

AD No. 13646
ASTIA FILE COPY

TECHNICAL REPORT
to the
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

TECHNICAL REPORT
NO. 10
PROJECT NR 051-258

THEORY OF ELECTROLYSIS AT CONSTANT CURRENT WITH PARTIAL OR
TOTAL CONTROL BY DIFFUSION-
APPLICATION TO THE STUDY OF COMPLEX IONS

by

PAUL DELAHAY AND TALLIVALDIS BERZINS

DECEMBER 1952
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
BATON ROUGE 3, LOUISIANA

DISTRIBUTION LIST : Q. TECHNICAL REPORTS

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Addressee</u>
1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 150 Causeway Street Boston, Massachusetts
2	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office The John Crerar Library Building 86 E. Randolph Street Tenth Floor Chicago 1, Illinois
1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, New York
1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1000 Geary Street San Francisco 9, California
1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 N. Green Street Pasadena 1, California
2	Officer-in-Charge Office of Naval Research Branch Office Navy Number 100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York
9	Director, Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C. Attention: Technical Information Officer
4	Chief of Naval Research Office of Naval Research Washington 25, D. C. Attention: Chemistry Branch
1	Research and Development Board Pentagon, Room 3D1041 Washington 25, D. C. Attention: Technical Reference Section
1	Dr. Ralph G. H. Siu, Research Director General Laboratories, Q1 Depot 2800 S. 20th Street Philadelphia 45, Pennsylvania

No. of CopiesAddressee

1	Dr. Warren Stubblebine, Research Director Chemical & Plastics Section, RDB-MPD Quartermaster General's Office Washington 25, D. C.
1	Dr. A. Stuart Hunter, Tech. Director Research and Development Branch MPD Quartermaster General's Office Washington 25, D. C.
1	Dr. A. G. Horney Wright Air Development Center Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio Attention: WRRS-4
1	Dr. A. Weisaler Department of the Army Office of the Chief of Ordnance Washington 25, D. C. Attn: CRDTB-PS
1	Research and Development Group Logistics Division, General Staff Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Dr. W. T. Read, Scientific Adviser
2	Director, Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C. Attention: Chemistry Division
2	Chief of the Bureau of Ships Navy Department Washington 25, D. C. Attention: Code 340
2	Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics Navy Department Washington 25, D. C. Attention: Code TD-4
2	Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance Navy Department Washington 25, D. C. Attention: Code Rexd
4	Mr. J. E. Heald Library of Congress Navy Research Section Washington 25, D. C.

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR TECHNICAL REPORTS

Page 111

No. of CopiesAddressee

1	Dr. H. A. Zahl, Tech. Director Signal Corps Engineering Laboratories Fort Monmouth, New Jersey
1	U. S. Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory San Francisco 24, California Attention: Technical Library
1	Naval Ordnance Test Station (Inyokern) China Lake, California Attention: Head, Chemistry Division
1	Office of Ordnance Research 2127 Myrtle Drive Durham, North Carolina
1	Technical Command Chemical Corps Chemical Center, Maryland
1	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Research Division Washington 25, D. C.
1	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Chemistry Division Brookhaven National Laboratory Upton, New York
1	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Library Branch, Tech. Information CRE P. O. Box E. Oak Ridge, Tennessee
1	Dr. A. E. Remick Department of Chemistry Wayne University Detroit 1, Michigan
1	Dr. Frank Hovorka Department of Chemistry Western Reserve University Cleveland 6, Ohio
1	Dr. David C. Grahame Department of Chemistry Amherst College Amherst, Massachusetts

DISTRIBUTION LIST FG. TECHNICAL REPORTS

Page iv

No. of CopiesAddressee

1	Dr. P. J. Elving Department of Chemistry University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan
1	Dr. N. H. Furman Department of Chemistry Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey
1	Dr. I. M. Kolthoff Department of Chemistry University of Minnesota Minneapolis 14, Minnesota
1	Dr. H. A. Laitinen Department of Chemistry University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois
1	Dr. Louis Meites Department of Chemistry Yale University New Haven, Connecticut
1	Dr. O. H. Müller Department of Physiology Syracuse University Syracuse, New York
1	Dr. Pierre Van Rysselberghe Department of Chemistry University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon
1	Dr. Stanley Wawzonek Department of Chemistry State University of Iowa Iowa City, Iowa
1	Dr. J. J. Lingane Department of Chemistry Harvard University Cambridge 38, Massachusetts
1	Dr. Leon O. Morgan Department of Chemistry University of Texas Austin, Texas

ABSTRACT

A mathematical analysis is made for the potential-time curves which are observed in electrolysis at constant current with mass transfer partially or totally controlled by semi-infinite linear diffusion. Three cases are considered: 1. Reversible electrochemical process; 2. Irreversible electrochemical process; 3. Electrochemical process preceded by a first order chemical reaction. The potential-time curves are characterized by a transition time whose value is derived for the above three cases. The transition time for given conditions of electrolysis is the same whether the electrode process is reversible or irreversible (cases 1 and 2). In the third case mentioned above, the transition time depends on the kinetics of the reaction preceding the electrochemical process. Conditions under which the theoretical treatment can be applied to the reduction of complex ions are stated. It is shown that for certain complexes (cadmium cyanide) dissociation must precede the electrochemical reaction, whereas other complexes (copper ethylenediamine) are reduced directly. The rate of recombination of Cd^{++} and CN^- ions is evaluated as being of the order of 4×10^9 (moles per lit.)⁻¹ sec.⁻¹ Experimental methods are briefly discussed, and the potentialities of the method as a tool in electrochemical studies are evaluated.

