Impact of Nanoparticles on the Segmental and Swelling Dynamics of Ionomer Nanocomposite Membranes
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ABSTRACT: While ionomer nanocomposites show promise for advancing the viability of energy storage technologies, such as the vanadium redox flow battery, the improvements in ion selectivity are appreciable only insofar as demonstrating feasibility of these hybrid materials and are largely insufficient for wide-scale implementation of such technologies. This is in part due to our lack of understanding of how the introduction of nanoparticles (NPs) alters the morphology and dynamics of the resultant ionomer nanocomposite. Herein, we employ time-resolved attenuated total reflectance−Fourier transform infrared (tATR-FTIR) spectroscopy, as well as neutron spin echo (NSE) spectroscopy, to capture the viscoelastic creep/swelling kinetics and segmental dynamics, respectively, of these ionomer nanocomposite membranes under hydration. The polymer swelling data from tATR-FTIR spectroscopy experiments was fit to a three-element model to quantify the relaxation time constant for each nanocomposite at various NP loadings. In addition, NSE spectroscopy experiments on hydrated ionomer nanocomposites showed, in general, a stiffening of the segmental dynamics with increasing NP loading as well as thermal history. In addition, data from these experiments, in conjunction with previous morphological and thermomechanical studies on Nafton−SiNP nanocomposites, suggest that the NPs reside at the interface of the hydrophobic and hydrophilic phases of the ionomer, thereby altering the vanadium ion transport via slowdown of fluorocarbon chain dynamics. Results from this study have profound implications for controlling ion selectivity in these ionomer nanocomposite membranes.

INTRODUCTION

Ionomer nanocomposites prepared with silica (SiO₂) nanoparticles (SiNPs) have garnered considerable attention in recent years for effectively suppressing undesirable vanadium ion crossover in vanadium redox flow batteries (VRFBs) without significantly altering desirable proton flux through the membrane.¹⁻⁴ The most widely used ionomer material for VRFBs is Nafton, a perfluorosulfonic acid polymer wherein sulfonic acid-terminated perfluorovinyl ether chains are grafted onto a Teflon-like backbone. In hydrated environments, the ionomer exists in a nanophase-segregated morphology, where the hydrophilic sulfonic groups form ionic channels that facilitate transport of protons and ions, while the hydrophobic Teflon-like domain provides excellent chemical and mechanical stability.¹,⁵,⁶ Nafton nanocomposites have been exhaustively investigated for their excellent methanol crossover resistances in direct methanol fuel cells (DMFCs),⁷⁻¹² motivating their implementation in VRFBs to combat the poor ion selectivity of the unmodified membrane. These ionomer nanocomposites have traditionally been fabricated using an in situ sol−gel condensation process,¹⁻³,⁷ whereby a preformed Nafton membrane is imbibed with precursor silica sol that, under heat, reacts to form a “condensed” silica phase within the membrane. More recently, these composites have been fabricated via solution-casting, as this technique provides the ability to introduce discrete nanoparticles of prescribed size and surface chemistry into the ionomer membrane.¹¹,¹³ In contrast to sol−gel nanocomposites, solution-cast membranes are fabricated by casting a dispersion (solution) of Nafton and SiNPs and allowing the solvent to evaporate, thereby forming a dense, nanocomposite membrane.
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In Nafton–SiO₂ nanocomposites, the nanoparticles are traditionally understood to be preferentially sequestered into the ionic channels, where they impede movement of hydrated vanadium ions via a size exclusion mechanism. In addition, Schwenzel et al. suggested that interactions between the sulfonic groups in the ionic channels and the SiNPs could render many sulfonic groups inaccessible for vanadium ion diffusion. However, a significant number of reports observe modifications to the thermomechanical behavior (e.g., α- and β-relaxations) of Nafton when SiNPs are introduced into the unmodified ionomer matrix. This is reminiscent of similar effects reported in other nanoparticle-modified systems and indicates that interfacial interactions between the polymer chains and nanoparticles are more enhanced than if the nanoparticles resided primarily in the ion channels of the ionomer. As such, these interactions may not be entirely dependent on the sulfonic activity in the ionic channels.

Previous studies using wide-angle X-ray spectroscopy have also reported perturbations at length scales correlating to the chain packing in the hydrophobic phase due to presence of SiNPs. In addition, small-angle neutron scattering (SANS) experiments on Nafton–SiO₂ reported by Davis and co-workers suggest that nanoparticles are too big to solely reside within the ionic channels and are predominantly present in the hydrophobic bulk. This was verified by the presence of large SiNP aggregates (hundreds of nanometers in diameter) in the transmission electron microscopy (TEM) images. The authors also found that annealing neat Nafton ionomer membranes as effective in reducing vanadium ion crossover as the introduction of SiNPs. These results present an interesting conundrum, as the SiNPs may not be directly interacting with vanadium ions as has previously been thought (i.e., by steric impedance). Rather, transport through the ionic channels in Nafton may be coupled to the polymer chain (segmental) dynamics and morphology.

Recent studies indicate that the Nafton morphology and segmental dynamics are affected at the Nafton–nanoparticle interface, where morphological variations at the interface were found to be specific to the nature of nanoparticle surface (hydrophobic vs hydrophilic), which engendered different nanophase ordering within Nafton in each case. Separately, a vast body of work highlights the impact of nanoparticles on the segmental dynamics and consequently glass transition temperatures in nanocomposites (e.g., SiNPs in a poly(methyl methacrylate) matrix). Thus, it is an ongoing challenge to correlate how the altered morphology in the “bound” Nafton layer (i.e., Nafton–SiO₂ interface) results in bulk-scale dynamics of the ionomer nanocomposite system.

