A thermodynamic model of non-ionic surfactants' micellization in the presence of polyoxometalates

Luc Girard, Bappaditya Naskar, Jean-François Dufrêche, Jonathan Lai, Olivier Diat, Pierre Bauduin

1   **A Thermodynamic Model of Non-Ionic Surfactants' Micellization in the Presence**

2   **of Polyoxometalates**

3   Luc Girard[1]*, Bappaditya Naskar[2], Jean-François Dufrêche[1], Jonathan Lai[1], Olivier Diat[1]

4   and Pierre Bauduin[1]

5   [1]ICSM, CEA, CNRS, ENSCM, Univ Montpellier, Marcoule, France

6   [2]Department of Chemistry, Sundarban Hazi Desarat College, University of Calcutta,
7   Pathankhali, PIN-743611, India

8

9
10
11   **ABSTRACT:** Polyoxometalates (POMs) are nanometric metal−oxide anions with an

12   unmatched range of chemical and physical properties. During the past decade, significant

13   efforts have been made to study POM surface activity and self-assembly properties that are

14   essential for catalysis applications and for producing organic−inorganic hybrid materials. A

15   previous work highlighted the tungstosilicate ($SiW_{12}O_{40}^{4-}$) and tungstophosphate ($PW_{12}O_{40}^{3-}$)

16   Keggin POM anions' spontaneous and noncovalent adsorption at the micellar surface of non-

17   ionic surfactants. In this study, the critical micelle concentrations (CMC) of two non-ionic

18   surfactants, the n-octyl-β-glucoside (C_8G_1) and the tetraethylene glycol monooctyl ether

19   (C_8E_4), were measured in the presence of POMs, and we propose herein thermodynamic

20   models to explain an increase or a decrease of the CMC depending on the choice of the

21   POM/surfactant couple.

22   **INTRODUCTION**

23   Polyoxometalates (POMs) are molecular oxo-clusters of the early transition metals in their

24   highest oxidation states. They can be considered either small water soluble oxides or nano-

25   ions (1-4 nm).[1] The variety of their chemical and physical structures at the atomic scale

26   makes them a key nano-particle used in numerous applications including in the medical,

27   analytical and material science fields[2-6]. Among these properties, the catalytic properties are

28   well known and noteworthy.[7-8] Their significant development in the last twenty years is also

29   related to their ability to self-assemble in large structures[9] with enhanced physical properties

30   but also to make hybrid organic-POM building blocks for designing smart complex[10-12] or

31   advanced functional materials and devices.[13] Nanometer-sized POM clusters, such as the

32   ones of Kegging type, can be classified as super-chaotropic anions[14] and adsorb at neutral

polar interfaces,[15-16] a property that was exploited to organize them into a lyotropic liquid crystal structure.[17-19] This latter property is particularly noteworthy, considering that the weak interactions taking place between the negatively charged POMs and neutral interfaces are of non-electrostatic origin and are sufficiently strong to promote adsorption. Indeed, most of the previous studies aiming at adsorbing POMs on interfaces used the more classical approach based on the electrostatic coupling between cationic interfaces, for instance covered by cationic surfactants, and the negatively charged POMs. Langmuir films were for example made at the water-air interface by using an electrostatic coupling method.[20-25] The electrostatic coupling approach between cationic surfactants and POMs was also used many times with other goals, for example to produce catalytic nano-particles[12] or POM self-assembly in non-aqueous solvents.[26] An alternative approach was proposed by using surfactants with POMs as polar heads covalently bound to alkyl chains.[11, 13, 27-28] POM-surfactants proved to be efficient in structuring POM building blocks in bulk and at interfaces by spontaneous self-assembly in 2D or 3D, playing with the wealth of amphiphilic structures and organization in liquid crystals or fluid phases, e.g. micelles or microemulsions.

It appears that the non-covalent approach has many advantages over the electrostatic and covalent ones: (i) it produces more flexible and liquid-like structures (micelles, lyotropic phases) compared to the electrostatic approach, and (ii) it is much less costly and time-consuming than the covalent approach that requires multiple-step synthesis. However, a key issue for the control of the adsorption and self-assembly properties of POMs in aqueous media is to understand their non-electrostatic interactions with polar non-ionic moieties at interfaces.

In the present study, we investigate how the POMs' adsorption on micelles influences the micellization process in order to go further in the understanding of the non-electrostatic interactions between POMs and non-ionic surfactants. The critical micellar concentration (CMC) values of the octyl-beta-glucoside (C_8G_1), and the tetraethylene glycol monooctyl ether (C_8E_4), two non-ionic surfactant systems with identical alkyl chain length and thus volume, were determined by the surface tension measurement at different POM concentrations with $PW_{12}O_{40}^{3-}$ (or $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$) and $SiW_{12}O_{40}^{4-}$ (or $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$), two Keggin's POMs for which we already know that they adsorb on these micellar surfaces.[15] The determination of the CMC is therefore used here as a thermodynamic probe of the POM/surfactant interactions[29] and we propose a thermodynamic model of the micellization process to explain our observation.

1

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Materials. $H_4SiW_{12}O_{40}.12H_2O$ 99.9% and $H_3PW_{12}O_{40}.12H_2O$ 99.995% were obtained from Aldrich. n-octyl-β-D-monoglucoside (C_8G_1) 99% was obtained from Anatrace. Tetraethylene glycol monooctyl ether (C_8E_4) 95,5% was synthesized following the steps described in Naskar et al..[15]

All the chemicals were used as received unless otherwise stated. Doubly distilled water (κ= 5−6 μS.cm^{-1} at 25°C) was employed for solution preparation. *pH* values of the solutions were measured and were always below 4.0, i.e. in the range of stability of the POMs in water.

