Novel Electric-Conductive Electro-Responsive Hydrogels for Smart Actuators with Unique Three-Dimensional CNTs-Enriched Conductive Network and Physical-Phase Interpenetrating Network

Zongrong Ying,* Qi Wang, Jie Xie, Bo Li, Xuemei Lin, Shengjie Hui

Department of Materials Science and Engineering, School of Chemical Engineering, Nanjing University of Science

and Technology, Nanjing 210094, China.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Table S1 comparison on mole fractions of the AA and AMPS segments within P(AMPS-co-AA) for four aspolymerized samples.

Sample	C _{AA} (%)	C _{AMPS} (%)	F _{AA} (%)	F _{AMPS} (%)
Pure P(AMPS-co-AA)	93.5	87.0	90.6	9.4
P(AMPS-co-AA)/NF	88.2	78.3	91.0	9.0
P(AMPS-co-AA)/Na-MMT	96.7	91.3	90.5	9.5
P(AMPS-co-AA)/CNT	94.4	96.7	89.8	10.2



Figure S1 FTIR spectrums of FC5-AB1 and PC5-A hydrogels.





Figure S2 ¹H NMR spectra of monomer solution sample (a) and four as-polymerized samples (b-e).



Figure S3 Electrical conductivity of three comparative hydrogels.



Figure S4 Tensile stress-strain curves of the comparative and targeted hydrogels.



Figure S5 Equilibrium swelling process of comparison hydrogels in deionized water.



Figure S6 Dependence of the water fractional content (Mt/M $_{\infty})$ on the time for AB1 (a) and FC5-AB1 (b) hydrogels.



Figure S7 Water retention performance of hydrogels in NaCl solution. (a, b) in 0.10 mol•L⁻¹ NaCl solution, (c) FC5-AB1.



Figure S8 (a) Bending behavior of comparison samples AB1, AB2 and AB3 hydrogels in 0.05 mol·L⁻¹ NaCl solution under an applied electric field of 375 V•m⁻¹, (b) Effect of the ionic strength on the actuation rate for comparison samples AB1, AB2 and AB3 hydrogels.