To probe the effect of nanoparticles on the segmental dynamics and viscoelastic behavior of Nafton, two series of nanocomposite membranes were prepared using extruded Nafton 117 films (sol–gel series) and Nafton 1100 resin solution (solution-cast series). At least two of the membranes in each series contained SiO₂ at a loading of approximately 4% (by mass) and 10% (by mass). Note that here that “% (by mass)” denotes mass of SiO₂ per mass of Nafton solids (i.e., g SiO₂/g Nafton). All nanocomposite samples prepared via the sol–gel method were subjected to thermal treatment (140 °C for 2 h) as part of the synthesis process. The thermal treatment, herein also termed “annealing,” is performed at a temperature well above the glass transition temperature of the Nafton ionomer and is expected to enhance the degree of order in the fluorocarbon chain packing within the membrane.

Thus, to investigate the impact of crystallinity on the sorption kinetics and polymer dynamics, these nanocomposite membranes were compared to unmodified Nafton membranes (no SiNPs), which were either unannealed (no heat treatment) or annealed (140 °C for 2 h).

In this study, we investigate nanoscale segmental relaxation dynamics and bulk swelling kinetics of Nafton–SiO₂ nanocomposites prepared by both sol–gel and solution-casting methods. Specifically, the diffusion-induced polymer swelling dynamics are characterized using time-resolved attenuated total reflectance–Fourier transform infrared (ATR-FTIR) spectroscopy. The swelling data were fit to a three-element viscoelastic model to gain insight into how the creep response of Nafton under osmotic stress is altered by the presence of SiNPs. In addition, the segmental dynamics of the Nafton–SiO₂ membranes were probed via neutron spin echo (NSE) spectroscopy. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time the molecular-level polymer dynamics in solution-cast and sol–gel synthesized Nafton–SiO₂ membranes have been reported.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Materials.** Nafton perfluorinated resin solution (20% by mass) in mixture of lower aliphatic alcohols and water, equivalent weight = 1100 g/mol sulfonic acid), tetraethyl orthosilicate (TEOS, ≥99.0% purity), methanol (HPLC grade, ≥99.9% purity), sulfuric acid (95%–98% purity, ACS reagent), and deuterium oxide (D₂O, 99.9 atom % D) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. Silicon oxide nanoparticles (99.5% purity, 10–20 nm particle size, nonporous) were obtained from Nissan Chemicals as a dispersion in methanol (30% by mass silica). Extruded Nafton 117 membranes (thickness ≈ 180 μm, equivalent weight = 1100 g/mol sulfonic acid) were obtained from Ion Power Inc. Hydrogen peroxide (30% by mass) in H₂O was procured from VWR International. Additionally, reverse osmosis (RO) water (resitivity ≈ 18 MΩ-cm) and dry nitrogen gas were used for all liquid water polymer swelling experiments.

**Membrane Purification.** Prior to use, commercially procured Nafton 117 membranes were purified and protonated. Specifically, the membranes were cut into 4 cm × 9 cm strips (for NSE spectroscopy experiments) or to the size of the ATR crystals (for ATR-FTIR spectroscopy experiments) and refluxed for 1 h in 3% (by mass) hydrogen peroxide, followed by deionized water, then 0.5 mol/L sulfuric acid, and finally deionized water. After each step, the membranes were thoroughly washed with deionized water. Finally, the purified films were dried at 90 °C under vacuum for 24 h to obtain dry polymer mass. Note that when nanocomposite films were prepared via solution casting, this purification step was not employed.

**Preparation of Nafton–SiO₂ Nanocomposite Membranes via the Sol–Gel Method.** After purification, dried Nafton 117 strips were equilibrated in a 2:1 (v/v) methanol/water solution for 4 h at room temperature. Following equilibration, a solution of TEOS and methanol (TEOS:methanol = 1:5:1 (v/v)) was added to a stoppered flask containing the equilibrated films as well as 50 mL of the methanol/water solution in which the films were equilibrated. The quantity of TEOS–methanol solution introduced in the flask was determined as to maintain the water to TEOS molar ratio at 4:1. Immediately after addition of TEOS, the films were sealed for the desired residence times (i.e., the time the film was left to soak in the precursor solution). Once removed from the reaction flasks, the films were washed with pure methanol and blotted dry to prevent gelation on the surface.

Next, the films were dried at room temperature for 24 h, followed by thermal treatment (annealing) for 2 h at 140 °C, after which the oven was allowed to cool to room temperature. The entire process (from drying to annealing to cooling) was performed under dynamic vacuum. To prevent delamination issues during ATR-FTIR characterization (i.e., membrane not being properly adhered to the...
ATR crystal), samples prepared for these experiments were clamped
between two 105 mm × 15 mm Teflon plates prior to being placed in
the vacuum oven. Finally, the dry, annealed Na‐SiO₂ nanocomposite
films were weighed to obtain the mass of silica phase in the films.

Preparation of Na‐SiO₂ Nanocomposite Membranes via the Solution‐Cast Method. A series of Na‐SiO₂
dispersions were prepared (with silica content ranging from 0% (by
mass) to 10% (by mass)) by transferring “as‐received” Naion stock
solution into a 25 mL scintillation vial and adding the appropriate
amount of silica nanoparticles. The vials were sonicated for 3‐4 h
to ensure uniform dispersion. The suspensions were then cast into a 5 × 7.5 cm polydimethylsiloxane mold, which was placed in a
Teflon Petri dish (for samples for NSE experiments) or onto a
trapezoidal, multirefraction germanium crystal (for tATR‐FTIR
experiments) and allowed to dry at room temperature overnight.
Membranes prepared via solution casting had thicknesses of ≈150
μm. For membranes requiring thermal treatment, the polymer‐coated
crystals were placed under dynamic vacuum and heated to 140 °C
for 2 h, followed by cooling to room temperature, before removing the
films. For NSE samples requiring thermal treatment, the samples
were carefully peeled from the Teflon dish using a pair of tweezers prior to
the aforementioned annealing step.

