慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ

Keio Associated Repository of Academic resouces

Scales of Acidity and Basicity of Slag Constituents . in Steelmaking

(Received October 15, 1949.)

Saburō Yanagisawa * Yoshirō Watanabe ** Michiharu Seki ***

Abstract

Acidity is defined as the tendency to accept an electron-pair from a base. Basicity is defined as the tendency to donate an electron-pair to an acid. The authors took $O⁼$ in place of electron-pair and made two scales of acidity and basicity of the constituent oxides of slag by using thermodynamic cycles discussing the validity of those scales.

The basicity scale was not sufficiently explicit in case of comparing each group of different valence types, and the result obtained by our acidity scale was not so sufficient because of the difficulties in determining the radii of negative polyatomic ions.

I Introduction

Althongh basicity or acidity of molten salts has an important meaning at the high temperature reaction both in ceramic industry and in steelmaking processes, the relative strength of acidity or basicity of oxide has not been determined except empirical one, i. e. CaO \equiv 1, S_iO₂ \equiv 1.

As the definition of acid and base, the H^+ -OH⁻ theory of Arrhenius¹, the H^+ theory of Brönsted² and the theory of Wickert³ have been adopted.

Recently H. Luder⁵ enlarged the electron-pair theory of Lewis⁴ and showed its excellent validity in explaining the acid-base reactions. According to his theory, base is a donor of electron-pair and acid is its acceptor, therefore, the tendency to accept an electron-pair from base means basicity and donate it to acid becomes $Lux⁶$ defined base and acid of molten salts as follows: acidity.

$Base = Acid + O$.

He also discussed the concentration of O^* represented by Po corresponding to P_H in aqueous solution.

* Ass'stant Professor of Keiō Univ.

** Lecturer of Faculty of Eng., Keiō Univ.

*** Assistant of Faculty of Eng., Keiō Univ.

- 1) S. Arrhenius, Z. physik. Chem., 1(1337),631.
- 2) J. N. Brönsted, Rec. trav. chim., 42(1923),718.
- 3) K. Wickert, Z. physik, Chem., Al78(1937),361.
- 4) G. N. Lewis, Valence and the Structure of Atoms and Molecules (1923). J. Am. Chem. Soc., 38(1916), 762.
- 5) H. Lnder, Chem. Rev., 27(1940),547.
- 6) H. Lux, Z. Elektrochem., 45(1939),303.

2 . Saburō YANAGISAWA. Yoshirō WATANABE and Michiharu SEKI

It is easy to understand that the above-mentioned $O⁼$ is the carrier of electron-pair and that the Lux's theory is the same as the Luder's in its essence. The concentration of $O⁼$ in molten borates was also studied by Dietzel⁷ by measuring E.M.F.

However, in these experiments they measured only the concentration of $O⁼$ and did not present any scale of basicity which we can use in comparing each substance quantitatively.⁸⁾ We are measuring such a scale of oxides in our experiments but here we will show the possibility and the results of our calculation of the scales of basicity and acidity of the slag constituent oxides by the theoretical methods.

II Theories of Basicity and Acidity

According to Luder's theory, the tendency of donating an electron-pair to acid can be used as a scale of basicity and the tendency of accepting an electron-pair from a base as a scale of acidity, if we shall be able to express these tendedcies quantitatively. As to oxides, however, it is sufficient to know the tendencies of $O⁼$ in place of electron-pair. The authors here decide that the basicity and the acidity of oxides correspond to the energy changes when the substances donate and accept O⁻ respectively. Therefore, the value of basicity is determined by dissociation energy U in the formula

$$
MO=M^{++}+O^{=}+U\text{ kcal},\qquad(1)
$$

and the value of acidity is determined by the reaction energy E in the formula $MO + O = MO = +E$ kcal. (2)

The smaller the energy U is - the easier the dissociation of MO into M^{++} and $O^$ is. — the stronger is its basicity. Similarly, in equation (2), the greater the energy E is the stronger is its acidity. The methods and the results of calculation of these energies U and E will be shown in the following sections.

