

## **Micro/Mesoscopic Approaches to the Ring Formation in Linear Wormlike Micellar Systems**

**Martin Kröger**

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Department of Physical Chemistry and the Fritz Haber Research Center, IL-91904 Jerusalem, Israel, and  
Institute of Polymers, Polymer Physics, ETH Zentrum, CH-8092 Zürich, Switzerland

**SUMMARY:** We hereby present i) a microscopic model for the self-assembly of linear wormlike micelles for which scission/recombination processes and loop formation are allowed, and ii) a mesoscopic analytic description of such systems. Both approaches predict the extent of loop formation as function of the micellar concentration, the end-cap energy and the flexibility of micelles. As a matter of fact, even if loop formation is unfavorable under many conditions, e.g., for stiff micelles and low end cap energies, they have to be treated correctly in any statistical approach to their behavior, since their presence can significantly affect the relaxation time spectrum, the rheological behavior and correlation function of various types.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Under many conditions amphiphilic systems self-assemble into cylindrical shaped polymer-like structures, so called linear wormlike micelles [1,2,3,4]. It is usually argued that the population of closed loops (or rings) in wormlike micellar systems is always small and can be neglected at all practical concentrations [1]. But loop formation can and has been already detected experimentally [5,6]. In our Brownian dynamics simulations we do observe loop formation under realistic conditions, which is – for a positive end-cap energy – an energetically favored, but entropically disfavored state of the system. How much it is disfavored at first glance should mainly depend on i) the ratio between average length and persistence length of the chains and ii) the end-cap energy. The average length in turn depends on the end-cap energy and concentration, since the flexibility, which is an intrinsic quantity, may be affected by concentration. We will demonstrate it later. Hence, if the end-cap energy is large, on one hand loop formation is preferred, on the other hand the ratio between average length and persistence length becomes large. For the same reason the limiting case of no ring formation is not simply obtained for very small end-cap energies, since then this ratio becomes small. Together, we

have two concurrent mechanisms which are affected by the end-cap energy. With increasing concentration the average length increases, but the chains usually become more flexible, such that we do not expect an universal increase or decrease of the ratio between average length and persistence length with concentration. For concentrated systems the end-cap energy should play a more important role for loop formation than in the dilute case.

In the following we study the length distribution of linear wormlike micelles and related quantities by using a functional integral approach in connection with methods provided by the statistical thermodynamics of Amphiphile self-assembly. [1,8]. The analytic results are in agreement with findings from our Brownian dynamics computer simulations. The treatment presented here is more general than the ones in [9,10] for classical chain polymers since the effect of scission/recombination and ring formation is taken into account.

## MESOSCOPIC MODEL

### Chemical potential for self-assembling systems

Let us denote the chemical potential of a cluster (which has to be identified with a linear chain) of size  $N$  in configuration  $s$  by  $\mu_s^{(N)} = E_s^{(N)} + k_B T \rho_s^{(N)}$ , where  $E_s^{(N)}$  denotes its energy and  $\rho_s^{(N)}$  stands for the number density of clusters of size  $N$  in configuration  $s$ . In chemical equilibrium, where all reactions  $N A_1 = A_N$  as well as linear combinations of these reactions take place simultaneously, one usually requires, for all  $s$ :  $N \mu^{(1)} = \mu_s^{(N)}$  [1]. Hence we can express the number densities of configurations  $s$  as

$$\rho_s^{(N)} \propto e^{\beta N \mu^{(1)}} e^{-\beta E_s^{(N)}}. \quad (1)$$

The number density of clusters of size  $N$  is then

$$\rho^{(N)} = \sum_s \rho_s^{(N)} = \frac{q^{(N)}}{q^{(1)}} [\rho^{(1)}]^N \propto q^{(N)} e^{N \beta (\mu^{(1)} + E_0)}, \quad (2)$$

where the configurational integral

$$q^{(N)} = \sum_s e^{-\beta \Delta E_s^{(N)}} \quad (3)$$

has been introduced. The densities are subject to the constraint of fixed number of beads of the total system, or alternatively, the bead concentration  $\phi = \sum_N N \rho^{(N)}$ . Within the context of the following dimensionless analysis,  $\phi$  has to be interpreted as the extent of contour length per volume, measured in units of the width of the wormlike micelles. Obviously, the aim becomes to calculate the configurational integral  $q^{(N)}$  of a cluster of size  $N$ .

