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#### Abstract

W hereas entropy can induce phase behavior that is as rich as seen in energetic system $s, m$ icrophase separation rem ains a very rare phenom enon in entropic system s . In th is paper, we present a density functional approach to study the possibility of entropy-driven $m$ icrophase separation in diblock copolym ers. O ur m odel system consists of copolym ens com posed of freely-jointed slender hard rods. The two types of $m$ onom eric segm ents have com parable lengths, but a signi cantly di erent diam eter, the latter di erence providing the driving force for the phase separation. At the sam e tim e these system s can also exhibit liquid crystalline phases. W e treat this system in the appropriate generalization of the O nsager approxim ation to chain-like particles. U sing 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 $m$ icroseparated phase alw ays preem pts the nem atic. In the lim it of in nitely long chains, the correlations $w$ ith in the chain becom e Gaussian and the approach becom es exact. This allows us to de ne a Gaussian lim it in which the theory strongly simpli es and the com petition betw een $m$ icrophase separation and liquid crystal form ation can be studied essentially analytically. O urm 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. $W$ e also determ ine the am plitude of the positional order as a function of position along the chain at the onset of the $m$ icrophase separation instability. F inally, we give suggestions as to how this type of entropy-induced $m$ icrophase separation could be observed experim entally.


## I. INTRODUCTION

M icrophase separation (MPS) is the phenom enon where an initially hom ogeneous phase develops an inhom ogeneous spatialstructure on a microscopic scale. U sually such system s consist in part of them odynam ically incom patible com ponents that left by them selves would tend to ( $m$ acroscopically) phase separate. H ow ever, due to additional constraints of a physical or chem ical nature the spatial separation between the com ponents is prevented from increasing beyond a m icroscopic length scale. This leads to phases in which the com ponents can dem ix only locally. There are a few archetypicalexam ples ofsystem s show ing MPS: (i) Two (usually exible) poly$m$ ers species that have an unfavourable $m$ utual interaction energy which are joined to $\quad$...nn a chem icalbond. This type ofblock copolym ers show sa wealth of m icrophases. (ii) Side-chain liquid crystalline polym ers (LC P s) . H ere, liquid crystal-form ing groups are linked to polym er backbones through exible spacers. T he m ost prom inent phase of these system $s$ is the sm ectic, where the LC groups form orientationally ordered layers separated by ${ }^{-1}$ lalered lam ellae containing the poym eric backbones (iii) Temary system sconsisting of water, oil and an am phiphilic surfactant. These system s can show a variety of $m$ icrostructured phases, $w$ th the am phiphilic surfactant stabilizing the oil-w ater interfaces

[^0]and thus preventing \m acrophase separation" A 11 three of the cases above are exam ples of therm otropic system $s$, i.e. system $s$ in which the phase behavior is govemed by tem perature as a controlling variable, re ecting the dom inanœe of energetic e ects.

R ecently, M P S w as observed in an entirely new class of system $s$. B inary m ixtures of bacteriophage viruses and (sm all) latex spheres w ith varying size ratios showed a surpr ly rich phase behaviour, including a lam ellar phase In this phase, the lam ellae are de ned by a \sm ectic" arrangem ent of the rodlike virus particles in layens ${ }^{-1}$ the spherical latex particles in betw een the layers $\quad$ These results are rem arkable for two reasons. F irst, unlike the previous archetypal cases ofM P S, we are dealing $w$ th a binary $m$ ixture which phase separates on a m icroscopic scale. There is no \hard" constraint like a chem icalbond that prevents the tw o species from phase separating on a m acroscopic scale, and both species rem ain in a uid state w ithin the layers. Second, it w as argued that the virus particles as well as the latex spheres can be $m$ odeled to a good extent to interact as hard bodies. C onsequently, the driving force causing this MPS must be of an entropic nature. This is also in stark contrast w ith M PS in block copolym ers, 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 $\cdots$ PS was already explored in com puter sim ulations and found to be qualitatively well de virial approxim ation the validity of which can only be guaranteed at low densities. H ow ever, as the experim entalsystem s are far from dilute this last treatm ent $m$ ay not capture all the essential ingredients. It has been argued that MPS in binary $m$ ixtures $m$ ay be caused by
the so-called depletion e ect which is generically a $m$ any boody interaction e ect and is not well described with a second-virial theory. Consequently, a m ore accurate approach would be required, certainly in order to resolve in detailw hat prevents the system from dem ixing m acroscopically.

T hat entropy per se can be the driving force for phase transitions has by now been well established. There are $m$ any exam ples ranging from ordering in $m$ onodisperse sy s like the liquid-to-crystaltransition in hard spheres and isotropic-to-nem atic transition in slender nara rods to dem ixing in binary mixtures, like e.g. the A sakura-O osawa (AO) mixture of hard spheres and ideal spheres colloid-polym er m ixtures In essence, the physicalm echanism in all tnese system $s$ is the sam $e$; 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 $m$ entioned depletion e ect; the ideal polym ers are depleted from a shell around the im penetrable colloids. O verlap of these depletion shells increases the free volum e available to the polym ers and hence this system $\mathrm{p}^{\text {lon }}$ separates into a colloid-rich and a colloid-poor uid H ow ever, whereas entropy can induce phase behaviour that is at least as rich as seen in energetic system $\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{M}$ n rem ains a very rare phenom enon in entropic system

A variant of the depletion e ect was also recently discovered in theoretical tre $\quad$ f binary $m$ ixtures of thin and thick hard rods These system s are seen to be able to phase separate in two isotropic uid phases due to depletion. Here, how ever, the dminion interaction appears as a genuine two-body e ect in contrast to the AO system, in which it is predom inantly a three-body e ect. C onsequently, this form of depletion $e$ ect survives the O nsager lim it (length width) applied to both species of rods, and for su ciently asym $m$ etric rods, preem pts the usu the orientationally ordered nem atic phase These have since been corroborated by sm ulations In the present paper, we propose to use the two-ooay depletion e ects betw een slender rods ofdi erent diam eters to construct a system which show sentropy-induced M P S . Taking our cue from the concepts developed in the eld of therm otropic block copolym ers, we connect a chain of freely rotating \thick" hard rods to a chain of freely rotating \thin" hard rods. The above-m entioned unfavourable depletion interaction betw een these tw o types of rods provides the tendency to fully dem ix, whereas the joint (connecting the tw o strands) prevents this. The soconstructed system of freely jointed hard diblock copoly$m$ ers (HDC) is in ourview one ofthem ost sim ple system s conceivable show ing entropy-induced M P S. Furtherm ore, and contrary to the case ofM P S in the binary rod-sphere $m$ ixtures, the physical $m$ echanism is both clear and robust. Of course, there is as yet no direct candidate for an experim ental system well described. H ow ever, it m ay
certainly be possible for experim entalists to connect (possibly long and exible) chem icalnolym ens to the ends of virus particles like TM V Together w ith an appropriate solvent this $m$ ay $m \mathrm{~m}$ ICK an e ective rodcoil system with only hard body interactions. In this system, the polym er tails are likely to stabilize the sm ectic phase of the virus particles and this could be view ed as a m icroseparated phase.

In order to describe this system we em ploy a density functional theory in the second-virialor O nsager approxim ation starting from rst principles. W e assum e that $m$ ultiple overlaps betw een tw o chains as w ell as selfoverlaps of the chains are unim portant. All three of the above arn om m on in theoreticaltreatm ents ofLCPs should becom e exact in the O n sager lim II w nere the tengths of the rods involved is m uch larger than their w idths. T he stationarity equations that determ ine the stable phases in our theory are solved $10-$ cally by means of a bifurcation (or, equivalent ${ }^{2}$ stability) analysis of the isotropic uid phase
A part from uctuations w ith a nonzero w ave vector corresponding to a $m$ icroseparated phase, we also consider spatially hom ogeneous uctuations $w$ ith nem atic sym $m e-$ try, in order to study the com petition betw een these tw o types of ordering. Forboth phases, w e obtain closed analytical expressions for the spinodaldensity. We nd that for long chains and nonzero di erence in the widths, the $m$ icroseparated phase alw ays preem pts the nem atic.
$N$ aturally we want to $m$ ake contact $w$ th the vast am ount of literature on therm otropic block copolym ers in the weak segregation lim it. $M$ ost of these follow the origina atm ent proposed in the sem inal paper by Leibler Leibler considered diblock copolym ers interacting via the heuristic Flory param eter and constructed a Landau expansion in the average com position uctuations. By applying the \random phase approxi$m$ ation" and retaining only leading orders of the Fourier m odes, he w as able to m ap out m ore or less the com plete phase diagram. Subsequent re nem en stended the theory t strong segregation regim $\epsilon$ added uctuations and included extra phases but did not change the essence of the approach. Leiplers resu ${ }^{\text {th }}$ have been con $m$ ed qualitatively by experim ent $R$ efs. therein) nite chains lengths sim ulations (Refs. and Refs. therein). I ne Leibler approach treats un- rrelations w ith in the polym ens on the $G$ aussian leve. W e 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 treat$m$ ent of the intrachain interactions is concemed. How ever, the interchain interactions betw een the polym ers 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 com posing hard rods. In the Leibler theory, these interactions are described generically by $m$ eans of the freely adjustable $F$ lory param eter. A full exploration of the parallels betw een the tw o approaches, how ever, w as
beyond the scope of this work.
A nother class of system $s$, that appears as a special case of our $m$ odel are the well-studied rod-coil diblock copolym ers. These consist of one sti (rodlike) block and a much more exible part. In such system s , liquid crystalline ordering com petes with M PS and a num ber of theoretical studies have been devoted to the sub ject. M ost of these combine the Leibler approach w th an additionalM aier-Saupe anisotropic orientational interaction resulting in the appearance of a nem atic phase (and som etim es an additional sm ectic phase) in the ph rious $m$ icroseparated phases H ow ever, the ratio of the F lory and une ll aler-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 sam e geom etric origin w th 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. H olyst considered parallel nailshaped pron-les which show ed a nem atic-to-sm ectic $A_{d}$ transition A s a m odel for surfactants, B olhu is and Frenkel stualed non-additive lexes of hard spheres and ideal spherocylinder-tails where Schm and von Ferber used hard slender roas for the to Of particular relevance to the present w ork is $R$ ef where D uchs and Sullivan investigate the phase behavior of hard worm like diblock copolym ers. H ow ever, in this latter work only di erences in persistence length are considered and not in thickness between the two com ponents. C onsequently they only nd com petition between a ne$m$ atic and a (orientationally ordered) sm ectic 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 D uijneveldt and A llen used M onte C arlo sim ulations to study the effect - $x$ xible tails on the phase behavior of spherocylinder: This w as later extended by $C$ asey and $H$ arrow ell to roa-coilm olecule hich the isolated rods do not posses a sm ectic phase

