Core-shell morphologies of semicrystalline PE-b-PS diblock copolymers within AAO nano porous templates

María Teresa Casas¹, Rose Mary Michell², Iwona Blaszczyk-Lezak³, Carmen Mijangos^{3,4,5}, Jordi Puiggali¹, Arnaldo T. Lorenzo⁶, Alejandro J. Müller^{*2,4,5}

¹ Departament d'Enginyeria Química, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Av. Diagonal 647,

Barcelona E-08028, Spain. ²Grupo de Polímeros USB, Departamento de Ciencia de los

Materiales, Universidad Simón Bolívar, Apartado 89000, Caracas 1080-A, Venezuela

³Instituto de Ciencia y Tecnología de Polímeros, CSIC, Juan de la Cierva, 3, 28006 Madrid, Spain

⁴POLYMAT and Polymer Science and Technology Department, Faculty of Chemistry, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Paseo Manuel de Lardizabal 3, 20018 Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain.

⁵IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain.

⁶The DOW Chemical Company, 2301 N Brazosport Blvd., Freeport, TX 77541, USA

*Corresponding author

Keywords: Confined crystallization, core-shell morphology, AAO templates, block copolymers

Abstract

Strongly segregated polyethylene-*b*-polystyrene (PE-*b*-PS) diblock copolymers were infiltrated within anodic aluminum oxide nanoporous templates (AAO) (with 60 nm diameter). After removing the nanofibers from the nanopores, TEM revealed their morphology. Regardless of their composition, the infiltrated nanofibers were constituted by core-shell or pseudo core shell nanocylinders. The affinity of PE to the AAO walls tailored the morphology towards PE shells with PS cores. The morphological observations successfully explained the confined crystallization of the PE block including novel double confinement effects.

Confined crystallization within nano-structured materials has been extensively studied in the last decade. ^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11} Recently, polymer crystallization within inorganic templates, such as Anodic Aluminum oxide (AAO) templates, has been investigated. ^{12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 24, 11, 10} In this hybrid nanoporous system, polymer crystallization occurs under confinement, in a similar way to other confined crystallization cases previously reported in the literature, such as in droplets, blends, copolymers and nanolayers ^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}.

Microdomains (MDs) size (a term applied generically to the micron or nanometer scale in this paper) can determine the confined crystallization behavior, especially when MDs are truly isolated ^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}. In the case of crystallization within AAO nanopores, it has been reported that crystallization temperatures decrease with nanopore diameter. However, when the infiltrated material is a strongly segregated diblock copolymer, the size of the MDs within

nanopores is determined by the composition of the block copolymer, the relationship between the size of the MDs in bulk and the nanopore diameter, and also the affinity of the blocks with the AAO surface.^{31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47} Hence, it is possible, by changing the block copolymer composition, to obtain different MDs sizes within the same AAO template.

We study in this paper, for the first time, the morphology of PE-*b*-PS diblock copolymers infiltrated within AAO templates and its relation with the crystallization behavior of the PE block. As far as the authors are aware, this is the first time that the morphology of infiltrated semi-crystalline diblock copolymers is revealed, since previous works have dealt with the morphology of infiltrated amorphous diblock copolymers.^{31 32 38 40 41 42 43 47}

The precursors of the materials employed were poly(1,4-butadiene)-*block*-polystyrene diblock copolymers (PB-*b*-PS). The synthesis of these materials was reported previously.⁴⁸ It was performed by sequential anionic polymerization of butadiene and styrene. These precursors were later hydrogenated in order to obtain PE-*b*-PS linear diblock copolymers.

Table 1 reports the molecular characteristics of the materials employed for infiltration (branch content and polydispersity index, PDI). The superscripts indicate the number average molecular weight (M_n) and the subscripts the composition in weight %. The molecular weight of the PE block is constant in all the samples employed.

Table 1: Molecular Characteristics of the samples.

Sample	% 1,2 Units	M_n (g/mol) (PE block)	PDI
PE ₂₅	11.0	24.4	1.01
E ₇₉ S ₂₁ ⁴¹	12.6	31.0	1.02
E ₅₃ S ₄₇ ⁵¹	11.3	26.4	1.04
E ₂₆ S ₇₄ ¹⁰⁵	11.3	26.4	1.05
E ₁₁ S ₈₉ ²⁴⁴	11.3	27.6	1.02

Ordered AAO templates were prepared by two-step electrochemical anodization of aluminum.⁴⁹⁻⁵⁰ The infiltration of the block copolymers into alumina templates with 60 nm diameter pores (see Figure 1) was carried out by placing the solid materials on top of the AAO template at 170 °C and then annealing them at 180 °C, under a nitrogen atmosphere for 5 h.

Figure 1: Top view of an AAO template with 60nm pore diameter

The bulk morphology of the PE-*b*-PS diblock copolymers was examined by bright field TEM using a JEOL 1220 operated at 100 kV. Thin sections were cut at -130°C using a LEICA EMFCS ultramicrotome equipped with a diamond knife. The samples were stained by exposure to RuO₄ vapor. On the other hand, the infiltrated samples were extracted from the AAO templates using a NaOH 5% w/v in a water/methanol solution. The extracted nanofibers, which tended to aggregate spontaneously in solution, were stained with RuO₄ vapor during three days, the samples were embedded in Spurr resin and cut with a diamond knife. Finally the samples were observed in a TEM Tecnai 10 FEI, operated a 100 KV. Figure 1 shows the procedure involved in sample preparation.

