



UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

ARCHIVIO DELLA RICERCA

University of Parma Research Repository

Adsorption of Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate at Water-Dodecane Interface in Relation to the Oil in Water Emulsion Properties

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Original

Adsorption of Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate at Water-Dodecane Interface in Relation to the Oil in Water Emulsion Properties / Llamas, Sara; Santini, Eva; Liggieri, Libero; Salerni, Fabrizia; Orsi, Davide; Cristofolini, Luigi; Ravera, Francesca. - In: LANGMUIR. - ISSN 0743-7463. - 34:21(2018), pp. 5978-5989. [10.1021/acs.langmuir.8b00358]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11381/2847284 since: 2021-10-04T11:01:59Z

Publisher:

American Chemical Society

Published

DOI:10.1021/acs.langmuir.8b00358

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

This document is confidential and is proprietary to the American Chemical Society and its authors. Do not copy or disclose without written permission. If you have received this item in error, notify the sender and delete all copies.

Adsorption of SDS at water/dodecane interface in relation to the oil in water emulsion properties

Journal:	<i>Langmuir</i>
Manuscript ID	la-2018-00358g.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Mar-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Llamas, Sara; CNR-Institute of Condensed Matter Chemistry and technologies for Energy, Unit of Genoa Santini, Eva; CNR-Institute of Condensed Matter Chemistry and Technologies for Energy, Unit of Genoa Liggieri, Libero; CNR-Institute of Condensed Matter Chemistry and Technologies for Energy, Unit of Genoa Salerni, Fabrizia; University of Parma Orsi, Davide; University of Parma, Department of Mathematical, Physical and Computer Science Cristofolini, Luigi; University of Parma, , Department of Mathematical, Physical and Computer Science Ravera, Francesca; CNR-Institute of Condensed Matter Chemistry and Technologies for Energy, Unit of Genoa

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Adsorption of SDS at water/dodecane interface in relation to
4
5 the oil in water emulsion properties
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Sara Llamas,¹ Eva Santini,¹ Libero Liggieri,¹ Fabrizia Salerni,² Davide Orsi,²
14
15 Luigi Cristofolini,^{1,2} Francesca Ravera^{1,*}
16
17
18

19 *¹CNR-Institute of Condensed Matter Chemistry and Technologies for Energy, Via*
20 *de Marini 6, 16149 Genoa, Italy*
21
22

23 *²Department of Mathematical, Physical and Computer Sciences, University of*
24 *Parma, Viale Usberti 7 A, 43124 Parma, Italy*
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 * Corresponding author: francesca.ravera@ge.icmate.cnr.it
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

The control of the behavior of oil in water emulsions requires deepen investigations on the adsorption properties of the emulsion stabilizers at interfaces, being these fundamental to explain the (de)stabilization mechanisms.

In this work, we present an extensive study on oil-in-water emulsions stabilized by Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate (SDS) below its critical micellar concentration. Dynamic tensiometry, dilational rheology and electrical conductivity measurements are used to investigate the adsorption properties at the droplet interface, while the ageing of the respective emulsions was investigated by monitoring the macroscopic thickness of the emulsion layer, by micro-imaging and Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS) analysis, to get information on the drop size distribution. In addition, the droplet coalescence is investigated by a microscopy set-up.

The results of this multi-techniques study allow deriving a coherent scenario where the adsorption properties of this ionic surfactant relate to those of the emulsion, such as for example, the prevention of droplet coalescence and the presence of other mechanisms, such as Ostwald ripening, responsible of the emulsion ageing.

Keywords: adsorption isotherm; emulsion stability; ionic surfactants; Ostwald ripening; coalescence; droplet size distribution

Introduction

Emulsions are colloidal systems interesting for a wide range of industries: chemical, pharmaceutical, cosmetic or food among others [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. The control of lifetime of emulsions is essential for all those technological applications. Different emulsifiers can be used to stabilize emulsions by modifying the liquid-liquid interface properties. Hence, the adsorption of surfactants, polymers, proteins or nanoparticles to the interface plays an essential role in the creation and stability of the emulsions [6,7,8, 9,10].

The adsorption of surfactants, in fact, reducing the interfacial tension and, as a consequence, the surface free energy of the liquid-liquid system, favors the creation of larger interfacial area during the emulsification process.

The main processes involved in the evolution of emulsions, are creaming or sedimentation – the gravity driven phase separation due to density differences -, Ostwald ripening and coalescence [8,11,12]. Ostwald ripening consists in the transfer of molecules of the dispersed liquid phase from small to large droplets. This phenomenon is driven by the difference of Laplace pressure of the droplets, which is inversely proportional to the radius, and reflects in a net mass transfer from small to big droplets [13,14]. The presence of adsorbed surfactant, inducing a dilational elastic character to the interface, may have the effect of hindering or, in some case, arresting the solvation of droplets [15]. This effect is quantified by the Gibbs criterion [16], which asserts that the drop size evolution stops when the dilational elasticity overcomes half the value of the interfacial tension. Coalescence is the process in which two emulsion droplets merge into a single larger one, due to the rupture of the liquid film between them. The thinning of this liquid film, which can lead directly to its rupture or to the formation of a thin common black film (10-100 nm), is a complex hydrodynamic process mainly driven by the mechanical properties of the water-oil interfaces, such as dynamic interfacial tension and dilational viscoelasticity [17, 18, 19]. High elasticity, for example tends to hinder this thinning, making more stable the liquid films. From this, it follows the importance to investigate the adsorption properties of emulsion stabilizer surfactants. Moreover, the behavior of thin films, mainly governed by disjoining pressure, also depends on large extend on the adsorption properties of

1
2
3 surfactants [20], which can be accessed by dynamic and equilibrium interfacial tension
4 investigation.
5

6 Reducing the amounts of surfactant is a valuable target for emulsion technology. To this
7 aim it is very important to assess the emulsion properties below the critical micellar
8 concentration (cmc) of the surfactant. In this regime, interfacial properties and their impact
9 of the destabilization processes vary significantly with surfactant concentration.
10
11

12
13 In this work, we chose to investigate dodecane-in-water emulsions stabilized by Sodium
14 Dodecyl Sulfate (SDS) in the range of concentration below the cmc. SDS is one of the
15 most used ionic surfactant employed in a wide number of applications. In particular, SDS
16 has been largely investigated at water/dodecane interface [21, 22] as well as stabilizer for
17 dodecane-in-water emulsions [13, 23, 24, 25]. The reason for this propensity to use
18 dodecane, as oil phase with SDS is that, among the impurities contained in SDS, one of
19 the most critical is dodecanol, produced by spontaneous hydrolysis. Due to its high surface
20 activity, in fact, dodecanol plays a dominant effect in the adsorption to the interface with
21 respect to SDS, even when present in trace amounts [26, 27]. However, in
22 water/dodecane systems, because of its large solubility in dodecane, dodecanol is
23 transferred into the oil phase, without affecting the adsorption of SDS.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 In this paper, we present an extensive study of this system, carried out characterizing the
32 liquid-liquid interfacial properties, by interfacial tension and dilational rheology
33 measurements, and the behavior of the respective emulsions, by monitoring the
34 macroscopic thickness of the emulsion layer and by microscope observation and Dynamic
35 Light Scattering (DLS) analysis to obtain information on the droplet size distribution.
36
37
38
39

40 Moreover, electrical conductivity measurements have been carried out to estimate the
41 surfactant depletion of the aqueous phase induced by the huge increase of the interfacial
42 area during emulsification. This effect is recognized to be very important to better
43 understand the relation between interfacial properties and stability of disperse system.
44 Both for foams [28] and in case of emulsions [29,30]. Moreover, the evaluation of the
45 actual concentration of the aqueous phase carried out in this study, allows estimating the
46 total interfacial area created by emulsification.
47
48
49
50

51 Finally, to complement this multi-techniques experimental study, using a purposely-
52 designed device, we investigated the behavior of two interacting bubbles to find the
53 coalescence conditions.
54
55
56
57

Experimental Section

Materials

Dodecane and Sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Germany) with purity higher than 99% and used without further purification. The water used were produced by a Millipore (Elix + Milli-Q) purification system with resistivity higher than 18 M Ω ·cm and a stable surface tension of about 72.5 mN/m at 20 °C. The value of the interfacial tension of dodecane against pure water was found 51.3 mN/m, not varying appreciably during one thousand seconds.

