



**HAL**  
open science

# Surface-induced Frustration in Solid State Polymorphic Transition of Native Cellulose Nanocrystals

Reeta Salminen, Niki Baccile, Mehedi Reza, Eero Kontturi

► **To cite this version:**

Reeta Salminen, Niki Baccile, Mehedi Reza, Eero Kontturi. Surface-induced Frustration in Solid State Polymorphic Transition of Native Cellulose Nanocrystals. *Biomacromolecules*, 2017, 18 (6), pp.1975-1982. 10.1021/acs.biomac.7b00463 . hal-01518291

**HAL Id: hal-01518291**

**<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01518291>**

Submitted on 4 May 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Surface-induced Frustration in Solid State Polymorphic Transition of Native Cellulose Nanocrystals

*Reeta Salminen,<sup>a</sup> Niki Baccile,<sup>b</sup> Mehedi Reza,<sup>c</sup> Eero Kontturi<sup>\*a</sup>*

## AUTHOR ADDRESS

<sup>a</sup> Department of Bioproducts and Biosystems, School of Chemical Engineering, Aalto University, P.O. Box 16300, 00076 Aalto, Finland.

<sup>b</sup> Chimie de la Matière Condensée de Paris, Sorbonne Universités, 75005, Paris, France

<sup>c</sup> Department of Applied Physics, P.O. Box 11100, 00076 Aalto, Finland

KEYWORDS: cellulose nanocrystals, host-guest system, image analysis, polymorphic transition, surface immobilization

ABSTRACT. The presence of an interface generally influences crystallization of polymers from melt or from solution. Here, by contrast, we explore the effect of surface immobilization in a direct solid state polymorphic transition on individual cellulose nanocrystals (CNCs), extracted from a plant-based origin. The conversion from native cellulose I to cellulose III crystal occurred via a

1  
2  
3 host-guest inclusion of ethylene diamine inside the crystal. 60% reduction in CNC width (height)  
4  
5 in atomic force microscopy images suggested that when immobilized on a flat modified silica  
6  
7 surface, the stresses caused by the inclusion or the subsequent regeneration resulted in exfoliation,  
8  
9 hypothetically between the van der Waals bonded sheets within the crystal. Virtually no changes  
10  
11 in dimensions were visible when the polymorphic transition was performed to non-immobilized  
12  
13 CNCs in bulk dispersion. With reservations and by acknowledging the obvious dissimilarities, the  
14  
15 exfoliation of cellulose crystal sheets can be viewed as analogous to exfoliation of 2D structures  
16  
17 like graphene from a van der Waals stacked solid. Here, the detachment is triggered by an inclusion  
18  
19 of a guest molecule inside a host cellulose crystal and the stresses caused by the firm attachment  
20  
21 of the CNC on a solid substrate, leading to detachment of molecular sheets or stacks of sheets.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 INTRODUCTION

29

30  
31 The possibility of atoms and molecules to organize themselves in multiple different crystalline  
32  
33 structures, i.e., polymorphism is a common feature of materials with famous cases such as ice,  
34  
35 silica and carbon.<sup>1-4</sup> Nearly all crystalline polymers also bear this property. Polymorphism is  
36  
37 important because the conformation and/or packing of the material affects its physical properties  
38  
39 such as melting point, conductivity, solubility, or mechanical properties.<sup>2,4-8</sup> Meanwhile, chemical  
40  
41 properties are influenced by crystalline packing which often controls the accessibility and  
42  
43 energetic state of the molecules, thereby affecting their chemical reactivity.<sup>3,5,9</sup> The extent (degree)  
44  
45 of crystallinity and the quality of the polymorphs can be tuned in various ways, e.g., by helical  
46  
47 inducers for polymers.<sup>10-12</sup>  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52


53 The presence of an interface can significantly affect the crystalline structure of materials, small  
54  
55 molecules<sup>13</sup> and polymers<sup>14,15</sup> alike. The impact of geometrical confinement in forms of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 droplets,<sup>16,17</sup> thin films,<sup>15,18-23</sup> adsorbed structures,<sup>24,25</sup> composite phases,<sup>26-28</sup> and blend  
4  
5 patterns<sup>14,29,30</sup> on polymer crystals specifically have been comprehensively investigated.  
6  
7 Altogether, the interfacial effect on polymer crystals has far reaching implications in several fields  
8  
9 of applications, including drug delivery,<sup>31</sup> semiconductors,<sup>32</sup> and photovoltaics.<sup>33</sup>  
10  
11

12  
13 From the fundamental perspective of interfacial polymer polymorphs, the most common  
14  
15 approach is to study crystallization from solution or melt onto a solid surface or perhaps observe  
16  
17 the effect of temperature as post treatment that leads to crystallization.<sup>13-15</sup> Biopolymers,  
18  
19 particularly proteins, have also received fair attention in this respect.<sup>34,35</sup> Furthermore, efforts to  
20  
21 elucidate crystallization and melting of monomolecular polymer layers on atomically smooth  
22  
23 surfaces have recently undergone an upsurge because of the popular appeal of 2D substrates like  
24  
25 graphene.<sup>36,37</sup> By contrast, actual polymorphic transitions from one crystalline form to another near  
26  
27 an interface are generally not investigated and biopolymers present a particularly tricky  
28  
29 experimental case for this because of their complex crystallinity. Such solid-state conversions  
30  
31 would, however, offer more room for maneuvering the properties of materials that are based on  
32  
33 interfacial structures. In this paper, we demonstrate a surface-induced frustration in a polymorphic  
34  
35 transition of cellulose, the polysaccharide responsible for the structural scaffold of all plant cells.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 In nature, crystalline cellulose occurs always as I<sub>α</sub> and I<sub>β</sub> polymorphs. There are two ways of  
42  
43 practically altering the crystalline structure: (i) dissolution/regeneration or alkaline swelling  
44  
45 leading to cellulose II form and (ii) treatment in liquid ammonia or some diamines like  
46  
47 ethylenediamine (EDA) resulting in cellulose III crystals. Of these, the transition to cellulose III  
48  
49 is a solid-state conversion: ammonia or diamine molecules enter the otherwise impenetrable  
50  
51 cellulose crystal in a host-guest style system, where at formation, the chains slip into the  
52  
53 arrangement with altered hydrogen bonding patterns (Figure 1). The major difference between  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


cellulose III and cellulose I is that in cellulose III the chains are not aligned as flat stacking sheets with van der Waals bonding in between but as conjugated sheets with zig-zagging hydrogen bonding between them.<sup>38-40</sup> This is caused by the primary alcohol rotating into a gauge-trans position from the trans-gauge position during the introduction of the guest molecule into the crystal<sup>39,41-44</sup> or – as proposed recently – proton hopping from one hydroxyl group to the other.<sup>45</sup> When the host molecule is removed by rinsing with methanol or ethanol, the gauge-trans position remains in the resulting cellulose III structure (Figure 1).<sup>42,43</sup> While cellulose I is the strongest and the most inert structure, the increased susceptibility to degradation of cellulose III has elicited suggestions that the polymorphic transition could be used as a pretreatment step when hydrolyzing cellulose into sugars for biofuel production.<sup>9,38,46</sup>