Figure 2: Schematic representation of the experimental procedure for the preparation of the samples observed by TEM. The AAO templates were dissolved to extract the nano fibers within them. Nanofibers aggregates then embedded in spurr resin. T and L represent the lines along which transversal and longitudinal cuts were made to the embedded samples.

Figure 2 shows representative micrographs of the different morphologies adopted by the PE-*b*-PS diblock copolymers. The block copolymers employed for infiltration have been the subject of previous studies (refs. 48, 51, 52, 53). The morphology of the infiltrated copolymers has never been reported before. Since a dramatic change in morphology occurred upon infiltration, the morphology of the bulk samples (before infiltration) is also included in **Figure 3** for comparison purposes.

In the case of the bulk un-infiltrated copolymers, **Figure 3** shows the typical morphologies exhibited by strongly segregated PE-*b*-PS diblock copolymers 48 that are composition dependent. As the content of PE in the copolymers decreases from 79 to 11%, the

following morphologies can be clearly distinguished (PS block MDs appear dark grey in the micrographs, while PE block MDs appear light gray): PS spheres/PE matrix (with full percolation of the PE matrix), PS/PE lamellae (with percolation paths between MDs caused by defects in the lamellar morphology), PE cylinders/PS matrix (where cylinders are generally isolated, although percolation between them is also possible) and finally PE spheres/PS matrix (where most spheres are isolated within the glassy PS matrix). Table 2 shows the sizes of the PE block MDs obtained previously by SAXS and TEM (ref. 48). For more details on the bulk morphology of the copolymers, see reference 48).

The infiltration process leads to a large reorganization of the diblock copolymer MDs. Figure 3 summarizes the morphological changes. The structures observed by TEM are within groups of fibrils extracted from the AAO template that have been embedded in spur resin to facilitate their sectioning and observation (see Figure 2). The embedded nanofibers aggregates were ultracryomicrotomed into thin sections that were cut parallel to the fiber axis (labeled “Longitudinal” in Figure 3) and perpendicular to it (“Transversal” in Figure 3). Figure 2 also indicates how these longitudinal and transversal cuts were made. In some cases, it is possible to observe small distortions originated by sample preparation. In order to facilitate the visualization of the structures obtained, the boundaries between fibrils are depicted with dashed lines in representative parts of the micrographs of Figure 3.

Sample	Un-infiltrated	Infiltrated within AAO 60 nm templates	
	Bulk	Transversal	Longitudinal
$E_{79}S_{21}^{41}$
$E_{53}S_{47}^{51}$
$E_{26}S_{74}^{105}$
$E_{11}S_{89}^{244}$

Figure 3. PE-*b*-PS diblock copolymer morphologies before and after infiltration within AAO templates as revealed by TEM.

Table 2. Domain Size “*l*” and spacing “*d*” of the PE-*b*-PS diblock copolymers as determined by TEM and SAXS measurements at room temperature. **48**

Sample	TEM		SAXS	Bulk Morphology
	<i>l</i> (nm)	<i>d</i> (nm)	<i>d</i> (nm)	
PE ²⁵	-	-	-	Bulk
E ₇₉ S ₂₁ ⁴¹	-	-	-	PS cylinders in a PE matrix
E ₅₃ S ₄₇ ⁵¹	16 ^a ± 3	62 ± 3	65	Lamellar
E ₂₆ S ₇₄ ¹⁰⁵	21 ^b ± 5	126 ^c ± 29	99	PE Cylinders
E ₁₁ S ₈₉ ²⁴⁴	12 ^b ± 2	105 ^c ± 13	108	PE Spheres

^aThickness of the PE lamellae

^bRadius of the microdomain

^cInterdomain distance

For a clear understanding of the morphologies presented in **Figure 3**, **Figure 4** shows a schematic representation of the blocks distribution inside the nanopores of the AAO template.

The nanopores are not really perfectly cylindrical but have an approximate hexagonal shape, as apparent in **Figures 1 and 3** and schematically depicted in the outer shape of the aggregated nanofibers in **Figure 4** (where hexagonal cross-sections has been depicted in the top views). The templates are first prepared with 35 nm pores (that have a more regular cylindrical shape), but are later enlarged until the desired 60 nm size is obtained. During this enlargement process (achieved by XXXXXXXXXX), the pores change to their final hexagonal like shapes. As a result, the extracted nanofibers also have hexagonal outer surfaces that can be seen when a

whole aggregated group of them has been embedded in spurr and cut together (see Figures 1 through 4).

In general, core-shell structures (or pseudo core-shell, where the shell is clear but the core may also contain some of the shell material dispersed in it) are seen in Figure 3 (see also Figure 4) for all samples, regardless of the original morphology in the bulk.

The final morphology of a block copolymer within AAO templates depends on their composition, but also on the following two aspects: 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 (a) the relationship between the size of the MDs and the interdomain distances in the bulk and the diameter of the AAO nanopores and (b) the preferential affinity of one block to the AAO wall.