A theugh our theory is form ulated for chains with a nite num ber of rodlike segm ents, we devote the major part of this paper to chains with an in nite num ber of segm ents in which the correlations betw een the segm ents are G aussian. W e form ulate a consistent G aussian lim it, in which the num ber ofm odelparam eters reduces to just three. The lim it is chosen in such a way that we can still consider the com petition betw een M P S and nem atic ordering. This is achieved by letting the di erence in thickness betw een the two types of rods to becom e innitesim ally sm all. The lim it m oreover is such that m ost of the assum ptions in the originalderivation of the $m$ odel are fully satis ed. Them ost prom inent results are phase diagram sas a function of the $m$ odelparam eters, show ing the regions of stability of the $m$ icroseparated or nem atic


F IG . 1: A n exam ple of a hard diblock copolym er. A freelyjointed chain of $M_{A}$ hard rodsw ith dim ensions $h_{A}$ and $d_{A}$ (left side) are connected to a freely-jointed chain of $M_{\text {B }}$ hard rods $w$ ith dim ensions $l_{B}$ and $d_{B}$ (right side).
phases. Furthem 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 follow s: 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. T he bifurcation analysis is the topic of Sec. IV and the G aussian lim it is applied in Sec.V . Sec. V I is the results section and we end w ith a discussion in Sec. V II.

## II. M ODELAND FORMALISM

W e consider a m onodisperse uid ofN diblock copoly$m$ ers in a volum e V. Each polym er is a chain of freelyjointed cylindrical rods connected end-to-end where the rst $M_{A}$ rods are of type $=A$ having length $\nexists$ and $w$ idth $d_{A}$ and the last $M_{B}$ mdc are of type $B$ with di$m$ ensions $l_{B}$ and $d_{B}$ (see $F$ ig $\quad W$ e assum $e$ that both types of rods are very slender, 1 d, with 2 fA;Bg, hard bodies, i.e. im penetrable to other rods. The total num ber of segm ents in a chain is $M=M_{A}+M_{B}$ and every segm ent has a labelm $2 \mathrm{f1}$;:::;M g specifying its position in the chain. The state of a segm ent is described by the position $r_{m}$ of its center of $m$ ass and an orientation, being a unit vector $\uparrow_{\mathrm{m}}$ pointing along its long axis in the direction of increasing $m$. The con $g-$ uration of a whole chain is fully characterized by the position of one of its segm ents (say the rst; $r_{1}$ ) and the orientations of all of them, $\quad=f r_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{g}$, so
$=f r_{1} ; g$. $T$ he position of a segm ent $m$ is then given by $r_{m}=r_{1}+\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{\mathrm{k}=1}^{1}\left(\mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{k}} \stackrel{r}{k}+l_{\mathrm{k}+1} \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{k}+1}\right)$ where $l_{k}=h_{\AA}$ if $\mathrm{k} \quad \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{B}}$ if $\mathrm{k} \quad \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}}+1$.

In density functional theory (DFT) the free energy of a (possibly inhom ogeneous) uid ofm olecules is expressed as a functionalofthe sin .-... olecule con guration distribution function, ${ }^{(1)}()$ U sing the second-virin 1n r O nsager) approxim ation II is form ulated as follow :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{dd}{ }^{0}{ }^{(1)}()^{(1)}\left({ }^{0}\right)\left(;{ }^{0}\right): \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

The int $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{R}}$ grals arepover single-m qlecule con $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{g}$ ration space where $d=d r_{0} d$ and $d={ }_{m} d r_{\mathrm{m}}$ and
$\mathrm{R} d!={ }_{0}^{R_{2}}{ }_{0}{ }^{R}{ }_{0}^{R} d \sin$. Further, ${ }^{(1)}$ ( ) is nom alized as follows ${ }^{(1)}() d=N$. The factor equals $\left(k_{B} T\right)^{1}$ in which $k_{B}$ is Boltzm ann's constant and $T$ the tem perature. The volum $e V_{T}$ we call the therm al volum $e^{\prime}$ and is a produ de B roglie them alw avelength of the m olecules $\quad$ Thequantity ( ; ${ }^{0}$ ) is the $M$ ayer function OI TWO m olecules with con gurations and ${ }^{0}$. A swe are dealing w ith hard segm ents, the potentialenergy $\mathrm{v}\left(\right.$; $\left.^{0}\right)$ betw een tw o chains is 1 when they overlap and 0 when they don't. C onsequently, the $M$ ayer function is given by

$$
\left(;{ }^{0}\right)=\exp \quad v\left(;^{0}\right) \quad 1=\quad \begin{align*}
& 1 \text { if overlap }  \tag{2}\\
& 0 \text { if no overlap }
\end{align*}:
$$

The con gurations ofboth chains involved can be highly irregular and the dependence of very complicated. $T$ herefore we approxim ate the chain-chain $M$ ayer function by the sum of all the segm ent-segm ent $M$ ayer functions $m, m 0$,

$$
\left(;{ }^{0}\right)=X_{m ; m^{0}=1}^{X^{M}} m ; m^{\circ}\left(r_{m} \quad r_{n} 0 ; \Re_{m} ; \uparrow_{m} 0\right):
$$

This expression, to which only individual pairs of seg$m$ ents contribute, is actually the rst tem in a system atic expansion of the $M$ ayer fiunction. $H$ igher order term $s$ involve inter . ${ }^{\text {. }}$. betw een $m$ ore than two segm ents sim ultaneously At this point we note that apart from (i) the secona virial approxim ation and (ii) the above expression for the chain-chain $M$ ayer function, another (iii) approxim ation has been $m$ ade. In this form alism the chains are allowed to self overlap, i.e. other than the spatial constraint that successive segm ents are connected to each other there are no interactions with in the chain. All three of these approxim ations are com $m$ only used ann when 1 d The neglect of the e ects of self-overlap .-. ssum ea to be reasonable in a dense polym er $m$ elt where screening e ectively com pensates the intram olecular interactions and as a result interactions betw een distant parts of the sam e chain are indistinguishable from interactions w ith the average environm ent because of loss of intrachain correlations.

In them odynam ic equilibrium, the free energy reaches a $m$ in $m u m$ and the functional ic stationary. Therefore, we consider the variation of Eo ith respect to (1),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{(1)()} F \quad=0 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith the chem icalpotential playing the role ofLagrange m ultiplier noeded to en force norm alization. Elim inating
from EC ields the (selffonsistent) stationarity equation,

In order to proceed, we de ne the single-segm ent distribution function (SDF) (ofsegm ent m), $m\left(r_{m} ; r_{m}\right)$, in the follow ing way

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z } \mathrm{Y} \\
& m\left(r_{m} ; r_{m}\right)=\quad \mathrm{d} \AA_{\mathrm{k}}{ }^{(1)}() \\
& { }^{k \notin m} Y \\
& =\quad d \AA_{k}{ }^{(1)}\left(r_{1}\left(r_{m} ;\right) ;\right) \text {; } \\
& \text { k } \boldsymbol{m}_{\mathrm{m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

in which $r_{1}$ is given by $r_{m} \quad{ }_{2}{ }^{P}{\underset{k=1}{1}\left(l_{k} \uparrow_{k}+l_{k+1} \uparrow_{k+1}\right)}^{n}$ and the pradict is over allsegm ents $k$ but the $m$ th. Integrating E C ver all $\uparrow_{\mathrm{k}}$ except for $\uparrow_{\mathrm{m}}$ as well and using Eq Je obtain a set of equations,

where $Q$ is the norm alization factor; the SD F's are norm alized in the sam eway as ${ }^{(1)}$ : i.e. drd $!\mathrm{m}(\mathrm{r} ; \uparrow)=$ N.

## III. PHASE BEHAVIOUR AND ORDER PARAMETERS

A. Isotropic P hase

At low polym er num ber density, $n=N=V$, the system is in the isotropic uid phase, and $m\left(r_{m} ; \uparrow_{m}\right)$ is a constant, so due to norm alization, ${ }_{m}^{(\text {iso })}=n=4$. C onsequently,
Z

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.d r^{0} d \uparrow^{0} \underset{m}{(\text { iso })}{ }_{k ; k^{0}\left(r_{k}\right.} \quad r_{;} ; \uparrow_{k} ; \uparrow^{0}\right) \\
& =\frac{n}{4} \quad d 0^{0} H_{k} H_{k} 0\left(d_{k}+d_{k} 0\right) \sin \quad\left(f_{k} \quad Q\right. \\
& =\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{n} \mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{k}_{0}\left(\mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{k}}+\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{k}} 0\right) \text {; } \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

where ( $\uparrow \quad 0$ is the planar angle between $\uparrow$ and $!^{0}$ and one can recognize $l_{k} l_{k^{0}}\left(d_{k}+d_{k} 0\right) \sin \left(!;!^{0}\right)$ as the excluded volum e of two rods $k$ and $k^{0} w$ th respective orientations ! and $\uparrow^{0}$. This yields the follow ing nom alization factor in the isotropic phase

$$
\begin{align*}
& Q_{\text {iso }}=(4)^{M_{A}+M_{B} V} \\
& \exp \quad \frac{1}{2} \cap M_{A}^{2} I_{A}^{2} d_{A}+M_{A} M_{B} I_{A} l_{B}\left(d_{A}+d_{B}\right)+M_{B}^{2} l_{B}^{2} d_{B} \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