Methods. The surface tension (γ) was measured as a function of the surfactant concentration using a drop shape analyzer (Krüss DSA 100). The surface tension values are the average values of 5 measurements at least for each point. The absolute precision is typically 1%. The CMC was determined at the apparent break in the surface tension. An error bar is estimated from the error made in the higher γ-slope determination. Various solutions of POMs at fixed concentrations were prepared either in water or in brine (100 mM of NaCl). Stock solutions of concentrated surfactants were also prepared in the same media. The density of each solution was measured at 23°C using a vibrating tube densitometer (Anton Paar DSA 5000). The liquid/air surface tension was measured after injecting a fixed number of mother solution drops into the cuvette containing the POMs solution. The γ values were accurate within ± 0.1 mN.m^{-1}.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The micellization of surfactants in water is a thermodynamic mechanism to minimize the free energy of the solution via the aggregation of the surfactants above a critical concentration (CMC). [29]

A) CMC as a function of POM concentration. CMC values of the two surfactant systems (C_8E_4 and C_8G_1) in water or in brine were determined via surface tension measurement as a function of the surfactant concentration and for different POM concentrations. Fig. 1A and 1C show the surface tension of C_8E_4 and C_8G_1 solutions respectively in the presence of 0, 5, 10 and 25 mM of $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$. Fig. 1B shows the surface tension of C_8G_1 solutions in the

1   presence of 2, 5, 10 and 25 mM of $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$. The critical micelle concentrations were

2   determined from the point of intersection of two straight lines of surface tension vs logarithm

3   bulk concentration curves above and below CMC. The averaged surface tension observed at

4   and above the CMC is called γ_{CMC}. CMC and γ_{CMC} values were reported in Table 1 for both

5   surfactants. The CMC variations as a function of POM concentration were also plotted in Fig.

6   2 to highlight the differences between the different surfactant/POM couples.

7   It was not possible to study the C_8E_4 / $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ system, as the solution turns to turbid at lower

8   concentration of C_8E_4 and becomes clear at higher concentration of C_8E_4 (observation for 2

9   mM $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$). It seems to be due to precipitation or coacervate formation at low

10   concentration.[30] This indicates that $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ interacts more strongly with C_8E_4 than $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$.

11   The CMC values of C_8G_1 and C_8E_4 in water without POMs are in line with literature data, i.e.

12   between 19 and 25 mM for C_8G_1[31-34] (titration calorimetry measurement which is known to

13   be very accurate gave 27.1 mM)[35] and around 8 mM for C_8E_4[15, 36, 37] (the titration calorimetry

14   value is 8.4 mM). In the presence of POMs, we determined a shift of the CMC to lower

15   values in the case of $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ with C_8E_4 or $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ with C_8G_1 as expected for an electrolyte

16   effect with non-ionic surfactant. However this effect is significant at very low concentration

17   of POM (below 10 mM) whereas it is observed with such amplitude above 100 mM for usual

18   electrolytes.[33, 38-40] On the other hand we determined a slight increase of the CMC when

19      $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ is added to a solution of C_8G_1.

Figure 1. Surface tension as a function of logarithm of the surfactant concentration at various POM concentrations: A) C_8E_4 with $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$, B) C_8G_1 with $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$, C) C_8G_1 with $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$. The CMC were determined from the point of intersection between the highest slope when the surface tension decreases before the CMC and the regime where the surface tension is constant.

We have also observed that the higher the POM concentration, the higher the surface tension at the CMC, γ_{CMC}, whatever the surfactant/POM couple. This effect has already been observed if we refer to other published works.[41-43] It was indeed shown that γ_{CMC} increases for mixed non-ionic and ionic surfactants, increasing the concentration of ionic surfactants or when using a pH sensitive surfactant for which the ratio of charged and non charged polar heads can be tuned. In all these cases an increase of the surface tension at the CMC can be correlated to the concentration of charge at the water/air interface enhancing the surface energy.

The surface tension without surfactant and for different concentrations of POM in solution was measured (see Table 1). Small variations of surface tension were observed in the presence of POMs, which indicates a very weak adsorption at the bare water/air surface, which likely arises from the slight surface activity of protons.[44] The effect of background salt was also studied for comparison between the C_8G_1 system and C_8E_4, with 100 mM of NaCl and at 10 mM of $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ with 100 mM of NaCl. The background salt has a slight effect on the CMC of C_8G_1 and C_8E_4 without POM. Indeed for C_8G_1 the CMC in 100 mM of NaCl (25.7 mM) is slightly lower than the CMC in pure water, i.e. 27.6 mM (see Table 1). As mentioned previously, this is not surprising for a non-ionic surfactant for which CMC is usually not or only slightly affected by the presence of salt at low concentrations. Ion effect on the non-ionic surfactant CMC becomes indeed significant only at high salt concentrations, i.e. in the molar range or when they show specific effect, with the CMC's decrease much more pronounced for "salting-out" ions than for "salting-in" ions.[39-40, 45] On the other hand, a significant CMC decrease is observed for the C_8G_1/$[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ (10 mM) system from 30.1 down to 23.5 mM when adding 100 mM of NaCl whereas an increase was determined adding only 10 mM of $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ POM to the pure system (from 27.6 up to 30.1 mM). This behavior is similar to the effect of the addition of salt to an anionic surfactant solution, which leads to a decrease of the CMC by a screening effect.[45] The same observation can be done for the C_8E_4//$[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ (10 mM) system. This observation could be qualitatively explained by a screening effect of the charges of an "ionic surfactant" formed by the association of POMs and the non-ionic surfactants.

The affinity of the POMs for surfactants was previously shown by studying the POMs' adsorption onto micellar surfaces using the same surfactants at higher concentration.[15] SAXS data were indeed analyzed taking into account a strong adsorption of the Keggin-type POMs, $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ and $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$, at the surface of non-ionic micelles made either with C_8G_1 or C_8E_4. It was also shown that depending on the chemical nature of the surfactant polar head (glucose or PEG), the POMs were more or less embedded in the polar heads corona and without a direct bond involved between POMs and surfactants. The consequences of the adsorption of POMs on the micelles were a huge increase of the stability of the micellar solution and a change in the micelle shape from elongated to spherical. It was also shown that for C_8E_4 solutions, the cloud point (CP), i.e. the temperature above which a liquid-liquid phase separation takes place, was increased from 40°C to 90°C by the addition of Keggin POMs. This is a tremendous effect compared to the one of thiocyanate, SCN⁻, one of the most

1   salting-in anions in the Hofmeister series, for which the CP only increases by a few degrees.

2   The salting-in effect and the adsorption propensity of POMs onto micelles were shown to be

3   stronger for the more polarizable POMs, $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ compared to $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ or other larger POM

4   nanoions such as DAWSON type of polyoxometalates i.e. following the POM's charge

5   density.[46] It was proposed that the driving force of the adsorption of POMs mainly originates

6   from the gain of entropy brought about by the release of several hydration water molecules in

7   the bulk. Indeed, a partial dehydration of both the POMs and the surface polar heads is

8   expected along with the adsorption of POMs at the micelle surface.

