Hydrolyzable Polyureas Bearing Hindered Urea Bonds

Hanze Ying and Jianjun Cheng*

Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1304 West Green Street, Urbana, Illinois, 61801, USA

*Corresponding author: jianjunc@illinois.edu
Table of Contents

General
   Materials
   Instrumentation

Determinations of binding constants of hindered urea bonds
   Determination of binding constant of 2
   Figure S1. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1 and S2
   Figure S2. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1, S2, and S4
   Figure S3. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1, S4, and S6
   Determination of binding constant of 3
   Figure S4. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S7 and S2
   Figure S5. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S7, S2, and S4
   Figure S6. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S7, S4, and S6
   Determination of binding constant of 4
   Figure S7. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S10 and S6
   Figure S8. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S10, S6, and S12
   Figure S9. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S10, S12, and S14
   Determination of binding constant of 5
   Figure S10. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1, S6, and S12
   Figure S11. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1, S12, and S14

Determinations of dissociation rates of hindered urea bonds
   Figure S12. Dissociation rate of urea 2
   Figure S13. Dissociation rate of urea 3
   Figure S14. Dissociation rate of urea 4

S2
Figure S15. Dissociation rate of urea 5  
Determinations of hydrolysis kinetics of hindered urea bonds  
Figure S16. hydrolysis of urea 1  
Figure S17. hydrolysis of urea 2  
Figure S18. hydrolysis of urea 3  
Figure S19. hydrolysis of urea 4  
Figure S20. hydrolysis of urea 5  

Synthesis of hindered polyurea  
Figure S21. $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra of poly(6/9)  
Figure S22. $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra of poly(7/9)  
Figure S23. $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra of poly(8/10)  
Figure S24. $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra of poly(6/10)  
Figure S25. Thermo gravimetric analysis (TGA) of linear polymers.  
Figure S26. Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) of linear polymers.  

Water degradation of linear hindered polyurea  
Figure S27. Degradation of poly(6/9) by water  
Figure S28. Degradation of poly(7/9) by water  
Figure S29. Degradation of poly(8/10) by water  
Figure S30. Degradation of poly(6/10) by water  

Degradation of cross-linked hindered polyurea by water  
Degradation of hydrophobic cross-linked polyurea by water  
Degradation of hydrophilic cross-linked polyurea by water
General

Materials. Anhydrous dimethylformamide (DMF) was dried by a column packed with 4Å molecular sieves. m-Xylylene diisocyanate was purchased from TCI America (Portland, OR, USA) and used as received. Tri-functional homopolymer of hexamethylene diisocyanate (HDI) (Desmodur N3900, Bayer MaterialsScience) was obtained from Innovadex. All deuterated solvents were purchased from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories, Inc. and used as received. All other chemicals were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA) and used as received unless otherwise specified.

Instrumentation. NMR spectra were recorded on Varian U400 (400 MHz), U500 (500 MHz), VXR-500 (500 MHz), UI500NB (500 MHz) spectrometer. Gel permeation chromatography (GPC) experiments were performed on a system equipped with an isocratic pump (Model 1100, Agilent Technology, Santa Clara, CA, USA), a DAWN HELEOS multi-angle laser light scattering detector (MALLS detector, Wyatt Technology, Santa Barbara, CA, USA) and an Optilab rEX refractive index detector (Wyatt Technology, Santa Barbara, CA, USA). The detection wavelength of TREOS was set at 658 nm. Separations were performed using serially connected size exclusion columns (10² Å, 10³ Å, 10⁴ Å, 10⁵ Å and 10⁶ Å Phenogel columns, 5 µm, 300 × 7.8 mm, Phenomenex, Torrance, CA, USA) using DMF as the mobile phase.
Determination of binding constants of hindered urea bonds

\[ R_1R_2 \quad NCO + HN^+R_4 \quad K_{eq} \quad R_1R_2 \quad N \quad N \quad R_4 \]

isocyanate amine urea

If the binding constant of urea is large, it is difficult to determine the binding constant \( K_{eq} \) directly through the equilibrium concentrations of isocyanate, amine and urea species. The \( K_{eq} \) of the hindered urea bond increases with the decrease of the substituents bulkiness. To accurately determine the binding constants, we used an ‘indirect’ method through equilibrium reactions between different urea species. (All used CDCl\(_3\) as the solvent)