**Figure 1.** The change in conformation and hydrogen bonding upon EDA-complexation and immersion into methanol.

Here, we utilized the possibility to extract nanosized single crystals of native cellulose I, that is, cellulose nanocrystals (CNCs), directly from plant-based fibers and then closely monitored the morphological changes occurring upon the conversion of cellulose I to cellulose III. This was

1  
2  
3 performed with two different methods: a) the polymorphic transition cellulose I→III was done in  
4 dispersion (Figure 2a), and b) the CNCs were immobilized on a cationized surface, prior to the  
5 I→III transition (Figure 2b). It turned out that when CNCs were electrostatically immobilized on  
6 a flat substrate, the polymorphic transition was visibly frustrated and the alterations could be  
7 ascribed to the breakage in the cellulose crystal. More precisely, the van der Waals bonded sheets  
8 in the crystal appeared to be exfoliated upon the frustrated polymorphic transition, which can be  
9 seen to resemble the exfoliation of 2D sheets like graphene from van der Waals solids. In this  
10 particular instance, however, we have a 1D longitudinal crystal and the exfoliation is triggered by  
11 a supramolecular entry of a guest molecule (EDA) in a host cellulose crystal instead of physical  
12 shear. The results can be seen as the first step in controlling the supramolecular rearrangements of  
13 bio-based polymers directly in solid state.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32



43 **Figure 2.** The sample preparation methods: a) The polymorphic transition with ethylenediamine  
44 (EDA) is done in dispersion, and then the CNC III is deposited on silicon substrate cationized with  
45 3-aminopropylmethoxysilane (APTS); b) CNC is first deposited on the APTS substrate, and the  
46 EDA treatment is performed.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EXPERIMENTAL


**Materials.** Whatman ashless filter paper was purchased from Whatman GmbH, (Dassel, Germany). Sulfuric acid (H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, 95-97%) ethylenediamine (EDA, ≥99.5 %), sodium hydroxide (NaOH), toluene (anhydrous, 99.8 %), methanol (≥99.8 %), and (3-aminopropyl)trimethoxysilane (APTS, 97 %) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich Finland Oy (Helsinki, Finland). Methanol was dried with 3 Å molecular sieves (Fluka) also purchased from Sigma-Aldrich Finland Oy (Helsinki, Finland). Ethanol (Aa grade 99.5% w/v) was purchased from the Altia Corporation (Rajamäki, Finland). Water was purified in a Milli-Q system (Millipore Corporation, resistivity 18.2 MΩ cm). Silicon wafers used as substrates were obtained from Okmetic (Vantaa, Finland), and silicon monoxide coated TEM grids from Science Services GmbH (München, Germany). Nitrogen gas (N<sub>2</sub>, ) was purchased from Oy AGA Ab (Espoo, Finland).

**CNC preparation.** CNCs were produced from ground Whatman 541 ashless filter paper (15 g) by acid hydrolysis with sulfuric acid (175 ml, 64 w-%) at 45 °C for 45 min, followed by quenching by addition 3 l of MilliQ-water. The CNCs were isolated by centrifugation, followed by purification with dialysis until the conductivity of the dialysis water was <5 μS.<sup>47</sup> The CNC counter ion was exchanged to Na<sup>+</sup> by adjusting the pH to 7 with 0.1 M NaOH, after which the product was dialysed again and freeze dried.<sup>48</sup> The CNCs were further purified by Soxhlet extraction with ethanol in order to remove the surface impurities.<sup>49</sup>

**Surface cationization of silicon wafers and TEM grids.** The silicon wafers were purified before cationization by immersing them into 3 M NaOH-solution for 20 s, followed by careful and excessive rinsing with MilliQ-water.<sup>50</sup> The wafers were then dried with N<sub>2</sub> and placed into ozonator (Bioforce Nanosciences UV.TC.EU.003) for 15 minutes followed by rinsing with water and drying with N<sub>2</sub>. The cationization of silicon wafers with APTS was done by immersing the

cleaned wafers into 1 % (v/v) APTS toluene solution for 40 minutes, rinsed with approximately 50 ml of toluene and dried in an oven for 30 minutes at 60 °C.<sup>51</sup> The TEM grids were cationized with the same method, omitting the purification steps.

**Immobilization of CNCs on silicon wafers and TEM grids.** The inherently anionic CNCs were then immobilized on the APTS surface (Figure 3) by spin coating (4000 rpm, 2200 rpm s<sup>-1</sup>) with WS-650SX-6NPP/LITE spin coater (Laurell Technologies Corporation, North Wales, PA, USA) and were cured in oven for 10 minutes at 80 °C. The low CNC concentration in the dispersion used (10 mg dm<sup>-3</sup>) formed submonolayers on the APTS surface. The cellulose III CNC submonolayers were also produced on APTS surfaces, but with a higher dispersion concentration (500 mg dm<sup>-3</sup>) due to a steep decrease in charge during the polymorphic transition.



**Figure 3.** Immobilization of CNC on the cationic APTS surface. The purple dotted lines represent the electrostatic interactions between the cationized surface and the anionic CNC. The scheme is not in scale.

TEM samples were prepared by the CNCs were adsorbed on the cationized TEM grids (10 μl, 10 mg dm<sup>-3</sup>), the excess rinsed with milliQ-water, and the excess water blotted carefully with filterpaper. The samples were allowed to air dry before the EDA treatment. For reference samples without the EDA treatment were also imaged.



1  
2  
3     **The polymorph transition.** Cellulose I was transformed into cellulose III by dispersing the  
4 CNCs into 75 % aqueous ethylenediamine (EDA) solution for 5 h at 35 °C, after which the EDA  
5 solution was decanted and the CNCs immersed in anhydrous methanol.<sup>43</sup> The methanol was  
6 decanted off and replaced with fresh anhydrous methanol. The washing step was repeated several  
7 times. The CNCs were then air dried.  
8  
9

10  
11     The polymorph transition of immobilized cellulose I to cellulose III were performed on the  
12 submonolayers of CNC. In these samples the EDA reaction time was 3 h in order to protect the  
13 presumably delicate cationized surface.  
14