Time‐Resolved ATR‐FTIR Spectroscopy. For liquid water
ionomer swelling measurements, time‐resolved infrared spectra
were collected using a Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectrometer
(Nicolet iS50R FT‐IR spectrometer; Thermo Scientific), which was
equipped with horizontal, temperature‐controlled attenuated total
reflectance (ATR) cell (Gateway ATR accessory; Specac, Inc.). For
solution‐cast membranes, the polymer films were deposited on a
multiple reflection, trapezoidal germanium (Ge) ATR crystal (Specac,
Inc., 45° beveled faces). For extruded Naion 117 membranes, the
preformed membranes were “physisorbed” onto the surface of a zinc
selenide (ZnSe) ATR crystal (Specac, Inc.) as previously described.
All infrared spectra were collected using a liquid nitrogen cooled
mercury–cadmium–telluride detector at a rate of two scans per
spectrum and a resolution of 4 cm⁻¹, resulting in a repeat collection
time of ≈0.78 s for tATR‐FTIR experiments.

Prior to liquid water swelling experiments, a background spectrum
of the ATR crystal was collected, and all subsequent spectra were
subtracted from this spectrum. Next, a polymer‐coated ATR crystal
(either Ge or ZnSe) was mounted into the flow‐through ATR cell by
placing a Kalrez gasket between the top plate and the top side of the
film. Then the cell was sealed. Once the flow through cells were
mounted on the ATR accessory, the films were dried in high‐purity
nitrogen for ~4 h before beginning each experiment.

To begin liquid water swelling experiments, reverse osmosis water
was pipetted into the ATR cell in the space above the polymer film (V
= 50 μL; the side opposite the polymer–crystal interface) and sealed
to prevent water evaporation during experiments. This was followed
by time‐resolved infrared spectral collection. All spectra were
collected at 25 °C, which was controlled by a temperature bath.
Immediately following each experiment, the thickness of the hydrated
membranes was measured using a digital micrometer (Mitutoyo) with
a 1 μm accuracy. Each film thickness was an average of five individual
measurements at different positions along the length of the film.

Neutron Spin Echo Spectroscopy. NSE experiments
were performed on the NGA neutron guide at the National Institute of
Standards and Technology Center for Neutron Research (NCNR) to
c characterize the dynamics within Na‐SiO₂ nanocomposites at a
scattering vector (Q) = 1.2 and 1.3 Å⁻¹, which correlate to the lateral
 packing length scale of the polymer chains. The neutron wavelength
was set to 6 Å with a Δλ/λ ≈ 20%. At this wavelength, a time range
of 5 ps–15 ns was available.

Prior to running the experiments, resolution and background
scattering data were collected using a titanium–zirconium alloy
sample and an aluminum empty cell, respectively. Next, the
membranes were equilibrated in D₂O overnight to minimize the
incoherent scattering from hydrogen. Once equilibrated, the
membranes were cut into the appropriate dimensions and sandwiched
between aluminum foil before being sealed inside aluminum cells. To
ensure good collection statistics, multiple membranes were “stacked”
inside of the aluminum cell to obtain an overall thickness of ≈1 mm
(anywhere from 5 to 7 membranes). Note that all samples prepared
via solution‐casting were annealed before characterizing them using
NSE spectroscopy, as unannealed samples were prone to tearing and
dissolution when hydrated.

At the start of each experiment, polarized diffraction measurements
were made at a Fourier time of 0.5 ns in the Q range of 0.1–1.5 Å⁻¹
to obtain a quantity proportional to S(Q,0) and the ratio between
cohesive and incoherent scattering. For each experiment, the data
were normalized to the intermediate structure factor at time t = 0 (i.e.,
S(Q,t)/S(Q,0)), after normalization of all data sets for the
instrumental energy resolution. All measurements were made at 298
K. The raw data sets were reduced and fit using DAVE, an in‐house
data analysis and visualization software employed at NIST which
consists of macros for data reduction and analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Swelling/Reorganizational Dynamics of Ionomer
 Nanocomposites. Figure 1 shows the time‐resolved infrared

![Infrared spectra of liquid water diffusing into dry, unannealed, unmodified Naion at 25 °C at selected time intervals. Arrows indicate the direction of spectral change with time.](image-url)
spectra of liquid water diffusing into unannealed, unmodified Nafion at 25 °C at the polymer–ATR crystal interface, where time \( t = 0 \) represents when the water was injected into the ATR flow-through cell. It can be seen that the intensity of the infrared band associated with the O–H stretching of water (peak centered at \( \approx 3400 \text{ cm}^{-1} \)) increases with time, while the intensity of the infrared band associated with the F–C–F stretching of Nafion (peak centered at \( \approx 1200 \text{ cm}^{-1} \)) decreases with time. The increase in O–H stretching is attributed to the diffusion of water through the thickness of the film, and the decrease in F–C–F stretching is representative of water-induced relaxation of the polymer.

The diffusion-relaxation behavior shown by the time-resolved spectra in Figure 1 has been previously observed for water vapor in Nafion membranes. In particular, Hallinan and co-workers observed anomalous, non-Fickian diffusion of water vapor in Nafion 117 when the Nafion was exposed to relative humidity (RH) jumps from 0% RH to 100% RH. They attributed the non-Fickian behavior to osmotic stress dissipation (i.e., water-induced viscoelastic relaxation), leading them to propose a three-element viscoelastic relaxation model to describe the coupling of water sorption kinetics and swelling of ionic domains due to diffusing water molecules. The applied stress \( (\sigma_0) \) and the strain \( (\varepsilon) \) can be related to the F–C–F infrared absorbance of Nafion with time \( (A(t)) \) through the equation

\[
\varepsilon \approx \frac{A_0}{A(t)} - 1 = \frac{\sigma_0}{\eta} \frac{t}{E} + \sigma_0 (1 - \exp(-\beta t))
\]

where \( A_0 \) is the absorbance of the F–C–F infrared band at \( t = 0 \), \( \eta \) is the viscosity of the hydrophobic region, \( E \) is the elastic modulus, and \( \beta \) is the creep relaxation (or swelling) time constant. That is, the dilution of the F–C–F infrared band with time due to molecular rearrangement/swelling of the hydrophilic ionic network can be analyzed with the above diffusion-driven polymer creep relaxation equation to obtain a viscoelastic time scale for water-induced swelling in the membrane. More information regarding the model can be found elsewhere.46,52