C hoosing the dim ensions of $\operatorname{rod} A$ as units, we de ne

$$
\begin{equation*}
I=l_{B}=I_{A} ; \tau=d_{B}=d_{A} ; M^{\sim}=M_{B}=M_{A} ; \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{M}=2 \mathrm{n}\left(\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{A}}^{2} \mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{B}}^{2} \mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{B}}\right): \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, Eq becom es
where we have also used $M=M_{A}+M_{B} \cdot W$ e also note that the norm alization factor $Q$ iso is exactly the partition sum of the block copolym ers in the isotropic phase.

$$
\text { B. } \quad \mathrm{N} \text { em atic } P \text { hase }
$$

In the (uniaxial) nem atic phase, there is orientational order with respect to a direction n , how ever, the system is still spatially hom ogeneous. T herefore, the SD F can be expanded in Legendre polynom ials.

$$
\begin{equation*}
m(r ; \Uparrow)=m(\curvearrowleft)=n^{X^{A}} \frac{2 j+1}{4} a_{m}^{(j)} P_{j}(\Uparrow \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith coe cients

$$
\begin{equation*}
n a_{m}^{(j)}=d n^{0} P_{j}\left(n^{0} \quad \hat{n}\right)_{n}(\overbrace{}^{0}): \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

D ue to norm alization, $a_{m}^{(0)}=1$ as it is in the isotropic phase and due to up-down sym $m$ etry of the nem atic, all $a_{m}^{(j)}=0$ for odd $j$ (in the isotropic uid, $a_{m}^{(j)}=0$ for all $j \notin 0)$. The lowest-order coe cient di erent in the nem atic and the isotropic phase is $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(2)}$ which is the usual M aier-Saupe order param eter. T he physical incentive to form a nem atic is that the average excluded volum e betw een rods is sm aller (and therefore the average free volum .-ailable to the rods is larger) in the nem atic phase

## C. M icroseparated P hase

M icroseparated phases consist of spatially distributed regions rich either in type-A or type $B$ rods and are typically govemed 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 an m ore exotic m onphologies like the gyroid phase In this paper we do not consider the various sym $m$ ecmes ofm icroseparated phases but focus on the $m$ agnitude of the dom inant w avelength and the density forw hich it becom es unstable. To that end, we observe that the SD F can be expanded in term $s$ of plane waves

$$
\begin{equation*}
m(r ; \uparrow)=\hat{q}_{\mathrm{q} 2 \mathrm{~L}}^{\mathrm{X}}(q ; \uparrow) e^{\mathrm{iq} \quad r} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith L som e set of wave vectors and the \coe cients" given by

$$
\hat{m}_{\mathrm{m}}(q ; \uparrow)=\mathrm{V}^{1^{Z}} \mathrm{dr} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{iq} \ell_{\mathrm{m}}\left(r^{0} ; \uparrow\right): ~}
$$

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 harm onics. H ow ever, in order to sim plify the analysis, this additional orientationalorder in the $m$ icroseparptod phase is usually neglected which we will show in Sec sperm itted for the case of in nitely long polym ers. In nom ogeneous uid phases like the nem atic, the SDF is independent on the spatial coordinate and only the coe cient $\wedge_{m}(0 ; \uparrow)$ at zero w avenum ber survives.
IV. BIFURCATION ANALYSIS
A. The B ifurcation Equation

At low densities, the isotropic phase is the globally stable phase, but at higher densities it w ill becom e unstable $w$ th respect to low er sym $m$ etry phases exhibiting som e form of ordering. P oints where these low er-sym $m$ etry 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 rst ordered phase that is also them odynam ically stable w ith respect to the isotropic phase. In this section, we perform a linear stability (or bifurcation) analysis around in ic parent solution, along the lines of $R$ efs C onsequently, we assum e isotropic distributions w In a perturbation of low er sym m etry,

$$
\begin{equation*}
m(r ; \uparrow)=\frac{n}{4}+\eta m ; 1(r ; \uparrow) ; \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where the proper norm alisation of the SDF requires drd! $m ; 1(r \cdot \uparrow)=0$. Inserting this in the stationarty equation e linearize the exponent $w$ ith respect to the in nitesm al param eter ",

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2 x^{M} \quad Z \\
& \exp 4^{X^{M}} \quad d r^{0} d!^{0} k^{0}\left(r^{0} ; \vdash^{0}\right) k ; k^{0}\left(r_{k} \quad r^{0} ; \uparrow_{k} ; \uparrow^{0}\right)^{5}= \\
& \mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}=12 \\
& \exp ^{4} \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}=1}^{\mathrm{X}^{4}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{k}}\left(\mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{k}}+\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}\right)^{5} \\
& 0 \quad \mathrm{X} \text { Z }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0} \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{align*}
& \begin{array}{l}
m ; 1\left(r_{m} ; \upharpoonright_{m}\right)=\frac{n}{(4)^{M}} \quad{ }_{k^{006 m}}^{Z} d!_{k^{00}} . \\
X Z
\end{array} \\
& d r^{0} d!^{0} k^{0} ; 1\left(r^{0} ;!^{0}\right) k ; k^{0}\left(r_{k} \quad r_{;} ; r_{k} ;!^{0}\right):  \tag{19}\\
& \mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}
\end{align*}
$$

These can be interpreted a generalized linear eigenvalue problem $w$ ith eigenfunctions $m ; 1(r ; \uparrow)$ and eigenvalue $n$, the bifurcation dencitr. There is an in nite hierarchy of solutions to Eq Er varying degrees of sym m etry. H ow ever, we are only interested in the one (or the few) corresponding to the lowest bifurcation density. N ote that the explicit dependence on the nom alization factor Q has dropped out since integration over $r_{m}$ and $\Gamma_{m}$ trivially yields zero on the left hand side by de nition and, after rearrangem ent of the integrals $m$ ade possible by the nite range of the $M$ ayer functions $k ; k^{0}$, also on the right hand side.

In order to $m$ ake the bifurcation equation, EC m ore transparent we de ne for the $m$ om ent as an auxiliary quantily, the elds,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { X Z }
\end{aligned}
$$

in term $s$ of which the bifurcation equation becom es

H ow ever, this eld $H_{\text {, }}$ is a function of $r_{k}$ and $r_{k}$ whereas on the left of Eq ve have a function of $r_{m}$ and $r_{m}$. A nd these are not independent and as

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{m}=r_{k}+P_{k ; m} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the vectorial \path " $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{m}}$ betw een k and m is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{m}}=\frac{1}{2}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}=\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{rX}}\left(\mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}} \bigcap_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}+\varliminf_{\mathrm{k}^{0}+1} \uparrow_{\mathrm{k}^{0}+1}\right) ; \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $k<m$. Further, $P_{m ; m}=0$ and the case of $k>m$ can be obtained by realizing that $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{m}}=\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{k}} \cdot \mathrm{Conon}$ quently, the interlying orientional integrations in Eq have to $m$ ake the connection and \transfer" the eld from segm ents $k$ to $m$.
$W$ e retum to E o via a delta function

$$
\begin{aligned}
& k^{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

N ext, we observe that in $E \quad$ here appear tw o spatial convolution integrals. Inerefore, it $m$ akes sense to $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{R}}$ oceed w ith a Fourier transform (i.e. $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{q})=$ V $\left.{ }^{1} d r_{m} e^{\text {iq }} g\left(r_{m}\right)\right)$, yielding

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { X Z } \\
& d!^{0} \hat{k}^{0} ; 1\left(q ; \wedge^{0}\right)_{k ; k^{0}}\left(q ; \upharpoonright_{k} ; \uparrow^{0}\right):  \tag{25}\\
& \mathrm{k}^{0}
\end{align*}
$$

$T h i s$ is the general form of the bifurcation equation for a low er-sym m etry solution bifurcating o the isotropicuid parent solution. N ote that the $q$-vector is the sam e for all segm ents. Furthem ore, at this point, we have not yet speci ed the intemal structure of the polym er, only that it is a chain ofcylindrically-sym $m$ etric (rodlike) seg$m$ ents which contains no closed loops. C onceming the rodlike segm ents, the Fourier transformed $M$ ayer function ${\hat{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}}$ is calculated in Appendir and is for very slender segm ents ( $l_{k} \quad d_{k}$ ) given byr

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { jo } \frac{1}{2} l_{k} \text { q } \quad k_{0}^{n} j_{0} \quad \frac{1}{2} l_{k} 0 \mathrm{Q} \quad{ }_{k}^{0} 0 \quad ; \tag{26}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have already discarded higher-order term s containing $\left(d_{k}+d_{k^{0}}\right) q$ as the $w$ ave vector $w$ ill be at $m$ ost of order $1=l_{A} ; B$ so these term $s w i l l$ be $s m$ all. $T$ he function $j_{0}(x)=\sin x=x$ is the spherical B easel function of zeroth order. W e proceed by solving Eq to which we refer as the bifurcation equation from now on.