9   **Table 1. Micellization parameters at 23°C of C_8G_1 and C_8E_4 in water or in brine with**

10   **various $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ or $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ concentrations: CMC and surface tension at CMC.**

Solvent (medium)		C_8G_1		C_8E_4	
	$\gamma_{solvent}$ /mN·m^{-1}	CMC /mM	γ_{CMC} /mN·m^{-1}	CMC /mM	γ_{CMC} /mN·m^{-1}
H$_2$O	72,6	27.6	30.5	9.2	29.9
100 mM NaCl	72.3	25.7	32.0	7.5	28.0
100 mM NaCl +10 mM $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$		23.5	34.5	3.2	32.6
5 mM $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$	72.5	29.4	32.3	5.9	32.1
10 mM $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$	72.6	30.1	34.1	4.5	34.3
25 mM $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$	69.3	31.5	35.4	4.7	35.2
2 mM $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$	72.2	20.2	36.3		
5 mM $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$	72.0	14.8	37.9		
10 mM $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$	71.2	11.0	39.7		
25 mM $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$	70.1	11.0	39.0		

11

12

Figure 2. CMCs' variation as a function of POM concentration in water for the three couples $C_8G_1/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$, $C_8G_1/[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ and $C_8E_4/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$. Dashed lines correspond to the thermodynamic model presented later in the document.

The effect of the addition of POMs on the CMC is significant compared to the effect of classical salts.[47-48] Moreover, the CMC either increases with POM concentration, as for the $C_8G_1/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ couple or decreases for $C_8G_1/[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ and $C_8E_4/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ couples respectively, as observed in Fig. 2. This significant effect of POMs could be related to their super-chaotropic character or super "salting-in" property.

In the following section an explanation is proposed for the different effects of the addition of $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ and $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ on the CMC of C_8G_1 and C_8E_4 using a thermodynamic approach based on the pseudo-phase model and thanks to a statistical mechanic calculation to determine the ΔG of POM adsorption onto the micelles.

B) Phase equilibrium model in micellar solutions of non-ionic surfactants in the presence of POMs.

The well-known pseudo-phase (see SI. 1) is used to describe the system as follows.[49] This model is generally considered to be valid at high aggregation numbers. In our case, the latter is between 25 to 45, depending on the adsorbed POMs. Thus pseudo-phase is a valid approximation as in that case, straightforward calculations show that the error on the Gibbs energy is around 1.3 % when the aggregation number is 30. Moreover, it has the big advantage that it does not depend on the aggregation number so that only one fitted parameter by equilibria is required.

As shown in Fig.2, we have observed two different behaviors for the CMC variation versus POMs concentration. We already know that two POMs studied here are adsorbed at the micelle surface of both surfactants.[15] A CMC increase indicates that the monomer form is stabilized. In order to explain this stabilization, the assumption is made that a fraction of surfactant molecules is not free but associated with POMs despite the fact that we have no direct or indirect evidence of the existence of these POM/monomer association and that the formation of this association is the predominant effect compared to the adsorption on POMs on the micelles. On the opposite, a decrease of the CMC can be explained by a stabilization

of the micelles, which suggests that POMs' adsorption onto the micelles becomes the predominant effect compared to the POM/monomer interaction.

Thus, when POMs are added to the system, different species could be considered and the simplest ones are: the monomer m, the POM p, the micelle M, the POM associated with the monomer m_a and the micelle associated with the POM M_a, with respective fractions according the three following equilibria and as sketched in Fig. 3:

$$m \quad \overset{(1)}{\Leftrightarrow} \quad m \text{ in M}$$

the basic equilibrium as already sketched and described in SI. 1.

$$m + p \quad \overset{(2)}{\Leftrightarrow} \quad m_a$$

and

$$m \quad \overset{(3)}{\Leftrightarrow} \quad m \text{ in M}_a$$

The equilibrium constant K_1^0 of the Equilibrium (1) can be expressed as (See SI. 1):

$$K_1^0 = \frac{1}{c_m} = e^{-\frac{\mu_M^0 - \mu_m^0}{k_B T}} = e^{-\frac{\Delta G_{mic}^0}{k_B T}} \qquad (1)$$

Likewise for the Equilibrium (2), we can write the chemical potential equilibrium as:

$$\mu_m^0 + k_B T \ln c_m + \mu_p^0 + k_B T \ln c_p = \mu_{m_a}^0 + k_B T \ln c_{m_a} \qquad (2)$$

where c_p and c_{m_a} are the POM concentration and the concentration of monomers associated with POM.

This new equilibrium constant K_2^0 can thus be expressed as:

$$K_2^0 = \frac{c_{m_a}}{c_m c_p} = e^{-\frac{\mu_{m_a}^0 - \mu_m^0 - \mu_p^0}{k_B T}} = e^{-\frac{\Delta G_a^0}{k_B T}} \qquad (3)$$

and depends on the energy of POM/monomer association, ΔG_a^0.

For the Equilibrium (3), the equality of the chemical potentials can be expressed as:

$$\mu_m^0 + k_B T \ln c_m = \mu_{M_a}^0 \qquad (4)$$

with the defined equilibrium constant K_3^0 as:

$$K_3^0 = \frac{1}{c_m} = e^{-\frac{\mu_{M_a}^0 - \mu_m^0}{k_B T}} = e^{-\frac{\Delta G_{mic,a}^0}{k_B T}} \qquad (5)$$

Equations (1) and (5) are not compatible, as the Equilibrium (1) cannot be present together with Equilibrium (3). In other words, only the most stable micellar aggregates, either the micelles without POMs (Equilibrium 1) or the one with POMs (Equilibrium 3) can be present

1 as a pseudo-phase. Thus, on one hand, if $\mu_M^0 < \mu_{M_a}^0$, the micelle without POMs is the most

2 stable state for aggregation and Equilibrium (1) and (2) take place according to Eq. (1) and

3 (3). On the other hand, if $\mu_M^0 > \mu_{M_a}^0$, the micelle with POMs is the most stable pseudo-phase

4 and Equilibrium (3) take place according to Eq. (5).