All glass materials utilized in the samples preparation and measurements were carefully cleaned with surfuric acid and subsequently rinsed with plentiful Milli-Q water in order to remove any impurity. With the same purpose, any other not glass materials were cleaned with isopropanol and rinsed with Milli-Q water.

Methods

A drop shape tensiometer [31] (PAT1 - Sinterface, Germany) was used for interfacial tension and dilational rheology measurements.

According to this technique, the value of the interfacial tension is obtained as result of a fitting procedure where the Laplace theoretical profile for axisymmetric gravity-deformed drops, under mechanical equilibrium, is fitted to the experimentally acquired profile of a liquid drop or bubble. More details on this technique are reported in ref. 32. For the present study an emerging drop of dodecane, with volume of about 30 mm³, is formed, in a time of about 1 second, at the tip of a U-shaped capillary tube immersed in aqueous SDS solution. The interfacial tension is acquired while maintaining constant the drop surface area since the formation of a fresh interface to a time long enough to warrant the achievement of the adsorption equilibrium.

Using the same tensiometer, the dilational viscoelasticity, E , versus frequency is obtained by the Oscillating Drop method [31]. Accordingly, after the achievement of the adsorption equilibrium, sinusoidal perturbations of the interfacial area (A) are imposed to the drop,

1
2 while the continuous acquisition of the interfacial tension. To obtain the real and imaginary
3 parts of E the following expression is used
4
5
6
7

$$E = \frac{\Delta\gamma}{\Delta A/A_0} e^{i\varphi} \quad (1)$$

8
9
10
11
12
13 where $\Delta\gamma$ and ΔA are the amplitudes of the oscillating surface tension and surface area,
14 respectively, A_0 the reference area and φ the phase shift between the surface tension and
15 surface area signals. For each frequency, ν , these quantities are extracted by the acquired
16 signals, by using the concepts of Fourier analysis. In this way, the complex dilational
17 viscoelasticity against frequency is evaluated in a range from 0.005 to 0.2 Hz. The upper
18 limit of the frequency range, typical of this technique, is due to the necessity to work under
19 mechanical quasi-equilibrium condition, which is a requirement for the Laplace equation
20 applicability [31]. All measurements reported below have been performed at 20°C.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Drop coalescence experiments have been performed in a purposely-designed set-up,
30 housed on the stage of an optical microscope. In this apparatus, two liquid droplets are
31 formed at the tip of small stainless steel capillaries, with diameter of 0.4 mm, immersed in
32 a second liquid contained in a cell, with volume of about 18 cm³. The growth of the
33 droplets is controlled by computer-driven high precision syringes. The system is also
34 equipped by 3-axial mechanical micromanipulators to bring in contact the droplets and, if
35 needed, press them one against the other. The experiments are video-recorded for further
36 analysis by using a USB 1024 x 768 pixels camera mounted on the microscope ocular.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Specifically, in this study, droplets of pure dodecane with typical diameters of 1-2 mm, are
44 investigated immersed in SDS solutions. This configuration corresponds to that of the oil in
45 water emulsions stabilized by SDS.
46
47

48 Emulsions are obtained by mixing the two liquid phases, using an Ultraturax mixer (IKA
49 ULTRA TERPAX T25), at 10.000 rpm for 10 minutes. The volume fractions of dodecane,
50 Φ_d , in the emulsions investigated were 0.2 and 0.5.
51
52

53 Emulsions are produced in glass beakers using a total liquid amount of 20 ml. A portion of
54 the emulsion is immediately transferred to glass vials of 4 ml (15 mm diameter and 48 mm
55 height). The evolution of the dodecane-in-water emulsion is then monitored by measuring
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the height of the emulsion phase, h_{em} , during the separation process. The time
4 dependence of the relative emulsion height, $h_r = h_{em}/h_t$, where h_t is the height of the
5 total liquid in the container, provides the first information on the stability of the obtained
6 emulsions.
7
8

9
10 To monitor the temporal evolution of the average droplet radius, the same emulsions are
11 transferred in appropriate cells to acquire and statistically analyze optical microscope
12 images.
13

14
15 More information on the evolution of the drop sizes in diluted samples were obtained by
16 DLS (Dynamic Light Scattering), by means of a Zetasizer-Nano (Malvern Instrument,UK).
17 By this instrument, the intensity autocorrelation function is obtained using the red line ($\lambda =$
18 632 nm) of a He-Ne in a quasi-backscattering configuration ($\theta = 173^\circ$). The technique is
19 applied here to evaluate the drop size distribution of the emulsions at different degree of
20 destabilization, or time from the emulsification. To fulfill the DLS requirement of single-
21 scattering event, highly diluted samples are required. The droplet size distribution at
22 different ageing times was then evaluated by performing the measurements on emulsion
23 batches with the desired age, diluted by a factor 10 with corresponding SDS solution just
24 before the measurement.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 The analysis of the normalized autocorrelation functions of the scattered intensity $g^2(t)$
33 provides the distribution of apparent diffusion coefficient and, through the Stokes-Einstein
34 relation, the droplet hydrodynamic diameter [33]. The application of this method to
35 evaluate the droplet size requires the condition of purely Brownian motion for the emulsion
36 droplets that, for the systems here investigated, can be satisfied only after a transient
37 phase, when the creaming process is no more relevant, being the larger droplets
38 transferred away from the acquisition zone. The analysis of the autocorrelation functions to
39 obtain the droplet distributions is based on a well-established approach utilizing the
40 CONTIN algorithm [34].
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 Electrical conductivity measurements have been utilized to estimate the actual bulk
51 concentration of the aqueous phase after the emulsification. This method is based on the
52 direct relation between the electrical conductivity of an ionic surfactant solution and its
53 concentration [35]. For emulsions, due to the surfactant adsorption at the droplet
54 interfaces, this concentration may be different from the initial one
55
56
57

To this aim, the electrical conductivity of the aqueous matrix phase, spilled from the emulsion, is measured using a high-resolution electrode (+Pt 100 5071 for Crison Basic 30 EC conductometer). The actual concentrations of the aqueous matrix phase are then evaluated by comparing these values with a previously determined master curve of the conductivity versus the ionic surfactant concentration.

Results

Interfacial properties

Figure 1 shows the dynamic interfacial tensions measured during the adsorption kinetics at the interface between pure dodecane and SDS aqueous solutions with concentration c , spanning from $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ to $7 \cdot 10^{-2}$ M. The corresponding equilibrium interfacial tensions are reported in Figure 2. The equilibrium adsorption properties of SDS have been widely investigated at water/air interfaces [36, 37] and some results on SDS adsorption at oil/water interfaces are also found in literature [38, 39]. As in most cases where ionic surfactants are concerned, the theoretical adsorption isotherms used to interpret the equilibrium surface tension of SDS are those assuming an electrostatic interaction among the adsorbed molecules. That is for example the Frumkin isotherm, for which the equilibrium surface pressure $\Pi = \gamma_0 - \gamma$, and the bulk surfactant concentration, c , are related through the following equations, in terms of the surface coverage $\theta = \Gamma\omega$,

$$\Pi = -\frac{RT}{\omega} [\ln(1 - \theta) + a_F \theta^2] \quad (2)$$

$$bc = \frac{\theta}{1-\theta} e^{-2a_F \theta} \quad (3)$$

where b is the adsorption equilibrium constant, a_F the Frumkin interaction parameter, γ_0 the surface tension of the pure solvent, R the gas constant, T the temperature and ω the molar area of the adsorbed surfactant. This latter, in some cases, is assumed to vary with the surface pressure, as $\omega = \omega_0(1 - \varepsilon\Pi)$, to account for a 2D compressibility of the adsorbed layer [40].

On the other side, recent studies [41, 42] have shown that at small coverage the alkyl tail of SDS molecules adsorbed at the water-alkane interface can lie parallel to the interface. Such conformation is due to the relatively large occurrence of gauche defects [43] in the alkyl chain, favored by the interaction with the oil molecules. Being free to rotate, under

these conditions SDS molecules project an area of the order of few square nanometers. By increasing the surface coverage – that is, the SDS concentration in the solution – such conformational disorder disappears due to the molecules packing, and the area occupied tends to the saturation limit of the vertically oriented molecules, compatible with the reported literature values of 40-70 Å². It is worth to stress that such reorientation capability seems a specific feature of SDS at the water-oil interface, resulting from the interaction of the alkyl tail with the alkane, even if, some authors report similar phenomena also for SDS at water-air interface [44].