## B. N em atic Solution

W e rst consider the nem atic solution, which is also the sim plest. In the nem atic phase, $q=0$ and the orientational integrals in the bifurcation equation are trivial and it reduces to
where $\hat{m}_{\mathrm{m}} ; 1\left(\hat{\wedge}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)=\hat{\mathrm{m}} ; 1\left(0 ; \hat{\mathrm{n}}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$ and
is sim ply m inus the excluded volum e of two rods w ith xed orientations, $\uparrow_{\mathrm{m}}$ and $\uparrow_{\mathrm{k}} 0$. This bifurcation equ-1 is the sam e as that of a m ixture disconnected rods so for orientational ordering the connectivity of the roas w ithin the chains does not play a role. T he kemel $\hat{\mathrm{A}}_{\mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}}$ is now only a function of the planar angle between the orientations of the rods, $j^{\uparrow}{ }_{m} \quad{ }_{n_{k}}^{0} j=j \sin \quad\left({ }_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{m}}\right.$ $\left.\uparrow_{k^{0}}\right)$ j. C onsequently, due to this uniaxial svmm etry the eigenfunctions of ${ }^{\wedge} \mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}$ and therefore ofEc re sim ply the Legendre polynom ials $P_{j}$ (see A ppendil Z
$w$ ith $s_{j}$ the Legendre coe cients of $j \sin j$. In case of the nem atic phase, it is well known that this becom es rst unstable w th respect to the m ode $j=2$, so $\hat{\mathrm{m}}_{\mathrm{m}}\left(1\left(\hat{\mathrm{f}}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)=\right.$ $(5=4) \mathrm{nG}_{\mathrm{n}}^{(2)} \mathrm{P}_{2}\left(\AA_{\mathrm{m}} \quad \hat{\mathrm{n}}\right) \mathrm{w}$ ith $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(2)}$ the Legendre coe cients. $T$ hen, the bifurcation equation becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(2)}=\frac{\mathrm{n}}{4}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}^{\mathrm{X}} I_{\mathrm{n}} I_{k^{0}}\left(\mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{m}}+\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}\right) \mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}^{(2)} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

w th $\mathrm{s}_{2}={ }^{2}=8$. This is an $M \quad \mathrm{M} \mathrm{m}$ atrix eigen value equation and therefore in principle $m$ uch too large to solve. H ow ever, by observing that the geom etric factor on the right hand side does not so much depend on the segm ents $m ; k^{0}$ but on whether they ${ }_{P}$ belpng to $A$ or $B$, we can split the summation, $k^{0}=\quad k^{0} 2 \quad w$ ith
$=A ; B$. Then, we can de ne the \type-average" coe cients, $C^{(2)}=(1=\mathrm{M}) \mathrm{m}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(2)}$ and Eo pecom es,

$$
\begin{equation*}
c^{(2)}=\frac{n}{32}_{0=A ; B}^{X} M \text { ollo }(d+d 0) c_{0}^{(2)}: \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

R ew riting this in term sof dim ensionless quantities,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{2}=\frac{\mathrm{R}}{32\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{\sim} 1^{2} \mathrm{~d}\right)} G_{2} \mathrm{C}_{2} \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith

$$
\mathrm{G}_{2}=\begin{array}{cc}
1 & \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{M}^{\sim} \Psi(1+\sigma)  \tag{33}\\
\frac{1}{2} \Psi(1+\sigma) & \mathrm{M}^{2} \mathbb{I}^{2} \widetilde{ }
\end{array} \quad \text { and } \mathrm{C}_{2}=\begin{gathered}
C_{\mathrm{A}}^{(2)} \\
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{B}}^{(2)}
\end{gathered}
$$

we now have reduced the problem to a simple $2 \quad 2 \mathrm{ma}$ trix eigenvalue equation. T here are two solutions for the density,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{A}=\frac{32\left(1+M^{2} T^{2} d\right)}{\mathrm{P} \overline{\operatorname{tr}^{2} G_{2} \quad 4 \operatorname{det} G_{2}}=\left(2 \operatorname{det} G_{2}\right) ;} \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ ith det and tr denoting the determ inant and trace respectively. A s the determ inant ofG 2 is negative, only the $m$ inus sign in E q ields a positive bifurcation density $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{nem}}$, so

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{nem}}= & \frac{32\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{2} 1^{2} d\right)}{\mathrm{p} \overline{\operatorname{tr}^{2} G_{2}} \quad 4 \operatorname{detG} \mathrm{~d}_{2}}=\left(2 \operatorname{detG}{ }_{2}\right): \tag{35}
\end{align*}
$$

$N$ ote that $w$ ithin the context of the $m$ odel as introduced in Sec this analytic expression for the nem atic bifurcation is an exact result. In the wider context of liquid crystalline polym ers, a $m$ ore generalderivation - fole ne$m$ atic bifurcation density can be found in $R$ ef

## C. M icroseparated Solution

In a m icroseparated phase, the wave vector $q$ is nonzero and the orientational integrals in the bifurcation equation have to be perform ed explicitly. H ow ever, we can $m$ ake $m$ uch progress by observing that $m$ ost of the integrals are still trivial, i.e. if segm ent $k^{\infty}$ does not lie between $k$ and $m$ it does not help to \pass on" the in nitesim al eld $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{k}}$ or equivalently, there is no dependence in the factor $\exp \left(i q{ }_{k} p_{m}\right.$ ). C onsequently, these M in kj 1 integrations each contribute a factor $d \AA=4$ which is in total (4 $)^{M}$ jn $k j 1$. On the other hand, conceming the interm ediate segm ents $k^{\infty}$ betw een k and m ; the only dependence on ${ }_{\mathrm{k}^{\infty}} 0$ is in the path $P_{k, m}$. Therefore, suppose for a $m$ om ent that $k+1<m$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Z mi }{ }^{1} \\
& d \bigcap_{k} \text { oo } e^{\text {iq } \quad R_{k ; m}}= \\
& k^{00}=k+1 \tag{36}
\end{align*}
$$

and it is easy to show that
Z

$$
\begin{equation*}
d!e^{\text {iq } k^{200}!}=4 \frac{\sin q l_{k} \infty}{q l_{k} 0}=4 \dot{j}\left(q l_{k}\right) ; \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have used $q=q \mathcal{q} w$ ith $q$ being the length and the unit vector of the direction of the w ave vector. W hen $m+1<k$, there is an extra $m$ inus ciom-as $P_{m ; k}=P_{k ; m}$ but this dnocnot change the resul only the end factors in Eq C onsequently, we de ne the factor
which is sym metric so $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{m}}(\mathrm{q})=\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{k}}(\mathrm{q})$. Inserting this in the bifurcation equation yields,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hat{m}_{; 1}\left(q ; r_{m}\right)=
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{n^{(4)^{2}}}{\substack{k^{0}\\
}} e^{m ; k \frac{1}{2} \text { iq } m^{2} f_{m}} F_{m ; k}(q)^{X} \\
& \text { Z }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
d \_d!^{0} \cos \frac{1}{2} q \quad{ }_{k} I \quad \hat{k}^{0} ; 1\left(q ; n^{0}\right)_{k ; k^{0}}\left(q ; r^{n} ;!^{0}\right) ; \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $k, m=\operatorname{sign}\left(\begin{array}{ll}m & k\end{array}\right)$ is the sign ofm $\quad k$. In stead of the other \end factor" $\exp \quad m ; k \frac{1}{2}$ iq $k$ I we have used $\cos \frac{1}{2} q{ }_{k} I$ as within the integral only the even part in $q$ survives. The rst term on the right hand side is due to the in nitesim al eld $H_{m}$ directly on segm ent $m$; the second term contains the contributions $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{k}}$ on seg$m$ ents $k \notin \mathrm{~m}$ wich are being transferred to segm ent $m$ via $F_{m ; k} \quad \Delta$ th is point we note that it is im possible to solve Eq nalytically for generalq and we will introduce an approxim ation justi ed for very long polym ers,
$\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}} ; \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{B}}$ 1. In this case the relevant w ave vector is expected to be $s m$ all in $m$ agnitude and consequently, the lend factors" as wellas the wave dependence of ${ }_{k ; k^{0}}$ are negligible. Therefore, we replace them by their zeroth order approxim ations in $q$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.{\hat{k} ; k^{0}}=\quad \vec{k} l_{k^{0}}\left(d_{k}+d_{k^{0}}\right)\right)^{\eta_{k}^{n}} \quad \hat{k}_{k^{0}}^{0} j \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \exp \quad \mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{k} \frac{1}{2} \text { iq } \quad \mathrm{m} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{m}}=1 \\
& \cos \frac{1}{2} \text { iq } \quad \mathrm{k} I_{k}=1 \tag{41}
\end{align*}
$$

Then the bifurcation equation becom es
where again as in the case of the nem atic solutions, ${\hat{k} ; k^{0}}\left(\uparrow ;{ }^{\circ}{ }^{0}\right)$ has the convenient property that it $m$ aps $P_{j}$ on $P_{j}$. Then the only $m$ ado frow wich the second term on the right hand side ofE o urvives (and we have w ave dependence) is for $\mathrm{P}_{0}$. (ror $j \in 0$ wo cim ply re-obtain the nem atic bifurcation equation, Ec C onsequently, integrating both sides over $\uparrow_{m}$, we dotain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(0)}(\mathrm{q})=\frac{n}{4}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{k}}(\mathrm{q})_{k^{0}}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}\left(\mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{k}}+\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}\right) \mathrm{S}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}^{(0)}(\mathrm{q}) \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have de ned $c_{m}^{(0)}(q)={ }^{R} d \imath_{m} \hat{m} ; 1\left(q ; \wedge_{m}\right)$ and where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Z } \tag{44}
\end{align*}
$$

w th $\mathrm{s}_{0}={ }^{2}$. The rest of the analysis is sim ilar to the nem atic case: again we have an $M \quad M$ eigenvalue equation and we $m$ ake use of the property of the geom etric factor that it depends on the types involyred and not on the segm ent labels, hence $\mathrm{k}^{0}=\mathrm{P}{ }^{0} \mathrm{k}^{0} 20 \mathrm{w}$ th ${ }^{0}=\mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{B} \cdot \mathrm{De} \operatorname{nin} \Phi \mathrm{C}^{(0)}(\mathrm{\Phi})=(1=\mathrm{M})^{\mathrm{P}} \mathrm{c}^{(0)}(\mathrm{q})$ and $\mathrm{F} ;{ }^{0}=(1=\mathrm{M} \quad \mathrm{M} \quad 0) \quad \mathrm{m} 2 \quad \mathrm{k}^{0} 2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{Eq} \quad$ ecom es

$$
\begin{aligned}
& c^{(0)}(q)=
\end{aligned}
$$

Rew riting in term sofdim ensionless quantities, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{0}(\mathrm{q})=\frac{\mathrm{nM}}{4\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{2}\right)\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{2} \Upsilon^{2} \sigma^{2}\right)} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{q}) \mathrm{G}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{0}(\mathrm{q}) \tag{46}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { and } C_{0}(q)=\begin{array}{c}
C_{A}^{(0)} \\
C_{B}^{(0)}
\end{array} \quad(\mathrm{q}) \text { : } \tag{47}
\end{align*}
$$