Electrolysis at constant current density with mass transfer partially or totally controlled by diffusion has been studied for many years. Early investigations ¹⁻⁴ were concerned with the verification of Fick's laws of diffusion, but more recent work ⁵⁻⁸ has been oriented toward the study of electrode processes and toward analytical applications. Recently, Gierst and Juliard ^{7, 8} developed a very ingenious method for the

- (1) H. F. Weber, Wied. Ann., **7**, 536 (1879).
 - (2) H.J.S. Sand, Phil. Mag., **1**, 45 (1901).
 - (3) F.G. Cottrell, Z. physik. Chem., **42**, 385 (1902).
 - (4) Z. Karaoglanoff, Z. Elektrochem., **12**, 5 (1906).
 - (5) J.A.V. Butler and G. Armstrong, Proc. Roy. Soc., **139 A**, 406 (1933);
Trans. Faraday Soc., **30**, 1173 (1934).
 - (6) For a survey see "Electrical Phenomena at Interfaces", J.A.V. Butler, Editor, Methuen and Company, London, 1951, Chapters VIII and IX.
 - (7) L. Gierst and A. Juliard, "Proceedings of the 2nd Meeting of the International Committee of Electrochemical Thermodynamics and Kinetics", 1950, Tamburini, Milan, pp.117 and 279.
 - (8) L. Gierst, Thesis, University of Brussels, 1952. We are indebted to Dr. Gierst for sending us a copy of his thesis.
-

oscillographic recording of voltage-time curves. These authors made some very interesting observations on electrode processes, and their study brought to light some of the potentialities of electrolysis at constant current. The theoretical treatment of this type of electrolysis is rather limited at the present, and it is the purpose of this paper to give a mathematical analysis of the boundary value problems encountered in this

method. Only cases involving semi-infinite linear diffusion in an unstirred solution will be discussed, since cases of spherical or cylindrical diffusion can be treated as linear diffusion problems provided that the duration of electrolysis is sufficiently short (1 second) - a condition which is generally fulfilled in the present type of electrolysis. Convection effects will be neglected on account of the short duration of electrolysis. Furthermore, it will be assumed that the solution being electrolyzed contains a large excess of supporting electrolyte, and that migration effects can be neglected. The discussion is divided in three parts according to the nature of the electrode process involved; a fourth part deals with the application of the method to the study of complex ions.

REVERSIBLE ELECTRODE PROCESSES

POTENTIAL-TIME VARIATIONS.

Consider the reduction of a substance Ox, and assume that the reduction product Red is soluble either in solution (or in mercury in the case of the deposition of an amalgam forming metal on a mercury electrode). The value of the concentration of substance Ox during electrolysis at constant current was calculated by Weber¹, Sand², and Rosebrugh and Miller⁹. Karsaglanoff⁴ derived the complete equation of

(9) T.R. Rosebrugh and L. Miller, J. Phys. Chem., **14**, 216 (1910).

the complete potential-time curve. His treatment need not be discussed here, but it is worth noticing that the curve representing the potential versus the square root of the electrolysis time is similar to a polarographic

wave for the reversible process being considered here. If one assumes that the concentration of substance Red is equal to zero before electrolysis, the potential of the electrode on which substance Ox is reduced is as follows, t seconds after the beginning of the electrolysis:

$$E = E^0 + \frac{RT}{nF} \ln \frac{f_0 I_i^{1/2}}{f_i I_0^{1/2}} + \frac{RT}{nF} \ln \frac{C^0 - P t^{1/2}}{I t^{1/2}} \quad (1)$$

where E^0 is the standard potential for the couple Ox - Red¹⁰, the f 's

(10) If an amalgam is involved, E^0 is the standard potential for the amalgam electrode.

are the activity coefficients of substances Ox and Red, and P is defined as follows

$$P = \frac{2 D_0}{\pi^{1/2} n F I_0^{1/2}} \quad (2)$$

In equation (2), I_0 is the constant current density for the polarizable electrode, D_0 the diffusion coefficient of substance Ox, and the other notations are conventional. The sum of the first two terms on the right-hand of equation (1) is identical to the polarographic half-wave potential $E_{1/2}$, when a mercury electrode is used in the constant current electrolysis. This observation enables one to predict from polarographic data the position of the potential-time wave in the range of potentials. For the experimental verification of equation (1), see reference 4.

DETERMINATION OF THE TRANSITION TIME.

After an electrolysis time τ such that $C^0 = P \tau^{1/2}$, the poten-

tial E given by equation (1) becomes infinite. The transition time τ - a term coined by Butler and Armstrong⁵ - is characteristic of the electrolysis conditions; $\tau^{1/2}$ is proportional to the concentration of reducible species and inversely proportional to the current density, etc. It is therefore important to determine τ in a reliable manner. This determination of τ would be obvious from the shape of the E vs $t^{1/2}$ curve, if it were not for the distortion of the voltage-time curve by the capacity current (double layer)^{7, 8}. This effect of the capacity current is taken into account in the method of determining τ of Fig. 1-A which is inspired from polarographic practice. Note that the potential E_2 corresponds to an electrolysis time $t = \tau/4$. When the potential-time curve has the shape of Fig. 1-B, the construction of Fig. 1-A leads to abnormally low values of the transition time. It is then necessary to apply the somewhat empirical method shown in Fig. 1-B. The selection of point E is a matter of common sense.

By introducing the value of the transition time from $C^0 = P \tau^{1/2}$ in equation (1), the third term on the right-hand becomes

$$\frac{RT}{nF} \ln \frac{\tau^{1/2} - t^{1/2}}{t^{1/2}}$$

Therefore, a plot of the logarithm of the quantity $(\tau^{1/2} - t^{1/2}) / t^{1/2}$ against potential should yield a straight line whose slope is nF / RT (see theory of reversible polarographic waves).