\[ K_1 \sim K_5 \text{ are mostly in the range that can all be accurately determined by } ^1H \text{ NMR, we could determine } K_{eq} \text{ by:} \]

\[ K_{eq} = K_1 \cdot K_2 \cdot K_3 \text{ (when } R_3=i-Bu, R_4=Et\text{) or } K_{eq} = K_1 \cdot K_2 \cdot K_3 \cdot K_4 \cdot K_5 \text{ (when } R_3=i-Pr, R_4=Et\text{)} \]
Determination of binding constant of urea 2 (Determination of binding constant of urea 1 with similar methods has been reported in ref. 19a in text)

Cyclohexylmethyl isocyanante (S1, 11.1 mg, 0.080 mmol) and 2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidine (S2, 8.0 mg, 0.056 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL). ¹H NMR spectra were collected 0.5 h after S1 and S2 were mixed at room temperature when equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S1). Concentration of each species was calculated based on the integral ratios of the ¹H NMR signals and the initial concentrations of S1 and S2. The equilibrium constants were calculated as $K_1 = [S3_{eq}] / ([S1]_{eq} \cdot [S2]_{eq})$.

Figure S1. ¹H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1 and S2. Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in cyclohexyl group. The spectrum was taken 30 min after
S1 and S2 were mixed. Binding constant $K_1$ was determined as

$$K_1 = \frac{[S_3]_{eq}}{([S_1]_{eq} \cdot [S_2]_{eq})} = 0.067 / (0.078 \times 0.036) \text{ M}^{-1} = 24 \text{ M}^{-1}$$
Cyclohexylmethyl isocyanate (S1, 10.0 mg, 0.072 mmol), 2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidine (S2, 9.5 mg, 0.067 mmol) and N-tertbutyl-N-isopropyl amine (S4, 6.8 mg, 0.059 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL) and added to the NMR tubes. ¹H NMR spectra were collected 12 h after mixing at room temperature after equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S2). The equilibrium constant of the reaction $K_2$ was calculated according to the concentration ratio of each species: $K_2 = ([S5]_{eq} \cdot [S2]_{eq})/([S3]_{eq} \cdot [S4]_{eq})$.

Figure S2. ¹H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1, S2, and S4 (and the produced compound S3, S5). Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in
cyclohexyl group. The spectrum was taken 12 h after mixing. The region containing peaks B, B’, F and F’ for the calculation of the concentration of each species is zoomed in.

\[ K_2 = ([S5]_{eq} \bullet [S2]_{eq}/([S3]_{eq} \bullet [S4]_{eq}) = 25. \]
Cyclohexylmethyl isocyanantate (S1, 10.2 mg, 0.073 mmol), N-tertbutyl-N-isopropyl amine (S4, 7.2 mg, 0.063 mmol) and N-tertbutyl-N-ethyl amine (S6, 6.7 mg, 0.066 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL) and added to the NMR tubes. ¹H NMR spectra were collected 12 h after mixing at room temperature after equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S3). The equilibrium constant of the reaction \( K_2 \) was calculated according to the concentration ratio of each species: \( K_3 = (\frac{[2]_{eq} \cdot [S4]_{eq}}{([S5]_{eq} \cdot [S6]_{eq})} \).

Figure S3. ¹H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1, S4, and S6 (and the produced compound S5, 2). Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in cyclohexyl group. The spectrum was taken 12 h after mixing. The region containing peaks C, C',
G and G’ for the calculation of the concentration of each species is zoomed in.

\[ K_3 = \frac{[2]_{eq} \cdot [S4]_{eq}}{[S5]_{eq} \cdot [S6]_{eq}} = 118. \]

So, for urea 2, \( K_{eq,2} = K_1 \cdot K_2 \cdot K_3 = 7.1 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1} \)
Determination of binding constant of urea

Benzyl isocyanante (S7, 11.1 mg, 0.083 mmol) and 2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidine (S2, 9.4 mg, 0.067 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL). ¹H NMR spectra were collected 0.5 h after S7 and S2 were mixed at room temperature when equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S4). Concentration of each species was calculated based on the integral ratios of the ¹H NMR signals and the initial concentrations of S7 and S2. The equilibrium constants were calculated as $K_1 = [S8]_{eq} / ([S7]_{eq} \cdot [S2]_{eq})$.