The features of an adsorbed layer in which the surfactant molecules (or, more often, one of his moieties) re-orient - from the horizontal to the vertical direction - under the effect of the packing are well captured by the two-state adsorption model [45, 46].

According to this model, the surfactant molecules may adsorb at the interface assuming two different areas per mole, ω_1 and ω_2 , corresponding, for example, to the parallel and normal orientation of the molecule with respect to the interface. The distribution of the adsorbed molecules between these two states depends on the degree of surface coverage, related to the equilibrium interfacial tension. This model provides the following equilibrium relation between surface pressure, $\Pi = \gamma^0 - \gamma$ and total adsorption Γ ,

$$\Pi = -\frac{RT}{\omega} \ln(1 - \Gamma\omega) \quad (4)$$

ω is here the average surface molar area weighted by the adsorptions in the two states, Γ_1 and Γ_2 , i.e. $\omega = (\omega_1\Gamma_1 + \omega_2\Gamma_2) / (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2)$. Accordingly, the Π -c adsorption isotherm reads

$$bc = \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{\Pi\omega}{RT}}}{\left(\frac{\omega_1}{\omega_2}\right)^\alpha e^{-\frac{\Pi\omega_1}{RT}} + e^{-\frac{\Pi\omega_2}{RT}}} \quad (5)$$

where b and α are two parameters related to the surface activity of the two states which, together with ω_1 and ω_2 , completely describe the equilibrium adsorption properties of the system.

1
2
3 Such model, though adequate to describe the features of the re-orientation of SDS
4 molecules at the water-oil interface, does not account for the lateral interaction of the ionic
5 surfactants.
6

7
8 In order to evaluate the effect of this interaction, we performed a comparative analysis of
9 the equilibrium interfacial tension data according to the two states model and to an
10 extended Frumkin Isotherm accounting also for a 2D compressibility of the adsorption
11 layer [47]. To this aim the theoretical isotherms have been fitted to the experimental data
12 using the ISOFIT package [48].
13
14

15
16 As shown in Figure 2, the measured equilibrium interfacial tensions are well described by
17 both the theoretical isotherms, the agreement with the two states isotherm being only
18 slightly better. However, the two models provide appreciably different trends of the surface
19 coverage against the bulk concentration (red curve in Figure 2) and of the parameters
20 more related to the dynamic behavior of the systems such as the Gibbs elasticity, E_0 , and
21 the characteristic frequency of diffusion, ν_D , (Figure 3), defined in the following as
22 rheological parameters. In particular, for the two-state model, the coverage $\omega\Gamma = \omega_1\Gamma_1 +$
23 $\omega_2\Gamma_2$ shows a plateau with values close to saturation already at a concentration of about
24 three orders of magnitude below the cmc.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 The best-fit values of the isotherm parameters, reported in Table 1, are coherent with their
33 physical meaning i.e. the occupational area of the SDS molecules and the degree of
34 surface activity of such kind of surfactants at liquid-liquid interfaces [27]. In particular, the
35 two-state model provides values for ω_1 and ω_2 , which are in agreement with the occupied
36 molecular areas reported elsewhere [42] for the SDS molecules respectively lying parallel
37 or packed vertically to the interface.
38
39
40

41
42 The analysis of the equilibrium interfacial tension versus the SDS concentration also
43 allows evaluating the critical micellar concentration cmc of SDS in water. The value
44 $\text{cmc} = 8.3 \cdot 10^{-3}$ M, obtained assuming the two state adsorption model, is in agreement with
45 that available in literature [27] at 20 °C.
46
47
48

49
50 Figure 4 reports the dilational viscoelasticity, E , against the SDS concentration for
51 frequency spanning in the range 0.005-1 Hz. The behavior exhibits an increase of the E
52 modulus up to a maximum, followed by a decrease towards zero while approaching the
53 cmc, that is the classical tendency for common soluble surfactants [49]. For these
54 systems, in fact, the diffusion process re-equilibrating the concentration profile is the main
55 mechanism governing the rheological response. Its characteristic time decreases with the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 surfactant concentration. The maximum arises from the interplay between the dilution of
4 the adsorption layer caused by the interface dilatation and the diffusive surfactant
5 exchange between the interface and the adjacent bulk, which tends to re-equilibrate it.
6 During the process the interfacial tension varies with the adsorption, following the
7 isotherm. At low surfactant concentration the diffusion is slow but the variations of
8 interfacial tensions are small, according to the slope of the isotherm. The values of E
9 remain therefore small. Increasing the concentration, the interfacial tension variations
10 increase but the diffusion process is more and more effective in contrasting the dilution of
11 the adsorption layer. Thus at a given perturbation frequency, the IT variation passes
12 through a maximum and tends to vanishes at the highest concentrations.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Figure 5 reports some examples of measured modulus of E against the frequency, ν . The
20 fitting curves, also reported in the figure, have been calculated by a rather general
21 theoretical expression of the complex dilational viscoelasticity which takes into account, as
22 governing processes of the adsorption kinetics, both the bulk diffusion and a re-
23 arrangement process occurring within the interfacial layer [50]. This equation reads,
24
25
26
27
28
29

$$30 \quad E = \left[\frac{E_1 + E_0 \lambda^2}{1 + \lambda^2} + (E_1 - E_0) \frac{i\lambda}{1 + \lambda^2} \right] \frac{1 + \xi + i\xi}{1 + 2\xi + 2\xi^2} \quad (6)$$

31
32
33
34
35 where $\xi = \sqrt{\nu_D/2\nu}$, $\lambda = \nu_k/\nu$, $\nu_D = D \left(\frac{\partial c}{\partial \Gamma} \right)^2$ and ν_k the characteristic frequencies of
36 diffusion and interfacial kinetic process, respectively, $E_0 = \frac{d\gamma}{d \ln \Gamma}$ the thermodynamic Gibbs
37 elasticity and E_1 the high frequency limit of E . Eq. 6, in case of negligible interfacial kinetic
38 process, that is $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, reduces to the classical Lucassen – van den Tempel expression
39 for diffusion-controlled adsorption [51], i.e.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

$$48 \quad E = E_0 \frac{1 + \xi + i\xi}{1 + 2\xi + 2\xi^2} \quad (7)$$

49
50
51
52 The analysis of the dilation viscoelasticity versus frequency provides information on the
53 kinetic mechanisms of the adsorption of SDS at the liquid-liquid interfaces.
54
55
56
57

Eq. 6 well describes the experimental data, assuming for the Gibbs elasticity the value calculated by the two state adsorption model. The characteristic diffusion frequency found by the fitting is three order of magnitude lower than that calculated using the thermodynamic parameters given by the model, assuming a diffusion coefficient of 10^{-10} m^2/s , which is the typical order of magnitude for short chain surfactant dissolved in water. This apparent discrepancy can be explained taking into account the fact that the adsorption of ionic surfactant, in the absence of electrolytes in the solution, yields a diffuse electric double layer close to the interface which acts as an adsorption barrier. The effect of such energy barrier, $\Delta\varepsilon$, is equivalent to assume an effective value of the diffusion coefficient, $D_{\text{eff}}=D \exp(-\Delta\varepsilon/RT)$ [52]. The best-fit values found here for ν_D correspond to an energy barrier of about three times the thermal energy of molecules in solution, which is completely acceptable in presence of adsorption of ionic surfactant.

Moreover, though the most relevant mechanisms governing the dilational behavior seems to be the diffusional exchange with the bulk solution, in the concentration range from 10^{-4} M to 10^{-3} M, a kinetic interfacial process is also detected by the viscoelasticity data (see Table I) even if the frequency range investigated is rather limited. A hypothesis for the nature of this re-organization process may come from the observation that the re-orientation model is the most appropriate for the description of the equilibrium properties of the systems and, on the other side, the region of concentration where this kinetic process is detected is that where the equilibrium adsorptions of the two orientation states are mostly distinct (see Figure 3c).

It is worth to notice that, the same analysis of the dilational viscoelasticity data, performed adopting the Frumkin model shows the not appropriateness of the model. Assuming, in fact, the Gibbs elasticity values obtained by the fitting of the Frumkin isotherm, no agreement was found between the theoretical $E(\nu)$ and the experimental data neither using the general Eq, 6 nor with the classical Lucassen- van den Tempel Eq. 7.

