 7, we start again from the symmetric case, $M^{\sim} = 1$ and $\tilde{I} = 1$. Subsequently, the ratio of lengths I is increased and we see that the derivative of the pro le to s jum ps at the pint. Furtherm ore, also here, the pint shifts to positive values and the A segments have a much more constant pro le than the B segments. By increasing Iwhile M remains constant one e ectively increases the am ount of material in the B part of the polymer. Therefore, it is not surprising that the



FIG. 7: Relative order along the polymer at bifurcation in the m icrossparated phase, $c_{A}^{0(0)}$ (s) for s 2 [D;1=(1 + M^{\,})] and $c_{B}^{0(0)}$ (s) for s 2 [L=(1 + M^{\,});1]. Parameters are ~= 4, M^{\,} = 1 and 1 = f1;1:5;2;3;4;5;7;10g (increasing in the direction of the arrow). The norm alization is such that the averages over $c_{A}^{0(0)}$ (s 2 A) and $c_{B}^{0(0)}$ (s 2 B) equal $c_{A}^{(0)} = 1$ and $c_{B}^{(0)} = 1=(M^{\,})$ respectively. The full circles indicate the \pints" of the A and B parts at s = 1=(1 + M^{\,}).

point of zero order shifts to the right. A dditionally, the B segments are much longer and therefore the spatial correlations persist over larger s explaining the more smooth pro le on the B side. It has to be noted that some of the pro les (especially for higher values of M° and 1 in Figs. 6 and 7) are taken at bifurcation densities far above the nematic bifurcation. We have nevertheless included them, being instructive in explaining the observed trends.

VII. CONCLUSION

We have considered a uid of freely-pinted hard diblock copolymers. The two polymer blocks A and B consist of slender Onsager rods of di erent dim ensions interacting via hard body repulsion only. We apply a DFT approach in the second virial approximation from rst principles, and analytically construct local solutions to the stationarity equations, by means of a stability (bifurcation) analysis of the isotropic phase. Spatial as well as orientational degrees of freedom are taken into account and consequently we obtain the spinodal densities for both the microseparated and the nem atic phases. It is shown that for long polymers the system always becomes unstable with respect to the microseparated phase rst. Consequently, this means that entropy can induce MPS in much the same way as it has been found to induce other forms of spontaneous ordering before. Furthermore, the mechanism is determined solely by the (difference in) dimensions of the rods and therefore has a conceptually simple geometric origin.

In order to make contact with the literature on thermotropic block copolymers we take the limit of in nitely long polymers in which the approximations become exact. In addition, by assuming a vanishing di erence in thickness of the two types of rods, we can still study the competition of the m icroseparated with the nem atic phase. W e present phase diagram s in term s of m odel param eters showing the regions of stable m icroseparated or nem atic ordering. W e also present the order along the polym er at the bifurcation of the m icroseparated phase.

In the present study, we have solved the stationarity equations up to rst-order in a bifurcation analysis. This yields, apart from the location of the spinodal or bifurcation density, only the magnitude of the density wave vector and the spherical harm onic mode to which the isotropic solution becom es unstable. However, the sym metry of the bifurcating microseparated solution is typically determ ined by one or more mutually independent (but equally long) vectors spanning the periodic phase (e.g. lam ellar, hexagonal or bcc). In order to obtain inform ation on the mutual orientation of these lattice vectors, and thus on the sym m etry of the phase, a higher order bifurcation analysis should be perform ed [31, 56, 57]. From these higher order bifurcation equations, it is also possible to determ ine whether the phase transition is of rst or second order and in the latter case one could in principle go on to construct the full equilibrium solution far away from the bifurcation point [31].

W e have not checked the validity of the approxim ations, Eqs. 40 and 41 for nite values of M . However, we can make a crude estimate, a posteriori, by concluding from Fig. 3 that the bifurcating wave length is of the order of the mean square end-to-end distance, 1. Consequently, the wave vector is ap-~ = =х proximately, q = 2 =2 and if we assume for a m om ent that the type-A rods and type-B rods are m ore or less equally long, then the mean-square end-to-end distance is x² $M \stackrel{?}{\downarrow}$. This in turn implies that the next order corrections in Eqs. 40 and 41 will be of order 2 Ĵ=M $(\frac{1}{2}q_{\rm A})^2$ ŧ 10=M . (In fact the rst order correction in $(\frac{1}{2}q_{\rm A})$ in Eq. 41 does not contribute to the value of the bifurcation density, but only to the form of the eigenfunction.) Consequently, already for this crude test case, the length of the polymer should be at least longer than 10 (M > 10) in order for the corrections to be smaller than the leading term . This suggests that much higher values of M are required for the present approach to yield quantitative agreem ent with the "true" behaviour.