III Calculation of Basicity

Cons:dering ·a cycle

$$
[M_mO_n] \xrightarrow{U'} \rightarrow m (M^{\frac{2n}{m^+}}) + n(O^*)
$$

\n
$$
\uparrow Q \qquad \qquad \downarrow -I+E \qquad (3)
$$

\n
$$
m[M] + \frac{n}{2}(O_2) \leftarrow -S-D \cdot m(M) + n(O)
$$

the energy U' is to be calculated by the relation

$$
U'=Q+S+I+D-E,\t\t(4)
$$

where the oxide is represented by M_mO_n , parentheses and square brackets show the gaseous and solid states respectively. U' denotes the energy which dissociates $[M_mO_n]$ into

- 7) A. Dietzel, W. Stegmaier, Glastechn. Ber., 18(1940).353.
- 8) Kuan- Han- Sun reported about the semi-quantitative scale of basicity but the authors have not got his paper yet. c.f. Chern; Abst. 42.

Scales of Acidity and Basicity of Slag Constituents in Steelmaking 3.

gaseous ions at 298°K; Q, the heat of formation of $[M_m O_n]$; S, the heat of sublimation of metal; D, the dissociation energy of oxygen molecule to atoms; I, the ionization potential of (M) ; and E, the electron affinity of oxygen. Now, assuming that specific heat of (M^{m+}_{m}) equals to that of (M) , the change of I by temperature is only due to the change of specific heat of· electron gas. Similarly, assuming that the specific heat of (0^z) is equal to that of (0) , the change of E by temperature is only due to the change of specific heat of electron gas. As I and E enter in the relation (4) , the changes of *E* and I by the specific heat of electron gas cancel out each other. Therefore, the data of I and E at 0° K are also valid in the formula (4) even at 298° K⁹. U in the formula (1) and U' have the relation

$U=U'-(m+n)RT$.

Here $(m+n)RT$ is the energy of work corresponding to the volume change of $(m+n)$ moles. Data in calculating U are shown on Table 1. The value of U does not change so much if the temperature becomes high and M_mO_n changes into the molten state.

To obtain the general scale independent of the valence types, i. e. M₂O, MO, M₂O₃, etc., the following consideration is necessary. The tendency of donating O^- depends on the strength of a bond when we consider that positive and regative ions are mutually surrounded in accordance with their coordination numbers. Tne larger the coordination number P^{12} in Table 2 is, the more bonds exist.

- 9) J. Shermann, Chem. Rev., 11 (1932), 93.
- 10) Landolt, Börnstein, Phys. chem. Tabellen
- 11) Harashima, Kotaino-Gyoshu-Kiko (Mechanisms of Binding of Solid), published in Japan, by Asakura puh. Co. (1948) P.3
- 12) Shibata, Muki-Kagaku-Genron (Fundametals of Inorg. Chern.), published in: Japan by Yoken-do pub. Co. (1914) PP. 97, 396, 398

(3)

To calculate the strength of a bond, U is divided by m and the coordination number P which is the number of oxygen atoms surrounding one positive atom. If we consider more· precitely, P must take a certain value in molten state but it is almost unknown to us. So we took the value in crystal state.

This value $\frac{U}{Pm}$ is to be used as a scale of basicity. However, for the so-called acidic oxides which tend to take 0 ⁼ into themselves, i. e. B₂O₃, S_{iO₂ or P₂O₅, this value} indicates the weakness of basicity when they behave as base. Therefore, in the treatment of these oxides, it seems more natural to measure their tendencies of accepting $O =$ from the base. The following section shows this method of calculation.

IV Calculation of Acidity

The energy E in formula (2) corresponds to the acidity of MO. To evaluate E the following cycle was considered for the double salt $XMO₂$ was adopted.

$$
\begin{array}{c}\n[XMO_2] \longrightarrow U \longrightarrow X^{++} + \text{MO}_2^- \\
\uparrow Q \qquad \qquad \downarrow E \qquad \qquad (5) \\
[XO] + [MO] \leftarrow \text{Uxo} \quad X^{++} + [MO] + O^- \\
\end{array}
$$

Q: the reaction energy for $[MO] + [XO] \rightarrow [XMO_2]$

U: the dissociation energy for $[XMO_2] \to X^{++} + MO_2^-$

Uxo: the dissociation energy for $[XO] \rightarrow X^{++} + O^-$

E: the energy for $[MO] + O^- \rightarrow MO_2^-$

From the cycle (5) , we have the relation

$$
E = Q + Uxo - U.
$$

To obtain the energy E, we must know the values of Q, Uxo, and U, but U is difficult to be determined directly.