Thus, even if in principle the appropriate isotherm for this ionic system should consider a lateral electrostatic interaction between the adsorbed molecules, it is clear that the Frumkin model is not sufficient to describe the adsorption of this surfactants even assuming a 2D compressibility of the adsorbed layer. The role of the re-orientation of the adsorbed molecules seems in fact to be fundamental.

The most appropriate model for this system should include both the re-orientation and the lateral interaction. However, such general model would be practically useless because of

1
2
3 the large number of parameters. Thus, in order to estimate the interaction parameter, we
4 applied the Frumkin isotherm separately at high and low concentration, using the two
5 molar areas obtained by the two state model. The results provide $a_F = -1.16$ for both the
6 low and high coverage zones and show that the behavior of the coverage at low surface
7 pressure is in agreement with that obtained with the 2 states model. In particular, the
8 value of the interaction parameter, a_F , is much smaller than that resulting from the fitting of
9 the Frumkin isotherm on all the concentration range.
10
11
12
13

14 Thus, we can conclude that assuming the two states model is the most appropriate way to
15 describe the thermodynamic and kinetic adsorption properties of this system while the
16 electrostatic interaction plays only a marginal role. In fact, at the water/oil interface, the
17 interaction of the molecule alkyl tails with the oil molecules prevails on the lateral
18 electrostatic repulsion.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Drop Coalescence**

25
26 The conditions for coalescence of droplets of pure dodecane immersed in SDS solutions
27 at different concentration, $10^{-7}M$, $10^{-6} M$ and $10^{-5}M$, brought in contact at different ageing
28 time, have been investigated using the set-up described in the methods section.
29
30

31 The results show that with surfactant concentration of $1 \cdot 10^{-6} M$ and higher, coalescence is
32 not observed, even if the drops are forced together several times, while for $1 \cdot 10^{-7} M$,
33 coalescence events are observed for “fresh” liquid interfaces, that is immediately after the
34 formation of the drop. For all the cases investigated, after a time of the order of a hundred
35 seconds from the formation of the droplets, it was not possible to observe coalescence.
36 Figure 6 shows, as paradigmatic examples of the observed behaviors, pictures from the
37 coalescence essays. The sequence of pictures a-b illustrate the case where coalescence
38 occurs immediately after the drop contact and the two drops merge in a single one. In the
39 sequence c-d instead coalescence is prevented even when the drops are forced together.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 It is important to notice that the correct comparison of the results of coalescence
47 experiments with the emulsion properties requires considering the SDS concentration in
48 the aqueous matrix of emulsions lower than the initial one, due to the adsorption of the
49 surfactant at the liquid-liquid interface.
50
51
52

53 For these reasons, coalescence experiments have been performed also with dodecane
54 droplets immersed in the aqueous phase of an emulsion obtained with 0.5 and 0.2 of
55 dodecane volume fraction. However also in this case, for SDS solutions with surfactant
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 concentration of $1 \cdot 10^{-6}$ M and higher, coalescence is not observed and, for $1 \cdot 10^{-7}$ M,
4 coalescence only occurs for fresh droplet surfaces.
5

6
7 Even if the reported study of coalescence deserves a more quantitative and statistically
8 relevant investigation, the observed trend is qualitatively clear, showing that coalescence
9 is already prevented at SDS concentrations well below the cmc.
10

11
12 Such result is coherent with the observation by other authors [53] on the stability of
13 dodecane-water-dodecane emulsion films containing the anionic surfactant AOT, which
14 were shown to be indefinitely stable in a wide range of surfactant and electrolyte
15 concentration, attributing such effect to the large repulsive forces within the film. Long-term
16 stability for spherical emulsion films of supramicellar SDS solutions in decane was also
17 reported in ref. [54].
18
19

20
21 It is generally accepted that the effective coalescence hindering of SDS in foams and
22 emulsions arise from the electrostatic repulsion between the surfactant layers at the two
23 sides of the liquid film between bubbles/droplets. The results reported here suggest that
24 for water-alkane emulsions an additional mechanism may help the stabilization. In fact, as
25 show in Figure 2, the possibility for the surfactant molecules to reorient provides a large
26 coverage already at a SDS concentration of $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ M, when the effect on surface tension is
27 a decrease of just a few mN/m.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Emulsion properties**

37
38 Emulsions were obtained according to the method described above for five different SDS
39 concentrations, spanning from $1 \cdot 10^{-7}$ M to $7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ M. For each SDS concentration, two
40 values of oil fraction in volume, 0.2 and 0.5, were investigated.
41
42

43
44 Figures 7 and 8 show, respectively, the relative emulsion height, h_{rel} , monitored during the
45 destabilization process and the images of the same emulsions after two hours and two
46 months from the formation.
47

48
49 For $\Phi_d = 0.2$ (Figure 7a), for the lowest surfactant concentration, the aqueous and
50 dodecane phases are completely separated within 5 minutes, while SDS solutions at $1 \cdot 10^{-7}$
51 M provide emulsions slightly more stable where the relative height h_{rel} reaches a constant
52 value of about 0.2, after 10 minutes. In this case, however, a non-emulsified fraction of
53 dodecane remains above the emulsion for all the time, since immediately after the
54 emulsification. For all the higher surfactant concentrations, from $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ to $7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ M, after a
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 time which depends on the concentration, h_{rel} reaches a value of about 0.3 and remains
4 constant for more than two months. The dodecane phase in these cases is always
5 completely emulsified.
6

7
8 A similar behavior has been observed for $\Phi_d=0.5$ (Figure 7b). For SDS concentration of
9 $1 \cdot 10^{-7} M$ and $1 \cdot 10^{-6} M$, the complete separation of the emulsions into two phases is
10 attained in 5 minutes and 8 hours, respectively. In the second case, however, h_{rel} is
11 already lower than 0.1, after 10 minutes. The situation changes for the higher surfactant
12 concentrations, which provide rather stable emulsions. In fact, at the beginning the
13 emulsions occupy the whole liquid phase, then, after a continuous decrease of h_{rel} , for a
14 time of the order of 100 minutes, the emulsions reach a stationary state with a constant
15 value of h_{rel} , weakly dependent on the surfactant concentration.
16
17

18
19 Moreover, it is worth to mention that, while for the SDS concentration of $7 \cdot 10^{-5} M$ and $7 \cdot 10^{-4}$
20 M , the dodecane phase remains completely emulsified, at least for 2 months (see Figure
21 8), this is not true for $c=1 \cdot 10^{-5} M$ where a fraction of dodecane appears above the
22 emulsion just after one minute from the formation.
23
24

25
26 Thus we can conclude that it is possible to obtain a good stability of emulsion for both the
27 values of Φ_d investigated and SDS concentration in the range $1 \cdot 10^{-5} M - 7 \cdot 10^{-4} M$, even if in
28 the case of $1 \cdot 10^{-5} M$, for $\Phi_d=0.5$, the dodecane phase is not completely emulsified (figure
29 8).
30
31

32
33 The evolution of the average droplet radii during 3 weeks of the $\Phi_d=0.5$ emulsions with
34 different SDS concentration measured by optical microscopy are reported in Figure 9. The
35 microscopy images were acquired from the side of the cell at a depth of 10 mm from the
36 top of the emulsion. In Figure 9b examples of images used for the evaluation of the
37 average radius are reported. In order to warrant a statistically adequate number of
38 droplets, each point in Figure 9a has been obtained by the analysis of at least 20 images,
39 mapping a horizontal strip at the given depth.
40
41

42
43 It is apparent from the figure that the droplet sizes do not vary appreciably after the initial
44 transient. After 2 weeks the average radii in the emulsions with SDS concentrations $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$
45 M , $7 \cdot 10^{-5} M$ and $7 \cdot 10^{-4} M$ are respectively $11.5 \mu m$, $10.1 \mu m$ and $9.8 \mu m$.
46
47

48
49 For the same emulsion formulations and $\Phi_d=0.5$, the time evolution of the droplet size
50 distribution has been investigated also by DLS.
51
52

1
2
3 Figure 10 reports the evolution of the average drop radius, R_d , corresponding to the
4 maximum of the droplet size distributions in number obtained by DLS. The bars are the
5 width at half height of the distribution, which provides an estimation of the emulsion
6 polydispersity.
7
8