In any case, it would be very interesting to extend the present approach to nite values of M. How ever, this is not straightforward, as the correlations within the chain would become non-Gaussian. One strategy could be to solve Eq. 39 directly num erically but this could become

tedious for large numbers of segments. A nother strategy would be to make an expansion in 1=M using the Gaussian limit as a reference state. This last route was followed by Fredrickson and Helfand [35] for Leibler's diblock copolymers and the results were con med by sim – ulations [37]. Indeed, there is a need for such a betterthan-Gaussian treatment, especially when the typical ordering length scales are of the same sizes as the com – ponents, e.g. for side chain liquid crystalline polymers form ing a smectic [58, 59].

As already mentioned in the introduction, there is as yet no experimental system exhibiting MPS due to the mechanism described in this paper. However, considering the ongoing progress in the eld of bioengineering [26, 60], it may become possible to prepare such a system . W e m ention again the possibility of long and thin polymers connected to TMV rods in an appropriate solvent. The solvent may be a problem as we have the double requirem ent that the polymers are at their point and that at the same time the TMV rods still act as hard particles. Still, such a system of entropic rod-coil copolym ers could be directly com pared to the simulation studies of Refs. [50, 51]. Additionally, it would be described by Eq. 39, which would than have to be solved for the case of M $_{\rm A}$ = 1 and M $_{\rm B}$ large. In a more general context, it becom es increasingly clear that entropyinduced e ects play a prom inent role in vivo [61], and it m ay be that sim ilar mechanisms as described here prevent dem ixing tendencies due to local constraints [60]. On the other hand, the mechanism may also be of relevance in therm otropic system swhere the two components of block copolymers also have short-range an isotropic repulsions which are usually of di erent range. In any case, observing entropy-induced m icrophase separation in monodisperse systems would certainly be an interesting experim ental challenge.

A cknow ledgm ents

The authors would like to thank M. Schmidt and D. Lukatsky for critically reading the manuscript. This work is part of the research program of the \Stichting voor Fundam enteel Onderzoek der Materie" (FOM), which is nancially supported by the \Nederlandse Organisatie voor W etenschappelijk Onderzoek" (NW O).PPFW would like to thank the Heinriche-Heine-Universitat D usseldorf for hospitality, where part of writing this paper was nished.

- [1] F. S. Bates and G. H. Fredrickson. Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem., 21:525, 1990.
- [2] F.S.Bates. Science, 251:898, 1991.
- [3] M.W. Matsen and F.S.Bates. Macrom olecules, 29:1091, 1996.
- [4] V. Shibaev and L. Lam, editors. Liquid Crystalline and M esom orphic Polymers. Springer, 1994.
- [5] D. Demus, J. Goodby, G. W. Gray, H.-W. Spiess, and V. Vill, editors. Handbook of Liquid Crystals: Vol. 3. High Molecular W eight Liquid Crystals. W iley-VCH,

1998.