IRREVERSIBLE ELECTRODE PROCESSES

The theoretical treatment of this case has not been reported before, as far as we know. If the reduction $Ox \rightarrow Red$ involved only one rate determining step, the rate of the electrochemical reaction is

$$\frac{i_0}{nF} = k_{f,h} f_o C_{ox}(0,t) - k_{b,h} f_r C_{red}(0,t) \quad (3)$$

where the C 's are the concentrations at the electrode surface ($x = 0$), and the k 's are the rate constants for the forward and backward electrochemical reactions, respectively. Note that these k 's are rate constants for an heterogeneous process and are consequently expressed in $\text{cm} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1}$. Furthermore, the k 's depend on the electrode potential as is shown below. No hypothesis regarding the kinetics of the reduction of substance Ox was made by Karsoglanoff⁴ in the derivation of the concentrations of substances Ox and Red , and consequently the values of $C_{ox}(0,t)$ and $C_{red}(0,t)$ obtained by this author can be introduced in equation (3). This yields the following relationship $C_{ox} = 0$ for $t < 0$, $C_{red} = 0$ for $t < 0$;

$$\frac{i_0}{nF} = k_{f,h} f_o (C^0 - 2t^{1/2}) - k_{b,h} f_r Q t^{1/2} \quad (4)$$

where the expression for Q is the same as for P (equation (2)) except that D_o is replaced by the diffusion coefficient D_r of substance Red . Since the electrode potential is implicitly contained in the rate constants $k_{f,h}$ and $k_{b,h}$, equation (4) gives formally the dependence of the electrode potential on time. Detailed equations are obtained by expressing $k_{f,h}$ and $k_{b,h}$ in terms of the electrode potential. Only the case in

which $k_{f,h}$ is much larger than $k_{b,h}$ at the current density i_0 will be considered here for the sake of simplicity. The restriction imposed by the condition $k_{f,h} \gg k_{b,h}$ is minor, since this inequality is verified for overvoltages of the order of at least 0.1 volt, whilst much larger voltages are generally encountered.

As in the case of the reversible electrode process the transition time obeys the relationship $Q^0 = P \tau^{1/2}$ (see equation (4), $k_{f,h} = \infty$, $k_{b,h} = 0$). By dropping the term in k_b in equation (4) and introducing the transition time, one obtains

$$k_{f,h} = \frac{\pi^{1/2} I_0^{1/2}}{2 f_0 (\tau^{1/2} - t^{1/2})} \quad (15)$$

Equation (5) is important because it enables one to calculate the rate constant $k_{f,h}$ from experimental data. Values of E are measured on the E - t curve for various values of t and the corresponding rate constant $k_{f,h}$ are calculated. A plot of the results yields the rate constant $k_{f,h}$ as a function of the electrode potential E . The diffusion coefficient D_0 needed in the application of equation (5) can be readily calculated from the transition time (see equation (2)). The variations of $k_{f,h}$ with E can be interpreted by considering the value of $k_{f,h}$ derived from the absolute rate theory. Thus

$$k_{f,h} = k_{f,h}^0 \exp \left[- \frac{n_a F}{RT} E \right] \quad (16)$$

where $k_{f,h}^0$ is a constant related to the free energy of activation for the forward electrode process¹¹, α is the transfer coefficient, and n_a the

(11) S. Glasstone, K.J. Laidler, and H. Eyring, "The Theory of Rate Processes", McGraw-Hill, New York, N.Y., 1941, p.577.

number of electrons involved in the rate determining step. The slope of the $\log k_{f,h}$ versus E line established from experimental results yields the product n_a , and the intercept at $E = 0$ for the same diagram yields $k_{f,h}^0$ and, consequently, the free energy of activation for the forward electrode process. The electrode potential can be explicitated as a function of time by combining equations (5) and (6). Furthermore, a plot of $\ln \left[1 - \left(\frac{t}{\tau} \right)^{1/2} \right]$ against E yields a straight line having a slope of $-\frac{RT}{n_a F}$. Finally, the potential at time zero

$$E_{t=0} = \frac{RT}{\alpha n_a F} \ln \frac{n_a F k_{f,h}^0 C^0}{i_0} \quad (7)$$

depends on the bulk concentration of substance Ox, and on the transfer coefficient.

As an example, potential-time curves have been plotted in Fig. 2 for various values of α and for the following data: $C^0 = 10^{-4}$ moles. cm.⁻³, $i_0 = 10^{-1}$ amp.cm.⁻², $D_0 = 10^{-5}$ cm².sec.⁻¹, $k_f^0 = 10^{-8}$ cm.sec.⁻¹, $n = n_a = 1$.

The present treatment is valid only when the effect of the backward process can be neglected (see above). When this is not so, the

$E-t^{1/2}$ curve has a shape similar to that observed in a reversible process, although the curve is somewhat more drawn out. A detailed analysis of such a case will not be presented here since the complete equation is too cumbersome to be of any practical value.

In the case of an irreversible wave, the potential E_2 corresponding to $t = \tau/4$ has no particular significance, and the graphic determination of τ by the method of Fig. 1-A is devoided of any theoretical basis. It is, however, reasonable to apply the method of Fig. 1-A in the determination of τ , since any other method which might be proposed would probably not be less empirical.

We have also treated the case of an irreversible process involving two consecutive rate determining steps of comparable rates. The boundary problem does not present any special difficulty, but the writing is rather heavy, and the resulting equation for τ appears too intricate to be of any real value in actual applications.

ELECTRODE PROCESS PRECEDED BY A CHEMICAL REACTION

Consider the electrode process in which a substance Z is in equilibrium with a substance Ox, the latter substance being reduced at markedly less cathodic potentials than Z. The transition time corresponding to the reduction of substance Ox is determined by the diffusion of substance Z toward the electrode and by the rate of transformation $Z \rightleftharpoons Ox$. This case was treated by Gierst and Juliard^{7, 8} who introduced a kinetic term in the expression of the transition time $\tau^0 = P\tau^{1/2}$. Such a treatment is questionable on two counts: 1. It is assumed that Fick's differential equation is applicable without modification; 2. A

rate constant for an heterogeneous process is introduced to characterize a process which occurs in solution. Such a treatment has its merits, but a more rigorous approach is desirable and leads to new results.

BOUNDARY CONDITIONS.

