

The Freely Jointed Chain Model

1. The End-to-End Distance

A polymer chain can adopt many different conformations because rotation around the covalent single bonds in the backbone is associated with very low energetic barriers. On a timescale of just a few picoseconds, the chain can change its shape, and over longer times it explores an astronomically large number of possible conformations. Because of this random motion, the **size of a polymer chain** cannot simply be taken as the straight sum of all bond lengths, which would correspond to the fully stretched chain. Instead, **entropy drives the chain to coil up**. To describe the typical size of such a coil, we need a statistical description of the end-to-end distance, R_n .

A simple but powerful starting point is the **freely jointed chain model**, where we imagine a polymer chain consisting of n perfectly rigid segments of fixed length a . Each segment is represented by a vector \vec{a}_i , and we assume that:

- all vectors have the same length: $|\vec{a}_i| = a$,
- the segments can rotate freely and independently in any direction,
- the angle between two segments a_i and a_j is denoted as $\theta_{i,j}$,
- torsional angles and bond angles are ignored.

The **end-to-end distance** is then just the sum of all bond vectors:

$$\vec{R}_n = \vec{a}_1 + \vec{a}_2 + \dots + \vec{a}_i + \dots + \vec{a}_n \quad . \quad (1)$$

Because each bond vector points in a random direction, the average chain has no preferred orientation and the average of \vec{R}_n is zero:

$$\langle \vec{R}_n \rangle = \langle \vec{a}_1 + \vec{a}_2 + \dots + \vec{a}_i + \dots + \vec{a}_n \rangle = \left\langle \sum_1^n \vec{a}_n \right\rangle = 0 \quad . \quad (2)$$

This does not mean the polymer has no size. It only tells us that if we average over many chains (or over a long time), the end-to-end vector cancels because the chain equally likely points in every direction.

To quantify the size of the chain, we therefore look at the **mean-square end-to-end distance**, $\langle R_n^2 \rangle$, which measures the squared magnitude (always positive), independent of direction. Expansion gives two contributions for $i = j$ and $i \neq j$:

$$\langle \vec{R}_n^2 \rangle = \langle (\vec{a}_1 + \vec{a}_2 + \dots + \vec{a}_n) \cdot (\vec{a}_1 + \vec{a}_2 + \dots + \vec{a}_n) \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{a}_i + \sum_{i \neq j} \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{a}_j \right\rangle \quad . \quad (3)$$

The first sum ($i = j$) contains just the squared lengths of each bond vector, giving na^2 . The second sum ($i \neq j$) contains the scalar products of two different bond vectors, which can be rewritten in terms of the angle between them:

$$\langle \vec{R}_n^2 \rangle = na^2 + a^2 \left\langle \sum_{i \neq j}^n \cos \theta_{i,j} \right\rangle . \quad (4)$$

For a freely jointed chain, each bond is completely independent on the others and can point in any direction with equal probability. This means that $\theta_{i,j}$ can take any value between 0 and 2π and the average $\cos \theta_{i,j}$ is zero:

$$\langle \vec{R}_n^2 \rangle = na^2 . \quad (5)$$

It is common to also use the **root-mean-square (rms) end-to-end distance**, which has the unit of a length:

$$\sqrt{\langle \vec{R}_n^2 \rangle} = \sqrt{na} . \quad (6)$$

This is the fundamental size scaling of an ideal chain: the size of the polymer coil increases linearly with the square root of the number of bonds, n . Equivalently, it scales with the square root of molar mass (since molar mass is proportional to n). If the molar mass doubles, the chain size increases only by a factor of $\sqrt{2} \approx 1.4$.

This square-root law is one of the most important results in polymer physics: it shows that polymers are **much more compact** than a fully stretched chain of the same number of bonds.