In order to estimate the probability of finding loops, we split the configurational integral of linear chains of size  $N$  as

$$q^{(N)} = q_{\text{open}}^{(N)} \left[ 1 + \frac{q_{\text{loop}}^{(N)}}{q_{\text{open}}^{(N)}} \right] = q_{\text{open}}^{(N)} \left[ 1 + \frac{g_N^{\text{loop}}}{g_N^{\text{open}}} e^{E_2} \right], \quad (4)$$

where  $g_N^{\text{loop}}$  and  $g_N^{\text{open}}$  abbreviate the degeneracy of configurations with same energy and same size  $N$  for closed and open 'loops', respectively. The expression involves the ratio of degeneracies of linear chains with and without loops times the Boltzmann factor according to the energy difference between a closed and open chain of size  $N$ . respectively.

### Statistics of the wormlike chain

The wormlike chain model was first proposed by Kratky and Porod [11] and extended to the continuum model (functional integrals) by Saitô, Takahashi and Yunoki [12] and Freed [13], which is described by the statistical weighting factor  $p[\mathbf{r}(s)]$  where the wormlike chain is described by a continuous curve in three-dimensional space  $\mathbf{r}(s)$ . Here,  $s$  measures the contour length along the chain,  $0 \leq s \leq L$ ,  $\kappa$  is the dimensionless ( $k_B T \equiv 1$  throughout the manuscript) bending elastic coefficient and  $\mathbf{u}(s) = \partial \mathbf{r}(s) / \partial s$  the differential (tangent) of the curve  $\mathbf{r}(s)$ , and  $A$  a normalization constant which is equal to the inverse of the partition function.

$$p[\mathbf{r}(s)] = A \exp \left[ -\frac{3}{2l} \int_0^L \mathbf{u}^2(s) ds - \frac{1}{2} \kappa \int_0^L (\mathbf{u}')^2(s) ds \right]. \quad (5)$$

The stretching coefficient  $l$  will be related to  $\kappa$  below. So far, this model does not take into account concentration effects, i.e., we should at least regard an effective  $\kappa$ , being a function of concentration (see Tab. 1). But notice that the model works also in both limits, flexible chains ( $\kappa < L$ ) as well as stiff chains ( $\kappa > L$ ). Using the constraint  $|\mathbf{u}(s)| = 1$  which means that the polymer chains cannot be stretched, Saitô et al. derived an approximate (series) solution for the tangent distribution function (Green's method). There are many other contributions in this field but no analytic solutions for all  $\kappa$  and the case of  $|\mathbf{u}(s)| = 1$  are available. We follow here the most recent approach of Zhao, Sun and Zhang. They got analytic solutions for any type of correlation function for the model (5) by studying the configurational statistics by functional integrals in quasi-momentum space [14]. A fundamental quantity is the correlation function

$$C(\mathbf{R}, s) \propto \langle \delta(\mathbf{r}(s_1) - \mathbf{r}(s_2) - \mathbf{R}) \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where  $s = s_1 - s_2$ ,  $0 \leq s_1, s_2 \leq L$  and  $\langle \dots \rangle$  means the statistical average over various configurations of the chain by functional integrals. In [14] it was stressed out that the correlation functions are actually more fundamental than the end-to-end distribution functions for wormlike chains. As pointed out in [15], the end-to-end distribution function gives the mean end-to-end distance as  $\langle R^2 \rangle = lL$  in the long chain limit, which in fact is only valid for ideal Gaussian chains. For the average end-to-end distance they obtain, by making use of an additional condition of the average length of the chain being  $L$ , which leads to the relationship  $l = 4\kappa/3$  [9,16]

$$\langle R^2 \rangle = l \left[ L - \frac{l}{2} (1 - e^{-2L/l}) \right],$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{R}^2 \rangle &= lL \quad \text{for } \kappa \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{Gaussian}), \\ \langle \mathbf{R}^2 \rangle &= L^2 \quad \text{for } \kappa \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{rodlike}).\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