Figure 2a shows the “factorized” (to their initial, unstrained-state value), initialized integrated absorbance of the F–C–F infrared band \( (A_0/A - 1) \) as a function of time for an unmodified, unannealed (i.e., no SiNPs and no thermal treatment) Nafion 117 membrane. Per eq 1, the integrated absorbance represents the volumetric strain within the Nafion–SiO2 nanocomposite films due to stresses imposed by diffusing water. The dotted red line in Figure 2a is the best-fit regression of the late-time ionomer relaxation data to the late-time solution of eq 1 (as \( t \to \infty \)), where the slope \( (\sigma_0/\eta) \) is \( 8.46 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ± } 1.11 \times 10^{-6} \text{ s}^{-1} \) and the y-intercept \( (\sigma_0/E) \) is \( 0.243 \text{ ± } 0.001 \text{ (} R^2 = 0.91 \text{)} \). With these parameters now determined, the full set of relaxation data for the unmodified, unannealed Nafion 117 membrane can be fit to eq 1, with the relaxation time constant, \( \beta \), as the only adjustable parameter. From this analysis, a relaxation time constant of \( \beta = 0.035 \text{ ± } 0.000 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ (} R^2 = 0.91 \text{)} \) was obtained. It should be noted that the polymer relaxation dynamics observed herein are at a much faster time scale than those previously observed by water vapor diffusion experiments. Consequently, viscoelastic relaxation constants obtained in this study were 1–2 orders of magnitude higher than those previously reported,46 indicating that significantly larger stresses are developed in the presence of liquid water than if 100% RH water vapor is sorbed.

This analysis was extended to sol–gel synthesized Nafion–SiO2 nanocomposite membranes (Figure 2b). From Figure 2b, we see that both the annealed and 4% (by mass) Nafion membranes exhibit slowed down swelling (relaxation) dynamics as compared to the unannealed, unmodified Nafion membrane (Figure 2a). Specifically, the relaxation time constants were determined to be \( \beta = 0.024 \text{ ± } 0.000 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ and } \beta = 0.002 \text{ ± } 0.001 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ (} R^2 = 0.99 \text{ in each case)} \) for the unmodified, annealed Nafion membrane (open green triangles) and Nafion containing 4% (by mass) SiO2 (open red squares), respectively. A summary of the relaxation model analysis for Nafion 117 and sol–gel membranes is presented in Table 1. Note that the values listed in the table are an average of multiple (at least three) experiments, and the ± values represent the standard deviation of the calculated, averaged parameter.

As we can see from Table 1, both annealing the Nafion 117 and the introduction of an SiO2 phase via sol–gel condensation in the membranes significantly alter the
Table 1. Normalized Relaxation Time Constant for Nafion and Nafion Nanocomposite Membranes Prepared by Both Sol–Gel and Solution-Cast Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>membrane</th>
<th>normalized relaxation time constant $[\beta_{\text{norm}}]$ (10^{-9} cm^2/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sol–gel membranes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion 117 (unannealed)</td>
<td>11.1 ± 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion 117 (annealed)</td>
<td>5.8 ± 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion/SiO2 nanocomposite, 4% (by mass) SiO2 (annealed)</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion/SiO2 nanocomposite, 10% (by mass) SiO2 (annealed)</td>
<td>3.0 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution-cast membranes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion (unannealed)</td>
<td>4.6 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion (annealed)</td>
<td>15.3 ± 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion–SiO2 nanocomposite, 4% (by mass) SiO2 (unannealed)</td>
<td>7.9 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion–SiO2 nanocomposite, 4% (by mass) SiO2 (annealed)</td>
<td>6.2 ± 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion–SiO2 nanocomposite, 10% (by mass) SiO2 (annealed)</td>
<td>4.6 ± 1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The thermal treatment conditions of all the samples are indicated (in parentheses) next to the sample name. Note that the values listed in the table are an average of multiple (at least three) experiments, and the ± values represent the standard deviation of the calculated, averaged parameter. Note that instead of presenting the relaxation time constant, $\beta$, we have “normalized” (scaled with the square of the thickness of the membrane) the calculated time constant. For ATR-FTIR experiments, relaxation (or swelling) of the membrane only occurs due to the diffusion of water into the membrane. As the time scale for diffusion for each experiment is a function of the membrane thickness, we must normalize the water-induced relaxation time constant to accurately compare relaxation data obtained for membranes with different thicknesses (i.e., $\beta_{\text{norm}} = L^2 \times \beta$, where $L$ is the thickness of the membrane). Treatment of the FTIR swelling data in this manner has previously been reported for this experimental technique."

swelling/rearrangement dynamics of the extruded Nafion 117 membrane. By heat-treating the Nafion 117 membrane, we observe an ≈50% reduction in the “normalized” relaxation time constant, implying that the ionomer network has become stiffer. This increase in membrane stiffness can be attributed to an increase in crystallinity and modulus of the membrane, both of which have been shown to increase with annealing. We observe an additional 7-fold decrease in the viscoelastic relaxation dynamics of the annealed Nafion 117 membrane with the introduction of 4% (by mass) SiO2. Furthermore, the $\beta_{\text{norm}}$ value for the 4% (by mass) SiO2 membrane was over an order of magnitude smaller than that calculated for unannealed Nafion 117 membranes.