Figure S4. ¹H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S7 and S2. Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 30 min after S7 and S2 were mixed. Binding constant $K_1$ was determined as $K_1 = [S8]_{eq} / ([S7]_{eq} \cdot [S2]_{eq}) = 0.100 / (0.052 \times 0.021) \text{ M}^{-1} = 92 \text{ M}^{-1}$.
Benzyl isocyanate (S7, 11.9 mg, 0.089 mmol), 2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidine (S2, 8.5 mg, 0.060 mmol) and N-tertbutyl-N-isopropyl amine (S4, 6.0 mg, 0.052 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl3 (0.55 mL) and added to the NMR tubes. 1H NMR spectra were collected 12 h after mixing at room temperature after equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S5). The equilibrium constant of the reaction $K_2$ was calculated according to the concentration ratio of each species: $K_2 = ([S9]_{eq} \cdot [S2]_{eq}) / ([S8]_{eq} \cdot [S4]_{eq})$. 

![Diagram of chemical reactions and NMR spectra]
Figure S5. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S7, S2, and S4 (and the produced compound S8, S9). Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 12 h after mixing. The region containing peaks B, H, H’ and E’ for the calculation of the concentration of each species is zoomed in. $K_2 = ([S9]_{eq} \cdot [S2]_{eq}/([S8]_{eq} \cdot [S4]_{eq}) = 43.$
Benzyl isocyanante (S7, 10.7 mg, 0.080 mmol), N-tertbutyl-N-isopropyl amine (S4, 7.5 mg, 0.065 mmol) and N-tertbutyl-N-ethyl amine (S6, 7.9 mg, 0.078 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL) and added to the NMR tubes. ¹H NMR spectra were collected 12 h after mixing at room temperature after equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S6). The equilibrium constant of the reaction $K_3$ was calculated according to the concentration ratio of each species: $K_3 = ([3]_{eq} \cdot [S4]_{eq}) / ([S9]_{eq} \cdot [S6]_{eq})$.

Figure S6. ¹H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S7, S4, and S6 (and the produced compound S9, 3). Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 12
h after mixing. The region containing peaks C, C’, H and H’ for the calculation of the concentration of each species is zoomed in. \( K_1 = ([S_3]_{eq} \cdot [S_4]_{eq}) / ([S_9]_{eq} \cdot [S_6]_{eq}) = 140. \)

So, for urea 3, \( K_{eq,3} = K_1 \cdot K_2 \cdot K_3 = 5.5 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \)
Determination of binding constant of urea 4

3-Isopropenyl-α,α-dimethylenzyl isocyanate (S10, 14.0 mg, 0.069 mmol) and N-tertbutyl-N-ethyl amine (S6, 7.8 mg, 0.077 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL). ¹H NMR spectra were collected 0.5 h after S10 and S6 were mixed at room temperature when equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S7). Concentration of each species was calculated based on the integral ratios of the ¹H NMR signals and the initial concentrations of S10 and S6. The equilibrium constants were calculated as \[ K_{123} = \frac{[S11]_{\text{eq}}}{([S10]_{\text{eq}} \cdot [S6]_{\text{eq}})} \].

Figure S7. ¹H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S10 and S6. Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 0.5 h after S10 and S6 were mixed. Binding constant
$K_{1^*2^*3}$ was determined as $K_{1^*2^*3} = [S11]_{eq} / ([S10]_{eq} \cdot [S6]_{eq})$