5

6
7

8 **Figure 3.** Sketch of the three equilibria of the surfactants taking into account the interaction

9 of POM anions with the non-ionic surfactant in an aqueous medium: the surfactant monomers

10 /micellar aggregation (equilibrium 1), the POM/surfactant association (equilibrium 2) and the

11 surfactant monomers/micellar aggregation taking into account the adsorption of POM onto

12 non-ionic micelles as already observed in reference (equilibrium 3).[15]

13

14 ***First case, the monomers are stabilized by the POMs (C_8G_1/[SiW_{12}]$^{4-}$ system).***

15 In this first case, the association POM-monomer is non negligible and results in an increase

16 of the surfactant solubility and thus of the CMC. From Eq. (1) and (3), we get the

17 concentration of monomers associated with POM:

18 $$c_{m_a} = CMC_0 c_p e^{\frac{-\Delta G_a^0}{k_B T}} = c_p e^{\frac{-\Delta G_a^0 + \Delta G_{mic}^0}{k_B T}} \qquad (6)$$

19 with the micellar critical concentration CMC_0 without POM into the system:

20 $$CMC_0 = e^{\frac{\Delta G_{mic}^0}{k_B T}} \qquad (7)$$

21 The total concentration of monomers not involved in a micelle reads:

22 $$CMC = c_m + c_{m_a} = CMC_0 + c_{m_a} \qquad (8)$$

23 Then, using Eq. (6), the *CMC* can be written as:

1 $$CMC = CMC_0 \left(1 + c_p e^{\frac{-\Delta G_a^0}{k_B T}} \right) = CMC_0 \left(1 + c_p K_2^0 \right) \qquad (9)$$

2 Thus, the model predicts a linear increase of the CMC versus the POM concentration in

3 solution. This expression (Eq. 9) can be compared with the experiments if we express CMC

4 as a function of the total POM concentration:

5 $$[POM] = c_p + c_{m_a} \qquad (10)$$

6 From Eq. (6) we obtain:

7 $$[POM] = c_p \left(1 + e^{\frac{-\Delta G_a^0 + \Delta G_{mic}^0}{k_B T}} \right) \qquad (11)$$

8 and finally

9 $$CMC = CMC_0 \left(1 + [POM] \frac{K_2^0}{1 + K_2^0 CMC_0} \right) \qquad (12)$$

10

11 By fitting in Fig. 2 the CMC variation versus $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ concentration for C8G1 system, we

12 obtain:

13 $CMC = 0.196\,[POM] + 27.706$ (in $mmol.L^{-1}$). Then, we deduce ΔG_{mic}^0, ΔG_a^0 and the constant

14 $K_2^0 = \frac{c_{m_a}}{c_p c_m}$ for the equilibrium $m + p = m_a$ and we find (for details see SI. 2.):

15 $\Delta G_{mic}^0 \approx -9\ kJ.mol^{-1}$, $\Delta G_a^0 \approx -5\ kJ.mol^{-1}$ and $K_2^0 = 8.8\ L\cdot mol^{-1}$, values that indicate a

16 lower Gibbs energy of micellization compared to the basic system without POM[50] but a non

17 negligeable POM/surfactant energy of complex formation.

18 The association constant can be simply expressed as a function of the proportion α of

19 association of surfactant with POM and the total initial concentration of POM and monomers,

20 c^{init}:

21 $$K_2^0 = 8,8\ L.mol^{-1} = \frac{\alpha\ c^{init}}{(1-\alpha)\ c^{init}(1-\alpha)\ c^{init}} \qquad (13)$$

22 If we consider $c^{init} = 25$ mM, then $\alpha = 16\ \%$, which means that about 1/6 of surfactants would

23 be associated with POM for concentrations close to the CMC. Even if the fraction of

24 POM/monomer complexes is weak, it is sufficient to slightly increase the CMC.

25

26 ***Second case, the micelles are stabilized by the POMs (C8G1/[PW12]3- and C8E4/[SiW12]4-***

27 ***systems).***

28 As mentioned above, a plausible alternative to explain a decrease of the CMC is that POMs

29 adsorption onto the micelle becomes the predominant effect in comparison to the

1 POM/monomer dimeric complex, which is negligible here. $\mu_{M_a}^0$ is now lower than μ_M^0. Thus

2 only Equilibria (3) has to be considered:

3 $\qquad m \qquad \overset{(3)}{\Leftrightarrow} \qquad m$ in M_a

4 and characterized by the equilibrium constant K_3^0 that depends on the free energy of

5 micellization ($\Delta G_{mic,a}^0$) with POMs. Due to the charges of the POMs adsorbed onto the

6 micelles, the previous method based on the equilibrium between the species cannot be solely

7 applied and an approach based on the specific calculation of the free energy of micellization

8 ($\Delta G_{mic,a}^0$) with POMs has to be used by establishing a lateral equation of state (EOS).[51-57]

9 This equation quantifies the different interactions between the surfactant heads within the

10 aggregates (whatever their shape) and also the interactions between the charged adsorbed

11 species (POMs) onto the micelles. For a non-ionic micellar system without POMs, the total

12 free energy of micellization (ΔG_{mic}^0) is considered to be the sum of two terms that represents

13 i) the hydrocarbon-water free energy, proportional to the water/alkane surface tension γ and

14 ii) the short-range steric repulsion energy of the surfactant head groups, inversely

15 proportional to the variation of the polar head surfaces ($a - a_0$).

16 Expressed here per mole of surfactant, the free energy of micellization without POM is

17 usually described by the eq. (14) as followed:

18 $\Delta G_{mic}^0 = F_{L/W} + F_{head-rep} = \gamma(a - a_0) + \dfrac{c}{a - a_0}$ $\qquad\qquad$ (14)

19 with a_0 is the minimal head group area and which is fixed, from pure steric considerations, at

20 0.36 nm^2 for C_8G_1 and 0.23 nm^2 for C_8E_4. We assume that the aggregation numbers, the size

21 parameter and the surface tension do not depend on the POMs. Experimentally, the

22 dependence is actually weak and steric effects only slightly depend on the surrounded

23 associations.

24 The factor c is calculated in the absence of POMs when the function is minimal thus with $c = $

25 $\gamma(a - a_0)^2$ with a the surface per polar head within the micelles taken from literature and

26 fixed at 0.49 nm^2 for C_8G_1 and 0.45 nm^2 for C_8E_4.[34, 58]

27 In the presence of POMs, an additional contribution to the free energy is considered that can

28 be split into two terms and accounts for (i) the adsorption process of the POM, $\left(\dfrac{F_{ads}}{N_{agg}}\right)$ and (ii)

29 the repulsions between the POMs adsorbed onto the micelles, $\left(\dfrac{F_{elec}}{N_{agg}}\right)$. N_{agg} is the aggregation

number which have to be taken into account to model the curvature of the system (N_{agg} C$_8$G$_1$ = 25 to 45 and N_{agg} C$_8$E$_4$ =33 as obtained for a spherical model in presence of POMs[15]) :

$$\Delta G^0_{\text{mic,a}} = F_{\text{L}/\text{W}} + F_{\text{head-rep}} + \frac{(F_{\text{ads}} + F_{\text{elec}})}{N_{\text{agg}}} \qquad (15)$$

The first contribution related to the POM adsorption onto the micelle can be written as

$$F_{\text{ads}} = N_{\text{ads}}(\Delta G_{\text{ads}} - k_B T \ln C^*_{\text{POM}}) \qquad (16)$$

where ΔG_{ads} denotes the variation of the Gibbs energy for one POM during the adsorption. C^*_{POM} is the POM concentration in the solvent.

