Thermodynamics of the System $InCl_3$-HCl-H_2O AT 25°C[1]

Kenneth S. Pitzer,[2,4] Rabindra N. Roy,[3] and Peiming Wang[2]

---

[1] Paper presented at the Thirteenth Symposium on Thermophysical Properties, June 22-27, 1997, Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.

[2] Department of Chemistry and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, U.S.A.

[3] Hoffman Department of Chemistry, Drury College, Springfield, Missouri 65802, U.S.A.

[4] To whom correspondence should be addressed.

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive equation for the thermodynamic properties of the system $InCl_3$-HCl-H_2O at 25° C in the ion-interaction (Pitzer) equation form is generated on the basis of a very recent and comprehensive array of electrochemical cell measurements of the HCl activity, together with older published measurements of the activity of $InCl_3$ in mixtures with 0.02 molal HCl. Alternate equations with and without explicit consideration of the ion pair $InCl^{2+}$ as a separate species are tested. Excellent agreement is obtained on either formulation between calculated and measured activities, although considerable uncertainty remains concerning the standard potential for the In electrode.

KEY WORDS: aqueous electrolytes, equation of state, indium chloride, Pitzer equation, thermodynamic properties.

INTRODUCTION

Aqueous $InCl_3$ differs markedly from other M^{3+}-Cl^- systems such as $AlCl_3$, $LaCl_3$, etc., in that In^{3+} has a strong association with Cl^- to $InCl^{2+}$ and a very strong tendency to hydrolyze to $InOH^{2+}$. Also, if solid indium is present, possibly as an electrode, the reduction reaction forming In^+ must be considered. Thus, the thermodynamics of the In^{+3}, Cl^-, H_2O system is both interesting and challenging.

By making measurements on the system $InCl_3$-HCl-H_2O the hydrolysis can be controlled or eliminated. Measurements were made and have been reported recently [1] for the electrochemical cell:

$$Pt,H_2\ HCl(m_A),\ InCl_3(m_B),\ H_2O|AgCl,Ag \qquad (a)$$

Published [2,3] values are available for the cell:

$$In(s)|HCl(m_A),\ InCl_3(m_B),\ H_2O|AgCl,Ag \qquad (b)$$

The present paper presents an analysis of all of these results in terms of the ion-interaction (Pitzer) equations [4,5]. Since the data for cell (b) extend only to an ionic strength, 0.33 mol kg^{-1}, the present equation has limitations for some properties outside of this range, but its refinement is straightforward when cell (b) is measured at larger molality. And the present range is sufficient to show clearly the tendency toward ion association to $InCl^{2+}$.

$$In^{3+} + Cl^- = InCl^{2+} \qquad (I)$$

The results for cell (b) at the lowest molality are examined for possible deviation arising from the reaction

$$In^{3+} + 2In(s) = 3In^+ \qquad (II)$$

Equilibrium constant values [6,7] reported for the hydrolysis reaction (III)

$$In^{3+} + H_2O = InOH^{2+} + H^+ \qquad \text{(III)}$$

and for the association reaction (I) are considered in the calculations. Conductance data [8] are also considered and are found to be generally consistent with respect both to ion-association and to hydrolysis effects.

EQUATIONS

The ion-interaction equations for a multisolute system as first proposed in l974 [4b] and widely used since [5] are adopted. But the exact form to represent the association to $InCl^{2+}$ must be considered. If the maximum degree of association is moderate, the method [4c] used for $MgSO_4$ and other +2 sulfates is simple; hence, it was tested and found to be satisfactory. No separate species is introduced but a specially designed binary interaction term is added.

The association is so strong, however, that it seemed worthwhile to make an alternate calculation with $InCl^{2+}$ as an explicit species and an equilibrium constant K for formation in reaction (I). This pattern has been used for the HSO_4^- ion, along with H^+ and $SO_4^=$ in various treatments [9,10]. For the present system, this introduces ion-interaction terms that can indicate the amount of further association to $InCl_2^+$. Thus, the results of this alternate formulation indicate more clearly the actual proportions of In^{3+}, $InCl^{2+}$, and $InCl_2^+$ present at various compositions. But the equations and calculations including the separate $InCl^{2+}$ species are much more complex; they will be presented in detail in a separate paper [11]. Only a summary of the results can be included here.