As in the previous two sections, the transition time for the reduction of substance Ox is calculated from the condition $C_{Ox}(0,t) = 0$. Consequently, it is necessary to determine the function $C_{Ox}(x,t)$. The latter is obtained by following a method similar to the one applied by Koutecky and Brdicka in the treatment of kinetic polarographic currents¹².

-
- (12) J. Koutecky and K. Brdicka, Collection Czechoslov. Chem. Commun., 12, 337 (1947).
-

However, the derivation given below is different from that of Koutecky and Brdicka because one of the boundary condition is not the same as in the case of kinetic polarographic currents.

Kinetic terms have to be added on the right-hand of the differential equation for linear diffusion, because of the occurrence of the transformation $Z \rightleftharpoons Ox$ in solution. Thus

$$\frac{\partial C_{Ox}(x,t)}{\partial t} = I_0 \frac{\partial^2 C_{Ox}(x,t)}{\partial x^2} + k_f C_Z(x,t) - k_f C_{Ox}(x,t) \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial C_Z(x,t)}{\partial t} = I_Z \frac{\partial^2 C_Z(x,t)}{\partial x^2} - k_f C_Z(x,t) + k_f C_{Ox}(x,t) \quad (9)$$

where the D 's are the diffusion coefficients, and the k 's the rate formal constants for the transformation $Z \rightleftharpoons O_x$. Note that the k 's in equations (8) and (9) are conventional rate constants (in sec.^{-1}).

The boundary conditions are obtained by expressing that the flux at the electrode surface is constant, and that substance Z is not reduced at the electrode. Thus

$$\left(\frac{\partial C_{O_x}(x,t)}{\partial x} \right)_{x=0} = \lambda \quad (10)$$

with

$$\lambda = \frac{i_0}{n F A D_0} \quad (11)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\partial C_Z(x,t)}{\partial x} \right)_{x=0} = 0 \quad (12)$$

The initial conditions are as follows

$$\frac{C_{O_x}(x,0)}{C_Z(x,0)} = K \quad (13)$$

$$C_{O_x}(x,0) + C_{Z_{red}}(x,0) = C^0 \quad (14)$$

where K is the equilibrium constant for the transformation $Z \rightleftharpoons O_x$.

VARIATIONS OF CONCENTRATIONS.

In order to solve the system of equations (8) and (9) it is useful to make several substitutions, as was done by Koutecky and Brdicka. Furthermore, it will be assumed for the sake of simplicity that the diffusion coefficients of substances Ox and Z are equal; this coefficient is represented by D in the subsequent equations. The following functions are introduced:

$$\psi(x, t) = C_{Ox}(x, t) + C_Z(x, t) \quad (15)$$

$$\varphi(x, t) = C_Z(x, t) - \frac{k_f}{k_f} C_{Ox}(x, t) \quad (16)$$

By using the Laplace transformation¹³ it can be shown (See Appendix)

-
- (13) R.V. Churchill, "Modern Operational Mathematics in Engineering", McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, N.Y., 1944. Note that Koutecky and Brdicka used the original Heaviside transform $f(s) = s \int_0^\infty \exp(-st) f(t) dt$ whereas in our calculations the transform is $\bar{f}(s) = \int_0^\infty \exp(-st) f(t) dt$.
-

that the transforms corresponding to equations (8) and (9) are as follows:

$$\bar{\psi}(x, s) = \frac{C^0}{s} + N \exp\left(-\frac{s^{1/2}}{D^{1/2}} x\right) \quad (17)$$

$$\bar{\varphi}(x, s) = M \exp\left[-\frac{(s + k_f + k_f)^{1/2}}{D^{1/2}} x\right] \quad (18)$$

The integration constants M and N are determined from the transforms of the boundary conditions (see Appendix). By inverse transformation one obtains the functions $f(x, t)$ and $\bar{f}(x, t)$. Thus (see Appendix)

$$f(x, t) = C^0 - 2\lambda \left(\frac{Dt}{\pi}\right)^{1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{4Dt}\right) + \lambda x \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{2\sqrt{Dt}}\right)$$

and by applying the convolution for $\bar{f}(x, s)$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}(x, t) = & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{Dt}} \left[\exp\left[-x\left(\frac{k_f + k_r}{2}\right)^{1/2}\right] \operatorname{erf}\left[\frac{(k_f + k_r)^{1/2} t^{1/2} - \frac{x}{2\sqrt{Dt}}}{1}\right] \right. \\ & \left. - \exp\left[x\left(\frac{k_f + k_r}{2}\right)^{1/2}\right] \operatorname{erfc}\left[\frac{(k_f + k_r)^{1/2} t^{1/2} + \frac{x}{2\sqrt{Dt}}}{1}\right] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The notations "erf" and "erfc" in equations (19) and (20) represent the error function having the quantity between brackets as argument, and the complement of this function, respectively. In view of the definition of the functions $f(x, t)$ and $\bar{f}(x, t)$, the concentrations $C_{ox}(x, t)$

and $C_2(x,t)$ can be calculated from equations (19) and (20), but it suffices to determine the function $C_{ox}(0,t)$ in order to calculate τ ; the value of $C_2(C,t)$ could be obtained in the same manner, but it is of little interest in the present case. From (15), (16), (19), and (20) one deduces

$$C_{ox}(0,t) = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{k_f}{k_p}} \left\{ C^0 - 2\lambda \left(\frac{Dt}{\pi} \right)^{1/2} - \lambda \frac{k_f}{k_p} \frac{D^{1/2}}{(k_f + k_p)^{1/2}} \operatorname{erf} \left[(k_f + k_p)^{1/2} t^{1/2} \right] \right\} \quad (21)$$