However, when the SiO2 loading is increased from 4% (by mass) SiO2 to 10% (by mass) SiO2, the value of $\beta_{\text{norm}}$ increases ≈260% to a value much closer to that obtained for annealed Nafion 117 membranes. This result is quite interesting as it follows, at least qualitatively, recent work by Davis and co-workers1 on sol–gel synthesized Nafion 117 nanocomposites. In their work, the vanadium ion crossover resistance for an ≈10% (by mass) SiO2 membrane was determined to be moderately improved over that for annealed, unmodified Nafion membranes (9.7 × 10^{-9} cm^2/s vs 11.0 × 10^{-9} cm^2/s), while over 4 times better than that obtained for unannealed, unmodified Nafion membranes (9.7 × 10^{-9} cm^2/s vs 44.0 × 10^{-9} cm^2/s).

As seen in Table 1, the calculated values of $\beta_{\text{norm}}$ show an analogous trend of decreasing relaxation dynamics, where the swelling dynamics show unannealed > annealed > 10% (by mass) SiO2. Unfortunately, the previously mentioned study did not perform permeation studies on Nafion 117 membranes containing 4% (by mass) SiO2, so it is unknown at this time how the significantly reduced swelling dynamics of these membranes translate to permeability of vanadium ions. In any case, current results from tFTIR-ATR spectroscopy experiments, when taken in conjunction with each other, begin to allude to a scenario where alterations in the Nafion membrane dynamics may play a significant role in controlling the ion selectivity of these membranes.

In contrast to sol–gel synthesized membranes, solution-cast films were created by casting from a dispersion of Nafion and SiNPs in a mixture of low aliphatic alcohols and water, where

Figure 3. Time-resolved absorbance data of the polymer backbone CF2 stretching as a function of time at 25 °C for solution-cast (a) unannealed Nafion and (b) annealed Nafion (open green triangles), unannealed 4% (by mass) silica (open blue circles), and annealed 4% (by mass) silica (open red squares). The dashed red line in (a) is the best-fit regression of the late-time absorbance data to the late-time solution of eq 1. The solid lines in both figures represent the full solution of eq 1, where the relaxation time constant ($\beta$) was the only adjustable fitting parameter. Note that only 20% of the time-resolved data are shown for clarity. The thermal treatment conditions of all the samples are indicated (in parentheses) next to the sample name.
the final dense membrane was formed after solvent evaporation. Figure 3a illustrates the diffusion-driven polymer relaxation in solution-cast membranes, described herein as factorized, integrated absorbance of the F–C–F infrared band as a function of time. The infrared data were fit to the three-element viscoelastic relaxation model, with the relaxation time constant, \( \beta \), as the only adjustable parameter. Note that the solution-cast Nafion membranes were, on average, thinner than the extruded Nafion 117 membranes (e.g., \( \approx 100 \mu m \) vs \( \approx 200 \mu m \)), and as such, the data collection time for these films was shorter (e.g., \( \approx 300 \) s vs \( \approx 1500 \) s). A summary of the relaxation model analysis for solution-cast Nafion and Nafion-SiNP membranes is presented in Table 1.

As seen in Table 1, the relaxation dynamics of the annealed Nafion membranes were \( \approx 3 \)-fold higher than that of the unannealed membranes. This result is in stark contrast to results obtained for extruded Nafion 117 membranes. The higher “stiffness” of the unannealed membrane may be due to the solution casting procedure utilized for membrane fabrication, as the membranes that form from this fabrication method are often thought of as being in a nonequilibrium state. That is, the dense membrane formed after solvent evaporation may lead to a more “frustrated” nanostructure for the Nafion membranes, which becomes more relaxed during thermal treatment of the membrane. This has been previously observed in a number of nanophase-segregated block copolymer systems, where solution-cast (or spun-cast) membranes are typically subject to long periods of thermal annealing.55–60

This effect may be further heightened by the fact that the membrane adheres to the ATR crystal, introducing mechanical constraint on one side of the membrane. More specifically, it introduces mechanical constraint on the same side of the membrane where the absorbance data are being measured (i.e., at the membrane–ATR crystal interface, where the depth of penetration is \( \approx 1 \mu m \)).52,61 In this case, the annealing procedure provides enough energy to allow the Nafion chains to “flow” into a less frustrated structure.62

Comparing unannealed Nafion to its nanocomposite counterpart, we see that the introduction of 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\) results in \( \approx 70\% \) increase in the value of \( \beta_{norm} \) for the nanocomposite membrane. This result could indicate that the introduction of NPs alters how the Nafion chains pack during the solvent evaporation process. Interestingly, annealing these membranes resulted in only a slight reduction in the value of \( \beta_{norm} \) for the resultant annealed nanocomposite membrane. If we compare annealed Nafion to its nanocomposite counterpart, we see that the introduction of 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\) results in \( \approx 60\% \) decrease in the value of \( \beta_{norm} \) for these nanocomposites is \( \approx 30\% \) lower than that of the annealed Nafion. This is further highlighted if we compare annealed Nafion to membranes containing 10% (by mass) SiO\(_2\), where the value for \( \beta_{norm} \) for these nanocomposites is \( \approx 30\% \) lower than that of the annealed Nafion. This result follows with previous studies which have reported reductions in membrane dynamics with increases in inorganic nanofillers.51,17,19–21,23,62,63

Surprisingly, we only observe a slight reduction in the value of \( \beta_{norm} \) for the annealed membranes when the fraction of SiO\(_2\) was increased from 4% to 10% (by mass), where the values of \( \beta_{norm} \) for unannealed Nafion and Nafion containing 10% (by mass) SiO\(_2\) were equivalent.

Similar to what we observed with the extruded Nafion 117 membranes, the values of \( \beta_{norm} \) track well with the vanadium ion permeability values previously reported.1 That is, the vanadium ion permeability was determined to be \( \approx 60\% \) higher in annealed Nafion membranes as compared to those that were annealed and contained 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\) (8.4 \( \times \) 10\(^{-9}\) cm\(^2\)/s vs 5.3 \( \times \) 10\(^{-9}\) cm\(^2\)/s). As seen from Table 1, the value for \( \beta_{norm} \) is \( \approx 150\% \) higher for annealed Nafion membranes when compared to their 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\) counterpart. Results from our current investigation suggest that the observed reduction in vanadium ion permeability with the introduction of SiNPs (at least for annealed, solution-cast membranes) may be due to a combined mechanism of increased stiffening of the polymer network as well as interaction of the SiNPs with the sulfonic acid groups of Nafion.