Other reasonable constraints can be formulated and lead to slightly different relationships between  $l$  and  $\kappa$ , e.g.,  $l = 3\pi^2\kappa/16$  (for  $|\mathbf{u}^2| = 1$ ),  $l = \kappa/3$  [13] or also  $l = 4\kappa/3$  by taking a limit on  $C(\mathbf{R}, s)$  which reads [14]

$$C(\mathbf{R}, s) = A e^{-R^2/4a_1(s)} \quad (8)$$

where

$$a_1(s) = \frac{l}{6} \left[ s - \frac{1}{\alpha} (1 - e^{-s\alpha}) \right], \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \equiv \sqrt{\frac{3}{\kappa l}} = \frac{3}{2\kappa}. \quad (9)$$

Using (8) we get the average monomer-monomer distance (distinguished from the end-to-end distance) separated by the contour distance  $s$ , for the wormlike chain model

$$\langle \mathbf{R}^2 \rangle(s) = l \left[ s - \frac{1}{\alpha} (1 - e^{-s\alpha}) \right], \quad (10)$$

from which (7) follows under the additional condition cited above, since  $\langle \mathbf{R}^2 \rangle \equiv \langle \mathbf{R}^2 \rangle(L)$ . From the correlation function the persistence length  $l_p(s)$  for finite contour distance  $s$  is derived as

$$l_p(s) = \frac{1}{\alpha} (1 - e^{-s\alpha}), \quad l_p \equiv l_p(1) \quad (11)$$

### Probability of loop formation

Now, to get the probability of finding the ends of a linear multibead chain with  $N$  beads and contour length  $L$  ( $L = aN$  with bond length  $a \equiv 1$  in order to use the same notation as used in a computational study of a discretized version of the wormlike chain model) within a finite interaction distance  $r_c \approx a = 1$ , we have to carry out the appropriate integral over  $C(\mathbf{R}, s)$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{g_N^{\text{loop}}}{g_N^{\text{open}}} &= [\int_0^{r_c} C(\mathbf{R}, L) d^3\mathbf{R}] / [\int_0^L C(\mathbf{R}, L) d^3\mathbf{R}] \\ &= [\int_0^{r_c} R^2 C(R, L) dR] / [\int_0^L R^2 C(R, L) dR]\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

Two plots are given in Fig. 1. We can show the following scaling behavior ( $r_c = 1$ )

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{g_N^{\text{loop}}}{g_N^{\text{open}}} &\approx (\kappa N)^{-\zeta} \quad \text{for } N > \zeta\kappa, \\ \frac{g_N^{\text{loop}}}{g_N^{\text{open}}} &\approx \zeta^\zeta \kappa^0 N^{-2\zeta} \quad \text{for } N \leq \zeta\kappa, \\ \text{with} \quad \zeta &\equiv \frac{3}{2},\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

which is valid for classical polymers too [17]. To derive the number density of living chains of size  $N$ , i.e.,  $N$  beads, one has to determine the coefficient of proportionality in (2) from the constraint of fixed concentration  $\phi$  (by making use of Eq. 19)

$$\begin{aligned}\phi &= \sum_N N \rho^{(N)} = \sum_N N \frac{q^{(N)}_{(1)}}{q^{(1)}} (\rho^{(1)})^N \\ &= e^{-\delta} \sum_N N e^{-N\alpha_o} \left[ 1 + \frac{g_N^{\text{loop}}}{g_N^{\text{open}}} e^{E_2} \right] \\ &= e^{-\delta} \alpha_o^{-2} + \omega^{-1} \sum_N N e^{-N\alpha_o} \frac{g_N^{\text{loop}}}{g_N^{\text{open}}}\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

with a positive quantity  $\alpha_o$

$$\alpha_o = -\log \rho^{(1)} - \delta, \quad (15)$$

an 'effective' scission energy  $\delta$ , which may be affected by salt concentration via the flexibility-induced degeneracy  $\omega(\kappa)$  (17)

$$\delta \equiv E_2 + \log \omega \quad (16)$$

and  $q_{\text{open}}^{(N)} = \omega^{N-1} e^{E_2(N-1)}$ , where  $\omega$  is independent of  $N$  for open chains [1]. A rough estimate for  $\omega$  as function of the bending coefficient  $\kappa$  is obtained from the form of the bending potential  $U(\vartheta) = \kappa(1 - \cos \vartheta)$  (see also the next section)