For the second term, F_{elec} explicitly stands for the electrostatic energy of the ions adsorbed to the surface and can be expressed as:[57]

$$F_{\text{elec}} = \frac{(ze)^2 N_{\text{ads}}^2}{8\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_r R_{\text{coll}}} \qquad (17)$$

with $z = 3$ or 4 the charge number of the POM, e the elementary charge, ε_0 and ε_r the vacuum and relative permittivities of the solvent, respectively. R_{coll} is the radius of the micelle ($4\pi R_{\text{coll}}^2 = a N_{\text{agg}}$) and N_{ads} is the average number of adsorbed POMs onto the micelles.

For the electrostatic formula, eq. (17), we should consider that the charges onto the micelle are uniformly distributed and that no correlation between the adsorbed ions is explicitly taken into account. This assumption remains valid when the ion adsorption is strong enough and when their distribution can be considered as a uniform shell of charges around the aggregates. However, in our case the number of POMs adsorbed is rather low (typically between 4 and 7 [15]) so that charge correlations have to be taken into account for ε_r (for details see SI. 3).

Finally the total free energy of micellization with POM adsorbed onto micelles can be written as:

$$\Delta G^0_{\text{mic,a}} = \gamma(a - a_0) + \frac{c}{a - a_0} + \frac{\left(\frac{(ze)^2 N_{\text{ads}}^2}{8\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_r R_{\text{coll}}} + N_{\text{ads}}(\Delta G_{\text{ads}} - k_B T \ln C^*_{\text{POM}})\right)}{N_{\text{agg}}} \qquad (18)$$

This total free energy is minimized versus N_{ads} and a in two steps (for details see SI. 4).

From previous fitting of SAXS spectra,[15] the ratio [surfactant]/[POM] on the micelle was estimated to be 4.3 (3 < N_{ads} <6 roughly depending on N_{agg} and the POMs concentration) for a solution of C$_8$G$_1$ with of [PW$_{12}$]$^{3-}$ and 5.3 (4< N_{agg} <6) for a solution of C$_8$E$_4$ with [SiW$_{12}$]$^{4-}$.

13

1   ΔG_{ads} has been fitted to find a value for N_{ads} close to the experimental value for the same

2   POM concentrations (10 mM).

3   The first minimization $\frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta G_{\mathrm{mic}}^0}{\mathrm{d}N_{\mathrm{ads}}} = 0$ (see Fig. S4 in SI. 4) leads to:

4    $N_{\mathrm{ads}} = \dfrac{(k_B T \ln C_{\mathrm{POM}}^* - \Delta G_{\mathrm{ads}}) 4 \pi \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_r R_{\mathrm{coll}}}{(ze)^2}$ (19)

5   Taking into account the results of the first step minimization, $\Delta G_{\mathrm{mic,a}}^0$ can be expressed now

6   as follows:

7    $\Delta G_{\mathrm{mic,a}}^0 = \gamma(\mathrm{a} - \mathrm{a}_0) + \dfrac{C}{\mathrm{a} - \mathrm{a}_0} - \delta\sqrt{\mathrm{a}}$ (20)

8   with $\delta = \dfrac{k_B T \left(\ln C_{\mathrm{POM}}^* - \frac{\Delta G_{\mathrm{ads}}}{k_B T} \right)^2}{4 L_B \sqrt{N_{\mathrm{agg}}} \pi z^2}$ (21)

9   The second step of $\Delta G_{\mathrm{mic,a}}^0$ minimization versus a was obtained by the Newton Raphson

10   method (for details see SI. 4) and makes it possible to get its minimum value at each POM's

11   concentration as well as the micellar characteristics i.e the N_{agg} and a, the surface per polar

12   head.

13   We found ΔG_{ads} to be -16 k_BT and -22 k_BT for $C_8G_1/[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ and $C_8E_4/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ respectively

14   (see dotted lines in Fig. S5 in SI. 5). These values cannot be compared directly as they

15   concern two different POMs adsorbed on different surfactant molecules. Nevertheless, these

16   values confirm the strong interaction of the POM with the polar interface of the non-ionic

17   micelles, whether the sugar heads or the EO chains. The ΔG_{ads} values may appear rather high

18   but are not so surprising when we consider some recent results concerning the POM crystal

19   formation in aqueous phase using EO oligomers.[59] Indeed, EO oligomers/POM crystals can

20   be formed spontaneously at low concentration and increasing the ionic strength, which imply

21   strong attractive interactions between both species in solution. The adsorption of a

22   polarizable anion on a polar surface implies that a few water molecules are released from the

23   hydration shells of both the surface and the ion.[60] This partial dehydration process has an

24   enthalpy cost which is higher for small salting-out anions compared to large salting-in or

25   chaotropic anions of low charge density. Moreover, the entropy gain associated to the release

26   of many water molecules into the bulk phase is supposed to be prominent over the enthalpy

cost for POMs, owing to their large size and large water shell. $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ anion is then expected to interact more strongly than $[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ with the surface of non-ionic micelles that are highly hydrated. This adsorption mechanism stabilizes the micelles and results in a decrease of the CMC. This effect is stronger when the POM is adsorbed into the hydrated micellar shell with the release of a large number of water molecules, as for the $C_8E_4/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ system with a ΔG_{ads} of -22 k_BT (as the polyethoxylated chains are more hydrated that the sugar heads). This interaction can even be so strong that POM may become a "sticky anchorage" between two micelles leading to the formation of a coacervate[30] or a demixion as observed in the case of $C_8E_4/[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ system. On the other hand, the lower ΔG_{ads} value obtained for the $C_8G_1/[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ system can be explained by the (rigid) sugar head that prevents the penetration of $[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ in the polar corona of the C_8G_1 micelle. This model does not take into account that the aggregation number can vary as a function of number of adsorbed POM. However, to check this effect, it will require synchrotron radiation to exploit weak scattering data at the CMC.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we have shown that the variation of the non-ionic surfactant CMC in presence of Keggin POM can be positive or negative as a function of the choice of the polar head/POM couple. Indeed, we observe either a stabilization of the micelle for $C_8G_1/[PW_{12}]^{3-}$ and $C_8E_4/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ system, a stabilization of the monomeric form for $C_8G_1/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ and even a coacervate for $C_8E_4/[PW_{12}]^{3-}$. Thermodynamic approaches were used to quantitatively describe the CMC increase and decrease. A classical pseudo-phase model was used when the surfactant monomer form was stabilized (CMC increase) whereas a lateral equation of state was applied when the POM adsorption onto the micelles was the dominant effect (CMC decrease). This work contributes to the general understanding of the non-electrostatic interactions taking place in water between POMs and non-ionic amphiphilic molecules and can be extended to different kinds of hydrophilic surfaces or interfaces. It represents a keystone for the future development of innovative materials with original nanostructures and functional properties. Considering also that polyoxometalates (POMs) have been previously investigated for their antimicrobial, anti-tumoral properties,[61-64] to prevent amyloid plaque formation[5, 65] and more generally to adsorb on phospholipid membranes,[66-68] this work will help to understand their physicochemical properties in a biological medium.