- [6] W. M. Gelbart, D. Roux, and A. Ben-Shaul. M icelles, M em branes, M icroem ulsions and M onolayers. Springer, Berlin, 1994.
- [7] G.G om pper and M.Schick.Self-Assem bling Am phiphilic System s. A cadem ic P ress, London, 1994.
- [8] M.Adam s, Z.Dogic, S.L.Keller, and S.Fraden.Nature (London), 393:349, 1998.
- [9] M. A dam s and S. Fraden. B iophys. J., 74:669, 1998.
- [10] T.Koda, M.Num a jiri, and S.Ikeda. J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., 65:3551, 1996.
- [11] Z. Dogic, D. Frenkel, and S. Fraden. Phys. Rev. E, 62:3925, 2000.
- [12] B. J. Alder and T. E. W ainwright. J. Chem. Phys., 27:1208, 1957.
- [13] L.Onsager. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci., 51:627, 1949.
- [14] S. Asakura and F. Oosawa. J. Chem. Phys., 22:1255, 1954.
- [15] S.Asakura and F.Oosawa. J. Polym. Sci., 33:183, 1958.
- [16] A.Vrij. Pure and Appl. Chem., 48:471, 1976.
- [17] W .C.K.Poon.J.Phys.: Cond.M att., 14:R 859, 2002.
- [18] H.N.W. Lekkerkerker and A. Stroobants. Nature (London), 393:305, 1998.
- [19] R.P. Sear and G. Jackson. J. Chem. Phys., 103:8684, 1995.
- [20] R. van Roijand B. Mulder. Phys. Rev. E, 54:6430, 1996.
- [21] R.P. Sear and B.M. Mulder. J. Chem. Phys., 1051, 1996.
- [22] H.Bosettiand A.Perera.Phys.Rev.E, 63:021206, 2001.
- [23] M .D ijkstra and R .van R oij.P hys.Rev.E, 56:5594, 1997.
- [24] R. van Roij, B. Mulder, and M. Dijkstra. Physica A, 261:374, 1998.
- [25] S.Fraden. Phase transitions in colloidal suspensions of virus particles. In M. Baus, L.F. Rull, and J.P. Ryckaert, editors, Observation, Prediction and Simulation of Phase Transitions in Com plex Fluids, page 113. K luwer A cadem ic Publishers, 1994.
- [26] Z. Dogic and S. Fraden. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A, 359:997, 2001.
- [27] A.R.K hokhlov and A.N.Sem enov. Physica A, 108:546, 1981.
- [28] A.R.K hokhlov and A.N.Sem enov. Physica A, 112:605, 1982.
- [29] G. J. Vroege and H. N. W. Lekkerkerker. Rep. Prog. Phys., 55:1241, 1992.
- [30] P.P.F.W essels and B.M.M ulder. Soft M aterials, 1:313, 2003.
- [31] R. F. Kayser Jr. and H. J. Raveche. Phys. Rev. A, 17:2067, 1978.
- [32] P.P.F.W essels and B.M.Mulder. to be submitted to Physica A.
- [33] L. Leibler. M acrom olecules, 13:1602, 1980.
- [34] A.N. Sem enov. Sov. Phys. JETP, 61:733, 1985.
- [35] G. H. Fredrickson and E. Helfand. J. Chem. Phys., 87:697, 1987.
- [36] M.W. Matsen and M. Schick. Phys. Rev. Lett., 72:2660, 1994.
- [37] H.Fried and K.Binder. J. Chem. Phys., 94:8349, 1991.
- [38] U. Micka and K. Binder. Macromol. Theory Simul., 4:419, 1995.
- [39] A.N. Sem enov and S.V. Vasilenko. Sov. Phys. JETP, 63:70, 1986.
- [40] R.Holyst and M.Schick.J.Chem.Phys., 96:730, 1992.
- [41] D.R.M.W illiams and A.Halperin. Phys. Rev. Lett.,

71:1557,1993.

- [42] C. Singh, M. Goulian, A. J. Liu, and G. H. Fredrickson. Macrom olecules, 27:2974, 1994.
- [43] R.A. Sones and R.G. Petschek. Phys. Rev. E, 50:2906, 1994.
- [44] R.R.Netz and M.Schick.Phys.Rev.Lett., 77:302, 1996.
- [45] M. Reenders and G. ten Brinke. Macromolecules, 35:3266, 2002.
- [46] R.Holyst. Phys. Rev. A, 42:3438, 1990.
- [47] P.G. Bolhuis and D. Frenkel. Physica A, 244:45, 1997.
- [48] M. Schm idt and C. von Ferber. Phys. Rev. E, 64:051115, 2001.
- [49] D. Duchs and D. E. Sullivan. J. Phys.: Cond. M att., 14:12189, 2002.
- [50] J.S.van Duijneveldt and M.P.Allen.M ol. Phys., 92:855, 1997.
- [51] A. Casey and P. Harrowell. J. Chem. Phys., 110:12183, 199.
- [52] R. Evans. Chapter 3, density functionals in the theory of nonuniform uids. In D. Henderson, editor, Fundamentals of Inhom ogeneous Fluids, page 85. Dekker, New York, 1992.
- [53] M.P.Allen, G.T.Evans, D.Frenkel, and B.M.Mulder. Adv. Chem. Phys., 86:1, 1993.
- [54] J. P. Hansen and I. R. M cD onald. Theory of Simple Liquids. A cadem ic Press, London, 2nd edition, 1986.
- [55] P.-G. de Gennes. Scaling Concepts in Polymer Physics. CornellUniversity Press, Ithaca and London, 1st edition, 1979.
- [56] B.M.Mulder. Phys. Rev. A, 35:3095, 1987.
- [57] B.M.Mulder. Phys. Rev. A, 39:360, 1989.
- [58] A. Donald and A. W indle, editors. Liquid Crystalline Polymers. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [59] W .Renz and M .W amer. Phys. Rev. Lett., 56:1268, 1986.
- [60] T. Surrey, F. Nedelec, S. Leibler, and E. Karsenti. Science, 292:1167, 2001.
- [61] T.Z.Rizvi. J.Mol. Liq., 106:43, 2003.