$$\log \omega = \int_0^\pi \sin \vartheta e^{-U(\vartheta)} d\vartheta = \frac{1}{\kappa} (1 - e^{-2\kappa}), \quad (17)$$

i.e.,  $\omega \rightarrow e^{2(1-\kappa)}$  and  $\omega \rightarrow e^{1/\kappa}$  for ideal flexible and stiff chains, respectively. The expression (17) reflects a scaling of the configurational integral with the contour length in units of the persistence length. Inserting (13) into (14), with  $r_c = 1$ , we have

$$\phi = e^{-\delta} \alpha_o^{-2} + \omega^{-1} \zeta^\zeta \sum_{N \leq \zeta \kappa} N^{-2} e^{-N\alpha_o} + \omega^{-1} \kappa^{-\zeta} \sum_{N > \zeta \kappa} N^{-1/2} e^{-N\alpha_o}. \quad (18)$$

Before we proceed we should recall relationships, which will be frequently used in the following (for any  $k+2 > 0, \alpha > 0$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}M_k &\equiv \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} N^{k+1} e^{-\alpha N} \approx \int_{N=1}^{\infty} N^{k+1} e^{-\alpha N} dN = \Gamma(k+2) \alpha^{-(k+2)}, \\ M_{k+1}/M_k &= \frac{\Gamma(k+3)}{\Gamma(k+2)} 1/\alpha = (k+2)/\alpha,\end{aligned}\quad (19)$$

where  $\Gamma(k) = (k-1)!$ , if  $k$  is an integer. E.g., for linear chains without loops the density  $\phi$  is proportional to the quantity  $M_k$  with  $k=0$  and the number and weight averaged sizes of linear micelles are expressed through the  $M$ 's as [1]

$$\langle n \rangle_{\#} \equiv \phi / [\sum \rho^{(N)}] = M_k / M_{k-1}, \quad \langle n \rangle_w \equiv M_{k+1} / M_k. \quad (20)$$

Obviously, in the classical case the ratio between weight and number average size is readily evaluated as  $M_{k+1}M_{k-1}/M_k^2 = (k+2)/(k+1) = 2$ . In opposite, evaluating the finite sums in (18) which involve  $N^{k+1}$  with  $k+2 < 0$  is more complicated. But, for example, we have for  $\alpha_o > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{M}_{(-3/2)} &\equiv \sum_{N=\zeta\kappa}^{\infty} N^{-1/2} e^{-\alpha_o N} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha_o}} (1 - \text{Erf}[\sqrt{\alpha_o \zeta \kappa}])^{\alpha_o \zeta \kappa < 1} \approx \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha_o}} - 2\sqrt{\zeta \kappa} \\ \underline{M}_{(-3)} &\equiv \sum_{N=1}^{\zeta\kappa} N^{-2} e^{-\alpha_o N} = e^{-\alpha_o} - \frac{e^{-\alpha_o \zeta \kappa}}{\zeta \kappa} + \alpha_o [\text{Ei}(-\alpha_o) - \text{Ei}(-\alpha_o \zeta \kappa)]\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

with the error function  $\text{Erf}(\cdot)$  and the exponential integral function  $\text{Ei}(\cdot)$ . In the following we present analytic results for various regimes.

## ANALYTIC RESULTS

**Quite stiff semiflexible chains:** To proceed with (18) in case of quite stiff chains, for which  $\zeta \kappa \alpha_o > 1$  is valid, we get a simple expression for  $\alpha_o$  (15) as function of effective scission energy  $\delta$  (16) and concentration  $\phi$  (note that  $\zeta \equiv 3/2$  from above)

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_o &= \phi^{-1/2} e^{-\delta/2} \\ \rho^{(N \leq \zeta \kappa)} &= e^{-N \phi^{-1/2} e^{-\delta/2} - \delta} [1 + \zeta \kappa^0 N^{-2\zeta} e^{E_2}] \\ \rho^{(N > \zeta \kappa)} &= e^{-N \phi^{-1/2} e^{-\delta/2} - \delta} [1 + (\kappa N)^{-\zeta} e^{E_2}] \approx e^{-N \phi^{-1/2} e^{-\delta/2} - \delta} \\ \langle n \rangle_{\#} &= \phi^{1/2} e^{\delta/2} = \phi^{1/2} e^{E_2/2} \sqrt{\omega}.\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