$= 0.107 / (0.018 \times 0.033) \text{ M}^{-1} = 180 \text{ M}^{-1}$
3-Isopropenyl-α,α-dimethylenzyl isocyanate (S10, 14.1 mg, 0.070 mmol), N-tertbutyl-N-ethyl amine (S6, 14.3 mg, 0.142 mmol) and N-tertbutyl-N-methyl amine (S12, 8.9 mg, 0.102 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL) and added to the NMR tubes. ¹H NMR spectra were collected 15 d after mixing at room temperature after equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S8). The equilibrium constant of the reaction $K_4$ was calculated according to the concentration ratio of each species: $K_4 = ([S13]_{eq} \cdot [S6]_{eq}) / ([S11]_{eq} \cdot [S12]_{eq})$. 
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Figure S8. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S10, S6, and S12 (and the produced compound S11, S13). Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 15 d after mixing. The region containing peaks G, G’, J and J’ for the calculation of the concentration of each species is zoomed in. $K_1 = ([S_{13}]_{eq} \bullet [S_{6}]_{eq})/([S_{11}]_{eq} \bullet [S_{12}]_{eq}) = 6.8.$
3-Isopropenyl-α,α-dimethylbenzyl isocyanate (S10, 10.1 mg, 0.050 mmol), N-tertbutyl-N-methyl amine (S12, 8.0 mg, 0.092 mmol) and N-isopropyl-N-ethyl amine (S14, 8.3 mg, 0.095 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL) and added to the NMR tubes. ¹H NMR spectra were collected 15 d after mixing at room temperature after equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S9). The equilibrium constant of the reaction $K_5$ was calculated according to the concentration ratio of each species: $K_5 = ([4]_{eq} \cdot [S12]_{eq})/([S13]_{eq} \cdot [S14]_{eq})$. 
Figure S9. $^{1}$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S10, S12, and S14 (and the produced compound S13, 4). Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 15 d after mixing. Here, no peaks for S13 were observed. By integrating area of 2.83 ppm ~ 2.89 ppm where peak G for S13 should be, we have $K_s = ([4]_{eq} \cdot [S12]_{eq} / ([S13]_{eq} \cdot [S14]_{eq}) > 840.$

So, for urea 4, $K_{eq,4} = K_{eq,2+3} \cdot K_4 \cdot K_5 > 1.0 \times 10^6 \text{ M}^{-1}$
Determination of binding constant of urea 5

\[
\text{S1} + \text{S6} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{2} \quad K_{\text{eq}} = 7.1 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}
\]

We already have the binding constant for 2: \( K_{\text{eq,2}} = K_1 \cdot K_2 \cdot K_3 = 7.1 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1} \)

Cyclohexylmethyl isocyanate (S1, 14.1 mg, 0.101 mmol), N-tertbutyl-N-ethyl amine (S6, 11.3 mg, 0.112 mmol) and N-tertbutyl-N-methyl amine (S12, 8.1 mg, 0.093 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl\(_3\) (0.55 mL) and added to the NMR tubes. \(^1\)H NMR spectra were collected 15 d after mixing at room temperature after equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S10). The equilibrium constant of the reaction \( K_4 \) was calculated according to the concentration ratio of each species: \( K_4 = ([\text{S15}]_{\text{eq}} \cdot [\text{S6}]_{\text{eq}})/( [\text{2}]_{\text{eq}} \cdot [\text{S12}]_{\text{eq}}) \).
Figure S10. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1, S6, and S12 (and the produced compound 2, S15). Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in cyclohexyl group. The spectrum was taken 15 d after mixing. The region containing peaks C, C’, G and G’ for the calculation of the concentration of each species is zoomed in. $K_4 = ([S15]_{eq} \cdot [S6]_{eq} \cdot [2]_{eq} \cdot [S12]_{eq}) = 5.7$. 
Cyclohexylmethyl isocyanate (S1, 9.4 mg, 0.068 mmol), N-tertbutyl-N-methyl amine (S12, 7.2 mg, 0.083 mmol) and N-isopropyl-N-ethyl amine (S14, 8.1 mg, 0.093 mmol) were dissolved in CDCl₃ (0.55 mL) and added to the NMR tubes. ¹H NMR spectra were collected 41 d after mixing at room temperature after equilibrium was reached/peaks integral stopped changing (Figure S11). The equilibrium constant of the reaction $K_s$ was calculated according to the concentration ratio of each species: $K_s = ([5]_{eq} \cdot [S12]_{eq}) / ([S15]_{eq} \cdot [S14]_{eq})$.