1 **AUTHOR INFORMATION**

2 **Corresponding Author**

3 *Fax: (+33) 466 339 288. E-mail: Luc.girard@enscm.fr

4 **Present Address**

5 ICSM, UMR 5257 (CEA, CNRS, UM, ENSCM) CEA Marcoule, BP17171, 30207 Bagnols-
6 sur-Céze, France

7 **Notes**

8 The authors declare no competing financial interest.

14 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

15 **Supporting Information Available:** The following information is given in the

16 supplementary file: description of the monomer micelle equilibrium using the pseudo phase

17 model; determination of ΔG^0_{mic}, ΔG^0_a and the constant K^0_2 for the $C_8G_1/[SiW_{12}]^{4-}$ system;

18 determination of ε_r and electrostatic energy for a number of POMs adsorbed on the micelle;

19 first minimization of $\Delta G^0_{mic,a}$ as a function of N_{ads}; second minimization of $\Delta G^0_{mic,a}$ as a

20 function of a .

21 **REFERENCES**

22 1.   Pope, M. T.; Muller, A., Polyoxometatlate Chemistry - An old field with new
23 dimensions in several disciplines. *Angew Chem Int Edit* **1991,** *30* (1), 34-48.
24 2.   Long, D.-L.; Burkholder, E.; Cronin, L., Polyoxometalate clusters, nanostructures
25 and materials: From self assembly to designer materials and devices. *Chemical Society*
26 *Reviews* **2007,** *36* (1), 105-121.
27 3.   Long, D.-L.; Tsunashima, R.; Cronin, L., Polyoxometalates: Building Blocks for
28 Functional Nanoscale Systems. *Angew Chem Int Edit* **2010,** *49* (10), 1736-1758.
29 4.   Blazevic, A.; Rompel, A., The Anderson-Evans polyoxometalate: From inorganic
30 building blocks via hybrid organic-inorganic structures to tomorrows "Bio-POM".
31 *Coordination Chemistry Reviews* **2016,** *307*, 42-64.

5.   Chen, Q.; Yang, L.; Zheng, C.; Zheng, W.; Zhang, J.; Zhou, Y.; Liu, J., Mo polyoxometalate nanoclusters capable of inhibiting the aggregation of A beta-peptide associated with Alzheimer's disease. *Nanoscale* **2014,** *6* (12), 6886-6897.

6.   Secheresse, F., *Polyoxometalate Chemistry: Some Recent Trends.* World Scientific: 2013; p 360.

7.   Hill, C. L.; Prosser-McCartha, C. M., HOMOGENEOUS CATALYSIS BY TRANSITION-METAL OXYGEN ANION CLUSTERS. *Coordination Chemistry Reviews* **1995,** *143*, 407-455.

8.   Zhao, M.; Ou, S.; Wu, C.-D., Porous Metal-Organic Frameworks for Heterogeneous Biomimetic Catalysis. *Accounts of Chemical Research* **2014,** *47* (4), 1199-1207.

9.   Liu, T. B.; Diemann, E.; Li, H. L.; Dress, A. W. M.; Muller, A., Self-assembly in aqueous solution of wheel-shaped Mo-154 oxide clusters into vesicles. *Nature* **2003,** *426* (6962), 59-62.

10.   Yang, Y.; Zhang, B.; Wang, Y. Z.; Yue, L.; Li, W.; Wu, L. X., A Photo-driven Polyoxometalate Complex Shuttle and Its Homogeneous Catalysis and Heterogeneous Separation. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **2013,** *135* (39), 14500-14503.

11.   Jallet, V.; Guillemot, G.; Lai, J.; Bauduin, P.; Nardello-Rataj, V.; Proust, A., Covalent amphiphilic polyoxometalates for the design of biphasic microemulsion systems. *Chem Commun* **2014,** *50* (50), 6610-6612.

12.   Leclercq, L.; Mouret, A.; Proust, A.; Schmitt, V.; Bauduin, P.; Aubry, J.-M.; Nardello-Rataj, V., Pickering Emulsion Stabilized by Catalytic Polyoxometalate Nanoparticles: A New Effective Medium for Oxidation Reactions. *Chem-Eur J* **2012,** *18* (45), 14352-14358.

13.   Zhang, J.; Song, Y.-F.; Cronin, L.; Liu, T., Self-Assembly of Organic-Inorganic Hybrid Amphiphilic Surfactants with Large Polyoxometalates as Polar Head Groups. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **2008,** *130* (44), 14408-+.

14.   Assaf, K. I.; Ural, M. S.; Pan, F. F.; Georgiev, T.; Simova, S.; Rissanen, K.; Gabel, D.; Nau, W. M., Water Structure Recovery in Chaotropic Anion Recognition: High-Affinity Binding of Dodecaborate Clusters to -Cyclodextrin. *Angew Chem Int Edit* **2015,** *54* (23), 6852-6856.

15.   Naskar, B.; Diat, O.; Nardello-Rataj, V.; Bauduin, P., Nanometer-Size Polyoxometalate Anions Adsorb Strongly on Neutral Soft Surfaces. *Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2015,** *119* (36), 20985-20992.

16.   Chaumont, A.; Wipff, G., Polyoxometalate Keggin Anions at Aqueous Interfaces with Organic Solvents, Ionic Liquids, and Graphite: a Molecular Dynamics Study. *Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2009,** *113* (42), 18233-18243.

17.   Constantin, D.; Davidson, P., Lamellar L-alpha Mesophases Doped with Inorganic Nanoparticles. *Chemphyschem* **2014,** *15* (7), 1270-1282.

18.   Poulos, A. S.; Constantin, D.; Davidson, P.; Imperor, M.; Judeinstein, P.; Pansu, B., A PGSE-NMR Study of Molecular Self-Diffusion in Lamellar Phases Doped with Polyoxometalates. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **2010,** *114* (1), 220-227.