As expected, in case of stiff chains and few loops we recover the classical result for  $\omega = 1$ , and the effect of flexibility comes into the result via  $\sqrt{\omega}$ . We may also quantify the range of this regime of 'quite stiff flexible chains'. According to (22) it is valid whenever  $e^{E_2}/N^3 \ll 1$  and  $e^{E_2}/(\kappa N)^{3/2} \ll 1$ , i.e., for sufficiently stiff ( $\kappa$ ) or long ( $N$ ) chains, if the scission energy  $E_2$  is comparably small.

**Flexible chains with loops:** In-case of fully flexible chains, i.e., for  $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ , or even for  $\kappa \zeta < 1$  the second term in (18) vanishes, because of  $N > \zeta \kappa$ , and the remaining terms read

$$\phi = e^{-\delta} \alpha_o^{-2} + \omega^{-1} \kappa^{-\zeta} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha_o}} \quad (23)$$

At sufficiently large effective scission energy  $\delta$  and for very flexible chains, i.e., if  $\kappa^{3/2}/e^{\delta} \ll \alpha_o^{3/2}/\omega$  is fulfilled, the second term on the rhs of (23) dominates and loop formation is preferred. In this limit, for the size distribution and average weight size we get a result which is now independent of the end-cap energy  $E_2$  and very sensitive to changes in the concentration

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_o &= (\phi \omega)^{-2} \pi \kappa^{-3}, \\ \rho^{(N)} &= \omega^{-1} \kappa^{-\zeta} e^{-N \alpha_o} N^{-\zeta}, \\ \langle n \rangle_w &= \Gamma(3/2) \alpha_o^{-1} = (\phi \omega)^2 \kappa^3 (4\pi)^{-1/2}.\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

**The general case: Semiflexible chains:** For chains with finite semiflexibility the exact nonlinear equation for  $\alpha_o$  and the expression for the size distribution read

$$\phi = e^{-\delta} \alpha_o^{-2} + \omega^{-1} \left[ \zeta^\zeta \underline{M}_{(-3)} + \kappa^{-\zeta} \bar{M}_{(-3/2)} \right], \quad (25)$$

$$\rho^{(N)} = e^{-\delta} e^{-N\alpha_o} \left[ 1 + \frac{g_N^{\text{loop}}}{g_N^{\text{open}}} e^{E_2} \right]. \quad (26)$$

Eqs. (25, 25) contain Eqs. (23, 24) as special cases. The rich scaling behavior of the average lengths  $\langle n \rangle_{\# , w}$  now follows directly by inserting the solution of Eq. (25), with (21) for  $\alpha_o$  into Eqs. (26, 20). The ratio  $g_N^{\text{loop}}/g_N^{\text{open}}$  has to be taken from Eq. (13). The number and weight averages, as obtained from  $\rho^{(N)}$  via (20) involve also the symbols  $\bar{M}_{(-1/2)}$ ,  $\bar{M}_{(1/2)}$  and  $\underline{M}_{(-2)}$  and  $\underline{M}_{(-1)}$ . These are rewritten as:

$$\underline{M}_{(k-2)} \equiv \int_0^{\zeta\kappa} dN N^{k-1} e^{-\alpha_o N} = \frac{\Gamma I(k, 0, \alpha_o \zeta \kappa)}{\alpha_o^{-k}}, \quad (27)$$

which, by definition involves the generalized incomplete gamma function  $\Gamma I$ , see [18] for more information. The remaining terms are expressed by the above results as follows

$$\bar{M}_{(k-2)} = \Gamma(k) \alpha_o^{-k} - \underline{M}_{(k-2)}. \quad (28)$$

After having introduced the expected behavior of wormlike micellar systems for which loop formation occurs, we turn to describe the simulation method which we use to study a microscopic model of such systems. The results will be discussed and compared to each other in the subsequent section.