It has been previously postulated that SiNPs may restrict access of the vanadium ions to the sulfonic sites within the ionic channels by adhering to the channel walls, thereby impeding the permeation of vanadium ions through the ionomer membrane.7 Notably, the authors report an insignificant impact of this interaction on ionic transport, concurrent with other similar studies where increased water uptake in these nanocomposites was attributed to the offset in proton conductivity.7,12,29 The engagement of sulfonic acid groups at the Nafion–NP interface due to electrostatic interactions can be correlated (at least qualitatively) to variations in the ion exchange capacity (IEC) of the nanocomposites. With regards to this, Jansto and Davis13 observed \( \approx 11\% \) reduction in the IEC of Nafion when unfunctionalized (bare) SiNPs were added to the ionomer (% (by mass) SiO\(_2\)). In addition, the reported variations in IEC with changes in surface functionalization of the SiNP was consistent with the notion that these particles directly interact with the pendant sulfonic acid groups in solution-cast Nafion nanocomposite membranes. Separately, Adjemian et al.18 posited similar interactions between titania nanoparticles and the sulfonic groups in Nafion to explain observations involving thermal decomposition and mass spectroscopy studies on a series of Nafion–titania nanocomposites. Additionally, the researchers argued that particle dispersion (which is itself affected by processing technique, i.e., sol–gel vs solution-casting) influences the degree of engagement of sulfonic groups, though this impact is diminished at higher particle loading where agglomeration dominates.64

When we compare the values of \( \beta_{norm} \) between the two synthesis methods, we observe quite different trends between the different ionomer membranes. First, we see that for solution-cast membranes the value of \( \beta_{norm} \) actually increases after the Nafion membrane is annealed, which is opposite to what we observe for the extruded Nafion 117 membranes. Again, we hypothesize this is due to the solution casting method, whereby the as-cast, unannealed membranes have a more “frustrated” structure that is relaxed by annealing the membrane, resulting in an increase in membrane swelling dynamics. However, we do observe a similar trend for both fabrication methods with the introduction of 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\) to the annealed Nafion membranes, where these nanocomposite membranes showed a large decrease in the value of \( \beta_{norm} \) compared to those membranes that had only received thermal annealing (i.e., annealed with no SiNPs). We again see a different trend for the different fabrication techniques when the fraction of SiNPs is increased from 4% to 10% (by mass). We believe the contrasting trends in the calculated relaxation dynamics may be indicative of the
different mechanisms by which the SiO$_2$ phase is introduced into the ionomer membrane.

As previously noted, the silica phase within the two series of membranes may be quite different due to the two different fabrication methods. Sahu et al.\textsuperscript{65} note a marked change in structural arrangement of SiO$_2$ phase toward a more linear conformation with increasing acid content (such as available within Nafton), when the nanocomposites are prepared via the sol–gel method. Additionally, an FTIR study of evolution of silica morphology within the ionomer matrix suggests that an increase in concentration of silica precursor drives the silica morphology from a cyclical network to more linear/extended network.\textsuperscript{66} In the case of sol–gel synthesized membranes, the silica precursor solution is the more mobile phase, as it has the freedom to assemble and nucleate around the pre-existing sulfonic clusters as it penetrates the Nafton membrane. This assembly can be heavily constrained by the fluorocarbon network and is understood to resolve to a linear network at higher concentrations to minimize conformational energy.

Alternatively, in the case of solution-cast membranes, the discrete, preformed SiNPs as well as the solvated ionomer chains can be considered mobile phases within the dispersion (solution). However, the kinetics of assembly are constrained by the entanglement effects of chains under increasing concentration (i.e., as the solvent evaporates). Thus, the resulting morphology and dispersion of NPs within the resultant nanocomposite may deviate from an “equilibrium state”, as the formation of the final dense membrane is governed by the rate of solvent evaporation. From these two contrasting pictures, it seems plausible that the mechanism by which SiNPs act to alter viscoelastic swelling properties of the polymer may be quite different, resulting in different trends at higher silica content (e.g., $\sim$10% (by mass) SiO$_2$). The structure (and dispersion) of the silica phase formed via solution-casting can be seen in TEM images from our recent investigations on analogous membranes and SiNPs. Unlike the percolated network of silica that is expected within composite membranes formed via the sol–gel technique, membranes formed using solution-casting method are shown to have discrete aggregate structures.\textsuperscript{2,3,5,32}

Note that differences in trends in the values of $\beta_{\text{norm}}$ between extruded and solution-cast membranes may be due to differences in the how the ionomer membranes “respond” to the diffusion of water through the membrane. Previous reports in the literature indicate that major structural reorganization takes place while Nafton undergoes hydration, where in general water-saturated hydrophilic domains exert significant forces on the hydrophobic domains.\textsuperscript{66–69} We postulate that our polymer relaxation data captures a difference in the reorganization kinetics between the two fabrication techniques. For extruded Nafton membranes, we capture an initial “pseudoequilibrium” in the ionomer swelling data that was previously masked when the frequency of absorbance data collection was too low (i.e., long time between collection of each data point).

As seen in Figure 4, we observe a plateau around 100 s in the relaxation data for the extruded Nafton membranes, indicating an initial “short time” reorganization of the Nafton nanostructure, followed by a longer term, potentially longer range, reorganization of the membrane (seen in longer experiments shown in Figure 2). Additionally, when this “short time” data is fit to eq 1, we observe that the relaxation dynamics are faster than what we calculate when the “long time” data is fit to the relaxation model (compare Figures 4 and 2a).