The elem ents of $F(q)$ are

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{A}}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}}^{2}} \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}}+
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{A} ; \mathrm{B}}=\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{B} ; \mathrm{A}}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}}} \frac{1 \quad\left(\dot{\mathrm{j}}\left(\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)\right)^{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}}}}{1 \underset{\dot{j}\left(\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)}{ }} \\
& \frac{1}{M_{B}} \frac{1}{1} \frac{\left(\dot{j}\left(q_{B}\right)\right)^{M_{B}}}{\dot{j}\left(q_{B}\right)} \tag{48}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{B} ; \mathrm{B}}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{B}}^{2}}\left(\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{B}}+\right. \\
& \frac{2}{1} \quad \begin{array}{llll}
\dot{\mathbf{j}}\left(\mathrm{ql}_{B}\right) & \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{B}} & \text { 1) } \frac{j_{0}\left(\mathrm{ql}_{B}\right)}{1} \quad\left(\dot{j}\left(\mathrm{ql}_{B}\right)\right)^{M_{B}}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

A gain there are two solutions for this $2 \quad 2$ eigen $x$ tho problem but this time the plus sign (see again Eq $y$ ields the physicalbifurcation density, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}$ ps, for the $\mathrm{m} \mathrm{I}^{-}$ croseparated phase (m ps),

$$
\begin{align*}
& \begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{mps}}=\frac{4\left(1+M^{2}\right)\left(1+M^{2} 1^{2} d\right)}{\mathrm{q} \frac{\mathrm{M}}{\operatorname{tr}^{2}\left(\mathrm{~F}^{\left.(q) G_{0}\right)}\right.}} \begin{array}{l}
4 \operatorname{detF}(\mathrm{q}) \operatorname{det} \mathrm{G}_{0}
\end{array}
\end{array} \\
& =\left(2 \operatorname{detF}(q) \operatorname{det} G_{0}\right): \tag{49}
\end{align*}
$$

A part from the appmeim ationcm ade in form ulating the model, Sec Eqs and eanctinate the only two
further approxim ations. From Eq $\quad$ is observed difurther approxim ations. From Eq $t$ is observed di-
rectly that the spinodal density of the $m$ icroseparated phase scaloc w ith $1=\mathrm{M}$, contrary to the nem atic spinodal, E o Thich does not depend on $M$ in this representation. C onsequently, for long enough polym ers the system will alw ays becom e unstable $w$ ith respect to the $m$ icroseparated phase. Furtherm ore, we note that for in nitely long chains (M) ! ) the approxim ations becom e exact (and the density needs to be rescaled, nM ) If the chains are not long, the approxim ations, Eqs anc $v$ ill not be valid. A n interesting case are e.g. rod-collcopolym ers where $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}}=1$ and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{B}}$ is large. The $\begin{array}{ll}\text { type-A rodsw ill tend to for } & \text { Ctic which the typo- } \\ \text { tails are likely to stabilize } & \text { In this case, Eq }\end{array}$ has to be solved num ericaly or in som e other (approxl$m$ ate) way. M oreover, the ordering of the type-A rods is
then likely to be dom inated by an orientationally ordered density uctuation, e.g. possibly exp [iq rP(q) $\quad$ ), instead of the sim ple exp [iq r] which we have in the present case. F inally, we note that the speci cation of the geom etry is contained in the $m$ atrix $F(q)$. U sing other geom $e-$ tries, e.g. ABABAB ... repeating multiblock nonokmers or branched geom etries, do not change E qs only the form off (q) (the only requirem sthat there are no closed loops w thin the polym ers

## V. THE GAUSSIAN LIM IT

In this section we w ill construct a consistent lim it for in nitely long chains ofourm odel. There are severalreasons for this approach. First of all, there is a large body of literature dealing $w$ th so-called $G$ aussian chains, i.e. polym ens which are coarse-grained on the level of the radius of gyration we want to $m$ ake contact $w$ ith those treatm ents Secondly, we do nat filly antrol the quality of the approxim ations, Eqs m ade for chains of nite length. It is clear, now ever, that these approxim ations becom e exact for in nitely long polym ers. Finally, by introducing this lim iting case the num ber ofe ective $m$ odel param eters is reduced, resulting in a conceptually sim pler system. The lim it of $M_{A} ; M_{B}!1$ does require that som e of the other param eters be rescaled as well. A dditionally, we w ant to take this lim it in such a way that the nem atic and $m$ icroseparated bifurcation densities rem ain of the sam e order of $m$ agnitude so that we can compare them. This extm reguinom ent is non-trivial as can be seen from Eqs and ecause $R_{m}$ ps scales w th $1=M$ and thus vanisnes for 10 ng polym ers. We can cure this divergence in a som ew hat unconventionalw ay by letting the di erence in thickness of the $A$ and $B$ segm ents vanish, $\widetilde{\sigma}!1$. In this way, the incentive for MPS is much reduced and $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{ps}$ \pulled up" to nonzero densities comparable to $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{nem}}$. Sum $m$ arizing, we take the lim its

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{M}_{A}!1 ; h_{A}!0 \text { and } a!1 \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

whilst $M_{A} \frac{1}{A}$ and $M_{A}\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & d\end{array}\right)^{2}$ rem ain nite. Furtherm ore, we keep the ratios $M^{\sim}$ and $I$ xed, such that the type B segm ents are sub ject to the sam e lim it. N ext, in order for the $O$ nsager approxim ation to still be valid, $d_{A}$ needs to rem ain much $s m$ aller than $l_{A}$ and therefore needs to go to zero even faster. This is corrected by letting the num ber 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

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{A}!0 \text { and } n!1 \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $2 n M_{A} l_{A}^{2} d_{A}$ and therefore also $\mathrm{A}=2 \mathrm{n} \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{A}}^{2} \mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{A}}+$ $M_{B} l_{B}^{2} d_{B}$ ) nite.

In the G aussian lim it, the relevant length scale is the radius of gyration or equivalently, the $m$ ean-square end-to-end distance. Them ean-square end-to-end distance is
de ned as

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{2}={ }_{k ; k^{0}}^{X}<I_{k} \uparrow_{k} \quad k \partial \AA_{k^{0}}>; \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

where < > denotes the average over a single chain
In a freely-jointed chain there is no orientational correlation betw een the segm ents so for our block copoly$m$ ers, the $m$ ean-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 dim ensionless w avenum ber as $\mathrm{q}=\mathrm{qx}$.

O ur reduced m odelhas three param eters, M , I goveming the com position and the relative size of the copoly$m$ eric blocks and ~ $M_{A}\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & d\end{array}\right)^{2}$ describing the rem aining di erence in thickness betw een the two com ponents and hence e ectively setting the incentive for dem ixing.

In the $G$ aussian lim it, the determ inant of $\mathrm{G}_{2}$ goes to zero, $\operatorname{det} G_{2}=\frac{1}{-} M^{2} \Upsilon^{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & d\end{array}\right)^{2}$ ! 0 . C onsequently, we can expand $E$ or sm all det ${ }_{2}$ and we obtain for the nem atic bifurcation density in the G aussian lim it,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{nem}}=\frac{32\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{\sim} \Psi^{2}\right)}{\operatorname{trG}} 2_{2}(\widetilde{\sim}=1), ~ 32 \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

which, conveniently, is a constant independent on the m odelparam eters. Setting the rst elem ent of the eigenvector to one, $c_{n e m}=\left(1 ; G_{n e m}\right)$, this is very simple in the G aussian lim it, $\mathrm{C}_{\text {nem }}=$ I. T herefore, at the nem atic bifurcation the $B$ segm ents are Itim es m ore strongly orientationally ordered than the A segm ents.

C onœming MPS, we rst calculate the elem ents of $F$ in the $G$ aussian lim it,

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{A ; A} & =\frac{12}{q_{A}^{2}} 1 \\
F_{A ; B}=F_{B ; A} & =\frac{6}{q_{A}^{2}} 1 e^{q_{A}^{2}}=6 \\
F_{A}^{2} & e^{q_{A}^{2}=6} \frac{6}{q_{B}^{2}} 1 \quad e^{q_{B}^{2}=6} \\
F_{B ; B} & =\frac{12}{q_{B}^{2}} 1
\end{aligned} \frac{6}{q_{B}^{2}} 1 \quad e^{q_{B}^{2}=6} .
$$

w ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
q_{A}^{2}=\frac{Q^{2}}{1+M^{\sim} \Upsilon^{2}} \text { and } q_{B}^{2}=\frac{Q^{2} M^{T} I^{2}}{1+M^{\sim} I^{2}} \tag{55}
\end{equation*}
$$

The determ inant of $\mathrm{G}_{0}$ also goes to zem detG $0=$ $\frac{1}{4} M^{2} I^{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & d\end{array}\right)^{2}!\quad 0 . N$ ext, expanding Eo $\quad$ or sm all detG 0 as well, we obtain for the bifurcation density of MPS in the Gaussian lim it,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{mps}}=\quad \lim _{\alpha!1} \frac{4\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{\sim}\right)\left(1+M^{\sim} 1^{2} \alpha\right)}{M} \frac{\operatorname{tr}\left(F G_{0}\right)}{\operatorname{det} \operatorname{det} G_{0}} \\
& =\frac{16\left(1+M^{\sim}\right)\left(1+M^{2} \mathbb{I}^{2}\right)}{\sim{ }^{2} M^{2} \mathbb{I}^{2}} \frac{\operatorname{tr}\left(F G_{0}\right)}{\operatorname{det} F} ; \tag{56}
\end{align*}
$$