## A BROWNIAN MOLECULAR DYNAMICS STUDY

As mentioned, the reason to study the probabilities of loop formation stems from our observation of loop formation in model wormlike micellar systems. We will briefly introduce this method and will concentrate on the equilibrium results, although the rheological properties of the samples under study are also partially known [19]. The systems were studied by incorporating the process of branching into our algorithm for linear wormlike micellar system, where loop formation was explicitly forbidden [8,20] in order to compare with classical results. The simulation method we use is a Nonequilibrium Brownian dynamics (NEBD) computer simulation. This method solves a many particle system numerically by adding stochastic (actually 'bivariate') forces to the deterministic part of the equation of motions in accordance with the fluctuation dissipation theorem. Typically, our systems consist of 5000 particles or 'beads'. The deterministic part of the motion of our particles is completely determined by the model potentials. The first one is a repulsive Lennard-Jones potential (WCA) which acts between all pairs of beads. It models the effect of excluded volume.

Second, in order to form chains, an attractive nonlinear spring force (FENE-C potential, introduced in [20]) acts between all pairs of beads (whose spatial distance is below a certain threshold value) as long as both beads have only one or two interacting neighbors. Such a transient bond between connected beads defines the chain itself as well as its contour and it breaks if any bond length exceeds the threshold value. The parameters of the FENE-C potential define the end-cap energy  $E_2$  of our model.

Moreover, we apply a bending potential which makes it possible to study chains with different flexibilities. This is a bending potential between neighboring bonds within chains of the form  $U(\vartheta) = \kappa[1 - \cos(\vartheta)]$ , where  $\kappa$  is the bending coefficient and  $\vartheta$  is the angle between connected bonds, such that  $\vartheta = 0$  for a stretched chain. Here, we present results of a Brownian dynamics simulation which does not take into account hydrodynamic interactions [21]. Some results are collected in Tab. 1. The agreement with the theoretical predictions is good for all concentrations, if the effect of concentration is incorporated into the bending coefficient. We do observe such a dependence as shown in Fig. 2. With increasing concentration the probability of loop formation decreases resulting from the increase of average length of micelles. With increasing scission energy loop formation becomes favorable, but increasing stiffness decreases the tendency of ring formation. These relations were quantified in the foregoing section. At large concentrations and large values for  $\kappa$  there are deviations from the square root behavior  $\langle n \rangle_{\#} \propto \sqrt{\phi}$  which are expected, when a mean-field approach is used to describe the effect of concentration. The analytic results were valid in the dilute limit. A snapshot is given in Fig. 3.

**Tab. 1.** Results from our Brownian dynamics computer simulation of linear wormlike micellar systems. The table contains the extracted values for the number and weight size averages  $\langle n \rangle_{\#,w}$  as well as the number of loops per bead and the measured persistence length  $l_p$  for different bead number concentrations  $\phi$ , end-cap energies  $E_2$  and bending coefficients  $\kappa$ .



end-cap energy  $E_2 = 4.7$ 

$\phi$	$\kappa$	$\log_{10} \frac{p_{\text{loop}}}{p_{\text{open}}}$	$\langle n \rangle_w$	$\langle n \rangle_{\#}$	$l_p$
0.05	1	-1.26	3.98	2.66	0.53
0.05	2	-1.48	4.91	3.07	1.00
0.05	3	-1.67	5.05	2.91	1.44
0.05	5	-2.67	5.37	3.02	3.58
0.05	10	-3.17	5.46	3.06	7.54
0.05	20	-3.43	5.04	2.95	13.5
0.05	50	-3.99	5.20	2.52	31.2
0.05	100	-4.22	5.17	2.22	62.6
0.05	200	-5.10	4.06	1.94	94.2
0.10	1	-1.27	5.74	3.67	0.63
0.10	2	-1.55	7.73	4.19	1.19
0.10	3	-2.25	8.94	4.48	2.11
0.10	5	-2.71	9.28	4.78	3.43
0.10	10	-2.89	10.1	4.84	6.84
0.10	20	-2.90	11.4	4.89	12.0
0.10	50	-3.09	12.4	4.80	21.1
0.10	100	-4.31	12.7	3.99	54.9
0.10	200	-6.22	21.1	3.49	103.
0.20	1	-1.65	12.9	6.70	0.96
0.20	2	-1.83	11.9	6.40	1.38
0.20	3	-2.38	14.2	7.17	2.02
0.20	5	-3.39	14.9	7.63	3.37
0.20	10	-3.17	16.5	7.87	5.73
0.20	20	-4.47	21.0	8.72	10.3
0.20	50	-3.39	22.9	7.98	23.3
0.20	100	-2.81	23.0	6.94	39.8
0.20	200	-3.50	30.9	8.02	61.9