Specifically, we observed an $\approx$25% increase in the value of $\beta_{\text{norm}}$ when only analyzing the short time data (for “short time” experiment, $\beta_{\text{norm}} = (13.93 \pm 1.45) \times 10^{-6}$ cm$^2$/s vs $\beta_{\text{norm}} = (11.1 \pm 2) \times 10^{-6}$ cm$^2$/s for repeat “long time” experiments). Surprisingly, over the time scale of interest for this discussion, we do not observe such a “pseudoequilibrium” in the swelling data for solution-cast Nafton. Again, we believe the absence of this “short time” plateau is related to differences in the reorganization mechanism between the extruded and solution-cast membranes. These multiple time scales we capture may also provide information regarding how the SiNPs are partitioned in the ionomer membrane, which will be the scope of our future studies.

**Segmental Dynamics of Ionomer Nanocomposites.**

To gain insight into the impact of the SiO$_2$ phase on the segmental relaxation dynamics of the Nafton–SiO$_2$ nanocomposite membranes, neutron spin echo (NSE) spectrometry was employed. Unlike elastic neutron scattering techniques (e.g., small-angle neutron scattering or SANS), NSE is a quasielastic neutron scattering method, which provides a measurement of the structural dynamics within polymer systems over large ranges of length and time scales. Figure 5 shows the NSE curves collected in correspondence of the sample structure factor peak, $Q = 1.2$ Å$^{-1}$ or $Q = 1.3$ Å$^{-1}$ (Q being the exchanged wavevector, which in this particular case, corresponds to the length scale of fluorocarbon chain packing), for both sol–gel synthesized (Figures 5a and 5b) and solution-cast Nafton and Nafton nanocomposite (Figure 5c) membranes at 25 °C. Note that the membranes were equilibrated in liquid D$_2$O for a period of 24 h prior to beginning experiments. Specifically, Figure 5 shows the intermediate structure factor for each series of Nafton membranes as a function of time, where the length scales correlating to the packing order of fluorocarbon were probed to interpret effect of changes in crystallinity and silica content on the segmental dynamics in the hydrophobic phase. Traditionally, the data in Figure 5 are best represented by a stretched exponential function (in context of relaxation in disordered polymeric systems, the
Figure 5. Neutron spin echo (NSE) data (intermediate structure factor as a function of time) for (a) neat, unannealed (open green triangles) and annealed (open black circles) Nafion 117 membranes, (b) annealed Nafion 117 membranes with 4% (by mass) SiO₂ (open red squares) and 13% (by mass) SiO₂ (open blue diamonds) prepared by sol–gel method, and (c) solution-cast, annealed Nafion with no SiNPs (open black circles), 4% (by mass) SiO₂ (open red squares), and 10% (by mass) SiO₂ (open blue diamonds). The solid lines are a best fit of the NSE data to the KWW model (eq 2). All membranes were equilibrated in D₂O. All NSE data were collected at \( T = 298 \) K and \( Q = 1.2 \) Å\(^{-1}\) (sol–gel samples) and 1.3 Å\(^{-1}\) (solution-cast samples). The thermal treatment conditions of all the samples are indicated (in parentheses) next to the sample name.

### Table 2. Model Parameters Obtained from a Regression of the NSE Data to the KWW Equation (Eq 2)\(^{48}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>membrane</th>
<th>pre-exponential constant ([A])</th>
<th>stretching exponent ([\alpha])</th>
<th>characteristic segmental relaxation time ([t_R]) (ns)</th>
<th>average segmental relaxation time ([\langle t_R \rangle]) (ns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sol–gel membranes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion 117 (unannealed)</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.03</td>
<td>14.2 ± 1.0</td>
<td>16.7 ± 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion 117 (annealed)</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.09</td>
<td>37.1 ± 1.5</td>
<td>43.7 ± 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion–SiO₂ nanocomposite, 4% (by mass) SiO₂ (annealed)</td>
<td>0.84 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.01</td>
<td>175 ± 55</td>
<td>731 ± 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion–SiO₂ nanocomposite, 13% (by mass) SiO₂ (annealed)</td>
<td>0.79 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.95 ± 0.05</td>
<td>11.2 ± 0.6</td>
<td>11.5 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution-cast membranes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion (annealed)</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.66 ± 0.02</td>
<td>60.2 ± 2.7</td>
<td>80.9 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion–SiO₂ nanocomposite, 4% (by mass) SiO₂ (annealed)</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.32 ± 0.05</td>
<td>370 ± 17</td>
<td>2600 ± 1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafion–SiO₂ nanocomposite, 10% (by mass) SiO₂ (annealed)</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.35 ± 0.05</td>
<td>140 ± 34</td>
<td>706 ± 367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“T”he thermal treatment conditions of all the samples are indicated (in parentheses) next to the sample name.

Kohlrausch–Williams–Watts (KWW) equation.\(^{47}\) The KWW equation is as follows:

\[
\frac{S(Q, t)}{S(Q, 0)} = A \exp \left[ -\left( \frac{t}{t_R} \right) ^\alpha \right] \tag{2}
\]

where \(S(Q, t)\) and \(S(Q, 0)\) are the intermediate structure factors (ISFs) at time \( t \) and at time \( t = 0 \), respectively, \( A \) is the pre-exponential factor, and \( t_R \) is the segmental relaxation time. The exponential, \( \alpha \), indicates the degree of inhomogeneity in the segment population being probed and is a mathematical parameter that “stretches” the exponential decay, indicating cooperative dynamics between different segments of the polymer chain (for general polymeric systems, \( \alpha \approx 0.5 \)).\(^{47,70}\) The solid lines in Figure 5a–c represent a best fit of the NSE data to the KWW model (eq 2). The values of the pre-exponential factor, the stretching exponent, and the segmental relaxation time obtained from this regression are listed in Table 2. From Figure 5 and Table 2, we see that the incorporation of SiO₂ results in an observable slowdown in the relaxation dynamics of the local chains. Note that a nonunity value of the pre-exponent factor \( (A) \) signifies that there are segmental dynamics at shorter time scales. However, interpretation of NSE data at these smaller time scales is beyond the scope of this study and will be analyzed in greater detail in a forthcoming investigation.