APPENDIX A: THE FOURIER TRANSFORMED SEGMENT-SEGMENT MAYER FUNCTION

The M ayer function $_{k,k^0}$ of two cylindrical rodlike segments k (with dimensions $l_k; d_k$ and coordinates $(r_k; !_k)$) and k^0 (with $l_{k^0}; d_{k^0}$ and $(r_{k^0}; !_{k^0})$) interacting via a hard-core potential (i.e. = 1;0 if overlap/no overlap) is given by

$$k_{k}^{k}(\mathbf{r}_{k} \quad \mathbf{r}_{0}; \mathbf{r}_{k}; \mathbf{r}_{k}) = \begin{array}{c} 1 \text{ if overlap} \\ 0 \text{ if no overlap} \end{array}$$
 (A 1)

We decompose the spatial vector $r_{k;k^0} = r_k \quad r_{k^0}$ in terms of the orientations,

$$\mathbf{r}_{k;k^{0}} = \mathbf{x}_{k} \mathbf{n}_{k} + \mathbf{x}_{k^{0}} \mathbf{n}_{k^{0}} + \mathbf{x}_{k;k^{0}} \mathbf{n}_{k;k^{0}}$$
(A2)

with $\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k,k^{0}} = (\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k} \quad \mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k^{0}}) = \mathbf{\hat{j}}\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k^{0}}$ if the unit vector in the perpendicular direction. There is overlap between the two rods for the following ranges of the coe cients, $\mathbf{x}_{k} \geq [\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k}=2;\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k}=2], \mathbf{x}_{k^{0}} \geq [\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k}=2;\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k^{0}}=2]$ and $\mathbf{x}_{k,k^{0}} \geq [(\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k}+\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k^{0}})=2]$. Next, the Fourier transform of the

M ayer function \hat{k}_{k} is given by

$$\sum_{k;k^{0}}^{Z} d\mathbf{r}_{k;k^{0}} e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{F}_{k}^{0}} e_{k;k^{0}} (\mathbf{r}_{k;k^{0}}; \mathbf{F}_{k}; \mathbf{F}_{k^{0}});$$
(A 3)

where the volume of the in nitesimal element is given by $dr_{k,k^0} = jr_k \qquad f_{k^0} j dx_k dx_{k^0} dx_{k;k^0}$. Consequently,

$$\begin{split} \hat{f}_{k;k^{0}}(q; \hat{f}_{k}; \hat{f}_{k^{0}}) &= \\ & Z_{l_{k}=2} & Z_{l_{k}0=2} & Z_{(d_{k}+d_{k^{0}})=2} \\ j\hat{f}_{k}(\hat{f}_{k^{0}}; j) & dx_{k} & dx_{k^{0}} & dx_{k;k^{0}} \\ & l_{k}=2 & l_{k^{0}=2} & (d_{k}+d_{k^{0}})=2 \\ exp[i(x_{k}q_{k}) + x_{k^{0}q_{k}} + x_{k;k^{0}q_{k}} + x_{k;k^{0}q_{k}} + x_{k;k^{0}} - x_{k;k^{0}}] \\ &= \frac{1}{k} l_{k^{0}} (d_{k} + d_{k^{0}}) j\hat{f}_{k} & \hat{f}_{k^{0}}^{0} jj_{0} & \frac{1}{2} l_{k} q_{k} & \hat{f}_{k^{0}} \\ & j_{0} & \frac{1}{2} l_{k^{0}} q_{k^{0}} & j_{0} & \frac{1}{2} (d_{k} + d_{k^{0}}) q_{k^{0};k^{0}} & (A 4) \end{split}$$