Taken into account the above and the micrographs in Figure 3 (see the “transversal” micrographs and also the schematic representation in Figure 4), it is evident that the PE block has a stronger affinity to the AAO surface as compared to the PS block, since it always appears at the outer part of the fibers (i.e., shells). This probably stems from its apolar nature. Figure 3 shows that the PE block always forms the shell while PS constitutes the core of the observed core-shell nanocylinders. In some cases, the composition of the core is more complex (see below). Even when the PE content in the diblock is only 11%, the PE block is situated between the AAO wall and the PS block. The affinity between PE and the AAO nanopore walls dictates in this case the morphology. The composition regulates, as expected, the relative sizes of the core, and its inner morphology, and shell of the concentric nanocylinders generated inside the templates.

Sample	Infiltrated within AAO 60 nm templates	
	Transversal	Longitudinal
$E_{79}S_{21}^{41}$
$E_{53}S_{47}^{51}$
$E_{26}S_{74}^{105}$

Figure 4. Schematic representation of the morphologies observed by TEM in **Figure 3** corresponding to the infiltrated PE-*b*-PS diblock copolymer within AAO templates. The PE block is represented in blue while the PS block in orange.

In the transversal cut shown in **Figure 3 (and Figure 4)**, it is possible to observe the distribution of the blocks inside the pores looking down from the top of the template. In the boundary between the PE and PS block (see **Figure 3**), it is possible to observe a dark shade that corresponds to the amorphous interphase between the blocks. The interphase is stained during the staining times employed for sample preparation. The same dark shade can be observed between the blocks in the un-infiltrated case. ^[48]

The inner cylinders correspond to PS blocks in the core-shell morphologies and they exhibit irregularities in some cases, especially in the infiltrated $E_{79}S_{21}^{41}$ sample. For this copolymer, PS is the minor component, and the longitudinal cut reveals that the MDs exhibit a transition between cylinders and spheres (see **Figure 3** and **Figure 4**). Yu et al. ^[43] studied the possible morphologies of a copolymer with an asymmetrical composition forming hexagonally packed cylinders in the bulk. Their predictions are based on computer simulations of a lattice model by applying a simulated annealing. Their simulations indicated that ^{[43 [, 44]} for the case when the majority block (i.e., PE) is attracted to the wall, and the diameter of the nanopore in the AAO template is small with respect to the interdomain distance of the minority block (i.e., PS) in

the bulk, both cylinders and spheres of the minor block may be observed. Hence the present results for the infiltrated $E_{79}S_{21}$ ⁴¹ morphologies are in agreement with their theoretical prediction.

In the case of a symmetrical diblock copolymer, the results of both simulations and experiments (for amorphous diblock copolymer samples) indicate that the most common morphology after infiltration is that of concentric cylinders. According to Monte Carlo simulations performed by Wang³⁹, a lamellar diblock copolymer should change its morphology after infiltration to a concentric cylindrical morphology, where the number of cylinders depends on the template pore diameter. An interesting feature is that this prediction established the possibility of a transitional morphology, where a clear core may not be observed. These predictions could partially explain the morphology observed in the infiltrated block copolymer $E_{53}S_{47}$ ⁵¹. In this block copolymer, the PS core contains inclusions of the PE block, while the rest of the PE block still forms the shell attached to the AAO walls (see Figures 3 and 4)

On the other hand, Sevink and Zvelindovsky³⁶ employed dynamic density functional theory, in order to predict infiltrated block copolymer morphologies. They found a large variety of possible structures, including a helical conformation, that is consistent with the morphology of the inclusions observed for the core in $E_{53}S_{47}$ ⁵¹. Considering this prediction and the experimental observation (see Figure 3) we concluded that the PE block is in the external border of the fibril (due to its affinity to the AAO wall), but also has a helical conformation in the inclusions within the center of the PS cores.

In the case of the $E_{26}S_{74}$ ¹⁰⁵ the observed morphology after infiltration is the expected by Yu et al.⁴³ for a system with a small pore diameter when the minor block has a preference for the AAO wall. In those cases, Yu et al.⁴³ predicted a core shell morphology with the minor block

forming the shell and the major block the core. Figures 3 and 4 show that E₂₆S₇₄¹⁰⁵ exhibits a morphology that fits perfectly with that predicted by Yu et al. 43

For the copolymer with only 11% PE, the morphology changed from PE nanospheres in the bulk sample to core-shell cylinders after infiltration, where the PE block forms the shell attached to the AAO walls. Drobiyal et al. 32 reported for infiltrated polystyrene-*block*-polybutadiene diblock copolymers (PS-*b*-PB) with spherical MDs in the bulk, different morphologies depending on the nanopore diameter. When the nanopore diameter was small, a morphology similar to the one reported here for E₁₁S₈₉²⁴⁴ was observed, however when the diameter of the pores was larger than a critical value, the authors reported a spherical morphology inside the nanopores.

Table 3 presents estimated values of the PS core diameters (ϕ_{theo}) calculated by assuming that perfect core-shell cylinders (with circular cross-sections) are formed (filling the 60 nm pores). It was also considered that the inner and outer diameters have values proportional to the block copolymer composition. Then, the PS core diameters were experimentally determined (ϕ_{exp}) by measuring them directly on the TEM micrographs (assuming circular cross-sections). The experimentally determined values are a perfect match to the theoretical expectations based on copolymer composition, when the core-shell morphology is not distorted (i.e., for E₂₆S₇₄¹⁰⁵ and E₁₁S₈₉²⁴⁴). In the cases where the PS core is distorted or contains PE block inclusions the correlation between the experimental value and theoretical estimation is not as good, as expected.