9
10 According to the method described in previous section, each R_d value reported in Figure
11 10 has been obtained on a sample extracted from the emulsion while it is evolving in time,
12 that is to a given age of the total emulsion.
13
14

15 It is important to underline that the buoyancy effects due to the density difference between
16 water and dodecane actually limit the range of size detectable by DLS analysis. In fact,
17 during the DLS essays, before reaching the stationary regime, necessary to acquire
18 appropriate correlation functions, that is purely Brownian motion of the droplets, a
19 transitory phase was observed, presumably related to the buoyancy that has the effect of
20 selectively removing from the DLS acquisition zone the larger droplets, i.e. those bigger
21 than few microns. Standing the above considerations, the DLS essays are not
22 quantitatively representative of the evolution of the whole droplet size distribution in the
23 investigated emulsion. Despite this limitation, the results by DLS analysis can be utilized
24 to get insights into the processes involved in the emulsion evolution.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The average radius for the emulsion with SDS concentration of $7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ M shows, in fact, a
32 definite increasing trend with time. Since, as shown in previous section, coalescence is
33 strongly hindered, Ostwald Ripening (OR) remains the only process that could contribute
34 to the emulsion evolution after the transient stage.
35
36
37

38 For SDS concentration of $7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ M, Figure 11 evidences that a linear dependence exists
39 between R_d and $t^{1/3}$, corresponding to a linear increase of the average drop volume. This is
40 the characteristic signature for the Ostwald ripening process [55], associated to a variation
41 of the average radius given by
42
43
44
45
46
47

$$\frac{4}{3}\pi(R_d^3 - R_{d0}^3) = \Omega t \quad (8)$$

48
49
50
51
52
53 where the volume rate Ω depends on the interfacial tension and on other characteristics of
54 the two liquid phases such as the solubility and the diffusion coefficient. Though this value
55 may differ of orders of magnitude passing from the most simplified conditions of very
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 diluted emulsions to concentrated ones, where the effect of droplets proximity becomes
4 important [13], the linear dependence on time is preserved.

5
6 From the best fit slope of the data in Figure 11 we obtain $\Omega=3.2 \cdot 10^{-8} \mu\text{m}^3/\text{s}$, which is in
7 reasonable agreement with those previously reported in ref. [14] ($1.1 \cdot 10^{-7} \mu\text{m}^3/\text{s}$), for a
8 dodecane-in-water emulsions stabilized by SDS in absence of electrolytes. The latter data
9 refers, in fact, to a semidilute (5% wt) emulsion stabilized by SDS at a concentration above
10 cmc. The smaller value of Ω obtained here in spite of the larger volume ratio, can be
11 attributed to the lack of micellar solubilization, which may be not sufficiently compensated
12 by the rate increase due to the transport across the films between the droplets [56, 57].

13
14 It is worth to notice that for SDS concentration of $7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ M, according to the Gibbs criterion,
15 one can assert that the OR process is not arrested by the presence of adsorbed layer, at
16 difference with the intermediate concentration of $7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ M (see Figure 3b).

17
18 On the other side, assuming the value obtained here for the rate Ω , the increase of the
19 average drop volume over the timescale of the present investigation (20000 min) is of the
20 order of $0.15 \mu\text{m}^3$, which corresponds to a variation of less than 20 nm on 1 μm radius.
21 Therefore, standing the limitation of the DLS method, such tiny increase cannot be
22 appreciated in population of droplets of micrometric size. This is in fact the case of the
23 emulsions stabilized by the lowest SDS concentration of $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ M (Figure 10), for which
24 the Gibbs criterion predicts again the occurring of OR.

25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 **Electrical conductivity**

39
40 The depletion effect of the aqueous phase of the emulsions, due to the SDS adsorption
41 onto the emulsion droplets interface is here quantitatively evaluated by electrical
42 conductivity measurements, according to the method described in previous section.

43
44 For these measurements, the aqueous phases were spilled from the emulsions after the
45 achievement of the stationary condition of the emulsified layer that is about 4 days since
46 the emulsification.

47
48 Figure 12 shows the measured conductivities of aqueous solutions, providing the master
49 curve to access the SDS concentration. The values obtained for the aqueous matrix phase
50 sampled from the emulsions are also reported in the figure at the abscissa corresponding
51 to the initial SDS concentrations in water, before emulsification. For both the emulsion
52 volume ratios, these values lie significantly below the master curve. This is a clear

1
2
3 evidence of the depletion resulting from the SDS adsorption at the large droplet interface
4 available in the emulsion. The actual SDS concentrations in the depleted emulsion matrix,
5 after emulsification, estimated by comparing these conductivities with the master curve,
6 are reported in Table III as c^* . The values for initial concentration of 10^{-6} M are not given
7 as, for such low SDS concentration, the electrical conductivity is of the order of the
8 sensitivity of the instrument.
9
10
11

12 A trivial mass balance of the partition of the surfactant molecules between the bulk and the
13 interface allows the total interfacial area, A_d , of the dodecane droplet dispersed in the
14 emulsion to be estimated as
15
16
17
18
19

$$A_d = \frac{(C_{in} - C^*)}{\Gamma^*} V_w \quad (9)$$

20
21
22
23
24
25 where Γ^* is the adsorption corresponding to the actual SDS concentration. Assuming an
26 equilibrium relation between the adsorption and the surfactant concentration in the
27 solution, Γ^* can be calculated through the two-state adsorption isotherm discussed above.
28 In the case of total emulsification of the dodecane phase, Eq. 9 provides the droplet radius
29 assuming a monodisperse droplet distribution, that is
30
31
32
33
34
35

$$R_d = \frac{3\Gamma^*}{(C_{in} - C^*)} \frac{V_d}{V_w} \quad (10)$$

36
37
38
39
40
41 The values obtained for R_d and the total droplet area, normalized by the total dodecane
42 volume, identified as $\sigma = A_d/V_d$, are also reported in Table III.
43
44

45 The value of σ for a given volume ratio increases with the surfactant concentration, which
46 corresponds to a decrease of the average droplet radius.
47
48

49 The interfacial coverage θ^* , corresponding to the actual SDS concentration in the aqueous
50 emulsion matrix is also reported in the table. It is particularly significant that at given initial
51 concentration, the values of θ are large and nearly the same for both volume ratios. This
52 large surface coverage can be a further mechanism at the origin of the emulsion stability,
53 as already discussed in relation to the coalescence results. Back to the physical picture of
54 the two-state model, this is a remarkable feature resulting from the ability of the surfactant
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 molecules to adsorb covering a large area of the interface even with a limited amount of
4 molecules.
5

6 These results show that independently on the initial surfactant concentration and volume
7 ratios, for the studied conditions, the stable emulsions present similar interfacial coverage,
8 even if they differ for the amount of area created, that is, on the amount and the size of
9 droplets produced in the emulsion.
10
11
12
13

14 15 **General Discussion**

16
17 It is interesting to compare the values of the radius R_d , obtained by conductivity
18 measurements (see Table III) with the average radii provided by microscopy observation,
19 reported in Figure 9. In fact, for emulsions formulated with SDS concentration larger than
20 $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ M, the radii by conductometry are of the same order of magnitude of those by
21 microscopy. For the lowest SDS concentration ($1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ M), instead, conductometry
22 provides values which are one order of magnitude larger than microscopy. In this case,
23 however, the measured conductivity lays close to the lower limit of the instrument range,
24 so that it is affected by a large relative error. Furthermore, one must consider that R_d is
25 calculated by σ which contains the contribution of all dodecane droplets. On the contrary,
26 for the microscope observation, due to creaming, a significant number of big droplets is
27 expected to transfer towards the emulsion/air interface, out of the acquisition zone. This
28 means that microscopy tends to underestimate the average radii of droplets in the
29 emulsions.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The analysis of the size evolution of the small droplets obtained by DLS analysis allowed
40 us to complete the scenario and recognize the role of Ostwald Ripening in the evolution of
41 the emulsions.
42
43

44 The transient observed at the initial stage of the emulsion evolution (see Figs 7) is most
45 probably due to creaming. Its duration is, in fact, compatible with the rise of droplets with
46 radii of the order of tens of microns over the size of the cuvette (1-2 cm), when considering
47 concentrated emulsions [58].
48
49
50