 $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{Z}}$

 $\mathfrak{p}(\xi)$ (form

Scales of Acidity and Basicity of Slag Constituents in Steelmaking 5

In calculating the value of U indirectly, there are two methods, (A) and (B) . (A) One is the method of calculating U as lattice energy of $[XMO_2]$. Assuming that crystal [XMO₂] consisted of two kinds of ions, X^{++} and sphericrl MO_2 the following relation exists.

$$
U = -\frac{Mz^2e^2}{r}(1-\frac{1}{n})
$$
 (6)

M; the Madelung constant

n ; the repulsion exponent ·

z ; the number of electron charge of ion

e ; the charge of an electron

r ; the lattice constant

(B) The other is the method of calculating from the data of the heat of solution. The energy U and the heat of solution have the relation,

$$
U = Hx^{++} + H_{MO_2} = -Hx_{MO_2}
$$
 (7)

Here $H_{X^{++}}$, H_{MO_2} and H_{XMO_2} respectively denote the heat of solution of gaseous X^{++} , of gaseous MO_2^- and of crystaline XMO₂, Among the above three heats of solution only the value of H_{MO_2} = has not yet been reported. For the heat of solution of monatomic ion, however, Bernal and Fowler¹³ presented the formulae (8) and (9), whose results are almost coincide with the observed values. The h~at of solution of monatomic gaseous ion. H, is given by in a Sa

$$
H = \frac{\eta - 1}{2\eta} \frac{z^2 e^2}{Rz} + nP(z) P(r) - Uw \qquad (8)
$$

 η : the dielectric constant of H₂O

z: the number of ionic charge

e: the charge of an electron

Rz: the critical radius of ion

n: the coordination number of ion

 $P(r)$: the potential energy between an ion and a water molecule

 $P(z)$: the correction term for $P(r)$

Uw: the corelation energy between water molecules.

The formula (8) is reduced to

$$
H = \frac{163 z^2}{Rz} + nP(z) P(r) - 31 \text{ kcal.}
$$
 (9)

There is a possibility to calculate the heat of solution even for complex ion by the above formula. The authors tried to examine the validity of the formula (9) for the complex ion CO_3 ⁼ in calcite by comparing the value U obtained by the method (B) with the value obtained by the method (A) .

13) J. D. Bernal, R. H. Fowler, J. Chem. Phys., 1 (1933), 515

 $\mathcal{L}^{\alpha} \mathcal{L}^{\beta}_{\mathcal{G}}$

151

6 Saburo YANAGJSAWA. Yoshiro WATANABE and Michiharu SEKI

a) U for $CaCO₃$ obtained by the method (Λ)

Madelung constant of calcite was calculated by Evien's method 14 and was determined as 1.77. Suppose n is $9₁₅$ U becomes by the formula (6) 646 kcal.

b) U for $CaCO_s$ obtained by the method (B)

When the constants and the heats of solution in formula (9) take the values on Table 3. U becomes 609 kcal.

Table 3. Calculation of Ucacoa

(1) Values of constants in formula (A) for CO_3^-

(2) Heats of solution for U_{CaCO_3} kcal/mole

Since these two values of U almost coincide, the formula $(\dot{9})$ can be regarded applicable to polyatomic ions. This formula will be used in the following calculation for acidity. The radius of $CO₃=$ on Table 3 is adopted by the following reason. The radius of $CO₃$ is determined as the value substructed the radius of cation from the carbon-metal distance. Table 4 shows the values for three carbonates.

The result of Table 4 indicates that the radius of $CO₃$ becomes larger by the strong contra-polarisation caused by cation. The true, not contra-polarized, radius of $CO₃$ will be smaller than the radii listed on Table 3, at least smaller than 2.09 obtained from MnCO₃. We obtained the U as 609 kcal by taking $r=2.09\text{\AA}$, but if we take the smaller value than 2.09\AA , U becomes larger and approaches 646 kcal which has been calculated by the method (A).

- 14) H. M. Evjen, Phys. Rev., 39 (1932), 675 ..
- 15) Shermann, op. cit. A change of n by ur.ity affects E by only 1 or 2 per cent from the equation (6) .
- 16) L. W. L. Bragg, Atomic Structure of Minerals (Cornell Univ. Press 1937) P.116
- 17) Goldschmidt's value

Scales of Acidity and Basicity of Slag Constituents in Steelmaking

Acidities of B_2O_3 and P_2O_5 cannot be obtained by the application of the formula 6) to the double salts, e.g. $Na_0P_2O_8$, $Ca_3P_2O_8$, $Na_0B_2O_6$ and $Ca_3B_2O_6$, because the ladelung constants of these double salts have not been determined. But those acidies can be calculated from the formula (8) or (9). Radii of BO $_3^2$ and PO $_4^2$ were sted on Table 5 calculated by the same method as Table 4.