Table 3 also lists the extended chain length value of the PE and PS chains within each block (calculated from the number average molecular weight values). For the PS case, the unperturbed average end to end distance of the chains was also calculated ($\langle r_0^2 \rangle^{1/2}$) 54. The

chain dimensions can perfectly fit within the AAO nanopores and can generally form the observed morphologies without significant conformational changes (in the case of the PS cores). For the case of the PS block within the $E_{79}S_{21}^{41}$ diblock copolymer, the small chain length probably contributes to the morphological instability observed in **Figure 3** (cylinders and spheres).

Table 3: Extended chain length (L) for each block, PS block core diameter (after infiltration), root mean square value of the unperturbed end to end distance of the PS block.

	PE block		PS block				
	M_{PE} (Kg/mol)	M_{PS} (Kg/mol)	L_{PE} (nm)	L_{PS} (nm)	ϕ_{theo} (nm)	ϕ_{exp}^a (nm)	$\langle r_0^2 \rangle^{1/2}$ (nm)
$E_{79}S_{21}^{41}$	32.4	8.6	291	21	13	26±4	6.2
$E_{53}S_{47}^{51}$	27.0	24.0	243	58	28	40±4*	10.4
$E_{26}S_{74}^{105}$	27.3	77.7	245	188	44	44±4	18.7
$E_{11}S_{89}^{244}$	26.8	217.2	241	525	53	52±4	31.2

^a Measured from the TEM micrographs. *Overestimated value because the PS core contains PE block helical inclusions.

A DSC Pyris Perkin Elmer Instrument, calibrated with tin and indium under an ultra high purity nitrogen atmosphere, was employed to study the thermal properties of the materials. Cooling and heating rates of 30 °C/min were employed. For the infiltrated samples, the total mass (block copolymer plus AAO template) was 25 mg, while the block copolymer mass was approximately 0.5 mg according to TGA experiments. The results were compared with those obtained with PE-*b*-PS neat samples at the same scanning rates and employing a mass of 2 mg.

Figure 5: DSC cooling scans at 30 °C/min for the indicated samples before and after infiltration within AAO 60 nm templates.

Figure 5 shows DSC cooling scans from the melt (after thermal history was erased) for PE and PE-*b*-PS diblock copolymer samples, before and after infiltration within AAO templates. It is important to note that the molecular weight and branch content neat PE and the PE block within the copolymers are constant for all the samples studied^[48]. Therefore, any changes observed in the crystallization behavior are a consequence of the confinement of PE chains.

Neat PE exhibits a sharp crystallization exotherm at 85 °C originated by heterogeneous nucleation (labeled α exotherm) where most of the sample crystallizes upon cooling from the melt (Figure 5a). Additionally, it displays a very small exotherm at much lower temperatures (i.e., 52 °C) which is due to intramolecular fractionation (labeled IF), a process typical of branched polyethylene samples (see ref. 55).

In the un-infiltrated diblock copolymer cases, a fractionated crystallization of the confined PE block (cylinders and spheres) can be observed in Figure 5 for E₂₆S₇₄¹⁰⁵ and E₁₁S₈₉²⁴⁴ (that has been studied previously for these block copolymers (see refs. 48, 51, 52, 53 for a detailed explanation of the DSC results and fractionated crystallization). Fractionated crystallization occurs when the number of MDs is in the same order of magnitude than the number of the most active heterogeneities present in the bulk polymer under consideration. The most active heterogeneities are capable of producing nucleation at low supercooling and generate the high temperature α crystallization exotherms. The crystallization of the PE block is fractionated into several exotherms, labeled in decreasing temperature order as α , β and γ . Exotherm β is also generated by heterogeneous nucleation, but with less active heterogeneities than those nucleating the α process (see ref. 48, 51, 52, 53).

Exotherm γ is due to the crystallization of clean MDs that do not possess heterogeneities within them. E₁₁S₈₉²⁴⁴ is the only un-infiltrated copolymer that crystallizes predominantly in the

γ exotherm (Figure 5e). This is a consequence of the unlikely percolation or interconnection between isolated PE spheres. Additionally, in this case, the number of clean MDs (PE nanospheres) is six orders of magnitude larger than the number of heterogeneities in bulk PE (see ref. 56).

The crystallization of the PE block isolated MDs that occur in the γ exotherms can start from homogeneous nuclei or from surface nucleation. Our previous works concluded that the PE block crystallizes by surface nucleation (at the interphase between the PE and the PS block) because crystallization does not occur at extreme supercoolings (T_c is still far from T_g). In fact, in our opinion, homogeneous nucleation has never been seen in PE, in spite of claims to the contrary (extensive discussion on this topic can be found in references 2, 7, 10, 11) 57, 55, 11, 55, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11

When the diblock copolymers are infiltrated (as well as neat PE) into the AAO templates, the crystallization occurs mostly at low temperatures in γ exotherms, while the β and α exotherms are usually very small. The number of nanopores in the templates (of the order of $10^{12}/\text{cm}^3$) exceeds in three orders of magnitude the number heterogeneities typically present in PE (of the order of $10^9/\text{cm}^3$, ref. 56). Therefore, statistically speaking if there is no remaining film on top of the template that can interconnect nanopores (and cause percolation through which crystallization can spread), the crystallization occurs in mostly heterogeneity free isolated cavities.