19.   Poulos, A. S.; Constantin, D.; Davidson, P.; Imperor, M.; Pansu, B.; Panine, P.; Nicole, L.; Sanchez, C., Photochromic hybrid organic-inorganic liquid-crystalline materials built from nonionic surfactants and polyoxometalates: Elaboration and structural study. *Langmuir* **2008,** *24* (12), 6285-6291.

20.   Musumeci, C.; Rosnes, M. H.; Giannazzo, F.; Symes, M. D.; Cronin, L.; Pignataro, B., Smart High-kappa Nanodielectrics Using Solid Supported Polyoxometalate-Rich Nanostructures. *Acs Nano* **2011,** *5* (12), 9992-9999.

21. de Viguerie, L.; Mouret, A.; Brau, H. P.; Nardello-Rataj, V.; Proust, A.; Bauduin, P., Surface pressure induced 2D-crystallization of POM-based surfactants: preparation of nanostructured thin films. *Crystengcomm* **2012,** *14* (24), 8446-8453.

22. Liu, S.; Tang, Z., Polyoxometalate-based functional nanostructured films: Current progress and future prospects. *Nano Today* **2010,** *5* (4), 267-281.

23. Kurth, D. G.; Osterhout, R., In situ analysis of metallosupramolecular coordination polyelectrolyte films by surface plasmon resonance spectroscopy. *Langmuir* **1999,** *15* (14), 4842-4846.

24. Kurth, D. G.; Volkmer, D.; Ruttorf, M.; Richter, B.; Muller, A., Ultrathin composite films incorporating the nanoporous isopolyoxomolybdate "Keplerate" (NH4)(42)[Mo132O372(CH3COO)(30)(H2O)(72)]. *Chem Mater* **2000,** *12* (10), 2829-+.

25. Liu, S. Q.; Volkmer, D.; Kurth, D. G., Functional polyoxometalate thin films via electrostatic layer-by-layer self-assembly. *J Clust Sci* **2003,** *14* (3), 405-419.

26. Li, X. X.; Wang, Y. X.; Wang, R. H.; Cui, C. Y.; Tian, C. B.; Yang, G. Y., Designed Assembly of Heterometallic Cluster Organic Frameworks Based on Anderson-Type Polyoxometalate Clusters. *Angew Chem Int Edit* **2016,** *55* (22), 6462-6466.

27. Dufaud, V.; Lefebvre, F., Inorganic Hybrid Materials with Encapsulated Polyoxometalates. *Mater.* **2010,** *3* (1), 682-703.

28. Landsmann, S.; Wessig, M.; Schmid, M.; Coelfen, H.; Polarz, S., Smart Inorganic Surfactants: More than Surface Tension. *Angewandte Chemie-International Edition* **2012,** *51* (24), 5995-5999.

29. Wennerstrom, H.; Lindman, B., Micelles - Physical-Chemistry of Surfactant Association. *Phys Rep* **1979,** *52* (1), 1-86.

30. Jing, B.; Qiu, J.; Zhu, Y., Organic–inorganic macroion coacervate complexation. *Soft Matter* **2017**.

31. Kjellin, U. R. M.; Claesson, P. M.; Vulfson, E. N., Studies of N-dodecyllactobionamide, maltose 6'-O-dodecanoate, and octyl-beta-glucoside with surface tension, surface force, and wetting techniques. *Langmuir* **2001,** *17* (6), 1941-1949.

32. Shinoda, K.; Yamanaka, T.; Kinoshita, K., Surface Chemical Properties in Aqueous Solutions of Nonionic Surfactants - Octyl Glycol Ether, Alpha-Octyl Glyceryl Ether and Octyl Glucoside. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* **1959,** *63* (5), 648-650.

33. Ericsson, C. A.; Soderman, O.; Garamus, V. M.; Bergstrom, M.; Ulvenlud, S., Effects of temperature, salt, and deuterium oxide on the self-aggregation of alkylglycosides in dilute solution. 1. n-nonyl-beta-D-glucoside. *Langmuir* **2004,** *20* (4), 1401-1408.

34. Bauer, C.; Bauduin, P.; Girard, L.; Diat, O.; Zemb, T., Hydration of sugar based surfactants under osmotic stress: A SAXS study. *Colloid Surface A* **2012,** *413*, 92-100.

35. Király, Z.; Börner, R. H. K.; Findenegg, G. H., Adsorption and Aggregation of C8E4 and C8G1 Nonionic Surfactants on Hydrophilic Silica Studied by Calorimetry. *Langmuir* **1997,** *13* (13), 3308-3315.

36. le Maire, M.; Champeil, P.; Moller, J. V., Interaction of membrane proteins and lipids with solubilizing detergents. *Bba-Biomembranes* **2000,** *1508* (1-2), 86-111.

37. Vulliezlenormand, B.; Eisele, J. L., Determination of Detergent Critical Micellar Concentration by Solubilization of a Colored Dye. *Anal Biochem* **1993,** *208* (2), 241-243.

38. Molina-Bolivar, J. A.; Hierrezuelo, J. M.; Carnero Ruiz, C., Self-assembly, hydration, and structures in N-decanoyl-N-methylglucamide aqueous solutions: Effect of salt addition and temperature. *J Colloid Interf Sci* **2007,** *313* (2), 656-664.

39.   Miyagishi, S.; Okada, K.; Asakawa, T., Salt effect on critical micelle concentrations of nonionic surfactants, N-acyl-N-methylglucamides (MEGA-n). *J Colloid Interf Sci* **2001,** *238* (1), 91-95.

40.   Carale, T. R.; Pham, Q. T.; Blankschtein, D., Salt Effects on Intramicellar Interactions and Micellization of Nonionic Surfactants in Aqueous-Solutions. *Langmuir* **1994,** *10* (1), 109-121.

41.   Matsubara, H.; Ohta, A.; Kameda, M.; Ikeda, N.; Aratono, M., Interaction between ionic and nonionic surfactants in the adsorbed film and micelle. Dodecylammonium chloride and tetraethylene glycol monooctyl ether. *Langmuir* **2000,** *16* (20), 7589-7596.

42.   Micheau, C.; Bauduin, P.; Diat, O.; Faure, S., Specific Salt and pH Effects on Foam Film of a pH Sensitive Surfactant. *Langmuir* **2013,** *29* (27), 8472-8481.

43.   Bagheri, A.; Khalili, P., Synergism between non-ionic and cationic surfactants in a concentration range of mixed monolayers at an air-water interface. *Rsc Adv* **2017,** *7* (29), 18151-18161.