DEPENDENCE OF THE TRANSITION TIME ON THE CONSTANTS k_f , k_p , and K

The transition time is obtained by equating to zero the right-hand member of (21). The resulting equation in τ can be solved graphically, but it is more fruitful to consider plots of $i_0 \tau^{1/2}$ versus i_0 . This type of diagram was first used by Gierst and Juliard^{7, 8}. From equation (21) one deduces the following equation for the product $i_0 \tau^{1/2}$

$$i_0 \tau^{1/2} = \frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2} n F C L^{1/2} - \frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2} C_0 \frac{1}{K(k_f + k_p)^{1/2}} \operatorname{erf} \left[(k_f + k_p)^{1/2} \tau^{1/2} \right] \quad (22)$$

Cases in which the error function is virtually equal to unity will be first considered. This simplification is permissible when the argument of the error function, $(k_f + k_p)^{1/2} \tau^{1/2}$, is larger than 2. The

product $i_0 \propto \frac{1}{2}$ is then a linear function of the current density, and one can calculate the value of $K(k_f + k_b)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ from the slope

$$= \frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2} \frac{1}{K(k_f + k_b)^{1/2}}$$

of the line $i_0 \propto \frac{1}{2}$ versus i_0 without having to know the diffusion coefficient D and the concentration C^0 . If the equilibrium constant K is known, the rate constants k_f and k_b are readily obtained ($K = k_f / k_b$).

When the quantity $[(k_f + k_b)^{\frac{1}{2}} \propto \frac{1}{2}]$ is smaller than 2, the error function in equation (22) is smaller than unity. A limiting value of the product $i_0 \propto \frac{1}{2}$ for large current densities is obtained by expanding the error function for small arguments $14 (\leq 0.1)$ and by retaining

(14) B. O. Peirce, "A Short Table of Integrals", Ginn and Company, Boston, 1929, p.120.

only the first term in the series. Thus, if $[(k_f + k_b)^{\frac{1}{2}} \propto \frac{1}{2}]$ is smaller than 0.1, equation (22) reduces to

$$i_0 \propto \frac{1}{2} = \frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2} \frac{1}{K(k_f + k_b)^{1/2}} \quad (23)$$

Under these conditions the quantity $i_0 \propto \frac{1}{2}$ is independent of the current density, and the electrode process is entirely rate controlled. Equation (23) shows that the equilibrium constant K for the transformation $Z \rightleftharpoons ZO_x$ can be calculated from experimental data provided that the limiting value of $i_0 \propto \frac{1}{2}$ can be determined. It is to be noted that when $K = \infty$,

formula (23) reduces to the equation $C^0 = P \leq \frac{1}{2}$ previously derived for the case in which there is no chemical reaction preceding the electrode process (see equation (1) and (2)).

The conclusions of the above discussion are summarized in Fig. 3.

This diagram was constructed on the basis of the following data:

$$K = 10^{-1}, C^0 = 1.1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ moles.cm.}^{-3}, D = 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2.\text{sec.}^{-1}.$$

It is of interest to note that in the treatment of Gierst and Juliard ^{7, 8}, the $i_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ versus τ relationship is represented by a straight line which intersects the abscissa axis at a current equal to $n F C^0 k_h$ where k_h is an heterogeneous rate constant. The value of this current was simply obtained by expressing that the rate of the transformation $Z \rightleftharpoons Ox$ is proportional to the concentration of substance Ox (C_Z being assumed to be negligible). From the treatment developed in the present paper one concludes that the heterogeneous rate constant k_h used by Gierst and Juliard actually is equal to the quantity $D^{1/2} K(k_f + k_b)^{1/2}$. Thus k_h has no real physical significance, but is rather a convenient mathematical device.

APPLICATION TO THE DETERMINATION OF K, k_f, k_b .

The upper limit in the measurement of the quantity $K(k_f + k_b)^{1/2}$ by the present method (see equation (22)) can be evaluated in the following manner. The value of the quantity $i_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ at $i_0 = 0$ is simply (see equation (22))

$$\frac{1}{2} \pi^{1/2} n F C^0 D^{1/2}$$

The order of magnitude of the maximum value of this quantity is ($C^0 \leq 10^{-5}$ mole.cm. $^{-3}$, $D \leq 10^{-5}$ cm 2 .sec. $^{-1}$, $n = 2$) approximately 6×10^{-3} amp.cm. $^{-2}$ sec. $^{\frac{1}{2}}$. On the other hand, the maximum current density which can be utilised is of the order of 10^{-1} amp.cm. $^{-2}$.^{7, 8} Furthermore, it can be conservatively assumed that a 10 per cent decrease in the quantity $i_0 \propto i^{\frac{1}{2}}$ can be detected as i_0 is varied from 0 to 0.1 amp.cm. $^{-2}$. The corresponding slope of the $i_0 \propto i^{\frac{1}{2}}$ versus i_0 line is therefore $-0.1 \times 6 \times 10^{-3} / 0.1$ or -6×10^{-3} sec. $^{\frac{1}{2}}$. By comparing this value with the slope deduced from equation (22) one deduces that the quantity $K(k_f + k_b)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ should be smaller than approximately 150 sec. $^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in order to observe with certainty the effect of the chemical reaction preceding the electrochemical process. If the equilibrium constant K is appreciably smaller than unity this condition can be written: $K k_b^{\frac{1}{2}} < 150$ sec. $^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

It is of interest to compare this criterion with the corresponding condition for polarographic kinetic currents. In the latter method the average limiting current is virtually diffusion controlled when the quantity $K k_b^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is smaller than 5 sec. $^{\frac{1}{2}}$ 15. Actually this limit is

(15) Compare ref.(12) with P. Delahay, J. Am. Chem. Soc., **73**, 4944 (1951).

somewhat smaller because of the uncertainty about the diffusion coefficient of the substance being studied. Thus a kinetic process which causes a 10 per cent decrease in the limiting current will generally be overlooked¹⁶. Therefore, it is reasonable to regard the value $K k_b^{\frac{1}{2}} = 1$ sec. $^{\frac{1}{2}}$ as the upper limit for which a kinetic effect can be


- (16) It could, however, be detected by studying the dependence of the limiting current on the head of mercury.

detected by the polarographic method. The value $K k_p^{\frac{1}{2}} = 1 \text{ sec.}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ corresponds to a slope of approximately $-1 \text{ sec.}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in the diagram $i_0 \sim \frac{1}{2}$ versus i_0 diagram. Since the minimum detectable slope is approximately $-6 \times 10^{-3} \text{ sec.}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, systems which yield an apparently normal polarographic wave might exhibit the characteristics of kinetic complications in electrolysis at constant current.