As seen from Table 2, the stretching exponent, \( \alpha \), varies from a value of \( \approx 0.32 \) to \( \approx 0.95 \). Note that at these length and time scales the rigid crystalline domains in the ionomer membranes have no time-dependent fluctuations. As such, these domains introduce a constant background in the ISF associated with the immobile segments, which would be reflected with higher relaxation times and, typically, increased stretching. Given this, it is more accurate to compare values of the average relaxation time for each membrane. By use of the values for \( \alpha \) and \( t_R \), the average relaxation time for each ionomer membrane can be calculated using the equation

\[
\langle t_R \rangle = \frac{t_R}{\alpha} \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \tag{3}
\]
where \( t_s \) is the average segmental relaxation time and \( \Gamma(1/\alpha) \) is the gamma function of \( 1/\alpha \). The segmental dynamics of the Nafion, both sol–gel synthesized and solution-cast, are significantly hindered with the introduction of just 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\). For solution-cast samples, the average segmental relaxation time increases from a value of \( t_s = 80.9 \pm 4.4 \) ns for annealed membranes to a value of \( t_s = 2600 \pm 1270 \) ns for membranes with 4% (by mass) SiNPs. Similarly, for nanocomposites synthesized via the sol–gel method, the average segmental relaxation time increases from a value of \( t_s = 43.7 \pm 5.5 \) ns for annealed membranes to a value of \( t_s = 731 \pm 234 \) ns for membranes with 4% (by mass) SiNPs. Note that, as the experimental time scale was on the order of tens of nanoseconds, values for the average segmental relaxation time above hundreds of nanoseconds cannot be taken as quantitatively accurate. The discrepancy between experimental time scale and resulting average relaxation times is directly reflected in the uncertainties on these values for membranes with 4% (by mass) SiNPs. However, despite these large uncertainties, qualitative inferences regarding the slowdown in segmental dynamics due to incorporation of nanoparticles at this concentration hold, as can be seen in Figure 5c, where the intermediate structure factors for these samples show the slowest decay with time. Surprisingly, for both series, when the SiO\(_2\) loading was increased to 10% (by mass), the average segmental relaxation time decreased from that observed for Nafion membranes containing 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\).

As seen in Table 2, the average segmental relaxation time for the solution-cast membranes decreases by \( \approx 70\% \) to a value of \( t_s = 706 \pm 367 \) ns when the SiNP loading is increased from 4% (by mass) to 10% (by mass) SiO\(_2\). However, the segmental relaxation time is still over 800\% greater than that of the annealed Nafion membrane with no SiNPs. Similarly, for sol–gel nanocomposite films, when the loading of the SiO\(_2\) phase is increased to \( \approx 13\% \) (by mass), we observe a significant decrease in the average segmental relaxation time to a value of \( t_s = 11.5 \pm 0.9 \) ns. However, unlike solution-cast membranes, the segmental relaxation time is over an order of magnitude faster when compared to membranes with 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\) and is equivalent to the segmental dynamics of an unannealed, unmodified Nafion membrane.

Previous FTIR analysis of the evolution of a 3-dimensional silica network within Nafion for sol–gel synthesized Nafion 117 membranes performed by Mauritz et al.\(^\text{1}\) indicated that the network structure/distribution of the silica phase transitioned from a cyclic, more cross-linked network to a reduced linear network as the SiO\(_2\) concentration was increased from 3% (by mass) to 10% (by mass). Furthermore, Deng and co-workers have suggested that for Nafion–SiO\(_2\) nanocomposites formed via the sol–gel method the main-chain dynamics of Nafion are coupled to the side-chain mobility, and these dynamics are hindered when the side chains are tethered to silicon oxide nanophases.\(^\text{2}\) Alternatively, for a Nafion nanocomposite containing titania NPs, Majztrik et al.\(^\text{64}\) observed that both NP size and NP loading affect the NP–Nafion interactions. Specifically, use of particles with larger surface area showed a greater degree of interaction between sulfonic groups and thus the Na\(_{\alpha}\) network could allow the sample to recover behavior of as-used, unmodified Nafion membrane. However, a more exhaustive investigation is required to confirm this hypothesis and also explain the similar behavior observed for solution-cast films, where the particles and Nafion chains have a significantly higher conformational entropy compared to the preformed, extruded Nafion 117 membranes. That is, the Nafion chains, and thus the Nafion nanostructure, have higher degrees of freedom to arrange and minimize any thermodynamically unfavorable interactions during membrane formation (i.e., during solvent evaporation).

---

**CONCLUSIONS**

In summary, the local segmental relaxation dynamics, as well as the bulk swelling dynamics of two series of Nafion nanocomposites, one synthesized via the sol–gel method and the other via solution casting, was measured using NSE and ATR-FTIR spectroscopy, respectively. Anomeric swelling/rearrangement data (i.e., dilution of the F–CF–F infrared band with time due to the diffusion of liquid water) obtained from ATR-FTIR measurements were fit to a three-element viscoelastic model to obtain swelling (relaxation) time constants, which indicated stiffening of polymer chains with the introduction of just 4% (by mass) SiO\(_2\). These trends were congruent with changes in the local segmental dynamics as measured by NSE spectroscopy, where a curious increase in the segmental dynamics was observed at higher silica loadings (10% (by mass) SiO\(_2\)) for both solution-cast and sol–gel synthesized nanocomposites. Presently, the data suggest that SiNPs reside at the interface of hydrophobic and hydrophilic domains and may act to impede vanadium swelling by a stiffening of the ionic network.

---
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