15  
16     **Conductometric titration.** Dried particles (0.2 g) were dispersed to 100 ml degassed water and  
17 0.2 ml of 0.5 M NaCl added. The CNC was then protonated with 0.1 M HCl, and was stirred for  
18 30 minutes. The dispersion was then titrated with 0.1 M NaOH-solution at rate 0.10 ml min<sup>-1</sup>  
19 adjusted by 751 GPD Titrino, Metrohm (Herisan, Switzerland). The charge content was  
20 determined from the conductivity curve obtained with Metrohm 712 conductometer (Herisan,  
21 Switzerland) where only one charged species was detected (sulfate groups). For untreated cellulose  
22 I CNCs, the charge was determined as 0.45 mmol g<sup>-1</sup> and for the cellulose III CNC, treated with  
23 EDA in dispersion, the amount of charged groups was 0.04 mmol g<sup>-1</sup>.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41     **Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM).** The submonolayers were imaged as presented in Figure 2:  
42 the cellulose III surfaces as they were and the surface immobilized transition samples before and  
43 after the EDA treatment. The imaging was performed with AFM MultiMode 8 scanning probe  
44 microscope from Bruker AXS Inc. (Madison, WI, USA) with an E scanner in tapping mode. The  
45 cantilevers used were NSC15/AIBS silicon cantilevers from Ultrasharp  $\mu$ masch (Tallinn, Estonia).  
46 The particle dimensions were obtained using SPIP 6.0.6 particle analysis. The width of the  
47 particles was determined from the height scale to overcome the error caused by the AFM tip  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


convolution. For sufficient statistical sampling 10 samples of each CNC type was imaged from 4 different spots.

**Transmission electron microscopy (TEM).** Cellulose I CNC and cellulose III CNC were imaged with a field-emission cryo-Transmission Electron Microscope (cryo-TEM, JEOL JEM-3200FSC). The sample temperature was maintained at -187 °C during the imaging. The images were taken in bright-field mode using zero-loss energy filtering (Omega type) with a slit width of 20 eV. Micrographs were recorded with a Gatan Ultrascan 4000 CCD camera and using Gatan DigitalMicrograph software (Gatan, Pleasanton, CA, USA).

**Solid state NMR.** <sup>13</sup>C solid-state Cross-Polarization (CP) Magic Angle Spinning (MAS) NMR experiments have been acquired on a Bruker Avance 300 MHz (7 T) spectrometer using 7 mm zirconia rotor spinning at a MAS frequency of  $\nu_{\text{MAS}} = 5$  kHz. The contact time is set to 2 ms, the recycling delay is set to 5 s and 320 transients have been used. CP is commonly used for its high sensitivity, however, CP is also known not to be quantitative as the peak relative intensities depend on the choice of the contact time. For this reason, we have also performed single pulse (SP) experiments using a classical high power heteronuclear decoupling pulse sequence, the disadvantage of SP being the poor signal-to-noise ratio. For these experiments, the recycle delay is set to 60 s and the number of transients to 120. Chemical shifts were referenced relative to tetramethylsilane (TMS;  $\delta = 0$  ppm). Deconvolution is initially performed on the CP-MAS Cellulose I spectrum for its high signal-to-noise ratio and then used to deconvolute the Cellulose III CP-MAS spectrum simply by letting the intensity vary. The SP-MAS spectra are then deconvoluted using the data from CP-MAS and only intensity is allowed to vary.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1  
2  
3 The polymorphic transition of CNCs in dispersion (Figure 2a) was followed by solid state  
4 nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy ( $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR). The conversion from cellulose I to III was  
5 performed by first preparing the EDA-cellulose complex from freeze dried CNCs and rinsing the  
6 EDA away with methanol – altogether an established procedure for cellulosic fibers<sup>43</sup> but not  
7 previously reported for CNCs. This change to cellulose III in bulk dispersion was determined with  
8  $^{13}\text{C}$  MAS NMR both using Cross Polarization (CP) (Figure S3) and single pulse (SP) (Figure 4  
9 and S2), the latter being used as a complement for CP experiments, more sensitive but known to  
10 be not quantitative. Cellulose I and cellulose III can be identified by the difference in chemical  
11 shift of the C6 peak, resonating at about 65 ppm and 63 ppm (Table S1), respectively, for cellulose  
12 I and cellulose III.<sup>39,52,53</sup> Before phase change, cellulose I is characterized by two C6 resonances  
13 (Figure 4), at 65.66 ppm and 63.04 ppm, respectively indicating the bulk and surface contribution  
14 of the CNCs, as suggested by Brinkmann et al.<sup>54</sup> After phase change, the bulk cellulose I  
15 contribution at 65.66 ppm is reduced by a factor 2.5 after CP, a value which is confirmed by the  
16 quantitative SP experiments (2.3) (Table S1). Meanwhile, the increase in the cellulose III  
17 resonance at 63.04 ppm is also estimated to a factor of 2.5. If one neglects, to a first approximation,  
18 the surface contribution of cellulose I before and after the phase change, one can reasonably  
19 estimate that cellulose III represents, after phase change, an average of  $75 \pm 4\%$  of the material,  
20 whereas the respective values for CP and SP experiments are 71% and 79% (see Supporting  
21 Information). More than just one EDA treatment would have undoubtedly increased the extent of  
22 cellulose III conversion, but we opted for a single treatment because EDA reduced the number of  
23 sulfate groups on the CNC surface and further exposures would have caused more problems in the  
24 eventual immobilization of CNCs, based on the attraction between sulfates and the APTS surface.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Figure 4.** SP-MAS  $^{13}\text{C}$ -NMR spectra of a) cellulose I CNC and b) cellulose III CNC with peak fits for C6-chemical shift. The purple curve is the peak fit to peak 63.04 ppm (cellulose III, and disordered cellulose on the crystal surface) and green to 65.66 ppm (cellulose I). The red curve is the peak fit sum. Full peak fit spectra can be found from Supporting Information (Figure S2).

The morphology of the CNCs upon cellulose I to III conversion in dispersion was followed by AFM (Figure 5) and particle size analysis from the respective images (Figure 6, Figure S1 and Table S2). The CNCs were deposited on a silicon surface that was cationized with 3-aminopropylmethoxysilane (APTS). As the CNC surfaces are dotted with anionic sulfate groups, the cationic APTS surface enabled nice separation of the CNCs, allowing a close examination of the crystals individually. However, cellulose III CNCs produced in dispersion required a higher dispersion concentration to yield an examinable submonolayer (Figure S1) because of a decreased surface charge from  $0.4 \text{ mmol g}^{-1}$  to  $0.04 \text{ mmol g}^{-1}$  as shown by conductometric titration. A similar reduction in surface charge has been observed when CNCs have been treated with alkaline, and