Formulation I without $InCl^{2+}$ as a separate species. For this calculation, the composition is expressed in terms of the unassociated ionic strength and ionic-strength fractions as follows:

$$m_A = m(HCl), \qquad m_B = m(InCl_3), \qquad I = m_A + 6m_B \tag{1a}$$

$$Y_A = m_A/I, \qquad Y_B = 6m_B/I \tag{1b}$$

The complete equations for $\ln\gamma_{HCl}$ and $\ln\gamma_{InCl_3}$ are given in Eqs. (2) and (3).

$$\begin{aligned}\ln\gamma_{HCl} = \ln\gamma(H^+,Cl^-) = f^\gamma &+ \frac{m_H m_{Cl}}{I}\left[\exp(-x_1) - g(x_1)\right]\beta^{(1)}_{H,Cl} + (m_H + m_{Cl})\left[\beta^{(0)}_{H,Cl} + \beta^{(1)}_{H,Cl}\, g(x_1)\right] \\ &+ [(m_H m_{Cl} + \frac{Z}{2}(m_H + m_{Cl})]\, C_{H,Cl} + m_{In}(\beta^{(0)}_{In,Cl} + {}^S\theta_{In,H} + {}^E\theta_{In,H} + m_H\, {}^E\theta_{In,H}) \\ &+ \left\{\frac{m_{In} m_{Cl}}{I}\left[\exp(-x_1) - g(x_1)\right] + m_{In} g(x_1)\right\}\beta^{(1)}_{In,Cl} \\ &+ \left\{\frac{m_{In} m_{Cl}}{I}\left[\exp(-x_2) - g(x_2)\right] + m_{In} g(x_2)\right\}\beta^{(2)}_{In,Cl} + m_{In}\left[\left(m_{Cl} + \frac{Z}{2}\right) C_{In,Cl} + \frac{1}{2}(m_H + m_{Cl})\psi_{In,H,Cl}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\ln\gamma_{InCl_3} = \ln\gamma(In^{3+}, 3Cl^-) = 3f^\gamma &+ \frac{3m_H m_{Cl}}{I}\left[\exp(-x_1) - g(x_1)\right]\beta^{(1)}_{H,Cl} + \frac{3m_H}{2}\left[\beta^{(0)}_{H,Cl} + \beta^{(1)}_{H,Cl}\, g(x_1)\right] \\ &+ \frac{3m_H}{4}(2m_{Cl} + Z)\, C_{H,Cl} + \frac{1}{2}(3m_{In} + m_{Cl})\,\beta^{(0)}_{In,Cl} \\ &+ \left\{\frac{3m_{In} m_{Cl}}{I}\left[\exp(-x_1) - g(x_1)\right] + \frac{1}{2}(3m_{In} + m_{Cl})\, g(x_1)\right\}\beta^{(1)}_{In,Cl}\end{aligned}$$

$$+\left\{\frac{3m_{In}m_{Cl}}{I}\left[\exp(-x_2)-g(x_2)\right]+\frac{1}{2}(3m_{In}+m_{Cl})g(x_2)\right\}\beta^{(2)}_{In,Cl}$$

$$+\frac{1}{4}(6m_{In}m_{Cl}+3Zm_{In}+Zm_{Cl})C_{In,Cl}+3m_{In}m_H\,{}^E\theta_{In,H}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}m_H({}^s\theta_{In,H}+{}^E\theta_{In,H})+\frac{1}{4}m_H(3m_{In}+m_{Cl})\psi_{In,H,Cl} \qquad (3)$$

$$f^{\gamma}=-A_{\Phi}\left[\frac{I^{1/2}}{1+bI^{1/2}}+\frac{2}{b}\ln(1+bI^{1/2})\right] \qquad (4a)$$

$$g(x)=\frac{2}{x^2}[1-(1+x)\exp(-x)] \qquad (4b)$$

$$x_1=\alpha_1 I^{1/2}, \qquad x_2=\alpha_2 I^{1/2} \qquad (4c)$$

$$m_H=m_A=IY_A, \qquad m_{In}=m_B=IY_B/6 \qquad (4d)$$

$$m_{Cl}=m_A+3m_B=I(1-Y_B/2) \qquad (4e)$$

$$Z=3m_{In}+m_H+m_{Cl}=I(2-Y_B) \qquad (4f)$$

The terms in $\beta^{(0)}_{In,Cl}$, $\beta^{(1)}_{In,Cl}$, ${}^s\theta_{In,H}$, $C_{In,Cl}$, and $\psi_{In,H,Cl}$ are the usual 2nd and 3rd order interaction terms between the indicated ions and need no further comment. The term in $\beta^{(2)}_{In,Cl}$ is the special term representing approximately the partial association to $InCl^{2+}$.