44.   Kunz, W.; Belloni, L.; Bernard, O.; Ninham, B. W., Osmotic coefficients and surface tensions of aqueous electrolyte solutions: Role of dispersion forces. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2004,** *108*, 2398-2404.

45.   Palladino, P.; Ragone, R., Ionic Strength Effects on the Critical Mice liar Concentration of Ionic and Nonionic Surfactants: The Binding Model. *Langmuir* **2011,** *27* (23), 14065-14070.

46.   Buchecker, T.; Schmid, P.; Renaudineau, S.; Diat, O.; Proust, A.; Pfitzner, A.; Bauduin, P., Polyoxometalates in the Hofmeister series. *Chem Commun* **2018,** *54* (15), 1833-1836.

47.   Molina-Bolivar, J. A.; Hierrezuelo, J. M.; Ruiz, C. C., Effect of NaCl on the self-aggregation of n-octyl beta-D-thioglucopyranoside in aqueous medium. *J Phys Chem B* **2006,** *110* (24), 12089-12095.

48.   Zhang, L.; Somasundaran, P.; Maltesh, C., Electrolyte effects on the surface tension and micellization of n-dodecyl beta-D-maltoside solutions. *Langmuir* **1996,** *12* (10), 2371-2373.

49.   Shinoda, K.; Hutchinson, E., Pseudo-phase separation model for thermodynamic calculation on micellar solutions. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* **1962,** *66* (4), 577-&.

50.   Garrido, P. F.; Brocos, P.; Amigo, A.; Garcia-Rio, L.; Gracia-Fadrique, J.; Pineiro, A., STAND: Surface Tension for Aggregation Number Determination. *Langmuir* **2016,** *32* (16), 3917-3925.

51.   Benshaul, A.; Gelbart, W. M., Theory of Chain Packing in Amphiphilic Aggregates. *Annu Rev Phys Chem* **1985,** *36*, 179-211.

52.   Israelachivili, J., *Intermolecular and Surface Forces*. 2nd Edition ed.; Academic Press, New York, 1991.

53.   Bauduin, P.; Zemb, T., Perpendicular and lateral equations of state in layered systems of amphiphiles. *Current Opinion in Colloid & Interface Science* **2014,** *19* (1), 9-16.

54.   Ennis, J., Spontaneous Curvature of Surfactant Films. *J Chem Phys* **1992,** *97* (1), 663-678.

55.   Leontidis, E.; Aroti, A.; Belloni, L.; Dubois, M.; Zemb, T., Effects of monovalent anions of the Hofmeister series on DPPC lipid Bilayers part II: Modeling the perpendicular and lateral equation-of-state. *Biophys J* **2007,** *93* (5), 1591-1607.

56.   Marcelja, S., Chain Ordering in Liquid-Crystals .2. Structure of Bilayer Membranes. *Biochim Biophys Acta* **1974,** *367* (2), 165-176.

1   57.   Muller, W.; Dejugnat, C.; Zemb, T.; Dufreche, J. F.; Diat, O., How Do Anions Affect
2   Self-Assembly and Solubility of Cetylpyridinium Surfactants in Water. *J Phys Chem B*
3   **2013,** *117* (5), 1345-1356.
4   58.   Matsubara, H.; Takumi, H.; Takamatsu, T.; Takiue, T.; Aratono, M., Surface
5   adsorption and micelle formation of aqueous solutions of polyethyleneglycol and sugar
6   surfactants. *Colloid and Polymer Science* **2009,** *287* (9), 1077-1082.
7   59.   Buchecker, T.; X., L. G.; Naskar, B.; Piftzner, A.; Diat, O.; Bauduin, P.,
8   Polyoxometalate/polyethylene glycol interactions in water: From nano-assemblies in
9   water to crystal formation by electrostatic screening. *Chem-Eur J* **2017,** *DOI:*
10   *10.1002/chem.201700044.*
11   60.   Collins, K. D., Charge density-dependent strength of hydration and biological
12   structure. *Biophysical Journal* **1997,** *72* (1), 65-76.
13   61.   Nabika, H.; Inomata, Y.; Itoh, E.; Unoura, K., Activity of Keggin and Dawson
14   polyoxometalates toward model cell membrane. *Rsc Adv* **2013,** *3* (44), 21271-21274.
15   62.   Rhule, J. T.; Hill, C. L.; Judd, D. A., Polyoxometalates in medicine. *Chemical Reviews*
16   **1998,** *98* (1), 327-357.
17   63.   Yang, H. K.; Cheng, Y. X.; Su, M. M.; Xiao, Y.; Hu, M. B.; Wang, W.; Wang, Q.,
18   Polyoxometalate-biomolecule conjugates: A new approach to create hybrid drugs for
19   cancer therapeutics. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* **2013,** *23* (5), 1462-1466.
20   64.   Yong, Y.; Zhou, L. J.; Zhang, S. S.; Yan, L.; Gu, Z. J.; Zhang, G. J.; Zhao, Y. L.,
21   Gadolinium polytungstate nanoclusters: a new theranostic with ultrasmall size and
22   versatile properties for dual-modal MR/CT imaging and photothermal
23   therapy/radiotherapy of cancer. *Npg Asia Mater* **2016,** *8.*
24   65.   Geng, J.; Li, M.; Ren, J. S.; Wang, E. B.; Qu, X. G., Polyoxometalates as Inhibitors of
25   the Aggregation of Amyloid beta Peptides Associated with Alzheimer's Disease. *Angew*
26   *Chem Int Edit* **2011,** *50* (18), 4184-4188.
27   66.   Jing, B. X.; Hutin, M.; Connor, E.; Cronin, L.; Zhu, Y. X., Polyoxometalate macroion
28   induced phase and morphology instability of lipid membrane. *Chem Sci* **2013,** *4* (10),
29   3818-3826.
30   67.   Kobayashi, D.; Nakahara, H.; Shibata, O.; Unoura, K.; Nabika, H., Interplay of
31   Hydrophobic and Electrostatic Interactions between Polyoxometalates and Lipid
32   Molecules. *J Phys Chem C* **2017,** *121* (23), 12895-12902.
33   68.   Nabika, H.; Sakamoto, A.; Motegi, T.; Tero, R.; Yamaguchi, D.; Unoura, K., Imaging
34   Characterization of Cluster-Induced Morphological Changes of a Model Cell Membrane. *J*
35   *Phys Chem C* **2016,** *120* (29), 15640-15647.
36
37

38

39   TOC:

40

1