end-cap energy  $E_2 = 8.1$ 


$\phi$	$\kappa$	$\log_{10} \frac{p_{\text{loop}}}{p_{\text{open}}}$	$\langle n \rangle_w$	$\langle n \rangle_{\#}$	$l_p$
0.01	0	-0.63	3.41	2.79	0.90
0.01	5	-1.76	7.88	4.64	2.69
0.01	20	-2.39	8.49	4.60	13.6
0.01	100	-2.71	5.01	2.38	57.8
0.02	0	-0.62	3.69	3.07	0.40
0.02	5	-1.93	13.5	6.57	3.53
0.02	20	-2.94	14.6	8.98	18.6
0.02	100	-4.51	11.5	3.95	83.4
0.05	0	-0.67	5.13	3.79	0.47
0.05	5	-2.25	20.0	10.0	3.80
0.05	20	-2.70	21.5	12.7	17.1
0.05	100	-3.40	34.4	12.8	75.0
0.10	0	-0.79	10.0	4.59	0.41
0.10	5	-2.29	35.5	18.6	3.82
0.10	20	-2.80	38.4	21.9	14.5
0.10	100	-3.50	33.9	18.7	59.6
0.15	0	-1.01	19.2	6.82	0.41
0.15	5	-2.39	43.0	21.9	3.89
0.15	20	-2.69	39.4	23.8	13.1
0.15	100	-3.19	34.7	18.5	38.0
0.20	0	-1.15	22.2	8.41	0.52
0.20	5	-2.69	40.8	22.4	3.68
0.20	20	-2.81	57.8	30.3	13.2
0.20	100	-3.29	69.1	16.9	28.1
0.30	0	-1.25	47.2	11.2	0.57
0.30	5	-1.60	49.3	23.1	2.95
0.30	20	-2.60	73.1	28.8	11.1
0.30	100	-3.41	53.3	23.9	21.7

 $\log_{10} \frac{p_{\text{loop}}}{p_{\text{open}}} (E_2 = 8.1)$ 

$\phi$	$\kappa = 0$	5	20	100
0.01	-0.63	-1.76	-2.39	-2.71
0.02	-0.62	-1.93	-2.94	-4.51
0.05	-0.67	-2.25	-2.70	-3.40
0.10	-0.79	-2.29	-2.80	-3.50
0.15	-1.01	-2.39	-2.69	-3.19
0.20	-1.15	-2.69	-2.81	-3.29
0.30	-1.25	-1.60	-2.60	-3.41

 $\log_{10} \frac{p_{\text{loop}}}{p_{\text{open}}} (E_2 = 4.7)$ 


$\phi$	$\kappa = 1$	2	3	5	10	20	50	100	200
0.05	-1.26	-1.48	-1.67	-2.67	-3.17	-3.43	-3.99	-4.22	-5.10
0.10	-1.27	-1.55	-2.25	-2.71	-2.89	-2.90	-3.09	-4.31	-6.22
0.20	-1.65	-1.83	-2.38	-3.39	-3.17	-4.47	-3.39	-2.81	-3.50




**Fig. 1.** Analytic results for the probability of loop formation as function of the length of a wormlike chain ( $N = L/a$ ) and the persistence length. The results for wormlike micellar (living) chains incorporate the nature of scission and are discussed in the text. They depend on the end-cap energy and concentration too. The persistence length  $l_p$  and  $N$  are measured in units of the width of the wormlike chain. Left:  $l_p = 1, 3, 5, 10, 20, 30, 50, 100$ . Right:  $N = 3, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100, 1000$ .