1  
2  
3 because EDA is highly alkaline, this was expected.<sup>55,56</sup> Dimensional analysis from AFM images  
4 (Figure 6a) of the original cellulose I CNCs gave average dimensions length of 114 nm and width  
5 of 4.5 nm (Table S2). CNC widths were actually deduced from CNC height because of the AFM  
6 tip deconvolution and because we deemed this as a more appropriate way of analyzing the width  
7 of a single cellulose crystal in a CNC. It is generally agreed that most CNCs are actually flat, lateral  
8 aggregates of 2-4 crystallites.<sup>57</sup> When deposited for AFM analysis, the aggregates lie flat on the  
9 substrate and the AFM height analysis yields a value for a single crystal in the flat aggregate.<sup>57</sup>  
10 Any compaction of the stiff cellulose crystal upon deposition to a solid substrate is unlikely and  
11 has never been reported. Contrary to AFM, TEM allows only the lateral dimensions to be analyzed  
12 and the width in the TEM images obviously represents the whole aggregate,<sup>57</sup> which is also  
13 consistent with our TEM results (Figure S4). In conclusion, AFM height analysis from CNC  
14 aggregates yields a realistic figure for a single cellulose crystal and this value (4.5 nm, Table S2)  
15 is consistent with the values for single crystals in cotton CNCs also in the study that reported the  
16 aggregates in the first place.<sup>57</sup>  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35


36 The width of dispersion method cellulose III crystals in CNCs was very similar to that of the  
37 original cellulose I crystals: width 5.2 nm and length 138.0 nm (Figure 5b and 6b, Table S2).  
38 Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) of cellulose I and III CNCs supported the observation  
39 that the crystal dimensions remained fairly unchanged before and after the polymorph transition  
40 (Figure S4), although the TEM analysis yields the width for the whole aggregate in a CNC. Judging  
41 from the unit cell parameters, the crystal dimensions of cellulose I and III should be similar to each  
42 other and, therefore, the close resemblance of the CNC dimensions is no surprise.<sup>38</sup> In contrast,  
43 when polymorphic transition was performed by strong aqueous NaOH solution on individual  
44 CNCs to cellulose II crystalline form where the morphology is changed completely from rod-like  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to spherical.<sup>55</sup> The contrast underlines the fundamental differences between the polymorphic  
4  
5 transitions of cellulose I into cellulose II and cellulose III.  
6  
7


8 When the lattice transition was performed on CNCs immobilized on an APTS treated silicon  
9  
10 surface (Figure 2b), the width of the crystals in cellulose III CNCs dropped to half of their original  
11  
12 size, 2.1 nm, whereas their average length did not change (Figure 5c and 6c, Table S2). Clearly,  
13  
14 some of the CNCs were detached from the surface, possibly due to the decreased electrostatic  
15  
16 attraction because of the cleavage of sulfate groups during exposure to EDA since the dissociation  
17  
18 of the sulfates should not be affected as EDA is highly alkaline. Therefore, one could question  
19  
20 whether the decreased width is just a statistical illusion of thicker crystals being detached and  
21  
22 thinner ones remaining on the surface. The number of CNCs on a sampled surface area does indeed  
23  
24 decrease from over 2600 (Table S2) to less than 800, but the initial amount of the CNCs thinner  
25  
26 than 2 nm (12 out of 2694) was not enough to explain the thin CNCs (330 out of 726) observed  
27  
28 after the EDA treatment as seen from Figure 6. The EDA treatment for the immobilized CNCs  
29  
30 was also performed by rinsing with water instead of methanol afterward (Figure 5d), which  
31  
32 reportedly does not result in a change in the crystal lattice, i.e., the EDA-cellulose complex reverts  
33  
34 back to a somewhat more disordered cellulose I structure.<sup>42,43</sup> However, the results of water rinsing  
35  
36 experiments were that the crystals thinned to an average width of 1.8 nm (Table S2), i.e., the same  
37  
38 as when rinsed with methanol. In conclusion, the crystal thinning with CNCs appears to occur  
39  
40 during EDA swelling or regeneration upon its removal and it occurs exclusively to the surface  
41  
42 immobilized CNCs because no thinning was observed for the CNCs treated in bulk dispersion  
43  
44 (Figures 5 and 6).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 Synchrotron-enhanced grazing incidence wide angle x-ray scattering (GI-WAXS) was  
54  
55 attempted to corroborate the decrease in crystal width and to elucidate the polymorph transition,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 but the amount of material was too small in the submonolayers to yield a meaningful diffraction  
4  
5  
6 pattern.  
7  
8  
9



31 **Figure 5.**  $1 \times 1 \mu\text{m}^2$  AFM height images: a) CNC b) CNC III, dispersion method c) CNC III,  
32 immobilized on the substrate before EDA-treated, rinsed with methanol d) CNC III, immobilized  
33 while EDA-treated, rinsed with water. Spherical objects present in a), c) and d) are impurities  
34 caused by APTS.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40




1  
2  
3 **Figure 6.** Dimensional distributions as determined from the AFM images. The width distributions  
4 are presented on the left column for a) cellulose I CNC, b) cellulose III CNC produced in  
5 dispersion, and c) cellulose III CNC produced while immobilized on substrate. The length  
6 distributions are on the right side for d) cellulose I CNC, e) cellulose III CNC produced in  
7 dispersion, and f) cellulose III CNC produced while immobilized on substrate. The width was  
8 determined as the height of CNCs from the substrate surface to omit the tip convolution. The APTS  
9 impurities were omitted from the particle analysis.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 When the immobilization experiment was repeated with APTS-modified silica-based TEM grids  
22 the crystal thinning upon polymorph conversion was not as obvious as with AFM (Figure S5). The  
23 APTS-coating on TEM-grids behaved differently than the APTS-coating on silica wafer, i.e., the  
24 CNC separation was not as efficient as on a smooth silica surface (Figure S5a). As previously  
25 discussed, TEM shows the aggregate size in a CNC rather than the width of an individual crystallite  
26 and this is also evident for both the cellulose III CNCs prepared in dispersion (Figure S5b) and the  
27 ones prepared immobilized on the surface (Figure S5b). As a result, overall CNC widths for the  
28 cellulose I CNC and cellulose III CNC prepared in dispersion were larger, 15.2 nm and 18.5 nm  
29 (Figure S5a and S5b), compared to the crystal widths determined by AFM height analysis, 4.5 nm  
30 and 5.2 nm, respectively. Similarly, the EDA treated immobilized CNCs show up as aggregates in  
31 TEM images (Figure S5c). However, these CNC aggregates are slightly thinner as 12.9 nm (Figure  
32 S5c) than the reference immobilized cellulose I CNC aggregates (15.2 nm). All in all, although the  
33 TEM experiments suggested that CNC thinning upon polymorphic transition does occur, the  
34 aggregation impeded making quantitative conclusions on the TEM images and hence the AFM  
35 results were regarded as statistically more reliable because the height analysis of the flat aggregates  
36 is able to reveal the alterations in the width of an individual crystal in a CNCs.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