FIG . 2: B iffurcation density for the $m$ icroseparated phase vs. the $m$ agnitude of the wave vector for $I=1$ and $\sim=4$ and $M^{\sim}=f 5 ; 4 ; 3 ; 2 ; 1 \mathrm{~g}$ (from top to bottom). The nem atic bifurcation density $\mathrm{r}_{\text {nem }}=32=10$ and has no wave dependence but is draw n as a straight line for com parison. D ue to sym -
 for $1=M^{r}$.
$w$ th $G_{0}=\lim { }_{\mathrm{a}!1} G_{0}$,

$$
G_{0}=\begin{gather*}
1  \tag{57}\\
M^{\sim} \Upsilon M^{\sim} \simeq \mathbb{M}^{2} \mathcal{T}^{2}
\end{gather*}:
$$

A dditionally, we note the symmetry in the A and B types, i.e. the follow ing transform ation $\mathrm{f}^{\sim} ; \mathrm{M}^{\sim} ; \mathrm{Igg}^{\text {! }}$ $\mathrm{f}^{\sim} ; 1=\mathrm{M} ; 1=$ Ig leaves the results unchanged. A gain, writing the eigenvector as follow $\mathrm{s} \mathrm{Cmps}_{\mathrm{m}}=\left(1 ; \mathrm{Cmps}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$ we obtain a simple expression in the $G$ aussian $\lim$ it $G_{m}=1 \neq \pi I$. $T$ his is the relative order of com ponent $B$ over A at bifurcation. The $m$ inus sign is due to the di erence of in phase betw een the density waves of A and B, i.e. where the density of A is enhanced the density of $B$ is depressed ( $e^{\mathrm{i}}=1$ ). The absolute value $1 \neq \Upsilon$ I is ratio of amplitudes of the two waves. The $m$ atrix $F$ contains the correlations within the polym er and is seen to feature the so-called D ebije functions, $g_{D}(x)=$ $(2=x)(1 \quad(1=x)(1 \quad \exp [\quad x]))$ re ecting the $G a$ character of the correlations. In the Leibler approad these appear in a sim ilar way and therefore, the correations are treated on the sam e level.
VI. RESULTS

## A. B ifurcation D ensity

In Fig we have plotted the analytical bifurcation density of the m icroseparated phase, Eq. tion of the wave vector for various values of ${ }^{\text {. }}$. M ost im portantly, all curves have a $m$ inim um 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 becom es rst unstable for uctuationsw ith a wave length corresponding to the minim um


FIG. 3: The minim um bifurcation density for the $m$ icroseparated phase vs. $\log M^{\sim}$ for ${ }^{\sim}=4$ and $I=f 0: 25 ; 0: 5 ; 1 ; 2 ; 4 \mathrm{~g}$ (right to left). The nem atic bifurcation density $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{nem}}=$ $32=10$ is constant and drawn as a straight line for com parison. Inset: the wave length for which the bifurcation density of them icroseparated phase is a m inim $u m, \sim_{m}=2=q_{n}$ in vs. $M^{\sim}$ for the sam e param eters; ${ }^{\sim}=4$ and $I=f 0 ; 25 ; 0: 5 ; 1 ; 2 ; 4 \mathrm{~g}$ (right to left).
density. W e have also plotted the nem atic bifurcation density, beinc constant independent of the w avenum ber $q$, in $F$ if For the curves which lie totally above the horizontalline, the system becom es unstable w ith respect to the nem atic phase at the density $\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{nem}}=32=$. For a curve ofw hich them inim um reachesbelow the horizontal line, the system becom es unstable w ith respect to a m icroseparated phase w th wave length $\sim_{m \text { in }}=2=G_{n}$ in at the $m$ inim um density $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m} \text { ps }}^{(\mathrm{m})}$. In F ig we have set the $A$ and $B$ segm ents to equal length, $T=1$ and the dem ixing param eter is $\sim=4$. Starting $w$ ith an asym $m$ etric polym er, $M^{\sim}=5, \mathrm{MPS}$ only occurs for high densities. $M$ aking the polym er $m$ ore sym $m$ etric and decreasing $M^{\sim}$ to one, the curves sh iff to low er densities until at $M^{2}=1$ it is at its lowest position. U pon a further decrease $M^{\sim}$ follow ing the sequence $M^{\sim}=f 1 ; \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{3} ; \frac{1}{4} ; \frac{1}{5} g$, we again follow the sam e curves in F if lue to the sym me try $\mathrm{f}^{\sim} ; \mathrm{M}^{\sim} ; \mathrm{Ig}_{\mathrm{Ig}}!\mathrm{f}^{\sim} ; 1=\mathrm{M}^{\sim} ; 1=\lg$ and the choice $I=1$, but now from the bottom to the top.
$W$ e have num erically determ ined the $m$ inim um of the M P S bifircation density w ith respent to the $w$ ave vector, Eq. and plotted that in F ig as a function of M for a fow di erent I. W e observe the sam e trend we saw in F ig for very asym $m$ etric polym ers, $M$ 1, the m inim um MPS bifurcation density is very high. Increasing $M^{2}$, the bifurcation density goes dow $n$ until a certain value Mr (dependinc on I) after which it goes up again. As shown in $F$ ig som $e$ of the curves reach below the horizontallinem arking the stability lim it of the isotropic phase tow ards nem atic ordering. C onsequently, in the interm ediate region the $m$ icroseparated phase is probably the $m$ ost stable phase, whereas for the $m$ ore asym $m$ etric polym ers M PS is likely to be preem pted by the nem atic phase. Furthem ore, there is also a dependence on I, i.e. increasing the asym $m$ etry betw een the $A$ and $B$ segm ents,
the curves shift to higher densities. A gain, we note that the tw o curves for $\tau=0: 5$ and $\Psi=2$ can be $m$ apped onto each other due ${ }^{+\rho}$ orm $m$ etry in the $m$ odelparam eters. In the inset of F if ve have plotted the value of the w ave length $\sim=2=q$ corresponding to $R_{m p s}^{(m \text { in })}$ vs. $M^{\sim}$. There is a rough correspondence as a function ofm in that the low er the M P S bifurcation densitios in $F$ if sonnect to the higher w ave lengths in $F$ ig nset). In general, we have observed that the w ave lengen for which the M PS is the stable phase (over the nem atic) roughly lie between 1 and 1.5 tim es the $m$ ean end-to-end distance $x$, i.e. the polym ers get som ew hat stretched at the phase transition.
B. Phase D iagram S

Figs in resent the phase diagram $s . W$ e have nu-
$m$ erically com puted the odel param eters for which the m inim um M P S bifurcation_density equals the nem atic bifurcation density. In $F$ ig the phase diagram is given in term $s$ of $M$ vs. $\sim$ for equal length segm ents, $\mathcal{I}=1$. For low ~ the incentive for MPS is too weak and the M P S bifurcation densities are higher than the nem atic ones everyw here. Increasing ${ }^{\sim}$, the M P S becom es stable for $M^{\sim}=1$ (totally sym $m$ etric diblock copolym er) and increasing ~ further the range of Mr for stable M PS grow s correspondingly. This is not surprising as the M P S bifurcation density scales sim ply w ith $1={ }^{\sim}$. T he inset off ig show s the vertical scale logarithm ically to show the sym $m$ etry with respect to $M^{2}!1=M^{2}$. In $F$ ig the phase diagram is nlatted for $M$ vs. I. The sam e observation as in Sec ian be $m$ ade: for asym $m$ etric poly $m$ ers, the nem aucic pnase is the $m$ ost stable $w$ hereas for $m$ ore sym $m$ etric ones the M-D G can be stable. Of course the am ount of area in F ic lepends sensitively on ${ }^{\sim}$. $N$ ote that Iplays a very sim lar role as M . N aively, one might expect that a di erence in lengths of the segm ents w ould also increase the tendency to m icrophase separate or at least not counteract to it. H ow ever, 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 ofm ${ }^{-n}$ in line $w$ ith earlier work on binary $m$ ixtures of rods P otentially, length di erences betw een the com ponent rods could drive M PS w ithin the nem atic phase, but probing th is would require the num erical solutions to the fill self-consistency problem, currently beyond our soope.

## C. The D ensity Shift along the P olym er

The elem ents of the ionnvectona the bifurcation as discussed in Secs and contain inform ation about the relative am plitude of the nascent ordering w ith respect to the the hom ogeneous and isotropic parent phase. H ow ever, by construction these quantities w ere averaged over all segm ents either of type A or B. In


FIG. 4: Phase diagram, $M$ vs. ~ for $I=1$. For the region $m$ arked $w$ ith $\backslash N$ em ", the lowest bifurcation density is the nem atic and for the region m arked with $\backslash \mathrm{MPS"}$ this is the $m$ icroseparated phase. The inset is the sam e phase diagram except that the vertical axis is logarithm ic to show the sym $m$ etry $w$ ith respect to $\mathrm{fM}^{\sim} ; \mathrm{Ig}^{\prime}!\quad \mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{M}^{\sim} ; 1=\mathrm{Ig}^{\prime}$.