## CONCLUSIONS

In this note we presented a route to the study of the statics and dynamics of loop formation in wormlike micellar systems. As shown, the probability of creating loops depends in the prescribed way on the end-cap energy and the persistence length, since the effect of concentration can be incorporated into a relationship between elastic bending coefficient and persistence length. With increasing concentration the persistence length increases until loop formation becomes very improbable, at high concentration the persistence length and hence the effective bending coefficient decrease due to collisions which occur on a length scale which is comparable to the mesh size. Hence, for real systems, if the persistence length and the probability of loops has been determined, e.g., by optical methods [3], the end-cap energy and the size distribution of micelles can be estimated by using the above formulas. We did not estimate the effect of branching on the number of loops here. A more complete discussion, which treats also branchings will be available soon [19].



**Fig. 2.** Left: The average weight size of wormlike micelles vs concentration for different bending coefficients  $\kappa$ . Right: The probability to find a certain bead inside a loop for different bending coefficients  $\kappa$  and concentrations  $\phi$ . These results are obtained by a Brownian dynamics computer simulation of the microscopic FENE-C model for wormlike micelles.



**Fig. 3.** Snapshot of a BD computer simulation configuration of wormlike micelles with parameters  $\phi = 0.02$ ,  $\kappa = 5$  and  $E_2 = 4$ . Here, a small system size, containing 1000 beads, was chosen for reasons of clarity.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the members of the Fritz Haber Research Center, in particular Avinoam Ben-Shaul, Yardena Raviv-Bohbot and Sylvio May for the fruitful discussions and the overall pleasant atmosphere which I enjoyed during my stay. For this period I acknowledge financial support of the Minerva foundation, Munich. Computing time was provided by the 'bigbug' parallel computer of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Konrad-Zuse-Zentrum für Informationstechnik (ZIB/Berlin) and the German super computing center in Jülich (HLRZ/Kfa GmbH).

## References

- [1] W.M. Gelbart, A. Ben-Shaul and D. Roux, *Micelles, membranes, microemulsions and monolayers* (Springer, NY, 1994)
- [2] J.N. Israelachvili, D. Mitchell J., B.W. Ninham, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. II **72**, 1525 (1976).
- [3] S.J. Candau, P. Hebraud, V. Schmitt, F. Lequeux, F. Kern and R. Zana, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **16** (1994) 1401
- [4] J.V. Selinger and R.F. Bruinsma, *Phys. Rev. A* **43** (1991) 2910
- [5] Y. Talmon, *Ber. d. Bunsenges. Physik. Chem.* **100** (100) 364.
- [6] E. Buhler, J.P. Munch and S.J. Candau, *Europhys. Lett.* **34**, 251-5 (1996).
- [7] M. Cates, *Macromolecules* **20**, 2289 (1987) 2289; *J. Phys. France* **49**, 1593 (1988).
- [8] W. Carl, R. Makhloufi and M. Kröger, *J. Phys. France II* **7** (1997) 931-946.
- [9] P. J. Flory, *Statistical mechanics of chain molecules* (Hanser, Munich, 1969).
- [10] H. Jacobsen and W.H. Stockmayer, *J. Chem. Phys.* **18** (1950) 1600.
- [11] O. Kratky and G. Porod, *Recueil Trav. Chim.* **68** (1949) 1106; G. Porod, *Monatsh. Chem.* **80** (1949) 251.
- [12] N. Saitô, K. Takahashi and Y. Yunoki, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **22** (1967) 219.
- [13] K.F. Freed, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **22** (1972) 1
- [14] S.R. Zhao, C.P. Sun and W.X. Zhang, submitted 1996 to *J. Chem. Phys.*
- [15] J.B. Lagowski and J. Noolandj, *J. Chem. Phys.* **95** (1991) 1266.
- [16] H. Benoit and P. Doty, *J. Phys. Chem.* **57** (1953) 958.
- [17] J.F. Brown and G.M.J. Slusarczuk, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **87** (1965) 931.
- [18] M. Abramowitz und I.A. Stegun, *NBS Handbook of mathematical functions* (Dover Publ. Inc., NY, 1964)
- [19] M. Kröger and A. Ben-Shaul, submitted 1997.
- [20] M. Kröger and R. Makhloufi, *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, 2531 (1995)
- [21] H.C. Öttinger, *Stochastic processes in polymeric fluids* (Springer, Heidelberg, 1996)