with the spherical Bessel function of zeroth order given by $j_0(x) = \sin x = x$. In the Onsager limit of very slender rods, l_k ; $l_{k^0} \quad d_k$; d_{k^0} while $l_k \, l_{k^0} (d_k + d_{k^0})$ stays – nite. In our system, we expect the wave length of the microseparated phase to be at least of the order of the lengths of the segments (although for large number of segments it is even much larger). Consequently, in this case, $j(d_k + d_{k^0})qj = 1$ and we use the leading order, which is $j_0 (\frac{1}{2} (d_k + d_{k^0})q = \frac{k_{jk^0}}{k_{jk^0}}) = 1$. Then, our nal result for the M ayer function is

$$\hat{k}_{k,k^{0}}(q; \mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k}; \mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k^{0}}) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \hat{k}_{k^{0}} (d_{k} + d_{k^{0}}) \mathbf{\hat{j}}_{k}^{k} \qquad \mathbf{\hat{k}}_{k^{0}}^{0} \mathbf{\hat{j}}$$

$$\mathbf{\hat{j}}_{0} \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \hat{k}_{k} q \qquad \mathbf{\hat{k}}_{0}^{k} \mathbf{\hat{j}}_{0} \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \hat{k}_{0} q \qquad \mathbf{\hat{k}}_{0}^{0} \quad \mathbf{\hat{k}} \quad \mathbf{\hat{k}} = \mathbf{\hat{k}} \mathbf{\hat{k}}_{0}$$

For q = 0, the Fourier transform ed M ayer function is

$$\hat{f}_{k;k^{0}} (\mathbf{!} \quad \hat{f} = \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{I}_{k^{0}} (\mathbf{d}_{k} + \mathbf{d}_{k^{0}}) \mathbf{j}^{t} \quad \mathbf{!}^{0} \mathbf{j}$$

$$= \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{I}_{k^{0}} (\mathbf{d}_{k} + \mathbf{d}_{k^{0}}) \frac{\mathbf{p}}{1 \quad (\mathbf{!} \quad \mathbf{0})^{2}}$$
(B 1)
$$(B 2)$$

and is therefore uniaxial, i.e. dependent on a single planar angle = arccos(? ⁰). Therefore, we can expand it in term s of Legendre polynom ials

$$\hat{A}_{k;k^{0}}(t) = \frac{1}{4} l_{k^{0}} (d_{k} + d_{k^{0}}) \int_{j=0}^{X^{1}} \frac{2j+1}{4} s_{j} P_{j}(t) + \frac{9}{3} s_{j} P_{$$

with $s_j = 2 \frac{R_1}{1} dx \frac{p}{1 - x^2} P_j(x)$. Then, using the decomposition in terms of spherical harm onics Y_{jri} , we can rewrite this as

$$\hat{f}_{k,k^{0}}(\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{I}_{k^{0}} (\mathbf{d}_{k} + \mathbf{d}_{k^{0}})$$

$$X^{i} \quad X^{j} \quad \frac{2j+1}{4} \mathbf{s}_{j} \mathbf{Y}_{j;i} (\mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{\hat{z}}) \mathbf{Y}_{j;i} (\mathbf{P}^{0} \quad \mathbf{\hat{z}}); (\mathbf{B} 4)$$

with the asterisk denoting the complex conjugate and \hat{z} some unit vector. It is now directly seen that the Legendre polynom ials are eigenfunctions of \hat{k}_{k,k^0} (? 9)

$$d! {}^{0}{}^{*}_{k;k^{0}} (! {}^{0}) P_{j} (! {}^{0} 2) = {}_{k} \mathbb{I}_{k^{0}} (d_{k} + d_{k^{0}}) s_{j} P_{j} (! 2) :$$
(B 5)

APPENDIX C:SPATIALORDER WITHIN THE POLYMER

It is possible to calculate the bifurcating order within the polymer. In case of freely-jointed chains in the nem atic phase this is trivial as this exactly $c^{(2)}$ for a segment of type \cdot . However, in case of MPS, segments of type A close to the \joint" with B segments will typically be more a ected by the B part of the polymer than segments of type A far away from the joint. This order within the polymer can be obtained by calculating the elements of the M -dimensional vector c_0^0 with elements $c_m^{(0)}$ and m 2 f1; ;M g (see 43). Therefore we proceed by de ning the matrix F⁰ (with a prime)

$$F_{m2}^{0}; \circ = \frac{1}{M_{0}} K_{k^{0}2}^{0} F_{m;k^{0}};$$
 (C1)

where the average is only perform ed over the second label and therefore $F_{m}^{\ 0}$; $_{\circ}$ is M $\qquad 2$ dimensional. Then, if the bifurcation density for them icroseparated phase $n_{m\,ps}$ and the corresponding eigenvector $c_{m\,ps}$ has been calculated beforehand (from Eq. 49), c_{0}^{0} can be computed by evaluating

$$c_0^0 = \frac{n_{m ps}M}{4(1 + M')(1 + M')^2 d} F^0 G_0 c_{m ps}:$$
 (C2)