1  
2  
3 As stated before, surface-induced polymer crystallization from solution or from melt is a  
4 common phenomenon but an interfacial effect in a solid state polymorphic transition has rarely  
5 been explored. The decrease in the CNC width observed particularly with AFM can be  
6 hypothetically explained by exfoliation of the outer layers of the crystals during the EDA treatment  
7 of the CNCs immobilized on a surface. In the native CNC, i.e., in a cellulose I crystal, the hydrogen  
8 bonded cellulose chains form molecularly thin sheets which are stacked on top of each other by  
9 van der Waals bonds (Figure 7).<sup>58</sup> When EDA swells the crystal by host-guest inclusion and the  
10 crystal is subjected to stress because of the immobilization, and we can speculate that the weaker  
11 van der Waals bonds would be more susceptible to cleavage than the stronger hydrogen bonds  
12 which are rearranged in the polymorphic transition process. The flat aggregates of CNCs could be  
13 disintegrated as well, but this would not explain the width (height) decrease observed with AFM.  
14 To better illustrate the case, we collected several high-resolution AFM images of individual  
15 immobilized CNCs that had undergone cellulose I to III conversion (Figure 8). The proposed  
16 exfoliation is especially visible in Figures 8b, 8d and 8e, where the immobilized CNC appears to  
17 have been cleaved in the longitudinal direction, with a thinner crystallite layer still attached to the  
18 CNC. Such defibrillation during a polymorphic transition has been previously reported for large  
19 cellulose microfibrils in *Valonia* alga but the authors speculated that the breakage could have been  
20 caused by the large size of the crystal, allegedly composed of smaller elementary units.<sup>44,52</sup>  
21 Moreover, the morphological alterations were not induced by the presence of an interface like in  
22 our case and the crystal thinning did not appear systematic. It appears that the binding to a surface  
23 prior to the host-guest type of entry by EDA into the crystallite causes strain in the lattice (Figure  
24 7). Furthermore, the cellulose chains closest to the cationized surface are hindered from tilting in  
25 the cellulose-EDA complex (Figure 7, phases 1 and 2) causing the upper layers to become  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 frustrated, and hence prone to break from the lattice and cause thinning. The fact that this  
4  
5 phenomenon of exfoliation was also present in the experiments on immobilized CNCs rinsed with  
6  
7 water (Figure 5d) strongly suggests that it occurs during the EDA complexation or indeed during  
8  
9 the regeneration to either cellulose III or cellulose I upon removal of EDA. In fact, the regeneration  
10  
11 can be a more plausible phase to enable exfoliation: the EDA actually plasticizes the swollen  
12  
13 crystal while the crystal shrinks during regeneration, rendering it more susceptible to frustration  
14  
15 by the underlying interfacial strain. Whatever the mechanisms for the exfoliation may be, the  
16  
17 presence of constraints imposed by the surface immobilization are still crucial for the exfoliation  
18  
19 to take place since no such phenomenon was observed in cellulose III CNCs produced in a bulk  
20  
21 dispersion (Figure 5).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Figure 7.** A schematic presentation of cellulose chains in a CNC. When EDA is introduced to form the host-guest complex (1) the lower chains are prevented to tilt (2) hypothetically causing exfoliation of layers of the CNC.



**Figure 8.** A collection of high resolution AFM height images of broken CNCs caused by EDA-complex formation while immobilized on APTS-modified substrate. Representative height profiles of these CNCs are presented in the Supporting Information (Figure S6)

In some ways, the structure of the cellulose crystal and the exfoliation of the layers is reminiscent of van der Waals solids and the exfoliation of 2D structures such as graphene or MoS<sub>2</sub>,<sup>59,60</sup> only one of the two lateral dimensions here is just a few molecular layers wide. Indeed, the exfoliation of graphene from graphite is enabled by the individualization of covalently bonded carbon sheets that are van der Waals bonded to one another just like the sheets formed by strong hydrogen bonding in cellulose hypothetically may be detached from one another by EDA inclusion because there is weaker van der Waals bonding between them.<sup>61</sup> Even covalent breakage of polymer chains by interfacial stress in so-called fatal adsorption has been reported, indicating that the forces can be truly significant upon surface induced frustration.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, physical exfoliation of the van der Waals bonded sheets in a cellulose I crystal has been claimed before by a means of high intensity sonication,<sup>63</sup> further strengthening our hypothesis of selective cleavage of cellulose crystal sheets by EDA. We must emphasize that the attribution of the specific site of exfoliation to the van der Waals bonded sheets is entirely speculative. Further studies in, e.g., molecular

1  
2  
3 dynamics simulations are required to further illuminate the case. If the specific site for exfoliation  
4  
5 can be verified, this may be useful even in the design of novel cellulose solvents which always  
6  
7 require an effective agent to break both the hydrogen bond and the van der Waals bond networks.  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 CONCLUSION

13  
14  
15 When the movement of the CNCs was restricted by electrostatic interactions with the substrate  
16  
17 during the polymorphic transition from cellulose I to cellulose III, the average width of individual  
18  
19 crystals in CNCs decreased from 4.5 nm to 2.1 nm as determined by height analysis from AFM  
20  
21 images. However, when transition was performed by EDA treatment to CNCs in dispersion, no  
22  
23 changes were observed in the crystal dimensions of CNCs, which was in line with the similar unit  
24  
25 cell dimensions of both polymorphs. We hypothesize that the immobilization on the substrate  
26  
27 causes frustration in the crystal lattice during the polymorphic transition. The frustration causes  
28  
29 the lattice to break, which is observed as a decreased thickness in CNC.  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 An important note is that the thinning seems to happen during the EDA complex formation or  
35  
36 lattice regeneration, since when the immobilized CNCs were rinsed with water after the EDA  
37  
38 treatment, the crystal width decreased similarly as when rinsed with methanol. This supports the  
39  
40 frustration hypothesis as a reason for the exfoliation, since the frustration would happen only in  
41  
42 the presence of the surface-CNC interactions at lattice change either during complexation with  
43  
44 EDA or upon regeneration to cellulose I or cellulose III.  
45  
46

47  
48 In essence, this study reports the chemical exfoliation of molecularly thin structures from a  
49  
50 biologically derived crystalline nanomaterial, aided by deliberately built interfacial stress. It may  
51  
52 serve as a starting point for similar efforts that can potentially lead to a new family of ultrathin  
53  
54 biological materials.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ASSOCIATED CONTENT  
4  
5

6  
7 The following files are available free of charge.