In conclusion, the conditions for the study of kinetic processes by electrolysis at constant current are far more favorable than in polarography when a rapid chemical transformation is involved.

SECOND ORDER PROCESSES.

Under certain conditions which are stated below, the previous treatment can be applied to cases in which the chemical transformation preceding the electrochemical reaction is one of the following two processes



or



where substance X is neither reduced nor oxidized at the potential at which substance OX is reduced. The rate of the transformation Z to OX is

$$f = k_f C_Z(x,t) C_X(x,t) - k'_f C_{OX}(x,t)$$

for reaction (24), and

$$i_f'(x,t) = i_f'' C_{O_2}(x,t) C_X(x,t)$$

for reaction (25). If the concentration of substance X is a function of x and t the boundary value problem is arduous to solve. In practice, however, it is often possible to carry out the electrolysis in presence of a large excess of substance X (say 100 times the bulk concentration of Z), and under these conditions the concentration $C_X(x,t)$ in the above equations can be replaced by the bulk concentration C_X^0 of substance X. Equations (8) to (23) can be applied provided that the constants k_f , k_b and K in these equations are defined as follows

$$i_f = i_f' C_X^0 \quad i_f = i_f'' \quad K = K' C_X^0 \quad (26)$$

$$i_f = i_f' \quad i_f = i_f' C_X \quad K = \frac{K''}{C_X^0} \quad (27)$$

The slope of the $i_0 \propto 1/2$ versus i_0 diagram are then ($k_f' \ll k_b$; $k_f' \ll k_b''$)

$$= \frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2} \frac{1}{K' (k_f')^{1/2} C_X^0}$$

for process (24), and

$$= \frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2} \frac{(C_X^0)^{1/2}}{K'' (k_b'')^{1/2}}$$

for reaction (25).

From the above values one concludes that the slope of the $i_0 \propto 1/2$ versus i_0 line decreases when the concentration of substance X is increased in the case of reaction (24), and that this slope increases with C_X^0 for reaction (25).

A classical example of electrode process involving a chemical reaction of the type represented by equation (24) is the reduction of pyruvic acid. The polarographic behavior of this substance was thoroughly investigated by Brdicka and coworkers¹² and the findings of these investigators can be readily transposed to the method at constant current. Examples of reaction (25) can be found by studying the reduction of complex ions as shown in the next section.

APPLICATION TO THE STUDY OF COMPLEX IONS

MECHANISM OF REDUCTION

The theoretical treatment developed in the last section leads to interesting conclusions with regard to the mechanism of the electrolytic reduction of complex ions. Three hypotheses can be made about the reduction of complex ions. It can be assumed: (1) That the complex is the entity which is reduced; (2) That dissociation of the complex must precede the electrochemical reaction; (3) That the previous two modes of reduction occur simultaneously.

From the foregoing considerations one deduces that the quantity $i_0 \propto 1/2$ is a function of the current density if dissociation precedes

the electrochemical reaction. The dissociation process generally involves several consecutive steps. Thus, if MX_n is the complex being studied, dissociation proceeds stepwisely with the formation of the intermediates MX_{n-1} , MX_{n-2} ... M_0 .¹⁷ Each of the consecutive steps in the disso-

(17) J. Bjerrum, Chem. Revs., **46**, 381 (1950).

ciation is characterized by two rate constants k_f and k_b . If the rate constants k_f for the consecutive steps are sufficiently different, it can be assumed that the over-all dissociation of the complex involves essentially one rate determining step. The treatment developed in the present section is then approximately valid. In applying this treatment it should be kept in mind that the equilibrium constant K in equation (22) corresponds to the equilibrium between two species involved in the slow step; K is not the over-all instability constant of the complex. Furthermore, values of k_f obtained in this manner are too low since the effect of the various consecutive steps is accounted for by assuming one single slow step. However, the results can be of interest in deciding whether or not dissociation precedes the electrochemical reaction as is shown in the following two examples.

REDUCTION OF ETHYLENEDIAMINE COPPER COMPLEXES

The characteristic i_0 $\propto 1/2$ versus i_0 were determined for the reduction of the copper ethylenediamine complexes on a mercury electrode, and the results are shown in Table I (see description of the apparatus in the experimental part).

TABLE I

Data for the reduction of copper ethylenediamine complexes^a at 20°

Current (i) 10 ⁻³ amperes	Transition time (τ) seconds	$i \tau^{1/2}$ 10 ⁻³ amp.sec. ^{1/2}
1.048	2.24	1.57
1.272	1.50	1.55
2.044	0.587	1.56
2.636	0.360	1.57
3.078	0.260	1.57
4.584	0.113	1.54
6.060	0.0522	1.38
7.455	0.0332	1.36
8.835	0.0298	1.53

^a Solution composition: 4 millimolar copper sulfate, 1.04 molar ethylenediamine, 1 molar potassium nitrate. Temperature 20°.

It is seen from Table I that the product $i \tau^{1/2}$ is independent of current through the cell¹⁸, and it can be concluded from this observation that either the complex involved is directly reduced or that

(18) Currents (i) rather than current densities (i₀) are used here.