Table 6 shows the E values of the above-mentioned double salts. Here, the radii anion involved in double salts were calculated from the yttrium compounds.

rom the results of Table 6

 $P_2O_5 + 3O = 2PO_1^{3-} + 370$ kcal $B_2O_3 + 3O^2 = 2BO_3^{3-} + 406$ kcal.

hen it is clear that the acidity of B_2O_3 is stronger than that of P_2O_5 .

Further research in calculating each value of E by the use of ionic radii in impounds which have the same crystal type and the same positive element was nable for us except the results of Table 6 because of the lack of data concerning those compounds.

V Discussion

In defining the scale of basicity as U/Pm there still remain uncertainities. Howver, the results in Table 2 will be summerized as follows:—

- 1) K_2O and Na_2O are the strongest bases and K_2O is stroger than Na_2O .
- 2) CaO is the next strong base and considerably stronger than MnO, MgO and FeO.
- 3) MnO and MgO are almost the same degree and may be stronger than FeO .
- 4) H₂O is stronger acids than the above compounds.
- 5) Al_2O_3 , Fe₂O₃ and Cr₂O₃ are almost the same.
- 6) SiO_2 , B_2O_3 , P_2O_5 are considerably stronger acid than the above oxides.

18) R. W. G. Wyckoff, The Structure of Crystals I, II (New York, 1931, 1935)

19) This value, the nearest distance for rhombohedral, can be converted from the distance a_{\circ} and the angle α of the rhombohedral unit cell by

$$
\sqrt{\frac{11-10\text{cos}\alpha}{4}}a_{\text{o}}.
$$

20) Goldschmidt's value

 (7)

 (8)

 \bar{z}

 \mathcal{L}^{\pm}

 ~ 10

Saburō YANAGISAWA. Yoshirō WATANABE and Michiharu SEKI

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim .

 $\ddot{}$

 $\overline{\mathbf{8}}$

 \sim

 $\bar{\psi}$.

 \bar{t}

 $\sim 2-10$ $\sqrt{2} \approx 10^4$

 $\overline{}$

 \hat{f} \mathbb{R}^2

 $\bar{\beta}$

n it is said that when two oxides react, neutralization occurs: the above oxide :he Taple 2 ·behaves as base and the below behaves as acid.

Therefore, two oxides indicated further apart in the table the easier cause a neuization reaction. For example, $SiO₂$, $B₂O₃$ or $P₂O₅$ neutralizes Na₂O, K₂O or CaO makes stable salt. H_2O will react as base for the acids shown below in the e and combine with the upper bases as acid. The same will be said about the ity of H₂O to CaO in molten slag. This scale may be considered to show a more onable measure for basic oxides than for acidic oxides.

'o compare each acidity of acidic oxide, i.e. SiO_2 , B_2O_3 or P_2O_5 , the second e defined as the tendency of accepting $O⁺$ will be more desirable. The second hod is more accurate because there is no error of dividing U by P m, but the hod is difficult in determining the radii of negative polyatomic ions.
 $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r}$

VI Conclusions

a shekara ta 1990

These scales were calculated to set up the semi-quantitative standard of basicity the benifit of slag control in steelmaking processes. However, these scales are precise in the actual processes, i . e. the molten state and the coexistence of ~~ oxides; .but the, order of this scales is in accordance with the tendency obtained he, experiences.

The authors are studying another scale to be applicable to all oxides by the 1al measurements at high temperature. The results will be reported later.

an Sing

in gol

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the second contribution of the second term of 1000 年4月 α \mathcal{L}^{max}

 α , β , β , β , β , β , α , α , α , β , β , β

 $\sim 20\%$.

Contractor Billion

rejekt skriv

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ ~ 200

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{S}^2)$, where $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{S}^2)$, $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{S}^2)$, and $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$, where $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ α .

 $\mathcal{F}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, where $\mathcal{F}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 经预计 医原子宫 is an

52.

Congression of

CONTRACTOR