51 Therefore, the overall results are coherent with a scenario where the main process
52 governing the emulsion evolution, besides creaming, is the increase of the droplet size
53 driven by the Ostwald ripening. On the contrary, the drop-drop coalescence cannot be
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 assumed as governing mechanism, because, as observed in the above reported
4 coalescence experiments, it is sufficient a very small amount of SDS to avoid it.
5

6 The outstanding capability of SDS to prevent coalescence even at very low concentration
7 seems to be in contradiction with the fact that stable emulsions cannot be obtained for
8 SDS concentrations of $1 \cdot 10^{-6}$ M and lower. Moreover, the conductivity measurements
9 show that the depletion of the SDS in the matrix cannot explain such contradiction.
10
11

12
13 Nevertheless, the fact that at low SDS concentration the emulsion destabilizes in a time
14 shorter than that needed to achieve a stable emulsion layer at the larger concentrations
15 can be explained taking into consideration the dynamic conditions of the droplets at the
16 early stage after the emulsification. In fact, due to the small amount of surfactant, during
17 the emulsification, relatively large dodecane droplets are produced that are subjected to a
18 quick creaming toward the top of the cell. Destabilization may then occur by the
19 coalescence of such drops, also with the floating planar film of dodecane that is formed at
20 the top of the cell. In fact, compared to the conditions of the coalescence experiment
21 described here, the conditions under which the above droplets interact each other and with
22 the dodecane upper layer are definitely more dynamic. This implies inhomogeneous
23 distribution of surfactant on the drop surface. In this case, at SDS concentration below
24 $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ M, the combination of high mobility of the adsorption layer with droplet motion [59]
25 and collision [60] may give rise to significant coverage inhomogeneities along the droplet
26 surface, which, not properly compensated by Marangoni flows, increase substantially the
27 coalescence.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Summary and conclusions**

41
42 We report a study of different properties involved with dodecane-in-water emulsions
43 stabilized by SDS. The analysis of these complementary results allows us to infer some
44 general conclusions about the behavior of these emulsions and the relation with the
45 adsorption properties of the stabilizer.
46
47
48

49 The first macroscopical observation of the emulsions behavior have shown that high
50 stability is obtained already at relatively low SDS concentrations, around $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ M, while, at
51 lower concentration the emulsions destabilize in few minutes.
52
53

54 The information on the time dependence of the droplets size, obtained combining the
55 results of the different techniques, DLS, electrical conductivity and microscopy, allowed us
56
57

1
2
3 to get insights into the processes involved in the emulsion evolution. In particular, it was
4 possible to conclude that drop coalescence is not relevant for the emulsions evolution,
5 except for the very low concentration during the early stage, just after the emulsification,
6 when drops are big and under very dynamic conditions. On the contrary the results
7 suggest that Ostwald ripening is responsible for the emulsion evolution on long-time scale.
8
9

10
11 Moreover, the conductivity measurements show that all the stable emulsions are
12 characterized by large and similar values of the surfactant surface coverage of the
13 droplets. Thus, the available amount of surfactant controls the maximum area achievable
14 in the stable emulsions and, being the volume of the disperse phase fixed, the average
15 size of the droplets.
16
17

18
19
20 The variability in the estimation of the droplet size obtained with the different techniques,
21 has been rationalized on the basis of considerations on the limitations of the different
22 utilized methodologies and of the buoyancy effects. However, this is in any case a source
23 of uncertainty for this type of studies, which could be avoided by using less invasive
24 methodologies. To this aim, and to suppress the effects of buoyancy, further studies may
25 benefit by microgravity experiments based on Diffusing-Wave Spectroscopy, performed
26 directly on the concentrate emulsion.
27
28
29
30

31
32 Concerning the role of the SDS adsorption properties, the investigation of the interfacial
33 properties has been fundamental to get insights into the adsorption properties of SDS at
34 dodecane-water interface and to understand the behavior of the corresponding emulsions.
35 In fact, the interfacial tension and dilational viscoelasticity measurements show a
36 remarkable feature of the surfactant molecules – captured by the two-state adsorption
37 model -, which are able to cover a large area of the interface, even with a limited amount
38 of adsorbed molecules. Together with a high electrostatic repulsion characteristic of ionic
39 surfactants, this feature results in a high stability of the liquid film between droplets,
40 hindering of the coalescence.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Such conclusions rise the question, which will be the subject of further studies, if other
48 surfactants sharing similar features are also good emulsion stabilisers.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the European Space Agency MAP projects “Soft Matter Dynamics”, “Particle Stabilized Emulsions -PASTA”, and by the corresponding grant of the Italian Space Agency (contract ASI n. 2013-028-R.O).

References

- 1 Becher, P. *Encyclopedia of Emulsion Technology*, Marcel Dekker-New York, 1985.
- 2 Sadurni, N.; Solans, C.; García-Celma, M. N. Studies on the formation of O/W nano-emulsions, by low-energy emulsification methods suitable for pharmaceutical applications. *Eur. J. Pharm. Sci.*, **2005**, *26*, 438-445.
- 3 Wang, L. J.; Dong, J.; Chen, J.; Li, X. Design and optimization of a new self-nanoemulsifying drug delivery system. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2009**, *330*, 443-448.
- 4 Wang, L. J.; Li, X.; Zhang, G.; Dong, J.; Eastoe, J. Oil-in-water nanoemulsions for pesticide formulations. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2007**, *314*, 230-235.
- 5 Sonneville-Aubrun, O.; Simonnet, J. T.; L'Alloret, F. Nanoemulsions: a new vehicle for skincare products. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2004**, *108*, 145-149.
- 6 Taisne, L.; Walstra, P.; Cabane, B. Transfer of Oil between Emulsion Droplets. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **1996**, *184*, 378-390.
- 7 Ivanov, I.B.; Kralchevsky, P. A. Stability of emulsions under equilibrium and dynamic conditions. *Colloids Surf., A*, **1997**, *128*, 155-175.
- 8 Langevin, D. Influence of interfacial rheology on foam and emulsion properties. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2000**, *88*, 209-222.
- 9 Santini, E.; Ravera, F.; Ferrari, M.; Alfè, M.; Ciajolo, A.; Liggieri, L. Interfacial properties of carbon particulate-laden liquid interfaces and stability of related foams and emulsions. *Colloids Surf., A*, **2010**, *365*, 189-198.
- 10 Yarranton, H. W.; Urrutia, P.; Sztukowski, D. M. Effect of interfacial rheology on model emulsion coalescence: II. Emulsion coalescence. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2007**, *310*, 253-259.
- 11 Leal-Calderon, F.; Schmitt, V.; Bibette, J. *Emulsion Science, Basic Principles*, Springer, **2007**.
- 12 Binks, B.P. *Modern Aspects of Emulsion Science*, The Royal Society of Chemistry, **1998**.
- 13 Schmitt, V.; Cattelet, C.; Leal-Calderon, F. Coarsening of Alkane-in-Water Emulsions Stabilized by Nonionic Poly(oxyethylene) Surfactants: The Role of Molecular Permeation and Coalescence. *Langmuir*, **2004**, *20*, 46-52
- 14 Weiss, J.; Herrmann, N.; McClements, D. J. Ostwald Ripening of Hydrocarbon Emulsion Droplets in Surfactant Solutions. *Langmuir*, **1999**, *15*, 6652-6657.
- 15 Georgieva, D.; Schmitt, V.; Leal-Calderon, F., Langevin, D. On the Possible Role of Surface Elasticity in Emulsion Stability. *Langmuir*, **2009**, *25*, 5565-5573.
- 16 Gibbs, J. W. *The Scientific Papers of J. Willard Gibbs*, Oxbow Press, Woodridge **1993**
- 17 Boos, J.; Preisig, N.; Stubenrauch, C. Dilational surface rheology studies of n-dodecyl- β -D-maltoside, hexaoxyethylene dodecyl ether, and their 1:1 mixture. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2013**, *197-198*, 108-117.
- 18 Sonin, A. A.; Bonfillon, A.; Langevin, D. Role of surface elasticity in the drainage of soap films. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1993, **71**, 2342-2345.
- 19 Kovalchuk, V. I.; Krägel, J.; Makievski, A. V.; Ravera, F.; Liggieri, L.; Loglio, G.; Fainerman, V. B.; Miller, R. Rheological surface properties of C12DMPO solution as obtained from amplitude- and phase-frequency characteristics of an oscillating bubble system. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2004**, *280*, 498-505.