This is permissible since a plot of $i \tau^{1/2}$ versus i has the same slope as a plot $i_0 \tau^{1/2}$ versus i₀.

the dissociation is so rapid that no kinetic effect is observed. The second hypothesis can be ruled out on the following grounds. The formation constants at 25° for the copper (+ 2) ethylenediamine system which are defined by the relationship ($en \neq$ ethylenediamine)

$$K_1 = \frac{C_{M(en)_n}}{C_{M(en)_{n-1}} C_{en}} \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

are according to Bjerrum^{17, 19}: $\log K_1 = 10.72$, $\log K_2 = 9.31$, $\log K_3 = -1.0$. If one assumes that the process corresponding to the

(19) Bjerrum's values are approximately the same as those of G.A. Carlson, J. P. McReynolds, and F.H. Verhoek, J. Am. Chem. Soc., **67**, 1334 (1945).

highest formation constant ($\log K_1 = 10.72$) is the slow step, one concludes that the rate constant k_p for this step would be larger than $10^{26} \text{ sec.}^{-1}$ (slope of the $i_0 \propto 1/2$ versus i_0 diagram steeper than $10^{-2} \text{ sec.}^{-1/2}$, see above; $K'' = 10^{-10.72}$). Such unreasonably large values for a rate constant ($kT/h \approx 6 \times 10^{12} \text{ sec.}^{-1}$) can not be accepted, and consequently one concludes that the copper ethylenediamine complexes are directly reduced.

REDUCTION OF THE CADMIUM CYANIDE COMPLEXES.

The example of the copper ethylenediamine complexes was selected to give an ab absurdo proof of the direct electrolytic reduction of a complex. There are cases in which the above theoretical principles enable one to establish the occurrence of a dissociation process prior to

the electrochemical reaction. This is the case in the reduction of cadmium cyanide complexes on a mercury electrode. Gierst and Juliard⁷ observed that the product $i_0 \propto 1/2$ for this process decreases very quickly when the current density increases, and these authors interpreted this variation of $i_0 \propto 1/2$ by assuming that dissociation precedes the electrochemical reaction. This interpretation can now be stated quantitatively on the basis of the above treatment. According to Bjerrum¹⁷, the formation constants for the cadmium-cyanide complexes are: $\log K_1 = 5.54$, $\log K_2 = 5.06$, $\log K_3 = 4.65$, $\log K_4 = 3.59$. If one takes the reaction corresponding to K_1 as the slow step, the rate constant k_b for the combination of Cd^{++} with one CN^- ion is²⁰ 4×10^9 (moles per lit.)⁻¹ sec.⁻¹ at 25°. It should be emphasized that this value of k_b is very

-
- (20) Calculated from a slope equal to 2.6 as measured on the $i_0 \propto 1/2$ versus i_0 for the reduction of a solution having the following compositions: 0.03 molar in cadmium, 0.3 molar in potassium cyanide. These data are taken from Fig. 8 in the paper of Gierst and Juliard⁷. Note that there must have been some concentration polarization for the cyanide, since the bulk concentration of the latter ion was only ten times the concentration of cadmium ion. This effect can, however, be neglected in the present approximate calculation.
-

approximate on account of the simplification made by assuming the existence of a single rate determining step in the dissociation of the cadmium cyanide complexes. Nevertheless, the above treatment shows that the cadmium cyanide complex must undergo dissociation before electrochemical reduction.

It can be concluded from above two examples that certain complexes are directly reduced, whereas other complexes are dissociated before being reduced electrolytically. The explanation for this difference in behavior results possibly from the nature of the bond between the metal and the complexing substance or from differences in structure (copper ethylenediamine complexes are plane, $\text{Cd}(\text{CN})_4^{2-}$ is tetrahedral¹⁷).

EXPERIMENTAL

The present paper is chiefly concerned with theoretical principles and only a brief description of the experimental methods will be given here. The apparatus was fundamentally the same as that of Gierst and Juliard⁷, although it was much simpler. The latter authors used a dropping mercury electrode whose operation had to be synchronized with the recording of the voltage-time curve. A mercury pool of constant area was used as polarizable electrode in our instrument, and consequently a synchronization device was not necessary. The mercury pool was found entirely satisfactory provided that the mercury is renewed before each recording and that wetting of the glass by the solution is avoided (silicone coating). The mercury pool electrode had the form of a U tube having two arms of unequal lengths. One arm of this tube was used for connection with the polarization circuit (platinum wire in mercury). The lid of the arm of the tube immersed in solution extended at least 0.5 centimeters above the level of the mercury in order to reproduce as well as possible the conditions of semi-infinite linear diffusion. The exposed area of the electrode was of the order of 1 square centimeter.

This electrode was immersed in one compartment of an H polarographic cell. A platinum electrode immersed in the other compartment of this cell, was the anode. Both arms of the cell were filled with the solution being studied. The potential of the mercury pool was recorded from the voltage between this electrode and an external saturated calomel electrode whose tip was in the vicinity of the mercury pool (approximately 1 cm.; not too close to avoid a perturbation in the field of diffusion). The solution was freed of oxygen by bubbling nitrogen through it for 15 minutes. This gas was also passed through the cell before each measurement in order to eliminate any gradient of concentration.

The apparatus for electrolysis at constant current (Fig. 4) was assembled from commercially available components. The electrolytic cell was fed at constant current by a regulated power supply P (250 volts) connected in series with the variable resistances R_1 and R_2 . The current was adjusted by means of R_1 , and the current intensity was determined by measuring the ohmic drop in the calibrated resistance R_2 by means of a Leeds and Northrup student potentiometer. The voltage between the mercury pool (e_3) and the reference electrode (e_2) was recorded by means of cathode-ray oscillograph (Dumont oscillograph 304 H; amplifiers not represented in Fig. 4). A 10 megohm resistor was inserted between electrode e_2 and the "Y" input of the oscillograph in order to lower the current drawn from the cell e_2e_3 . The single-sweep time T basis of the oscillograph was operated by means of S_2 , the necessary signal being applied to terminal B. A D.P.S.T. relay was used for S_1S_2 , and this relay was adjusted in such a manner as to close S_2 slightly before S_1 in order to

avoid missing the zero time point. A switch could be used for S_1 and S_2 , but a relay can be more easily adjusted to obtain a short lag between the closing of S_1 and S_2 . The horizontal axis of the oscillograph was calibrated by applying a sinusoidal signal of known frequency (Hewlett Packard audio oscillator, model 200 I) to the "Z" modulation input of the oscillograph, and by actuating the relay S_1S_2 , the "Y" input amplifier being turned off. An horizontal trace composed of a succession of bright spots was recorded in this fashion, and the distance between two successive bright spots was readily calculated from the frequency of "Z" modulation. Oscillograms were photographed on 35 mm. film and readings were made from enlarged images.