2. The Radius of Gyration

While the end-to-end distance is a natural size measure for linear chains, it is not useful for branched or ring polymers that either have too many ends or no ends at all. A more general measure of polymer size that applies to any architecture is the **radius of gyration**, R_g , which quantifies how the entire chain is spread around its center of mass. For a chain with n bonds (and hence $n + 1$ beads of equal mass), the positions of the beads are given by the vectors $\vec{r}_0, \vec{r}_1, \dots, \vec{r}_n$. The center of mass of the chain is then

$$\vec{r}_{\text{cm}} = \frac{1}{n + 1} \sum_{i=0}^n \vec{r}_i . \quad (7)$$

The **squared radius of gyration** is defined as the mean-squared distance of all beads from the center of mass (and is usually averaged over the ensemble of polymer conformations):

$$\langle R_g^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{n + 1} \sum_{i=0}^n \langle (\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_{\text{cm}})^2 \rangle . \quad (8)$$

R_g thus represent the radius of the cloud of monomers around the center of the coil and also connects to its moment of inertia about the center of mass (MR_g^2). To evaluate Equation 8 directly, which contains

the random center of mass, it is more convenient to rewrite the same quantity in terms of mean-square distances between all bead pairs (see Equations A1 to A6 in the Appendix for a derivation):

$$\langle R_g^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^n \langle (\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j)^2 \rangle . \quad (9)$$

This identity is useful because, for an ideal freely jointed chain (see Equation 5), the mean-square distance between two beads depends only on the number of bonds separating them, not on their absolute positions along the chain:

$$\langle (\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j)^2 \rangle = |i - j| a^2 . \quad (10)$$

Inserting Equation 10 into Equation 9 gives

$$\langle R_g^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^i |i - j| a^2 . \quad (11)$$

Since the terms are symmetric in i and j , the inner sum can be restricted to $j < i$ and multiplied by 2 (see Equations A7 to A14 in the Appendix for a detailed derivation). The double sum can then be evaluated explicitly:

$$\langle R_g^2 \rangle = \frac{a^2}{(n+1)^2} \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (i - j) = \frac{a^2}{(n+1)^2} \cdot \frac{n(n+1)(n+2)}{6} = \frac{a^2 n(n+2)}{6(n+1)} . \quad (12)$$

For long chains ($n \gg 1$), the factor $(n+2)/(n+1)$ tends to 1. Thus, **the radius of gyration relates to the end-to-end distance as**

$$\langle R_g^2 \rangle = \frac{na^2}{6} = \frac{1}{6} \langle R_n^2 \rangle . \quad (13)$$

The factor 1/6 is universal for the freely jointed chain in the long-chain limit. This relation is particularly useful: experiments (light scattering, SAXS) typically measure R_g , while theory or simulations often provide R_n .

Appendix

To derive the expression for the squared radius of gyration in terms of pairwise distances (Equation 9), let us denote the total number of beads by $N = n + 1$. Expanding the square in Equation 8 gives:

$$\langle R_g^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n \langle (\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_{\text{cm}})^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\vec{r}_i^2 - 2\vec{r}_i \vec{r}_{\text{cm}} + \vec{r}_{\text{cm}}^2) . \quad (\text{A1})$$

Inserting the definition of the center-of-mass (Equation 7) into the terms containing \vec{r}_{cm} gives:

$$\langle R_g^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\vec{r}_i^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N 1 - 2\vec{r}_i \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{r}_j + \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{r}_j \right)^2 \right] . \quad (\text{A2})$$

Here, we introduced a redundant sum in the first term so that later all terms will share the denominator. The last term requires some care: since its inner sum does not depend on i , every contribution in the outer sum is identical. Summing N identical terms and dividing by N just gives back the same expression:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{r}_j \right)^2 = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{r}_j \right)^2 . \quad (\text{A3})$$

This square can be expanded as the scalar product of two identical sums, which can be combined into a double sum:

$$\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{r}_j \right)^2 = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \vec{r}_i \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{r}_j \right) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{r}_i \vec{r}_j . \quad (\text{A4})$$

Substituting this back into Equation A2 gives

$$\langle R_g^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\vec{r}_i^2 - 2\vec{r}_i \vec{r}_j + \vec{r}_i \vec{r}_j) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\vec{r}_i^2 - \vec{r}_i \vec{r}_j) . \quad (\text{A5})$$