- 1
2
3
4 20 Deminière, B.; Colin, A.; Leal Calderon, F.; Bibette, J. Coarsening due to coalescence and life-time
5 of concentrated emulsions. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences - Series IIC -*
6 *Chemistry*, **1998**, *1*, 163-165.
- 7 21 Bonfillon, A.; Langevin, D. Viscoelasticity of monolayers at oil-water interfaces. *Langmuir*, **1993**,
8 *9*, 2172-2177.
- 9 22 Deshiikan, S. R.; Bush, D.; Eschenazi, E.; Papadopoulos, K. D. SDS, Brij58 and CTAB at the
10 dodecane-water interface. *Colloids Surf., A*, **1999**, *136*, 133-150.
- 11 23 Goloub, T.; Pugh, R. J. The role of the surfactant head group in the emulsification process:
12 Single surfactant systems. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2003**, *257*, 337-343.
- 13 24 Sole, I.; Solans, C.; Maestro, A.; González, C.; Gutiérrez, J. M. Study of nano-emulsion
14 formation by dilution of microemulsions. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2012**, *376*, 133-139.
- 15 25 Siddiqui, S. W. The effect of oils, low molecular weight emulsifiers and hydrodynamics on oil-in-
16 water emulsification in confined impinging jet mixer. *Colloids Surf., A*, **2014**, *443*, 8-18.
- 17 26 Javadi, A.; Mucic, N.; Vollhardt, D.; Fainerman, V. B.; Miller, R. Effects of dodecanol on the
18 adsorption kinetics of SDS at the water-hexane interface. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2010**, *351*, 537-
19 541.
- 20 27 Fainerman, V. B.; Lylyk, S. V.; Aksenenko, E. V.; Petkov, J. T.; Yorke, J.; Miller, R. Surface
21 tension isotherms, adsorption dynamics and dilational visco-elasticity of sodium dodecyl
22 sulphate solutions. *Colloids Surf., A*, **2010**, *354*, 8-15.
- 23 28 Boos, J.; Drenckhan, W.; Stubenrauch, C. On How Surfactant Depletion during Foam
24 Generation Influences Foam Properties. *Langmuir*, **2012**, *28*, 9303-9310.
- 25 29 Tcholakova, S.; Denkov, N. D.; Danner, T. Role of Surfactant Type and Concentration for the
26 Mean Drop Size during Emulsification in Turbulent Flow. *Langmuir*, **2004**, *20*, 7444-7458.
- 27 30 Tcholakova, S.; Denkov, N. D.; Lips, A. Comparison of solid particles, globular proteins and
28 surfactants as emulsifiers. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, **2008**, *10*, 1608-1627.
- 29 31 Loglio, G.; Pandolfini, P.; Miller, R.; Makievski, A. V.; Ravera, F.; Ferrari, M.; Liggieri, L. *Novel*
30 *Methods to Study Interfacial Layers*, D. Mobius, R. Miller (eds.), Elsevier, Amsterdam, **2001**,
31 439-483.
- 32 32 Loglio, G.; Pandolfini, P.; Liggieri, L.; Makievski, A. V.; Ravera, F. *Bubble and Drops Interfaces*,
33 R. Miller and L. Liggieri (Eds.), Brill, Leiden-The Netherlands, **2011**, 7-38.
- 34 33 Martinez, V. A.; Thijssen, J. H.; Zontone, F.; van Megen, W.; Bryant, G. Dynamics of hard
35 sphere suspensions using dynamic light scattering and X-ray photon correlation spectroscopy:
36 Dynamics and scaling of the intermediate scattering function. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **2011**, *134*,
37 054505.
- 38 34 Provencher, S.W. CONTIN: A general purpose constrained regularization program for inverting
39 noisy linear algebraic and integral equations. *Computer Physics Communications*, **1982**, *27*,
40 229-242.
- 41 35 Cooney, G. A.; Nwokobia, F. U. Conductivity Studies of Binary Mixtures of Ionic and Non-ionic
42 Surfactants at different Temperatures and Concentrations. *J. Appl. Sci. Environ. Manage*,
43 **2014**, *18*, 530-534.
- 44 36 Kolev, V. L.; Danov, K. D.; Kralchevsky, P. A.; Broze, G.; Mehretea, A. Comparison of the van
45 der Waals and Frumkin adsorption isotherms for sodium dodecyl sulfate at various salt
46 concentrations. *Langmuir*, **2002**, *18*, 9106-9109.
- 47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 37 Prosser, A. J.; Franses, E. I.; Adsorption and surface tension of ionic surfactants at the air–
5 water interface: review and evaluation of equilibrium models. *Colloids Surf., A*, 2001, 178, 1–
6 40.
- 7 38 Pradines, V.; Fainerman, V. B.; Aksenenko, E. V.; Krägel, J.; Mucic, N.; Miller, R. Adsorption of
8 alkyl trimethylammonium bromides at the water/air and water/hexane interfaces. *Colloids*
9 *Surf., A*, **2010**, 371, 22–28.
- 10 39 Mucic, N.; Gochev, G.; Won, J.; Ulaganathan, V.; Fauser, H.; Javadi, A.; Aksenenko, E. V.;
11 Krägel, J.; Miller, R. Adsorption of equimolar aqueous sodium dodecyl sulphate/dodecyl
12 trimethylammonium bromide mixtures at solution/air and solution/oil interfaces. *Colloid Polym.*
13 *Sci.*, **2015**, 293, 3099–3106.
- 14 40 Fainerman, V. B.; Miller, R.; Kovalchuk, V. I. Influence of the Two-Dimensional Compressibility
15 on the Surface Pressure Isotherm and Dilational Elasticity of Dodecyldimethylphosphine
16 Oxide. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **2003**, 107, 6119-6121.
- 17 41 de Aguiar, H. B.; de Beer, A. G. F.; Strader, M. L.; Roke, S. The Interfacial Tension of
18 Nanoscopic Oil Droplets in Water Is Hardly Affected by SDS Surfactant. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*,
19 **2010**, 132, 2122–2123.
- 20 42 de Aguiar, H. B.; Strader, M. L.; de Beer, A. G. F.; Roke, S. Surface Structure of Sodium
21 Dodecyl Sulfate Surfactant and Oil at the Oil-in-Water Droplet Liquid/Liquid Interface: A
22 Manifestation of a Nonequilibrium Surface State. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **2011**, 115, 2970–2978
- 23 43 Sammalkorpi, M.; Karttunen, M.; Haataja, M. Structural Properties of Ionic Detergent
24 Aggregates: A Large-Scale Molecular Dynamics Study of Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate. *J. Phys.*
25 *Chem. B*, **2007**, 111, 11722-11733
- 26 44 Kawai, T.; Kamio, H.; Kon-No, K. Infrared External Reflection Spectroscopy of Sodium Dodecyl
27 Sulfate Monolayers at the Air–Solution Interface: Removal of Bulk-Phase Water
28 Concentration Effects. *Langmuir* **1998**, 14, 4964-4966
- 29 45 . Fainerman, V. B.; Miller, R.; Wustneck, R.; Makievski, A. V.; Adsorption Isotherm and Surface
30 Tension Equation for a Surfactant with Changing Partial Molar Area. *J. Phys. Chem.*, **1996**,
31 100, 7669-7675
- 32 46. Fainerman, V. B.; Zholob, S. A.; Lucassen-Reynders, E. H.; Miller, R.; Comparison of various
33 models describing the adsorption of surfactant molecules capable of interfacial reorientation *J.*
34 *Colloid Interface Sci*, **2003**, 261, 80–83
- 35 47 Fainerman, V. B.; Aksenenko, E. V.; Mucic, N.; Javadi, A.; Miller, R. Thermodynamics of
36 adsorption of ionic surfactants at water/alkane interfaces. *Soft Matter*, **2014**, 10, 6873-6887.
- 37 48 ISOFIT; <http://www.thomascatt.info/Scientific/AdSo/AdSo.htm>
- 38 49 Stubenrauch, C.; Fainerman, V. B.; Aksenenko, E. V.; Miller, R. Adsorption Behavior and
39 Dilational Rheology of the Cationic Alkyl Trimethylammonium Bromides at the Water/Air
40 Interface. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **2005**, 109, 1505-1509.
- 41 50 Ravera, F.; Ferrari, M.; Liggieri, L. Modelling of dilational visco-elasticity of adsorbed layers with
42 multiple kinetic processes. *Colloids Surf., A*, **2006**, 282, 210-216.
- 43 51 Liggieri, L.; Miller, R. Relaxation of surfactants adsorption layers at liquid interfaces. *Curr. Opin.*
44 *Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2010**, 15, 256–263.
- 45 52 Ravera, F.; Ferrari, M.; Liggieri, L., Adsorption and partitioning of surfactants in liquid–liquid
46 systems. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2000**, 88, 129-177.
- 47 53 Binks, B. P.; Cho, W. G.; Fletcher, P. D. I. Disjoining Pressure Isotherms for Oil–Water–Oil
48 Emulsion Films. *Langmuir*, **1997**, 13, 7180-7185.