F IG . 5: P hase diagram, $M^{\sim}$ vs. I for ${ }^{\sim}=4$. For the region $m$ arked $w$ ith $\backslash N$ em ", the low est bifurcation density is the ne$m$ atic and for the region $m$ arked $w$ ith $\backslash M$ PS" this is the $m$ icroseparated phase. The inset is the sam e phase diagram except that the axes are logarithm ic to show the sym $m$ etry w ith respect to $\mathrm{IM}^{\sim} ; \mathrm{Ig}^{\prime}!\mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{M}^{\sim} ; 1=\mathrm{Ig}^{2}$.
case of the nem atic ordering, this also coincides exactly w ith the order of each of the segm ents individually as there is no orientational coupling betw een the segm ents and these therefore behave as being independent. H ow ever, in case of M PS, there clearly is a spatial coupling betw een the segm ents and, consequently, one would expect a di erent degree of ordering e.g. for segm ents w hich are close to the free end and those which are close to the joint. Those close the joint are be sub jected to tw o counteracting density $w$ aves and $w$ ill order less than those at the free ends. In order to to quantify these e ects we have to com pute the com ponents of the $M$-dim ensional vector $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(0)}$ (Eq. . In appendis we explain how these are obtainea rrom the type-averaged 2-dim ensional eigenvectors by $m$ eans of an additionalquantity: the half type-averaged $m$ atrix $\mathrm{F}^{0}$. In the G aussian $\lim$ it, this $\mathrm{M}-$


FIG. 6: Relative order along the polym er at bifurcation in the $m$ icroseparated phase, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{A}}^{0(0)}(\mathrm{s})$ for $\mathrm{s} 2\left[0 ; 1=\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{\sim}\right)\right]$ and $C_{B}^{0(0)}(s)$ for $s 2\left[1=\left(1+M^{\sim}\right) ; 1\right]$. P aram eters are ${ }^{\sim}=4$, $I=1$ and $M^{\sim}=f 1 ; 1: 5 ; 2 ; 3 ; 4 ; 5 ; 7 ; 10 \mathrm{~g}$ (increasing in the direction of the arrow). The norm alization is such that the averages over $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{A}}^{0(0)}(\mathrm{s} 2 \mathrm{~A})$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{B}}^{(0)}(\mathrm{s} 2 \mathrm{~B})$ equal $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{A}}^{(0)}=1$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{B}}^{(0)}=$
$1=(\mathbb{M}$ I) respectively. $T$ he full circles indicate the $\backslash j$ joints" of the $A$ and $B$ parts at $s=1=\left(1+M^{\top}\right)$.
dim ensionalvector reduces to the follow ing 2-dim ensional eigenvector (w ith a prim e),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{0}^{0}(\mathrm{~s})={ }_{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{A}}^{0(0)}}^{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{B}}^{0(0)}}(\mathrm{s} 2 \mathrm{~A})^{!}(\mathrm{s} 2 \mathrm{~B})^{!} \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

which now depends, on the continuous labels 2 [0;1], where s $2\left[0 ; \frac{1}{1+\mathrm{M}}\right]$ implies s 2 A and s $2\left[\frac{1}{1+\mathrm{M}^{2}} ; 1\right] \mathrm{m}-$ plies s 2 B. In Figs an we plot the com ponents of $c_{0}^{0}$ ( $s$ ) along the polym er (as a function ofs) for increasing $M^{\sim}$ and I respectively. The dem ixing param eter is taken to be ${ }^{\sim}=\Lambda$

In F is $\quad$ we start from the sym $m$ etric case, $\mathrm{M}^{\sim}=1$ and $I=1$ where the pro $l e$ is also sym $m$ etric around $s=0: 5$. All A segm ents have positive order and all B segm ents have negative order and the average of $A$ and $B$ is +1 and

1 respectively as expected. IncreasingMr, the B part of the polym er becom es larger than the A part and the joint shifts to the left. The norm alization rem ains such that average order of the A segm ents is still 1 and that of the B segm ents is $1 \neq T$. H ow ever, it is rem arkable that the B segm ents close to the joint obtain a positive order w ith increasing $M^{\top}$, i.e. they order $w$ ith respect to the density wave of A instead of that of B. This is due to the fact that in the polym er there is m uch m ore $\mathrm{m} a-$ terial from the B part. C onsemiontly, this e ect becom es stronger for larger $M^{2}$. In $F$ in we start again from the sym $m$ etric case, $M^{\sim}=1$ and $1=1$. Subsequently, the ratio of lengths $I$ is increased and we see that the derivative of the pro le to $s$ jumps at the joint. Furtherm ore, also here, the joint shifts to positive values and the A segm ents have a much $m$ ore constant pro $l e$ than the $B$ segm ents. By increasing Iw hile Mrem ains constant one e ectively increases the am ount ofm aterial in the B part of the polym er. Therefore, it is not surprising that the


FIG.7: R elative order along the polym er at bifurcation in the $m$ icroseparated phase, $C_{A}^{0(0)}(s)$ for $s 2\left[0 ; 1=\left(1+M^{\sim}\right)\right]$ and $C_{B}^{0(0)}(s)$ for s $2\left[1=\left(1+M^{\sim}\right) ; 1\right]$. P aram eters are ${ }^{\sim}=4, M^{\sim}=$ 1 and $I=f 1 ; 1: 5 ; 2 ; 3 ; 4 ; 5 ; 7 ; 10 \mathrm{~g}$ (increasing in the direction of the arrow). The norm alization is such that the averages over $C_{A}^{0(0)}(s 2 A)$ and $C_{B}^{(0)}(s 2 B)$ equal $C_{A}^{(0)}=1$ and $C_{B}^{(0)}=$
$1=(\mathbb{M}$ I) respectively. $T$ he full circles indicate the $\backslash$ joints" of the $A$ and $B$ parts at $s=1=\left(1+M^{\sim}\right)$.
point of zero order shifts to the right. A dditionally, the B segm ents arem uch longer and therefore the spatial correlations persist over larger $s$ explaining the $m$ ore sm ooth pro le on the B side. It has to be noted that som e of tho pro bs (especially for higher values of $M^{\sim}$ and $I$ in $F$ igs an are taken at bifurcation densities far above the nem atic bifurcation. W e have nevertheless inchuded them, being instructive in explaining the observed trends.

## VII. CONCLUSION

W e have considered a uid of freely-jinted hard diblock copolym ers. The two polym er blocks A and B consist of slender O nsager rods of di erent dim ensions interacting via hard body repulsion only. We apply a DFT approach in the second virial approxim ation from rst principles, and analytically construct local solutions to the stationarity equations, by $m$ eans of a stability (bifurcation) analysis of the isotropic phase. Spatial as well as orientationaldegrees of freedom are taken into account and consequently we obtain the spinodal densities for both the $m$ icroseparated and the nem atic phases. It is show $n$ that for long polym ers the system alw ays becom es unstable $w$ ith respect to the $m$ icroseparated phase rst. $C$ onsequently, this $m$ eans that entropy can induce M P S in much the same way as it has been found to induce other form $s$ of spontaneous ordering before. Further$m$ ore, the $m$ echanism is determ ined solely by the (difference in) dim ensions of the rods and therefore has a conceptually sim ple geom etric origin.

In order to $m$ ake contact $w$ ith the literature on ther$m$ otropic block copolym ers we take the lim it of in nitely long polym ers in which the approxim ations becom e exact. In addition, by assum ing a vanishing di erence in
thickness of the two types of rods, we can still study the com petition of the $m$ icroseparated $w$ ith the nem atic phase. W e present phase diagram $s$ in term $s$ ofm odelparam eters show ing 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 $m$ agnitude of the density $w$ ave vector and the spherical harm onic mode to which the isotropic solution becom es unstable. H ow ever, the sym $m$ etry of the bifurcating $m$ icroseparated solution is typically determ ined by one or $m$ ore $m$ utually independent (but equally long) vectors spanning the periodic phase (e.g. lam ellar, hexagonal or bcc). In order to obtain inform ation on the $m$ utual orientation of these lattioe vectors, and thus on the sym $m$ etry of the phase der bifurcation analysis should be perform ec
From these higher order bifurcation equations, II 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 fullinimerium solution far aw ay from the bifurcation point

W e have not chocked the validity or the approxim ations, Eqs anc for nite values of M. H ow ever, we can make a envale estim ate, a posteriori, by concluding from $F$ ig that the bifurcating wave length is of the order of the $m$ ean square end-to-end distance, ~ = =x 1. C onsequently, the wave vector is approxim ately, $q=2=\sim 2$ 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 $m$ ean-square end-to-end distance is $x^{2} M$. Thic in tum implies that the next order corrections in Eqs all be of order $\left.\left(\frac{1}{2} q_{\AA}\right)^{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad 2\right)^{2}=\mathrm{M} \quad 10 \equiv \mathrm{~V}_{1}$. (In Iact the rst order correction in ( $\frac{1}{2} q_{A}$ ) in Eo loes not contribute to the value of the bifurcation densily, but only to the form of the eigenfunction.) C onsequently, already for this crude test case, the length of the polym er should be at least longer than $10(\mathrm{M}>10)$ in order for the corrections to be sm aller than the leading term. This suggests that $m$ uch higher values of $M$ are required for the present approach to yield quantitative agreem ent w ith the "true" behaviour.

In any case, it would be very interesting to extend the present approach to nite values of M. H ow ever, this is not straightforw ard, as the correlations $w$ thin the chain would bocom_ non-G aussian. O ne strategy could be to solve E o irectly num erically but this could becom e
tedious for large num bers of segm ents. A nother strategy would be to $m$ ake an expansion in $1=M$ using the G aussian $\lim$ it as a reference state. follow ed by Fredrickson and H elfand for Leibler's diblock $c^{-n}$ ers and the results were con $m$ ed by sim ulations Indeed, there is a need for such a better-than-G aussian treatm ent, especially w hen the typicalordering length scales are of the same sizes as the com ponents, e.g. for ${ }^{\text {in }}$ in liquid crystalline polym ers form ing a sm ectic

A $s$ already $m$ entioned in the introduction, there is as yet no experim ental system exhibiting MPS due to the $m$ echanism described in this paper. H ow ever, considering thor roing progress in the eld of bioengineering it $m$ ay becom e possible to prepare such a system. W em ention again the possibility of long and thin polym ers connected to TMV rods in an appropriate solvent. T he solvent $m$ ay be a problem as we have the double requirem ent that the polym ers are at their point and that at the sam e tim e the TMV rods still act as hard particles. Still, such a system ofentropic rod-coil copolym ers cou ? studies of $R$ efe A dditionally, it would be described by Eq wnien would than have to be solved for the case $O 1 \mathbb{M}_{A}=1$ and $M_{B}$ large. In a m ore general context, it becom es increasingly clear thon ntropyinduced e ects play a prom inent role in vivo and it $m$ ay be that sim ilar $m$ echanism $s$ as described nere vent dem ixing tendencies due to local constraints O $n$ the other hand, the $m$ echanism $m$ ay also be of resvance in therm otropic system sw here the tw o com ponents ofblock copolym ers also have short-range anisotropic repulsions which are usually of di erent range. In any case, observing entropy-induced $m$ icrophase separation in $m$ onodisperse system $s$ would certainly be an interesting experim ental challenge.
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## APPENDIX A:THE FOURIER TRANSFORMED SEGMENT-SEGMENTMAYERFUNCTION