8  
9 **Supporting Information.** NMR fitting procedures, TEM images, and further AFM images with  
10 height profiles and dimensional data.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15  
16  
17 AUTHOR INFORMATION  
18

19  
20 **Corresponding Author**  
21

22 eero.kontturi@aalto.fi  
23  
24

25  
26 **Funding Sources**  
27

28 This research is funded by the Academy of Finland (Project 259500).  
29  
30

31  
32 ACKNOWLEDGMENT  
33

34 Dr. Jessie Peyre (UPMC, France) is acknowledged for measuring the charge of untreated CNCs.  
35  
36

37  
38 ABBREVIATIONS  
39

40 CNC, cellulose nanocrystal; CP-MAS  $^{13}\text{C}$ -NMR, cross-polarization magic angle spin  $^{13}\text{C}$ -nuclear  
41 magnetic resonance; SP-MAS, single pulse magic angel spin; AFM, atomic force microscopy;  
42  
43 TEM, transmission electron microscopy; APTS, 3-aminopropyltrimethoxysilane; EDA,  
44  
45 ethylenediamine  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

1. Gaffney, E. S.; Matson, D. L. Water ice polymorphs and their significance on planetary surfaces. *Icarus* **1980**, *44*, 511-519.
2. Keskar, N. R.; Chelikowsky, J. R. Structural properties of nine silica polymorphs. *Phys. Rev. B* **1992**, *46*, 1-13.
3. Dubrovinsky, L. S.; Dubrovinskaia, N. A.; Prakapenka, V.; Seifert, F.; Langenhorst, F.; Dmitriev, V.; Weber, H.; Le Bihan, T. A class of new high-pressure silica polymorphs. *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.* **2004**, *143–144*, 231-240.
4. Hazen, R. M.; Downs, R. T.; Jones, A. P.; Kah, L. Carbon Mineralogy and Crystal Chemistry. *Rev. Mineral. Geochem.* **2013**, *75*, 7-46.
5. Mercury, L.; Vieillard, P.; Tardy, Y. Thermodynamics of ice polymorphs and ‘ice-like’ water in hydrates and hydroxides. *Appl. Geochem.* **2001**, *16*, 161-181.
6. Tchijov, V. Heat capacity of high-pressure ice polymorphs. *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids* **2004**, *65*, 851-854.
7. Li, Q.; Ma, Y.; Oganov, A. R.; Wang, H.; Wang, H.; Xu, Y.; Cui, T.; Mao, H.; Zou, G. Superhard Monoclinic Polymorph of Carbon. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2009**, *102*, 175506-1-175506-4.
8. Miller, E. D.; Nesting, D. C.; Badding, J. V. Quenchable Transparent Phase of Carbon. *Chem. Mater.* **1997**, *9*, 18-22.
9. Igarashi, K.; Wada, M.; Samejima, M. Activation of crystalline cellulose to cellulose III<sub>I</sub> results in efficient hydrolysis by cellobiohydrolase. *FEBS J.* **2007**, *274*, 1785-1792.