Figure 6 illustrates the general decrease in crystallization temperatures observed after infiltration as a consequence of confinement in the AAO nanopores. Lines joining the experimental data points corresponding to the dominating crystallization temperatures (i.e., those peak T_c values that correspond to the largest enthalpy exotherms) are drawn in Figure 6.

A particularly interesting case is $E_{26}S_{74}^{105}$. In this diblock copolymer, the PE block forms cylinders (Figure 3) that exhibit some percolation that is responsible for the appearance of the fractionated crystallization 48. The crystallization of isolated heterogeneity free cylinders occurs at 50 °C (corresponding to the γ exotherm in Figures 5d). When this sample is infiltrated in the 60 nm nanopores, the crystallization temperature corresponding to the γ exotherm is depressed to lower temperatures (see Figures 5d and 6) giving rise to a novel double confinement effect 22. However, when this effect was recently reported 22, the morphological change experienced by the sample upon infiltration was unknown.

Figure 6. Peak crystallization temperatures obtained from Figure 5. The solid lines join the data points where the dominant crystallization peak of each sample was found (i.e., largest latent crystallization enthalpy exothermic peaks). Red symbols are for infiltrated materials and black symbols for bulk samples.

Thanks to the TEM experiments performed here (Figure 3), the origin of double confinement in the PE nanocylinders of $E_{26}S_{74}^{105}$ can now be clearly ascertained. The PE block

phase is confined at two different surfaces: (a) the interface between the alumina and the PE shell and (b) the interphase between the PE shell and the covalently linked glassy PS core. If the morphology were different, for instance a PE core with a PS shell in contact with alumina walls, the double confinement would not exist and there would be no difference in crystallization behavior between un-infiltrated and infiltrated copolymer. Therefore, the observation of the morphology of the nanofibers is essential to correctly interpret the changes in crystallization behavior due to infiltration into AAO templates.

As was pointed out by Carvalho and Dalnoki-Veress [58 59] the nature of the surface has an important influence in the crystallization temperature of isolated MDs. They demonstrated that in the case of well dispersed heterogeneity free polyethylene droplets, the crystallization occurred preferentially at the surface of the droplets and never inside their volume. Hence surface nucleation is the dominant mechanism in the PE case, instead of homogeneous nucleation (which would occur within the droplets volume).

Table 5 shows estimated values of the volume corresponding to PE MDs for selected samples and their corresponding γ peak temperatures. The volumes were estimated by measuring the size of the PE shells in the micrographs of Figure 3 and the knowledge of the lengths of the nanopores (i.e., 100 μm), always assuming that the shapes were always perfect concentric cylinders.

Table 5: Estimated volume of PE MDs for selected samples

Sample	$V \text{ (nm}^3\text{)}$	$T_c \text{ (}^\circ\text{C)}$
PE/35nmAAO ^a	9.62×10^7	45.1
PE/60nmAAO	2.83×10^8	51.5

$E_{79}S_{21}^{41}/60\text{nm AAO}$	1.83×10^8	48.5
$E_{53}S_{47}^{51}/60\text{nm AAO}$	1.74×10^{8b}	54.5
$E_{26}S_{74}^{105}/60\text{nm AAO}$	1.08×10^8	44.5
$E_{11}S_{89}^{244}/60\text{nm AAO}$	5.06×10^7	--
$E_{11}S_{89}^{244}$ in bulk	7.24×10^{3c}	46.9

^a From ref 11. ^b Underestimated, since the volume calculated corresponds only to the external shell (and in this case there are PE helical inclusions within the PS cores). ^c Calculated as the volume of a sphere with a diameter of 24 nm

Table 5 shows for the infiltrated samples a correlation between T_c and volume, since in most cases, a reduction in volume leads to a reduction in crystallization temperature. In the particular case of the $E_{53}S_{47}^{51}$ diblock copolymer the volume is underestimated, due to a limitation to exactly estimate the volume of the PE inclusions inside the PS core. The volume of the PE MDs for neat $E_{11}S_{89}^{244}$ was calculated in order to establish the importance of the surface nature during PE crystallization. In this case, the results presented in **Table 5** show no correlation between the volume of the PE phase and the crystallization temperature in comparison to the infiltrated samples. The volume of the PE spheres is 5 orders of magnitude smaller than the volume of any of the infiltrated PE block MDs, and the crystallization temperature is similar in both cases. Such lack of overall dependence of T_c on the volume of the MDs (with different surfaces or interphases), indicate that the nucleation is not homogeneous and depends on the exact nature of the surface or interphase (e.g., alumina versus glassy PS). If the nucleation were homogeneous a clear correlation with the phase volume would have been expected.

The infiltration of $E_{11}S_{89}^{244}$ within the 60 nm template leads to an undetected level of crystallization in the infiltrated material (**Figure 4e**). This is probably due to a combination of low crystallinity and small amount of crystals in the sample, which resulted in an extremely low value of exothermic heat that was not detected by our DSC.