CONCLUSION

It is possible to develop a rigorous treatment for electrolysis at constant current with mass transfer partially or totally controlled by semi-infinite linear diffusion. The characteristics of the potential-time curves appear to be particularly useful in the study of irreversible electrode processes. In such studies the method at constant current is more advantageous than polarography because the mass transfer problem can be treated rigorously; in polarography only an approximate solution of the boundary value problem can be given because of the complications resulting from the expansion of the mercury drop. Likewise, the method at constant current appears very promising in the study of the mechanism of the reduction of complex ions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: The present investigation is part of a project sponsored by the Office of Naval Research, and the support of this organization is gratefully acknowledged.

APPENDIX

By assuming that $D_z = D_0 = D$ and introducing the functions $\psi(x,t)$ and $\phi(x,t)$ defined by equations (15) and (16) one transforms the boundary value problem originally stated by equations (8) to (14) into the following problems

$$\frac{\partial \psi(x,t)}{\partial t} = I \frac{\partial^2 \psi(x,t)}{\partial x^2} \quad (28)$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi(x,t)}{\partial t} = I \frac{\partial^2 \phi(x,t)}{\partial x^2} - (k_p + k_r) \phi(x,t) \quad (29)$$

with the initial and boundary conditions as follows

$$\psi(x,0) = C^0 \quad (30)$$

$$\phi(x,0) = 0 \quad (31)$$

$$\frac{\partial \psi(x,t)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \phi(x,t)}{\partial x} = \lambda \left(1 + \frac{k_p}{k_f} \right) \quad (32)$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi(x,t)}{\partial x} = - \frac{k_p}{k_f} \frac{\partial \psi(x,t)}{\partial x} \quad (33)$$

The new initial and boundary conditions (30) to (33) are easily derived from equations (10) to (14) by using the following values of $C_{Ox}(x,t)$ and $C_Z(x,t)$

$$C_{Ox}(x,t) = \frac{\psi(x,t) - \phi(x,t)}{1 + \frac{k_p}{k_f}} \quad (34)$$

$$C_Z(x,t) = \frac{\phi(x,t) + \frac{k_p}{k_f} \psi(x,t)}{1 + \frac{k_p}{k_f}} \quad (35)$$

which result from the definition of $\psi(x,t)$ and $\phi(x,t)$ by (15) and (16).

After Laplace transform with respect to the variable t , equations (28) and (29) are reduced to following ordinary differential equations

$$I \frac{d^2 \bar{F}(x, s)}{dx^2} - S \bar{F}(x, s) + C'' = 0 \quad (36)$$

$$I \frac{d^2 \bar{F}(x, s)}{dx^2} - (S + k_f + k_p) \bar{F}(x, s) = 0 \quad (37)$$

and the boundary conditions are accordingly

$$\frac{d \bar{F}(0, s)}{dx} - \frac{d \bar{F}(L, s)}{dx} = \frac{\lambda (1 + \frac{k_p}{k_f})}{S} \quad (38)$$

$$\frac{d \bar{F}(0, s)}{dx} = \frac{k_p}{k_f} \frac{d \bar{F}(L, s)}{dx} \quad (39)$$

The solutions of equations (36) and (37) ($\bar{F}(x, s)$ and $\bar{\varphi}(x, s)$) are bound for $x \rightarrow \infty$ were given above in equations (17) and (18).

The integration constant l and N are evaluated by satisfying the boundary conditions (38) and (39). Thus

$$\bar{F}(x, s) = \frac{C''}{S} - \lambda \frac{S^{1/2}}{S^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{S^{1/2} x}{I^{1/2}}\right) \quad (40)$$

$$\bar{\varphi}(x, s) = \lambda \frac{k_p}{k_f} \frac{1}{S \left(\frac{S + k_f + k_p}{I} \right)^{1/2}} \exp\left[-x \left(\frac{S + k_f + k_p}{I} \right)^{1/2}\right] \quad (41)$$

By inverse transformation or

$f(x,t)$ and $f(x,t)$. The is
given in equation (19), is
transform of $f(x,s)$ is

$$f(x,t) = \frac{k_p}{k_f} \int_0^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\pi \tau} \right) d\tau$$

For the evaluation of the integral in (42) see the
applying the result obtained by this author, equation (20) is
derived.

(21) H. Korenstein, Quart. Appl. Math., 3, 183 (1945).

As a final comment, it should be mentioned that the equation for
the potential-time curve can be derived from the above results. If the
reduction Ox to Red is irreversible, the potential during electrolysis
is calculated by the same method as that exposed in the section entitled
"Irreversible Electrode Processes". The concentration $C_{Ox}(0,t)$ needed
in this calculation is given in equation (21). If the process is re-
versible the potential is calculated from the Nernst formula. The con-
centration $C_{Red}(0,t)$ needed in this calculation is determined from the
flux of this substance (equal to $-D \frac{\partial C_{Ox}(0,t)}{\partial x}$) at the electrode
surface and by application of Duhamel's theorem²². This derivation is

(22) See for example H.S. Carslaw and J.C. Jaeger, "Conduction of Heat
in Solids", Oxford University Press, London, 1947, p. 18.

02

ohm decade

tiometer; B, in.

oscillograph; e_1 , p

calomel electrode); e_3 , m




FIG. 1B




FIG. 2




FIG. 3




FIG. 4