- 1  
2  
3 10. Kawauchi, T.; Kumaki, J.; Kitaura, A.; Okoshi, K.; Kusanagi, H.; Kobayashi, K.; Sugai, T.;  
4  
5  
6 Shinohara, H.; Yashima, E. Encapsulation of Fullerenes in a Helical PMMA Cavity Leading to a  
7  
8 Robust Processable Complex with a Macromolecular Helicity Memory. *Angew. Chem.* **2007**,  
9  
10 *120*, 525-529.  
11  
12  
13  
14 11. Yashima, E.; Matsushima, T.; Okamoto, Y. Poly((4-carboxyphenyl)acetylene) as a Probe for  
15  
16 Chirality Assignment of Amines by Circular Dichroism. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1995**, *177*, 11596-  
17  
18 11597.  
19  
20  
21  
22 12. Inai, Y.; Tagawa, K.; Takasu, A.; Hirabayashi, T.; Oshikawa, T.; Yamashita, M. Induction of  
23  
24 One-Handed Helical Screw Sense in Achiral Peptide through the Domino Effect Based on  
25  
26 Interacting Its N-Terminal Amino Group with Chiral Carboxylic Acid. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**,  
27  
28 *122*, 11731-11732.  
29  
30  
31  
32 13. Jones, A. O. F.; Chattopadhyay, B.; Geerts, Y. H.; Resel, R. Substrate-Induced and Thin-  
33  
34 Film Phases: Polymorphism of Organic Materials on Surfaces. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **2016**, *26*,  
35  
36 2233-2255.  
37  
38  
39  
40 14. Michell, R. M.; Müller, A. J. Confined crystallization of polymeric materials. *Prog. Polym.*  
41  
42 *Sci.* **2016**, *54-55*, 183-213.  
43  
44  
45  
46 15. Li, H.; Yan, S. Surface-Induced Polymer Crystallization and the Resultant Structures and  
47  
48 Morphologies. *Macromolecules* **2011**, *44*, 417-428.  
49  
50  
51  
52 16. Carvalho, J. L.; Dainoki-Veress, K. Homogeneous Bulk, Surface, and Edge Nucleation in  
53  
54 Crystalline Nanodroplets. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2010**, *105*, 237801-237804.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 17. Weber, C. H. M.; Chinche, A.; Krausch, G.; Rosenfeldt, S.; Ballauff, M.; Harnau, L.;  
4  
5  
6 Göttker-Schnetmann, I.; Tong, Q.; Mecking, S. Single Lamella Nanoparticles of Polyethylene.  
7  
8 *Nano Lett.* **2007**, *7*, 2024-2029.  
9  
10  
11 18. Frank, C. W.; Rao, V.; Despotopoulou, M. M.; Pease, R. F. W.; Hinsberg, W. D.; Miller, R.  
12  
13 D.; Rabolt, J. F. Structure in thin and ultrathin spin-cast polymer films. *Science* **1996**, *273*, 912-  
14  
15 915.  
16  
17  
18  
19 19. Kumaki, J.; Kawauchi, T.; Yashima, E. Two-Dimensional Folded Chain Crystals of a  
20  
21 Synthetic Polymer in a Langmuir - Blodgett Film. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 5788-5789.  
22  
23  
24  
25 20. Ma, Y.; Hu, W.; Reiter, G. Lamellar Crystal Orientations Biased by Crystallization Kinetics  
26  
27 in Polymer Thin Films. *Macromolecules* **2006**, *39*, 5159-5164.  
28  
29  
30  
31 21. Toolan, D. T. W.; Isakova, A.; Hodgkinson, R.; Reeves-McLaren, N.; Hammond, O.; Edler,  
32  
33 K. J.; Briscoe, W. H.; Arnold, T.; Gough, T.; Topham, P. D.; Howse, J. R. Insights into the In fl  
34  
35 uence of Solvent Polarity on the Crystallization of Poly(ethylene oxide) Spin-Coated Thin Films  
36  
37 via in Situ Grazing Incidence Wide-Angle X - ray Scattering. *Macromolecules* **2016**, *49*, 4579-  
38  
39 4586.  
40  
41  
42  
43 22. Aissou, K.; Kwon, W.; Mumtaz, M.; Antoine, S.; Maret, M.; Portale, G.; Fleury, G.;  
44  
45 Hadziioannou, G. Archimedean Tilings and Hierarchical Lamellar Morphology Formed by  
46  
47 Semicrystalline Miktoarm Star Terpolymer Thin Films. *ACS Nano* **2016**, *10*, 4055-4061.  
48  
49  
50  
51 23. Bisbey, R. P.; DeBlase, C. R.; Smith, B. J.; Dichtel, W. R. Two-dimensional Covalent  
52  
53 Organic Framework Thin Films Grown in Flow. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2016**, *138*, 11433-11436.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 24. Reiter, G.; Sommer, J. Crystallization of Adsorbed Polymer Monolayers. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*  
4  
5 **1998**, *80*, 3771-3774.  
6  
7  
8  
9 25. Karki, A.; Nguyen, L.; Sharma, B.; Yan, Y.; Chen, W. Unusual Morphologies of Poly(vinyl  
10 alcohol) Thin Films Adsorbed on Poly(dimethylsiloxane) Substrates. *Langmuir* **2016**, *32*, 3191-  
11  
12 3198.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 26. Xu, J.; Chen, T.; Yang, C.; Li, Z.; Mao, Y.; Zeng, B.; Hsiao, B. S. Isothermal Crystallization  
18 of Poly(L-lactide) Induced by Graphene Nanosheets and Carbon Nanotubes: A Comparative  
19  
20 Study. *Macromolecules* **2010**, *43*, 5000-5008.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 27. Laird, E. D.; Wang, W.; Cheng, S.; Li, B.; Presser, V.; Dyatkin, B.; Gogotsi, Y.; Li, C. Y.  
26 Polymer Single Crystal-Decorated Superhydrophobic Buckypaper with Controlled Wetting and  
27  
28 Conductivity. *ACS Nano* **2012**, *6*, 1204-1213.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 28. Parros-Bujans, F.; Palomino, P.; Fernandez-Alonso, F.; Rudic, S.; Alegria, A.; Colmenero, J.;  
34 Encisco, E. Intercalation and Con fi nement of Poly(ethylene oxide) in Porous Carbon  
35  
36 Nanoparticles with Controlled Morphologies. *Macromolecules* **2014**, *47*, 8729-8737.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 29. Prud'homme, R. E. Crystallization and morphology of ultrathin films of homopolymers and  
42  
43 polymer blends. *Prog. Polym. Sci.* **2016**, *55-54*, 214-231.  
44  
45  
46  
47 30. Tol, R. T.; Mathot, V. B. F.; Reynaers, H.; Groeninckx, G. In *Relationship between Phase*  
48  
49 *Morphology, Crystallization, and Semicrystalline Structure in Immiscible Polymer Blends*;  
50  
51 Harrats, C., Thomas, S. and Groeninckx, G., Eds.; Micro- and nanostructured multiphase  
52  
53 polymer blend systems: Phase Morphology and Interfaces; Taylor and Francis: Boca Raton,  
54  
55 2006; pp 391-420.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 31. Kim, B.; Park, S. W.; Hammond, P. T. Hydrogen-Bonding Layer-by-Layer- Assembled  
4 Biodegradable Polymeric Micelles as Drug Delivery Vehicles from Surfaces. *ACS Nano* **2008**, *2*,  
5 386-392.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 32. Lei, Y.; Deng, P.; Lin, M.; Zheng, X.; Zhu, F.; Ong, B. S. Enhancing Crystalline Structural  
12 Orders of Polymer Semiconductors for Efficient Charge Transport via Polymer-Matrix-  
13 Mediated Molecular Self-Assembly. *Adv. Mater.* **2016**, *28*, 6687-6694.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 33. Liu, Y.; Zhao, J.; Li, Z.; Mu, C.; Ma, W.; Hu, H.; Jiang, K.; Lin, H.; Ade, H.; Yan, H.  
20 Aggregation and morphology control enables multiple cases of high-efficiency polymer solar  
21 cells. *Nature Commun.* **2014**, *5*, 5293-1-8.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 34. Pechkova, E.; Nicolini, C. Protein nanocrystallography: a new approach to structural  
29 proteomics. *Trends Biotechnol.* **2004**, *22*, 117-122.  
30  
31  
32  
33 35. Chen, C.; Zuckermann, R. N.; DeYreo, J. J. Surface-Directed Assembly of Sequence-  
34 Defined Synthetic Polymers into Networks of Hexagonally Patterned Nanoribbons with  
35 Controlled Functionalities. *ACS Nano* **2016**, *10*, 5314-5320.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 36. Gulde, M.; Rissanou, A. N.; Harmandaris, V.; Müller, M.; Schäfer, S.; Ropers, C. Dynamics  