Figure S11. ¹H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound S1, S12, and S14 (and the produced compound S15, 5). Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in cyclohexyl group. The spectrum was taken 41 d after mixing. Here, no peaks for S15 were
observed except for a very weak peak D as shown in zoomed in picture.

\[ K_5 = ([5]_{eq} \bullet [S12]_{eq}) / ([S15]_{eq} \bullet [S14]_{eq}) > 1130. \]

So, for urea 5, \( K_{eq,5} = K_{eq,2} \bullet K_4 \bullet K_5 > 1.0 \times 10^8 \text{ M}^{-1} \)
Determinations of dissociation rates of hindered urea bonds (Determination of dissociation rate of urea 1 with similar methods has been reported in ref. 18 in text)

The dissociation kinetics ($k_1$) of hindered urea compounds 2-5 were determined (Figure S12-15, respectively). To urea compounds were added butyl isocyanate to capture the released free amine. The rates of consumption of urea compounds were monitored by $^1$H NMR at 37 °C and dissociation rates were calculated based on those data. (All used CDCl$_3$ as the solvent)
Figure S12 Dissociation rate of urea 2. i) $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound 2 (6.2 mg, 0.026 mmol) and S16 (10.1 mg, 0.102 mmol, and the produced compound S1 and S17) in CDCl$_3$ (550 μL). The spectrum was taken 30 min after 2 and S16 were mixed at 37°C. Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in cyclohexyl group. ii) $^1$H NMR spectra showing exchange reaction between 2 and S16 at 37°C. The rate of consumption of 2 was used to
calculate the dissociation rate with the following equation: 

\[ k_1 = \frac{\ln \frac{[2]}{[2]_0}}{T} = -\frac{\ln 0.91}{0.5 \text{ h}} = 0.19 \text{ h}^{-1} \]

(T: reaction time, peak A’ used for the calculation overlapped with background noise in the same range, which has been deducted in the calculation)
Figure S13. Dissociation rate of urea 3. i) $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound 3 (7.4 mg, 0.032 mmol) and S16 (11.9 mg, 0.120 mmol, and the produced compound S7 and S17) in CDCl$_3$ (550 μL). The spectrum was taken 30 min after 3 and S16 were mixed at 37°C. Peaks are assigned to each compound. ii) $^1$H NMR spectra showing exchange reaction between 3 and
S16 at 37°C. The rate of consumption of 3 was used to calculate the dissociation rate with the following equation: 

\[ k_1 = -\frac{\ln [3]}{[3]_0} = -\frac{\ln 0.91}{0.5 \text{ h}} = 0.19 \text{ h}^{-1} \] (T: reaction time)
Figure S14. Dissociation rate of urea 4. i) $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound 4 (8.3 mg, 0.029 mmol) and S16 (9.6 mg, 0.097 mmol, and the produced compound S10 and S17) in CDCl$_3$ (550 μL). The spectrum was taken 16 h after 4 and S16 were mixed at 37°C. Peaks are assigned to each compound. ii) $^1$H NMR spectra showing exchange reaction between 4 and S16 at 37°C. The rate of consumption of 4 was used to calculate the dissociation rate with the following equation: 

$$k_d = -\frac{\ln [4]}{T} = -\frac{\ln 0.88}{16 \text{ h}} = 0.008 \text{ h}^{-1} \quad (T: \text{reaction time})$$
Figure S15. Dissociation rate of urea 5. i) $^1$H NMR spectrum of the mixture of compound 5 (6.4 mg, 0.028 mmol) and S16 (8.3 mg, 0.084 mmol, and the produced compound S1 and S17) in
CDCl₃ (550 µL). The spectrum was taken 250 h after 5 and S₁₆ were mixed at 37°C. Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in cyclohexyl group. ii) ¹H NMR spectra showing exchange reaction between 5 and S₁₆ at 37°C. The rate of consumption of 5 was used to calculate the dissociation rate with the following equation: 

\[
k_{-1} = - \frac{\ln \left[ \frac{[5]}{[5]_0} \right]}{T} = - \frac{\ln 0.79}{250 \text{ h}} = 0.0009 \text{ h}^{-1}
\]