In conclusion, the morphology of a semi-crystalline diblock copolymer infiltrated within AAO templates was observed for the first time. The morphologies obtained allow us to explain the changes in confined crystallization of the crystallizing phase upon infiltration. The origin of the novel double confinement effect, recently reported by some of us, has been satisfactorily explained by the observed core-shell morphologies, where the PE block was found to form the shell in contact with the alumina walls, while the PS constituted the core of the nanofibers. The sizes of the MDs and their exact morphology (since they can contain inclusions or imperfections) was determined by composition but the overall core-shell shape was dictated by the affinity of the PE block towards the alumina walls. The PE phase was found to experience surface nucleation either at the alumina walls or at the PE-PS diblock copolymer interphase.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

*alejandrojesus.muller@ehu.es

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

(Word Style “TD_Acknowledgments”). Generally the last paragraph of the paper is the place to acknowledge people, organizations, and financing (you may state grant numbers and sponsors here). Follow the journal’s guidelines on what to include in the Acknowledgments section.

REFERENCES

1. Frensch, H.; Harnischfeger, P.; Jungnickel, B. J. Fractionated Crystallization in Incompatible Polymer Blends. In *Multiphase polymers: blends and ionomers ACS symposium series 395*; Utracky, L. A., Weiss, R. A., Eds.; American Chemical Society: Washington, 1989; pp 101-125.

2. Müller, A. J.; Balsamo, V.; Arnal, M. L. Nucleation and crystallization in diblock and triblock copolymers. *Adv Polym Sci* **2005**, *190*, 1-63.
3. Hamley, I. W. Crystallization in Block Copolymers. *Adv Polym Sci* **1999**, *148*, 113-137.
4. Loo, Y.; Register, A. Crystallization Within Block Copolymer Mesophases. In *Developments in Block Copolymer Science and Technology*; Hamley, I. W., Ed.; Wiley: New York, 2004.
5. Castillo, R. V.; Müller, A. J. Crystallization and morphology of biodegradable or biostable single and double crystalline block copolymers. *Prog Polym Sci* **2009**, *34*, 519-560.
6. Müller, A. J.; Balsamo, V.; Arnal, M. L. Crystallization in block copolymers with more than one crystallizable block. In *Lecture notes in physics: progress in understanding of polymer crystallization*; Reiter, G., Strobl, G., Eds.; Springer: Berlin, 2007; Vol. 714, pp 229-259.
7. Müller, A. J.; Arnal, M. L.; Lorenzo, A. T. Crystallization in Nano-Confined Polymeric Systems. In *Handbook of Polymer Crystallization*; Piorkowska, E., Rutledge, G., Eds.; Wiley: New York, 2013.
8. Nadan, B.; Hsy, J.; Chen, H. Crystallization Behavior of Crystalline-Amorphous Diblock Copolymers Consisting of a Rubbery Amorphous Block. *Polymer Rev* **2006**, *46* (2), 143-172.
9. Takeshita, H.; Shiomi, T.; Takenaka, K.; Arai, F. Crystallization and higher-order structure of multicomponent polymeric systems. *Polymer* **2013**, *54* (18), 4776-4789.
10. Michell, R. M.; Blaszczyk-Lezak, I.; Mijangos, C.; Müller, A. J. Confinement effects on polymer crystallization: From droplets to alumina nanopores. *Polymer* **2013**, *54* (54), 4059-4077.
11. Michell, R. M.; Blaszczyk-Lezak, I.; Mijangos, C.; Müller, A. J. Confined crystallization of polymers within anodic aluminum oxide templates. *J. Polym. Sci. Part B: Polym. Phys.* **2014**, *52* (18), 1179-1194.
12. Duran, H.; Steinhart, M.; Hans-Jürgen, B.; Floudas, G. From Heterogeneous to Homogeneous Nucleation of Isotactic Poly(propylene) Confined to Nanoporous Alumina. *Nano Lett* **2011**, *11* (4), 1671-1675.
13. Shin, K.; Woo, E.; Jeong, Y. G.; Kim, C.; Huh, J.; Kim, K.-W. Crystalline Structures, Melting, and Crystallization of Linear Polyethylene in Cylindrical Nanopores. *Macromolecules* **2007**, *40* (18), 6617-6623.
14. Garcia-Gutiérrez, M.-C.; Linares, A.; Hernández, J. J.; Rueda, D. R.; Ezquerro, T. A.; Poza, P.; Davies, R. Confinement-Induced One-Dimensional Ferroelectric Polymer Arrays. *Nano letters* **2010**, *10* (4), 1472-1476.
15. Hui, W.; Wei, W.; Huang, Y.; Wang, C.; Su, Z. Polymorphic Behavior of Syndiotactic Polystyrene Crystallized in Cylindrical Nanopores. *Macromolecules* **2008**, *41* (20), 7755-

7758.