42 and Structure of Monolayer Polymer Crystallites on Graphene. *Nano Lett.* **2016**, *16*, 6994-7000.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 37. Gulde, M.; Schweda, S.; Storeck, G.; Maiti, M.; Hak Ki, Y.; Wodtke, A. M.; Schäfer, S.;  
48 Ropers, C. Ultrafast low-energy electron diffraction in transmission resolves polymer/ graphene  
49 superstructure dynamics. *Science* **2014**, *345*, 200-204.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 38. Chundawat, S. P. S.; Bellesia, G.; Uppugundla, N.; da Costa Sousa, L.; Gao, D.; Cheh, A.  
4  
5 M.; Agarwal, U. P.; Bianchetti, C. M.; Phillips, G. N. J.; Langan, P.; Balan, V.; Gnanakaran, S.;  
6  
7 Dale, B. E. Restructuring the Crystalline Cellulose Hydrogen Bond Network  
8  
9 Enhances Its Depolymerization Rate. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 11163-11174.  
10  
11  
12  
13 39. Wada, M.; Chanzy, H.; Nishiyama, Y.; Langan, P. Cellulose III<sub>I</sub> Crystal Structure and  
14  
15 Hydrogen Bonding by Synchrotron  
16  
17 X-ray and Neutron Fiber Diffraction. *Macromolecules* **2004**, *37*, 8548-8555.  
18  
19  
20  
21 40. Parthasarathi, R.; Bellesia, G.; Chundawat, S. P. S.; Dale, B. E.; Langan, P.; Gnanakaran, S.  
22  
23 Insights into Hydrogen Bonding and Stacking Interactions in Cellulose. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2011**,  
24  
25 *115*, 14191-14202.  
26  
27  
28  
29 41. Wada, M.; Heux, L.; Isogai, A.; Nishiyama, Y.; Chanzy, H.; Sugiyama, J. Improved  
30  
31 Structural Data of Cellulose III<sub>I</sub> Prepared in Supercritical  
32  
33 Ammonia. *Macromolecules* **2001**, *34*, 1237-1243.  
34  
35  
36  
37 42. Wada, M.; Kwon, G. J.; Nishiyama, Y. Structure and Thermal Behavior of a Cellulose  
38  
39 I-Ethylenediamine Complex. *Biomacromolecules* **2008**, *9*, 2898-2904.  
40  
41  
42  
43 43. Lokhande, H. T.; Shukla, S. R.; Chidambareswaran, P. K.; Patil, N. B. Ethylenediamine-  
44  
45 induced conversion of cellulose I to cellulose III. *J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Lett. Ed.* **1977**, *15*, 97-99.  
46  
47  
48  
49 44. Roche, E.; Chanzy, H. Electron microscopy study of the transformation of cellulose I into  
50  
51 cellulose III<sub>I</sub> in *Valonia*. *Int. J. Biol. Macromol.* **1981**, *3*, 1981-206.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 45. Chen, P.; Marianski, M.; Baldauf, C. H-Bond Isomerization in Crystalline Cellulose III:  
4 Proton Hopping versus Hydroxyl Flip-Flop. *ACS Macro Lett.* **2016**, *5*, 50-54.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 46. Ono, Y.; Tanaka, R.; Funahashi, R.; Takeuchi, M.; Saito, T.; Isogai, A. SEC-MALLS  
10 analysis of ethylenediamine-pretreated native celluloses in LiCl/N,N-dimethylacetamide:  
11 softwood kraft pulp and highly crystalline bacterial, tunicate, and algal celluloses. *Cellulose*  
12 **2016**, *23*, 1639-1647.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 47. Edgar, C. D.; Gray, D. G. Smooth model cellulose I surfaces from nanocrystal suspensions.  
20 *Cellulose* **2003**, *10*, 299-306.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 48. Beck, S.; Bouchard, J.; Berry, R. Dispersibility in Water of Dried Nanocrystalline Cellulose.  
26 *Biomacromolecules* **2012**, *13*, 1486-1494.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 49. Labet, M.; Thielemans, W. Improving the reproducibility of chemical reactions  
32 on the surface of cellulose nanocrystals: ROP of  $\epsilon$ -caprolactone  
33 as a case study. *Cellulose* **2011**, *18*, 607-617.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 50. Ahola, S.; Salmi, J.; Johansson, L.; Laine, J.; Österberg, M. Model films from native  
40 cellulose nanofibrils. Preparation, swelling, and surface interactions. *Biomacromolecules* **2008**,  
41 *9*, 1273-1282.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 51. van Duffel, B.; Verbiest, T.; Van Elshocht, S.; Persoons, A.; De Schryver, F. C.;  
48 Schoonheydt, R. A. Fuzzy Assembly and Second Harmonic Generation of  
49 Clay/Polymer/Dye Monolayer Films. *Langmuir* **2001**, *17*, 1243-1249.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 52. Chanzy, H.; Henrissat, B.; Vincendon, M.; Tanner, S. F.; Belton, P. S. Solid-state  $^{13}\text{C}$ -N.M.R.  
5  
6 and electron microscopy study on the reversible cellulose I $\rightarrow$ III $_I$  transformation in *Valonia*  
7  
8 . *Carbohydr. Res.* **1987**, *160*, 1-11.  
9  
10  
11 53. Isogai, A.; Usuda, M.; Kato, T.; Toshiyuki, U.; Atalla, R. H. Solid-state CP/MAS  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR  
12  
13 Study of Cellulose Polymorphs. *Macromolecules* **1989**, *22*, 3168-3172.  
14  
15  
16  
17 54. Brinkmann, A.; Chen, M.; Couillard, M.; Jakubek, Z. J.; Leng, T.; Johnston, L. J. Correlating  
18  
19 Cellulose Nanocrystal Particle Size and Surface Area. *Langmuir* **2016**, *32*, 6105-6114.  
20  
21  
22  
23 55. Jin, E.; Guo, J.; Yang, F.; Zhu, Y.; Song, J.; Jin, Y.; Rojas, O. On the polymorphic and  
24  
25 morphological changes of cellulose nanocrystals (CNC-I) upon mercerization and conversion to  
26  
27 CNC-II. *Carbohydr. Polym.* **2016**, *143*, 327-335.  
28  
29  
30  
31 56. Lokanathan, A.; Khan, M. A. U.; Rojas, O.; Laine, J. Cellulose nanocrystal-mediated  
32  
33 synthesis of silver nanoparticles: role of sulfate groups in nucleation phenomena.  
34  
35 *Biomacromolecules* **2014**, *15*, 373-9.  
36  
37  
38  
39 57. Elazzouzi-Harfaoui, S.; Nishiyama, Y.; Putaux, J. -L.; Heux, L.; Dubreuil, F.; Rochas, C. The  
40  
41 Shape and Size Distribution of Crystalline Nanoparticles Prepared by Acid Hydrolysis of Native  
42  
43 Cellulose. *Biomacromolecules* **2008**, *9*, 57-65.  
44  
45  
46  
47 58. Nishiyama, Y.; Sugiyama, J.; Chanzy, H.; Langan, P. Crystal Structure and Hydrogen  
48  
49 Bonding System in Cellulose I $_{\alpha}$  from Synchrotron X-ray and Neutron Fiber Diffraction. *J. Am.*  
50  
51 *Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 14300-14306.  
52  
53  
54  
55 59. Geim, A. K.; Grigorieva, I. V. Van der Waals heterostructures. *Nature* **2013**, *499*, 419-425.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 60. Bhimanapati, G. R.; Lin, Z.; Meunier, V.; Jung, Y.; Cha, J.; Das, S.; Xiao, D.; Son, Y.;  
4  
5 Strano, M. S.; Cooper, V. R.; Liang, L.; Louie, S. G.; Ringe, E.; Zhou, W.; Kim, S. S.; Naik, R.  
6  
7 R.; Sumpter, B. G.; Terrones, H.; Xia, F.; Wang, Y.; Zhu, J.; Akinwande, D.; Alem, N.; Schuller,  
8  
9 J. A.; Schaak, R. E.; Terrones, M.; Robinson, J. A. Recent Advances in Two-Dimensional  
10  
11 Materials beyond Graphene. *ACS Nano* **2015**, *9*, 11509-11539.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 61. Novoselov, K. S.; Geim, A. K.; Morozov, S. V.; Jiang, D.; Zhang, Y.; Dubonos, I. V.; Firsov,  
17  
18 A. A. Electric Field Effect in Atomically Thin Carbon Films. *Science* **2004**, *306*, 666-669.  
19  
20  
21  
22 62. Lebedeva, N. V.; Sun, F. C.; Lee, H.; Matyjaszewski, K.; Sheiko, S. S. "Fatal Adsorption" of  
23  
24 Brushlike Macromolecules: High Sensitivity of C–C Bond Cleavage Rates to Substrate Surface  
25  
26 Energy. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 4228-4229.  
27  
28  
29  
30 63. Li, Q.; Renneckar, S. Supramolecular Structure Characterization of Molecularly Thin  
31  
32 Cellulose I Nanoparticles. *Biomacromolecules* **2011**, *12*, 650-659.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Table of Contents Graphics