(T: reaction time)
Determination of hydrolysis kinetics of hindered urea bonds

We compared the hydrolysis kinetics of urea 1-5 by comparing the percentage of hydrolysis after 24 h at 37 °C environment. Urea 1-5 were dissolved in mixture of d6-DMSO and D₂O (v(d₆-DMSO):v(D₂O)=5:1) with concentration of 0.1 M. After incubation at 37 °C for 24 h, ¹H NMR spectra were collected to characterize the percentage of hydrolysis (through the ratio of produced amine and original urea).
Figure S16. Hydrolysis of urea 1. Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 24 h after dissolving in mixture of d6-DMSO and D2O (v(d6-DMSO):v(D2O)=5:1) at 37 °C. The region containing peaks G, G’ for the calculation of the percentage of hydrolysis is zoomed in. The percentage of hydrolysis was determined as 58%.
Figure S17. Hydrolysis of urea 2. Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in cyclohexyl group. The spectrum was taken 24 h after dissolving in mixture of d6-DMSO and D2O (v(d6-DMSO):v(D2O)=5:1) at 37 °C. The region containing peaks C, C’ for the calculation of the percentage of hydrolysis is zoomed in. The percentage of hydrolysis was determined as 85%.
Figure S18. Hydrolysis of urea 3. Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 24 h after dissolving in mixture of d6-DMSO and D2O (v(d6-DMSO):v(D2O)=5:1) at 37 °C. The region containing peaks D, D’ for the calculation of the percentage of hydrolysis is zoomed in. The percentage of hydrolysis was determined as 55%.
Figure S19. Hydrolysis of urea 4. Peaks are assigned to each compound. The spectrum was taken 24 h after dissolving in mixture of d6-DMSO and D2O (v(d6-DMSO):v(D2O)=5:1) at 37 °C. The region containing peaks F, F’ for the calculation of the percentage of hydrolysis is zoomed in. The percentage of hydrolysis was determined as 10%.
Figure S20. Hydrolysis of urea 5. Peaks are assigned to each compound except for the protons in cyclohexyl group. The spectrum was taken 24 h after dissolving in mixture of d6-DMSO and D$_2$O (v(d$_6$-DMSO):v(D$_2$O)=5:1) at 37 °C. No detectable hydrolysis was observed.
Synthesis of hindered polyurea

**Synthesis of polymer (poly(6/9))**: Equal molar 1,3-bis(isocyanatomethyl)cyclohexane (6, 1.94 g, 10.0 mmol) and N,N'-di-tert-butylethylene-diamine (9, 1.72 g, 10.0 mmol) were dissolved in DMF (10 g). The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight vigorously. The polymer solution was directly used for GPC characterization and degradation study. Equal molar of 6 (0.194 g, 1.0 mmol) and 9 (0.172 g, 1.0 mmol) were mixed in CDCl₃ (1.0g). The solution was stirred at room temperature overnight vigorously, diluted by a factor of 10, and directly characterized by NMR without purification. Polymer solution in DMF was precipitated by ether (100 mL × 3). The white solid was collected by centrifuge and dried by vacuum oven overnight (yield: 90%, Mn = 22K, PDI = 1.55). The obtained solid was used for TGA and DSC characterizations.

**Synthesis of polymer (poly(7/9))**: Equal molar m-xylene diisocyanate (7, 1.88 g, 10.0 mmol) and N,N'-di-tert-butylethylene-diamine (9, 1.72 g, 10.0 mmol) were dissolved in DMF (10 g). The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight vigorously. The polymer solution was directly used for GPC characterization and degradation study. Equal molar of 7 (0.188 g, 1.0 mmol) and 9 (0.172 g, 1.0 mmol) were mixed in CDCl₃ (1.0g). The solution was stirred at room temperature overnight vigorously, diluted by a factor of 10, and directly characterized by NMR without purification. Polymer solution in DMF was precipitated by ether (100 mL × 3). The white solid was collected by centrifuge and dried by vacuum oven overnight (yield: 92%, Mn = 22K, PDI = 1.33). The obtained solid was used for TGA and DSC characterizations.
Synthesis of polymer (poly(8/10)): Equal molar 1,3-Bis(1-isocyanato-1-methylethyl)benzene (8, 2.44 g, 10.0 mmol) and N,N'-di-iso-propylene-diamine (10, 1.44 g, 10.0 mmol) were dissolved in DMF (10 g). The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight vigorously. The polymer solution was directly used for GPC characterization and degradation study. Equal molar of 8 (0.244 g, 1.0 mmol) and 10 (0.144 g, 1.0 mmol) were mixed in CDCl₃ (1.0g). The solution was stirred at room temperature overnight vigorously, diluted by a factor of 10, and directly characterized by NMR without purification. Polymer solution in DMF was precipitated by ether (100 mL × 3). The white solid was collected by centrifuge and dried by vacuum oven overnight (yield: 87%, Mn = 44K, PDI = 1.45). The obtained solid was used for TGA and DSC characterizations.