16. Lutkenhaus, J. L.; McEnnis, K.; Serghei, A.; Russell, T. P. Confinement Effects on Crystallization and Curie Transitions of Poly(vinylidene fluoride-co-trifluoroethylene). *Macromolecules* **2010**, *43* (8), 3844–3850.
17. Steinhart, M.; Haissam, P. G.; Prabhakaran, M.; Gösele, U. Coherent Kinetic Control over Crystal Orientation in Macroscopic Ensembles of Polymer Nanorods and Nanotubes. *Phys Rev Lett* **2006**, *97*, 027801.
18. Steinhart, M.; Senz, S.; Wehrspohn, R. B.; Gösele, U.; Wendorff, J. H. Curvature-Directed Crystallization of Poly(vinylidene difluoride) in Nanotube Walls. *Macromolecules* **2003**, *36* (10), 3646–3651.
19. Woo, E.; Huh, J.; Jeong, Y. G.; Shin, K. From Homogeneous to Heterogeneous Nucleation of Chain Molecules under Nanoscopic Cylindrical Confinement. *Phys Res Lett* **2007**, *98* (13), 136103.
20. Wu, H.; Wang, W.; Huang, Y.; Su, Z. Orientation of Syndiotactic Polystyrene Crystallized in Cylindrical Nanopores. *Macromol. Rapid Commun.* **2009**, *30* (3), 194–198.
21. Wu, H.; Wang, W.; Yang, H.; Su, Z. Crystallization and Orientation of Syndiotactic Polystyrene in Nanorods. *Macromolecules* **2007**, *40* (12), 4244–4249.
22. Michell, R. M.; Lorenzo, A. T.; Müller, A. J.; Lin, M.-C.; Blaszczyk-Lezak, I.; Martín, J.; Mijangos, C. The Crystallization of Confined Polymers and Block Copolymers Infiltrated Within Alumina Nanotube Templates. *Macromolecules* **2012**, *45* (3), 1517–1528.
23. Wu, H.; Su, Z.; Takahara, A. Isotactic polystyrene nanorods with gradient crystallite states. *Soft Matter* **2012**, *8* (11), 3180–3184.
24. Suzuki, Y.; Duran, H.; Steinhart, M.; Butt, H.-J.; Floudas, G. Homogeneous crystallization and local dynamics of poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO) confined to nanoporous alumina. *Soft Matter* **2013**, *9* (9), 2621–2628.
25. Martín, J.; Maiz, J.; Sacristan, J.; Mijangos, C. Tailored polymer-based nanorods and nanotubes by "template synthesis": From preparation to applications. *Polymer* **2012**, *53* (6), 1149–1166.
26. Maiz, J.; Schäfer, H.; Rengarajan, G. T.; Hartmann-Azanza, B.; Eickmeier, H.; Haase, M.; Mijangos, C.; Steinhart, M. How Gold Nanoparticles Influence Crystallization of Polyethylene in Rigid Cylindrical Nanopores. *Macromolecules* **2013**, *46* (2), 403–412.
27. Martín, J.; Nogales, A.; Mijangos, C. Directional Crystallization of 20 nm Width Polymer Nanorods by the Inducement of Heterogeneous Nuclei at Their Tips. *Macromolecules* **2013**, DOI: 10.1021/ma401050p.

28. Li, M.; Wu, H.; Huang, Y.; Su, Z. Effects of Temperature and Template Surface on Crystallization of Syndiotactic Polystyrene in Cylindrical Nanopores. *Macromolecules* **2012**, *45* (12), 5196–5200.
29. Lin, M.-C.; Nandan, B.; Chen, H.-L. Mediating polymer crystal orientation using nanotemplates from block copolymer microdomains and anodic aluminium oxide nanochannels. *Soft Matter* **2012**, *8* (28), 7306–7322.
30. Martín-Fabiani, I.; García-Gutiérrez, M.-C.; Rueda, D.; Linares, A.; Hernández, J.; Ezquerro, T.; Reynolds, M. Crystallization under one-dimensional confinement in alumina nanopores of poly(trimethylene terephthalate) and its composites with single wall carbon nanotubes. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces* **2013**, *5* (11), 5324–5329.
31. CHEN, J.-T.; ZHANG, M.; YANG, L.; AVALLONE, A.; RUSSELL, T. P. Templated Nanostructured PS-*b*-PEO Nanotubes. *Journal of Polymer Science: Part B: Polymer Physics* **2007**, *45*, 2912–2917.
32. Dobriyal, P.; Xiang, H.; Kazuy, M.; Russell, T. P. Cylindrically Confined Diblock Copolymers. *Macromolecules* **2009**, *42* (22), 9082–9088.
33. Li, W.; Wickham, R. A. Self-Assembled Morphologies of a Diblock Copolymer Melt Confined in a Cylindrical Nanopore. *Macromolecules* **2006**, *39*, 8492–8498.
34. Li, W.; Wickham, R. A.; Garbary, R. A. Phase Diagram for a Diblock Copolymer Melt under Cylindrical Confinement. *Macromolecules* **2006**, *39*, 806–811.
35. Miao, B.; Yan, D.; Wickham, R. A.; Shi, A.-C. The nature of phase transitions of symmetric diblock copolymer melts under confinement. *Polymer* **2007**, *48*, 4278–4287.
36. Sevink, G. J. A.; Zvelindovsky, A. V. Block copolymers confined in a nanopore: Pathfinding in a curving and frustrating flatland. *J. Chem. Phys.* **128**, 084901.
37. Sevink, G. J. A.; Zvelindovsky, A. V.; Fraaije, J. G. E.; Huinink, H. P. Morphology of Symmetric Block Copolymer in a Cylindrical Pore. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *115* (17), 8226–8230.
38. Sun, Y.; Steinhart, M.; Zschech, D.; Adhikari, R.; Michler, G. H.; Gösele, U. Diameter-Dependence of the Morphology of PS-*b*-PMMA Nanorods Confined Within Ordered Porous Alumina Templates. *Macromol. Rapid. Commun.* **2005**, *26*, 369–375.
39. Wang, Q. Symmetric diblock copolymers in nanopores: Monte Carlo simulations and strong-stretching theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 024903.
40. XIANG, H.; SHIN, K.; KIM, T.; MOON, S.; MCCARTHY, T. J.; RUSSELL, T. P. The Influence of Confinement and Curvature on the Morphology of Block Copolymers. *J Polym Sci Part B: Polym Phys* **2005**, *43*, 3377–3383.