At this point, the expression looks asymmetric, since only \vec{r}_i^2 appears explicitly squared. However, the definition of R_g^2 is symmetric in all beads. To restore this symmetry, we add the same expression with i and j swapped (the double sum does not depend on which index is called i or j) and divide by 2. In this way, both indices contribute equally:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle R_g^2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\vec{r}_i^2 - \vec{r}_i \vec{r}_j) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\vec{r}_i^2 - \vec{r}_i \vec{r}_j) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N (\vec{r}_j^2 - \vec{r}_j \vec{r}_i) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\vec{r}_i^2 - 2\vec{r}_i \vec{r}_j + \vec{r}_j^2) = \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j)^2 . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Finally, reinserting $n = N - 1$ recovers Equation 9 in the main text.

For evaluating the double sum in Equation 11, note that the inner term is symmetric: $|i - j| = |j - i|$. This means that every off-diagonal pair (i, j) with $i \neq j$ is counted twice in the full sum, while the diagonal terms $|i - i| = 0$ contribute nothing. We can therefore restrict the inner sum to the case $j < i$ and multiply by 2 to account for the symmetric contributions with $j > i$:

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^i |i - j| = 2 \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (i - j) = 2 \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=1}^i k \quad . \quad (\text{A7})$$

For each fixed i , the inner sum runs over all $j < i$. Let us define $k = i - j$, with an increasing order, $k = 1, \dots, i$ (although k runs from i down to 1, when j goes from 0 to $i - 1$). Note that when $i = 0$, the inner sum is empty and contributes zero, so including $i = 0$ does not cause problems. The inner sum is a standard arithmetic series:

$$\sum_{k=1}^i k = 1 + 2 + \dots + (i - 1) + i = \frac{i(i + 1)}{2} \quad . \quad (\text{A8})$$

This formula can be rationalized by pairing the first and last term of the expansion, the second and second-to-last term, etc. There are $i/2$ such pairs, each giving $(i + 1)$. Substituting Equation A2 into Equation A1 gives

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^i |i - j| = 2 \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{i(i + 1)}{2} = \sum_{i=0}^n (i^2 + i) = \sum_{i=0}^n i^2 + \sum_{i=0}^n i \quad , \quad (\text{A9})$$

which reduces the original double sum to two well-known sums, one over the integers (see Equation A2), and one over their squares. A standard way to derive the latter is by using the identity obtained from expanding the differences of two consecutive cubes:

$$i^3 - (i - 1)^3 = 3i^2 - 3i + 1 \quad . \quad (\text{A10})$$

Summing both sides of Equation A4 from $i = 1$ to n gives:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n i^3 - \sum_{i=1}^n (i - 1)^3 = 3 \sum_{i=1}^n i^2 - 3 \sum_{i=1}^n i + \sum_{i=1}^n 1 \quad . \quad (\text{A11})$$

On the left-hand side, each term in the first sum is canceled by a term in the second sum, except for the very last term n^3 . Thus, only n^3 remains, and we obtain using the result from A2:

$$n^3 = 3 \sum_{i=1}^n i^2 - 3 \frac{n(n + 1)}{2} + n \quad . \quad (\text{A12})$$

Rearranging gives the closed form for the sum of squares:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n i^2 = \frac{1}{3} \left(n^3 + \frac{3n(n + 1)}{2} - n \right) = \frac{2n^3 + 3n^2 + n}{6} = \frac{n(2n^2 + 3n + 1)}{6} = \frac{n(n + 1)(2n + 1)}{6} \quad . \quad (\text{A13})$$

Finally, substituting the results from Equations A2 and A7 into Equation A1 gives the explicit result for the double sum:

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^i |i-j| = \sum_{i=0}^n i^2 + \sum_{i=0}^n i = \frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{6} + \frac{n(n+1)}{2} = \frac{n(n+1)(n+2)}{3}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Here, the outer sum is written from $i = 0$, as in Equations A1 and A3. This is equivalent to starting at $i = 1$ (as used in Equations A5–A7) because the $i = 0$ term is zero and does not change the result.