- 1
2
3
4 54 Gabrieli, R.; Loglio, G.; Pandolfini, P.; Fabbri, A.; Simoncini, M.; Kovalchuk, V. I.; Noskov, B. A.;
5 Makievski, A. V.; Krägel, J.; Miller, R.; Ravera, F.; Liggieri, L. Spherical cap-shaped emulsion
6 films: thickness evaluation at the nanoscale level by the optical evanescent wave effect.
7 *Colloids Surf., A*, **2012**, *413*, 101–107.
- 8
9 55 Voorhees, P. W. The theory of Ostwald ripening. *J. Stat. Phys* **1985**, *38*, 231-252.
- 10 56 Krustev, R.; Platikanov, D.; Nedyalkov, M.; Permeability of Foam Common Black Films to Gas.
11 Part 2. *Colloids Surf., A*, **1997**, 123-124, 383.
- 12 57 Ramanathan, A.; Muller, H.-J.; Mohwald, H.; Krastev, R. Foam Films as Thin Liquid Gas
13 Separation Membranes. *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, **2011**, *3*, 633–637.
- 14 58 Chanamai, R.; McClements, D. Creaming Stability of Flocculated Monodisperse Oil-in-Water
15 Emulsions. *J. Colloid Interface Sci*, **2000**, *225*, 214–218.
- 16 59 Ulaganathan, V.; Krzan, M.; Lotfi, M.; Dukhin, S. S.; Kovalchuk, V. I.; Javadi, A.; Gunes, D. Z.;
17 Gehin-Delval, C.; Malysa, K.; Miller, R. Influence of β -lactoglobulin and its surfactant mixtures
18 on velocity of the rising bubbles. *Colloids Surf., A*, **2014**, *460*, 361–368
- 19 60 Malysa, K.; Krasowska, M.; Krzan, M. Influence of surface active substances on bubble motion and
20 collision with various interfaces. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **2005**, *114–115*, 205–225.
- 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

Table I: Best- fit parameters obtained from the two states model isotherm and the modified Frumkin isotherm

Model	ω_1 (m ² /mol)	ω_2 (m ² /mol)	b (m ³ /mol)	α	a_F	ϵ (m/mN)
Two States	1.40 10 ⁶	1.80 10 ⁵	2.90	2.6		
Frumkin + 2D compressibility		5.5 10 ⁵	5.32 10 ⁻¹		-3.4	9 10 ⁻³

Table II: Parameters obtained by fitting Eq. 6 and maintaining constant the Gibbs elasticity, E_0 , at the value provided by the two state adsorption isotherm. The diffusion characteristic frequency, assuming $D=10^{-10}$ m²/s, was $\nu_D=6.1$ Hz for all concentrations.

C_{SDS} (M)	E_0 (mN/m)	ν_D (Hz)	E_1 (mN/m)	ν_k (Hz)
1.0 10 ⁴	15.94	0.202	--	--
2.0 10 ⁴	10.88	0.013	12.47	0.051
4.0 10 ⁴	8.56	0.001	12.25	0.099
7.0 10 ⁴	9.11	0.003	14.94	0.053
1.0 10 ³	10.78	0.014	--	--

Table III: Results from the conductivity measurements on the aqueous matrix phase of emulsions. See text for the explanation of the reported quantities.

C_{ini} (M)	$\Phi_d = 0.5$				$\Phi_d = 0.2$			
	C^* (M)	σ (m ² /L)	Θ^*	R_d (μ m)	C^* (M)	σ (m ² /L)	Θ^*	R_d (μ m)
1.0 10 ⁻⁵	3.3 10 ⁻⁶	10.82	0.85	277.2	5.1 10 ⁻⁶	30.50	0.88	98.4
7.0 10 ⁻⁵	1.8 10 ⁻⁵	72.02	0.96	41.7	3.2 10 ⁻⁵	207.65	0.98	14.4
1.0 10 ⁻⁴	4.2 10 ⁻⁵	74.18	0.98	40.4	4.5 10 ⁻⁵	283.85	0.98	10.6
7.0 10 ⁻⁴	4.4 10 ⁻⁴	261.56	0.98	11.5	5.4 10 ⁻⁴	731.15	0.98	4.1




Figure 1: Interfacial tension against time of dodecane-SDS aqueous solutions for a freshly formed interface at different values of SDS concentration in water.




Figure 2: Equilibrium interfacial tension versus SDS concentration in water, at 20°C, and best fit isotherms from the two states (a) and Frumkin (b) models. The surface coverage $\theta = \omega\Gamma$ is calculated by the isotherm best fit parameters. The vertical dotted lines identifies the SDS concentrations at which emulsification was investigated.




Figure 3: For the Frumkin (a) and two-states (b) models: calculated dependence on SDS concentration of: the Gibbs elasticity, E_0 (solid green curve); half the interfacial tension, $\gamma/2$ (short-dashed blue curve); characteristic frequency of the diffusion process, ν_D (long-dashed red curve), assuming $D=1 \cdot 10^{-10}$ m²/s for SDS in water. Corresponding adsorptions (total, state 1 and state 2) for the two-state model (c).




Figure 4: Modulus of the dilational viscoelasticity, E , versus the SDS concentration in water and for different values of frequency.




Figure 5: Modulus of the dilational viscoelasticity, E , versus frequency, for different values of SDS concentration in water, and theoretical curves obtained by fitting Eq. 6 to the experimental data. In the fitting procedure the values of the Gibbs elasticity, E_0 , are fixed to those calculated for the two-state model using the best fit parameters of the adsorption isotherm (see text for details).




Figure 6: Examples of images from coalescence tests of dodecane droplets in SDS aqueous solution. For SDS concentration $1 \cdot 10^{-7}$ M (a,b) coalescence occurs immediately after droplets contact. For SDS concentration $1 \cdot 10^{-6}$ M (c,d) coalescence do not occurs even when forcing the droplets together.




Figure 7: Relative emulsion height versus the emulsion age, for different initial SDS concentrations in water and for $\Phi_d = 0.2$ and $\Phi_d = 0.5$.






Figure 8: Emulsion images after two hours (a, c) and two months (b, d) since the formation, for $\Phi_d = 0.5$ (a, b) and $\Phi_d = 0.2$ (c, d). In all the images the initial SDS concentration in water are from left to right: $1 \cdot 10^{-7}$, $1 \cdot 10^{-6}$, $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$, $7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and $7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ M.



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 9: a) Average droplet radii by optical microscopy versus the emulsion age for different values of initial SDS concentration in water and $\Phi_d=0.5$. The bars are the width of the size distribution. b) Examples of images utilized for the evaluation at the emulsion age of 2 weeks.




Figure 10: Average droplet radius from DLS measurements versus the emulsion age, for different values of initial SDS concentration in water and $\Phi_d=0.5$. The bars represent the width of the distribution. The insert reports the radius distribution in number corresponding to each SDS concentration at the emulsion age of two weeks.




Figure 11: Same data as Figure 10, for initial SDS concentration in water of $7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ M, plotted against $t^{1/3}$, and the best fit straight line whose slope provides an Ostwald ripening rate of $3.2 \cdot 10^{-8} \mu\text{m}^3/\text{s}$.




Figure 12: Electrical conductivity of aqueous SDS solutions against concentration (calibration curve) and of the emulsion aqueous phase against the initial SDS concentration at two different dodecane fractions.

1
2
3
4
5 Adsorption of SDS at water/dodecane interface in relation to the oil in water emulsion properties,
6 *S. Llamas, E. Santini, L. Liggieri, F. Salerni, D. Orsi, L. Cristofolini, F. Ravera*
7
8
9

10
11 **Graphical Abstract**
12
13
14
15