The elements of F 0 are given by

$$F_{m2A;A}^{0} = \frac{1}{M_{A}} 1 + \frac{2 (j_{a}(ql_{A}))^{m-1} (j_{a}(ql_{A}))^{M_{A}}}{1 j_{a}(ql_{A})}$$
(C3)

$$F_{m 2A;B}^{0} = \frac{1}{M_{B}} (j_{0} (ql_{A}))^{M_{A}} \frac{1}{1} (j_{0} (ql_{B}))^{M_{B}} (C4)$$

$$F_{m 2B;A}^{0} = \frac{1}{M_{A}} (j_{0} (ql_{B}))^{m M_{A} - 1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{(j_{0} (ql_{A}))^{M_{A}}}{1 - j_{0} (ql_{A})} (C5)$$

$$F_{m 2B;B}^{0} = \frac{1}{M_{B}} 1 + \frac{2 (j_{B}(ql_{B}))^{m 1 M_{A}} (j_{B}(ql_{B}))^{M m}}{1 j_{B}(ql_{B})}$$
(C 6)

where m 2 f1; $_{A}$ gMwhen m 2 A and m 2 fM $_{A}$ + ; M g when m 2 B. For each of these elements again $F_{B,B}^{0}$ (s 2 1; holds that the average of m yields the matrix ${\tt F}$ (see above Eq.45 and Eq.48), ie.

$$F_{,0} = \frac{1}{M} \prod_{m=2}^{X} F_{m2}^{0}; o:$$
 (C7)

In the Gaussian limit, we have to de ne a continuous \label", s = m = M, with m and M going to in nity such that s keeps its value. Consequently, s 2 [0;1] and F⁰ becom es

$$F_{A,A}^{0} (s 2 A) = \frac{6}{q_{A}^{2}} 2 \exp \frac{q_{A}^{2}}{6} s (1 + M^{\circ})$$
$$\exp \frac{q_{A}^{2}}{6} (1 - s (1 + M^{\circ}))$$
(C8)

$$F_{A,B}^{0} (s 2 A) = \frac{6}{q_{B}^{2}} - 1 \exp - \frac{q_{B}^{2}}{6} \exp - \frac{q_{A}^{2}}{6} (1 - s(1 + M^{2}))$$
 (C9)

$$F_{B,A}^{0} (s 2 B) = \frac{6}{q_{A}^{2}} \quad 1 \quad \exp \quad \frac{q_{A}^{2}}{6} \\ = \frac{q_{B}^{2}}{6} (s \frac{1 + M^{2}}{M^{2}} - \frac{1}{M^{2}}) \quad (C 10)$$

$$B = \frac{6}{q_{B}^{2}} 2 \exp \frac{q_{B}^{2}}{6} s \frac{1 + M^{*}}{M^{*}} \frac{1}{M^{*}} \exp \frac{q_{B}^{2}}{6} (1 - s) \frac{1 + M^{*}}{M^{*}} (C 11)$$

...

where s 2 $[0; \frac{1}{1+M}]$ when s 2 A and s 2 $[\frac{1}{1+M}; 1]$ when s 2 B. Note that in the Gaussian limit F^0 is simply a 2 2 m atrix, how ever, with s-dependence. Consequently, unlike F , F 0 is not sym m etric. And additionally, also the M -dim ensional eigenvector becom es 2-dim ensional,

$$c_{0}^{0}(s) = \begin{array}{c} c_{A}^{0(0)}(s \ 2 \ A) \\ c_{B}^{0(0)}(s \ 2 \ B) \end{array} : (C \ 12)$$

Finally, it has to be noted that in the Gaussian limit, rst the product of G $_{0}$ and $c_{m\,\text{ps}}$ has to be taken and only then the lim it can be applied to (G $_0\,c_{m\,{\rm ps}})$.