In Eqs. (2) and (3), ${}^E\theta_{ij}(I)$ and ${}^E\theta_{ij}(I)$ are the theoretical electrostatic functions for the unsymmetrical mixing [4d,5] and depend only on the charges of the ions I and j, the

total ionic strength, and the solvent properties. The parameter b has its universal value 1.2. The parameter α_1 retains the standard value 2.0 for HCl, of course. For $InCl_3$ alternate values were tested for α_1 and α_2. The best fit was obtained for the standard 2.0 for α_1 and 7.0 for α_2. These last values differ from the 1.4 and 12 selected for the 2-2 electrolytes but a difference between 3-1 and 2-2 electrolytes is reasonable.

The Nernst equation then represents the relationship between the EMF of cell (a), E_a, and the activity coefficient of HCl in the presence of indium chloride, and between the EMF of cell (b), E_b, and activity coefficient of $InCl_3$ in the presence of HCl.

$$E_a = E_a^0 - \frac{2RT}{F}\ln\gamma_{HCl} - \frac{RT}{F}\ln\left[m_H m_{Cl}\right] \tag{5}$$

$$E_b = E_b^0 - \frac{4RT}{3F}\ln\gamma_{InCl_3} - \frac{RT}{3F}\ln\left[m_{In} m_{Cl}^3\right] \tag{6}$$

where E_a^0 and E_b^0 are the standard potentials of cell (a) and cell (b), respectively, with F the Faraday constant.

The parameters for HCl, $\beta_{H,Cl}^{(0)}$, $\beta_{H,Cl}^{(1)}$, $C_{H,Cl}$, and E_a^0 were taken from the previous work [1,4,5]. The adjustable parameters are $\beta_{In,Cl}^{(0)}$, $\beta_{In,Cl}^{(1)}$, $\beta_{In,Cl}^{(2)}$, ${}^s\theta_{In,H}$, $C_{In,Cl}$, $\psi_{In,H,Cl}$, and E_b^0.

EXPERIMENTAL DATA AND PARAMETER EVALUATION

In general, measurements [2,3] of cell (b) with the indium electrode are subject to uncertainty from spontaneous reaction of indium metal with water. This was examined carefully by Hampson and Piercy [3], who found that their addition of 0.02 mol kg^{-1} of

HCl was adequate to yield good results. Also, their data agree very well with the earlier measurements of Hakomori [2]. But all of these results are for a single molality of HCl, 0.02 mol kg^{-1}. Thus, it is impossible to evaluate the five binary parameters, $\beta^{(0)}$, $\beta^{(1)}$, $\beta^{(2)}$, θ, E_b^0 from their data. At their maximum ionic strength of 0.33 mol kg^{-1}, $m_B = 0.0527$, the tertiary parameters are presumably negligible. Hakomori's estimate of 558 mV for E_b is reasonable with an uncertainty of a few mV, but nothing further can be determined.

The measurements of Roy et al. [1] for cell (a) are very extensive and range from 0.05 to 3.5 in I and 0.0 to 0.9 in Y_B. Taken alone they yield values for most parameters. But for cell (a) the composition dependence of $\beta^{(0)}_{In,Cl}$ and ${}^s\theta_{In,H}$ is the same; hence, only the combination $\left({}^S\theta_{In,H} + \beta^{(0)}_{In,Cl}\right)$ can be obtained. Also, there is so little difference in the composition dependency in Eq. (2) for $\psi_{H,In,Cl}$ and $C_{In,Cl}$ that their separate evaluation is not possible. And obviously, cell (a) cannot yield E_b^0.

Statistical adjustment of all parameters in Formulation I to fit simultaneously the data from all three sources yields the parameters in Table I. Figure 1 compares the calculated E_b values for cell (b) with the experimental values. The agreement is good. The large negative value of $\beta^{(2)} = -68.5$ indicates strong association to $InCl^{2+}$. The value for the standard potential E_b^0 is $559._5$ mV; it is uncertain in that there is a substantial implied extrapolation of ionic strength from 0.02 to zero. This is discussed below.