41. Xiang, H.; Shin, K.; Kim, T.; Moon, S. I.; McCarthy, T. J.; Russell, T. P. Block Copolymers under Cylindrical Confinement. *Macromolecules* **2004**, *37*, 5660- 5664.
42. Xiang, H.; Shin, K.; Kim, T.; Moon, S. I.; McCarthy, T. J.; Russell, T. P. From Cylinders to Helices upon Confinement. *Macromolecules* **2005**, *38* (4), 1055-1056.
43. Yu, B.; Jin, Q.; Ding, D.; Li, B.; Shi, A.-C. Confinement-Induced Morphologies of Cylinder-Forming Asymmetric Diblock Copolymers. *Macromolecules* **2008**, *41* (11), 4042-4054.
44. Yu, B.; Sun, P.; Chen, T.; Jin, Q.; Ding, D.; Li, B. Confinement-Induced Novel Morphologies of Block Copolymers. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2006**, *96*, 138306.
45. Zhu, Y.; Jiang, W. Self-Assembly of Diblock Copolymer Mixtures in Confined States: A Monte Carlo Study. *Macromolecules* **2007**, *40*, 2872- 2881.
46. Maniadis, P.; Tsimpanogiannis, I. N.; Kober, E. M.; Lookman, T. Phase segregation of diblock copolymers in nanopore geometries. *EPL* **2008**, *81*, 56001.
47. Shin, K.; Xiang, H.; Moon, S. I.; Kim, T.; McCarthy, T. J.; Russell, T. P. Curving and Frustrating Flatland. *Science* **2004**, *306*, 76.
48. Lorenzo, A. T.; Arnal, M. L.; Müller, A. J.; Boschetti de Fierro, A.; Abetz, V. *Eur. Polym. J.* **2006**, *42*, 516.
49. Li, A. P.; Muller, F.; Birner, A.; Nielsch, K.; Gosele, U. *Journal Of Applied Physics* **1998**, *84* (11), 6023-6026.
50. Masuda, H.; Fukuda, K. Ordered Metal Nanohole Arrays Made by a Two-Step Replication of Honeycomb Structures of Anodic Alumina. *Science* **1995**, *268* (5216), 1466-1468.
51. Müller, A. J.; Lorenzo, A. T.; Castillo, R. V.; Arnal, M. L.; Boschetti-de-Fierro, A.; Abetz, V. Crystallization Kinetics of Homogeneous and Melt Segregated PE Containing Diblock Copolymers. *Macromol. Symp.* **2006**, *245-246*, 154-160.
52. Müller, A. J.; Lorenzo, A. T.; Arnal, M. L.; Boschetti de Fierro, A.; Abetz, V. Self-Nucleation Behavior of the Polyethylene Block as Function of the Confinement Degree in Polyethylene-Block-Polystyrene Diblock Copolymers. *Macromol. Symp.* **2006**, *240*, 114–122.
53. Lorenzo, A. T.; Arnal, M. L.; Müller, A. J.; Boschetti-de-Fierro, A.; Abetz, V. Nucleation and Isothermal Crystallization of the Polyethylene Block within Diblock Copolymers Containing Polystyrene and Poly(ethylene-alt-propylene). *Macromolecules* **2007**, *40* (14), 5023–5037.
54. Brandrup, J.; Immergut, E.; Grulke, E. *Polymer Handbook*; John Wiley and Sons: New York, 1999.

55. Mathot, V. *Calorimetry and Thermal Analysis of Polymers*; Hanser Publishers: New York, 1994.
56. Müller, A. J.; Balsamo, V.; Arnal, M. L.; Jakob, T.; Schmalz, H.; Abetz, V. Homogeneous Nucleation and Fractionated Crystallization in Block Copolymers. *Macromolecules* **2002**, *35* (8), 3048-3058.
57. Müller, A. J.; Arnal, M. L. Thermal fractionation of polymers. *Prog. Polym. Sci.* **2005**, *30* (5), 559-603.
58. Carvalho, J. L.; Dalnoki-Veress, K. Surface Nucleation in the Crystallisation of Polyethylene Droplets. *Eur Phys J E* **2011**, *34* (6), 1-6.
59. Carvalho, J. L.; Dalnoki-Veress, K. Homogeneous Bulk, Surface, and Edge Nucleation in Crystalline Nanodroplets. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2010**, *105*, 237801.
60. Loo, Y. L.; Register, R. A.; Ryan, A. J. Modes of Crystallization in Block Copolymer Microdomains: Breakout, Templated, and Confined. *Macromolecules* **2002**, *35* (6), 2365–2374.

Insert Table of Contents Graphic and Synopsis Here