TheM ayer function $k ; k^{0}$ oftw o cylindricalrodlike seg$m$ ents $k$ ( $w$ th dim ensions $l_{k} ; d_{k}$ and coordinates ( $r_{k} ; \digamma_{k}$ )) and $k^{0}$ (w ith ${l_{k}}^{0} ; d_{k} 0$ and $\left(r_{k^{0}} ; \uparrow_{k^{0}}\right)$ ) interacting via a hardcore potential (i.e. $=1$; 0 if overlap/no overlap) is given by

$$
\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{k} \mathrm{k}^{0}}\left(r_{\mathrm{k}} \quad \mathfrak{r}_{0} ; \boldsymbol{;} \uparrow_{\mathrm{k}} ; \uparrow_{\mathrm{k}^{0}}\right)=\quad \begin{gather*}
1 \text { if overlap }  \tag{A1}\\
\text { if no overlap }
\end{gather*}
$$

W e decom pose the spatial vector $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}}=r_{\mathrm{k}} \quad \mathfrak{K}^{0}$ in term s of the orientations,
 perpendicular direction. There is overlap betw een the tw o rods for the follow ing ranges of the coe cients, $x_{k} 2$
 $\left.\left.d_{k^{0}}\right)=2 ;\left(d_{k}+d_{k^{0}}\right)=2\right]$. N ext, the Fourier transform of the
$M$ ayer function $\hat{k}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}}$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z }
\end{aligned}
$$

where the volum e of the in nitesim alelem ent is given by $d r_{k ; k^{0}}=j^{j} \Re_{k} \quad \hat{k}^{0}{ }^{0} \dot{d} x_{k} d x_{k^{0}} d x_{k ; k^{0}}$. C onsequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\hat{k} ; k^{0}}\left(q ; r_{k} ; \uparrow_{k^{0}}\right)=
\end{aligned}
$$

w th the spherical B essel function of zeroth order given by $j_{0}(x)=\sin x=x$. In the $O$ nsager lim it of very slender rods, $l_{k} ; l_{k} 0 \quad d_{k} ; d_{k} 0$ while $l_{k} l_{k} 0\left(d_{k}+d_{k} 0\right)$ stays nite. In our system, we expect the wave length of the $m$ icroseparated phase to be at least of the order of the lengths of the segm ents (although for large num ber of segm ents it is even much larger). C onsequently, in this case, $j\left(d_{k}+d_{k}\right)^{0} j 1$ and we use the leading order, which is $j_{0}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(d_{k}+d_{k^{0}}\right) q \quad{ }_{k}^{n} ; k^{0}\right)=1$. Then, our nal result for the $M$ ayer function is

$$
\begin{align*}
& j_{0} \quad \frac{1}{2} l_{k} q \quad{ }_{k}{ }^{\wedge} j_{0} \quad \frac{1}{2} l_{k} \circ \mathrm{q} \quad{ }_{k^{0}} \text { : } \tag{A5}
\end{align*}
$$

APPENDIX B:THEEIGENFUNCTIONSOF

$$
{\hat{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}\left(\begin{array}{l}
( \\
\text { R) }
\end{array} \mathrm{FOR} \mathrm{q}=0\right.}^{0}
$$

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

$$
\begin{align*}
& =Z_{k} k^{0}\left(d_{k}+d_{k}\right)^{p} \overline{1 \quad\left(\AA \quad 0 y^{2}\right.} \tag{B1}
\end{align*}
$$

and is therefore uniaxial, ie. dependent on a single planar angle $=\arccos (\hat{} \quad \hat{}$ ). Therefore, we can expand it in term $s$ of Legendre polynom ials

$$
\begin{equation*}
{\hat{k} ; k^{0}}(\uparrow \quad \eta)=k_{k^{0}}\left(d_{k}+d_{k}\right)^{x^{1}} \quad \frac{2 j+1}{4} S_{j} P_{j}(\hat{\imath} \quad q) ; \tag{B3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ ith $s_{j}=2{ }^{R_{1}}{ }_{1} d x x^{p} \frac{x^{2}}{1} P_{j}(x)$. Then, using the decom position in term $s$ of spherical harm onics $Y_{j ; i}$, we can rew rite this as

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\hat{k} ; k^{0}}\left(\begin{array}{r}
n
\end{array} \quad \eta=\quad k_{k^{0}}\left(d_{k}+d_{k^{0}}\right)\right. \\
& X_{j=0 i}^{X} X_{j}^{j} \frac{2 j+1}{4} s_{j} Y_{j ; i}(\uparrow  \tag{B4}\\
& \text { 2) } \mathcal{Y}_{j, i}(\overbrace{}^{0}
\end{align*}
$$

w ith the asterisk denoting the com plex conjugate and $\hat{z}$ som e unit vector. It is now directly seen that the Legendre polynom ials are eigenfunctions of ${\hat{k} ; \mathrm{k}^{0}}$ ( $\uparrow \quad$ )

## Z

$$
d!^{0 \wedge_{k ; k^{0}}\left(\begin{array}{l}
n
\end{array}\right\} P_{j}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
n^{0} & \hat{z}
\end{array}\right)={ }_{k} H_{0}\left(d_{k}+d_{k^{0}}\right) S_{j} P_{j}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\hat{\varepsilon} & \hat{z} \tag{B5}
\end{array}\right): ~}
$$

## APPENDIX C:SPATIAL ORDER W ITHIN THE POLYMER

It is possible to calculate the bifurcating order w th in the polym er. In case of freely-jinted chains in the ne$m$ atic phase this is trivial as this exactly $c^{(2)}$ for a seg$m$ ent of type. H ow ever, in case of MPS, segm ents of type A close to the \joint" w ith B segm ents w ill typically bem ore a ected by the B part of the polym er than segm ents of type A far aw ay from the joint. This order w ithin the polym er can be obtained by calculating the elem ents of the $M$-dim ensional vector $C_{0}^{0}$ w ith elem ents $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(0)}$ and m 2 f ; $\quad ; \mathrm{M} \mathrm{g}$ ( se . Therefore we proceed by de ning the $m$ atrix $F^{0}$ (w ith a prim e)
where the average is only perform ed over the second label and therefore $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{m}}^{0}$; 0 is $\mathrm{M} \quad 2$ dim ensional. Then , if the bifurcation density for them icroseparated phase $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{ps}$ and the corresponding eigenrootor $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{ps}$ has been calculated beforehand (from Eo $\quad \mathrm{C}_{0}^{0}$ can be com puted by evaluating

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{0}^{0}=\frac{\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{mps}} M}{4\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{\top}\right)\left(1+\mathrm{M}^{\top} \mathbb{1}^{2} व\right)} \mathrm{F}^{0} \mathrm{G}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{mps}}: \tag{C2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The elem ents of ${ }^{0}$ are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{m} 2 \mathrm{~A} ; \mathrm{A}}^{0}= \tag{C3}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& F_{m 2 A ; B}^{0}=\frac{1}{M_{B}}\left(j_{0}\left(q_{l_{A}}\right)\right)^{M_{A}} m \frac{1 \quad\left(\dot{j}\left(q l_{B}\right)\right)^{M_{B}}}{\left.1 \dot{j}^{\left(q l_{B}\right.}\right)} \tag{C4}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{m} 2 \mathrm{~B} ; \mathrm{B}}^{0}=
\end{aligned}
$$

 holdcthat the aromge ofm yields them atrix $F$ (see above and Eq i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
F ; 0=\frac{1}{M}_{m 2}^{X} F_{m 2}^{0} ; 0: \tag{C7}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the G aussian lim it, we have to de ne a continuous $\backslash$ label" $\mathrm{s}=\mathrm{m}=\mathrm{M}$, w th m and M going to in nity such that s keeps its value. C onsequently, s $2[0 ; 1]$ and $\mathrm{F}^{0}$ becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
& F_{A ; A}^{0}(s 2 A)=\frac{6}{q_{A}^{2}} \quad 2 \quad \exp \quad \frac{q_{A}^{2}}{6} s\left(1+M^{\sim}\right) \\
& \exp \frac{q_{A}^{2}}{6}\left(1 \quad s\left(1+M^{\sim}\right)\right)  \tag{C8}\\
& F_{A ; B}^{0}(s 2 A)=\frac{6}{q_{B}^{2}} \quad 1 \quad \exp \quad \frac{q_{B}^{2}}{6}  \tag{C12}\\
& \exp \frac{q^{2}}{6}\left(1 \quad s\left(1+M^{2}\right)\right)  \tag{C9}\\
& F_{B ; A}^{0}(s 2 B)=\frac{6}{q_{A}^{2}} 1 \quad \exp \quad \frac{q_{A}^{2}}{6} \\
& \exp \frac{q_{B}^{2}}{6}\left(s^{1+M^{2}} \frac{1}{M^{2}}\right)^{\#} \tag{C10}
\end{align*}
$$

where s $2\left[0 ; \frac{1}{1+\mathrm{M}^{2}}\right]$ when s 2 A and s $2\left[\frac{1}{1+\mathrm{M}^{2}} ; 1\right]$ when s 2 B. N ote that in the Gaussian lim it $\mathrm{F}^{0}$ is simply a 22 m atrix, how ever, w ith s-dependence. C onsequently, unlike $\mathrm{F}, \mathrm{F}^{0}$ is not sym m etric. A nd additionally, also the M -dim ensional eigenvector becom es 2-dim ensional,

$$
\mathrm{C}_{0}^{0}(\mathrm{~s})=\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{A}}^{0(0)}(\mathrm{s} 2 \mathrm{~A})^{(0)} \\
& \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{B}}^{(0)}(\mathrm{s} 2 \mathrm{~B})
\end{aligned}:
$$

Finally, it has to be noted that in the Gaussian lim it, rst the product of $G 0$ and $C_{m p s}$ has to be taken and only then the lim it can be applied to ( $\mathrm{G}{ }_{0} \mathrm{Cm}_{\mathrm{ms}}$ ).
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