The comparison with the numerous cell (a) measurements is shown in Fig. 2 as calculated curves and experimental points. Again, the agreement is good with most deviations less than 1 mV and a maximum deviation of 1.7 mV. Now the redundancy

between $\beta^{(0)}_{In,Cl}$ and $\theta_{H,In}$ is broken and the separate values are well determined. For the third virial parameters $C_{In,Cl}$ and $\psi_{In,H,Cl}$, however, the uncertainty remains large since the only measurements from cell (b) are at very low ionic strength. As seen in Table I, each of these third-order parameters is small. And if one is removed from the equation and the remaining parameters optimized, the overall statistical error is not increased significantly. Indeed, a reasonably good fit is obtained without either of these parameters. Thus, the three-particle-interaction parameters involving In^{3+} remain essentially unknown pending measurements on cell (b) at higher ionic strength.

From the large, negative value of $\beta^{(2)}$ it is clear that the association in reaction (I) is so great that alternate calculations should be made in which $InCl^{2+}$ is recognized as an additional species. The equations now become much more complex and a full description cannot be included here. Such calculations have been made (Formulation II), and will be reported elsewhere [11] in detail. It is interesting to note here the results for the extreme case of complete association to $InCl^{2+}$, Formulation III. These are shown as the dashed curves on Figs. 1 and 2. The agreement in Fig. 1 for cell (b) (In electrode) is even better than for Formulation I, while the agreement in Fig. 2 for cell (a) (H_2 electrode) is not quite as good. But the agreement is good for both extreme cases and, as expected, also for any large but finite value of the association constant.

The standard potential for cell (b) for Formulation I is $559._5$ mV which yields $336._9$ mV for the In,I^{3+} electrode. While these values are reasonable, the uncertainty is large. Formulation II treatments with finite association constants yield values lower by several mV. One can only conclude at this point that the cell (b) potential is in the range 550-560

mV.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Engineering and Geosciences of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.

REFERENCES

1. L. N. Roy, T. M. Beasley, K. M. Kuhler, J. K. Bice, W. S. Good, R. N. Roy, and K. S. Pitzer, *J. Solution Chem*. **25**: 1241 (1996).
2. S. Hakomori, *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. **52**: 2372 (1930).
3. N. A. Hampson and R. Piercy, *J. Electroanal. Chem*. **51**: 91 (1974).
4. (a) K. S. Pitzer, *J. Phys. Chem*. **77**: 268 (1973); (b) K. S. Pitzer and J. J. Kim, *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. **96**: 5701 (1974); (c) K. S. Pitzer and G. Mayorga, *J. Solution Chem*. **3**:539 (1974); (d) K. S. Pitzer, *J. Solution Chem*. **4**:249 (1975).
5. K. S. Pitzer, in *Activity Coefficients in Electrolyte Solutions*, 2nd Edition, K. S. Pitzer, ed. (CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 1991), pp. 75-153.
6. L. G. Hepler and Z. Z. Hugus, Jr., *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. **74**: 6115 (1952).
7. T. Moeller, *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. **63**: 1206 (1941).
8. A. N. Campbell, *Can. J. Chem*. **51**: 3006 (1973).
9. K. S. Pitzer, R. N. Roy, and L. F. Silvester, *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. **99**: 4930 (1977).
10. S. L. Clegg, J. A. Rard, and K. S. Pitzer, *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans*. **90**: 1875 (1994).
11. K. S. Pitzer, R. N. Roy, and P. Wang, *J. Phys. Chem*. (in press).

Table I. Ion-Interaction Parameters for Formulation I in Eqs. (2) and (3)

$\beta^{(0)}_{HCl}$/kg.mol^{-1}	0.1775[a]	$\beta^{(0)}_{InCl}$/kg.mol^{-1}	-2.813
$\beta^{(1)}_{InCl}$/kg.mol^{-1}	0.2945[a]	$\beta^{(1)}_{InCl}$/kg.mol^{-1}	9.077
		$\beta^{(2)}_{InCl}$/kg.mol^{-1}	-68.51
		${}^{S}\theta_{InH}$/kg.mol^{-1}	2.150
C_{HCl}/kg^{2}.mol^{-2}	0.0004[a]	C_{InCl}/kg^{2}.mol^{-2}	0.051
		ψ_{InHCl}/kg^{2}.mol^{-2}	0.094

[a] From reference 5.



Fig. 1. Comparison of the experimental EMF values for cell (b), symbols, with the calculated curves, continuous and dashed for Formulations I and III, respectively.



Fig. 2. The same for cell (a) at various ionic strengths, I, and ionic strength fractions of $InCl_3$, Y_B.