Synthesis of polymer (poly(6/10)): Equal molar 1,3-bis(isocyanatomethyl)cyclohexane (6, 1.94 g, 10.0 mmol) and N,N'-di-iso-propylene-diamine (10, 1.44 g, 10.0 mmol) were dissolved in DMF (10 g). The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight vigorously. The polymer solution was directly used for GPC characterization and degradation study. Equal molar of 6 (0.194 g, 1.0 mmol) and 10 (0.144 g, 1.0 mmol) were mixed in CDCl₃ (1.0g). The solution was stirred at room temperature overnight vigorously, diluted by a factor of 10, and directly characterized by NMR without purification. Polymer solution in DMF was precipitated by ether (100 mL × 3). The white solid was collected by centrifuge and dried by vacuum oven overnight (yield: 95%, Mn = 120K, PDI = 1.72). The obtained solid was used for TGA and DSC characterizations.
Figure S21. $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra of poly(6/9)
Figure S22. $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra of poly(7/9)
Figure S23. $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra of poly(8/10)
Figure S24. $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra of poly(6/10)
Figure S25. Thermo gravimetric analysis (TGA) of linear polymers.
Figure S26. Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) of linear polymers. Second heating curve from -50 °C to 175 °C were shown.
Water degradation of linear hindered polyurea

To 500 µL as prepared DMF solution of each polymer (see page S38-39), 25 µL water was added. The mixture was incubated at 37 °C with vigorous stirring. Samples were taken out at different time intervals for monitoring of molecular weight change by GPC.
Figure S27. Water degradation of poly(6/9). GPC curves from light scattering detector showing water degradation of poly(6/9) after incubation in DMF (containing 5% water) at 37 °C for variant time intervals.
Figure S28. Water degradation of poly(7/9). GPC curves from light scattering detector showing water degradation of poly(7/9) after incubation in DMF (containing 5% water) at 37 °C for variant time intervals.
Figure S29. Water degradation of poly(8/10). GPC curves from light scattering detector showing water degradation of poly(8/10) after incubation in DMF (containing 5% water) at 37 °C for variant time intervals.
Figure S30. Water degradation of poly(6/10). GPC curves from light scattering detector showing water degradation of poly(6/10) after incubation in DMF (containing 5% water) at 37 °C for variant time intervals.
Water degradation of cross-linked hindered polyurea

Water degradation of hydrophobic cross-linked hindered polyurea. Tri-functional homopolymer of hexamethylene diisocyanate (11, 100 mg, 0.198 mmol) was dissolved in DMF (650 µL). A solution of N,N'-di-tert-butylethylene-diamine (9, 51.4 mg, 0.299 mmol) in DMF (205 µL) and water (50 µL) was added. The mixture was homogenized for 5 s and let sit for 1 min at room temperature for gelation to happen. After that, the gel was incubated at 37 °C for degradation study.

Water degradation of hydrophilic cross-linked hindered polyurea. Poly(ethylene glycol) methyl ether methacrylate (12, 4.13 g, 8.26 mmol), 2-Isocyanatoethyl methacrylate (S23, 128 mg, 0.826 mmol), N,N'-di-tert-butylethylene-diamine (9, 71.2 mg, 0.413 mmol) and 2-Hydroxy-4′-(2-hydroxyethoxy)-2-methylpropiophenone (S24, 40 mg, dissolved in 40 µL DMSO) were mixed and irradiated by UV (365 nm, 40 mW/cm²) for 15 min to yield cross-linked polymer G1. G1 was divided and transferred into 15 mL centrifuge tubes with each one containing 300 mg polymer. Polymer was first immersed in deionized water for 12 h at 37 °C to remove all the unreacted monomers, solvent and photo initiator. After that the tubes were filled with PBS and incubated at 37 °C to start water degradation study. At different time point, samples were taken out and washed with deionized water for 3 times and weighed after drying by lyophilization. Degree of weight loss was used to characterize the degradation kinetics. The experiments were repeated in triplicate. As negative control, N,N'-di-iso-propylethylene-diamine (10, 59.5 mg, 0.413 mmol) instead of N,N'-di-tert-butylethylene-diamine were used to synthesize cross-linked polymer G2. Water degradations of G2 were characterized with the same procedures.