Thermochemical Studies of Hydrolytic Reactions

8. A Recalculation of Calorimeter Data on Uranyl Hydrolysis

ROBERT ARNEK and KURT SCHLYTER

Department of Inorganic Chemistry, The Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm 70, Sweden

The calorimeter data, reported in 1962 by one of the authors (K.S.), on uranyl hydrolysis in the medium 3 M NaClO₄ at 25°C have been recalculated by means of the computer program LETA-GROPVRID. The following results were obtained (deviations 3σ):

In the preceding paper in this series ¹ a recalculation of data from enthalpy titrations on hydrolysed iron(III) perchlorate solutions was reported. Similar titrations were made on hydrolysed uranyl perchlorate solutions, in the concentration range 5—100 mM (UO₂)_{total}, in the medium 3 M NaClO₄ at 25°C.² Using the preliminary equilibrium constants given by Hietanen ³ the heats of formation of the different uranyl hydrolysis products were calculated by successive approximations, using graphical methods. The uranyl data have now been recalculated in the same manner as the iron(III) data, by means of the computer program LETAGROPVRID.^{4,5}

THE LETAGROPVRID TREATMENT

We write $\beta_{p,q}$ for the equilibrium constant and $\Delta H_{p,q}$ for the enthalpy change of

 $q{\rm UO_2}^{2+} + p{\rm H_2O} \Rightarrow ({\rm UO_2})_q ({\rm OH})_p^{(2q-p)+} + p{\rm H^+}$

The formulas and equilibrium constants of the complexes in the medium 3 M NaClO₄ at 25°C have been determined with emf methods by Hietanen and Sillén.⁶ They explained their emf data by assuming the complexes $(\mathrm{UO}_2)_{\epsilon}(\mathrm{OH})_{p}^{(2q-p)+}$ with the (p,q) values (2,2), (4,3), (5,3) and (6,4) and the equilibrium constants $\beta_{2,2}=9.6\times10^{-7}$ M, $\beta_{4,3}=1.5\times10^{-14}$ M², $\beta_{5,3}=2.9\times10^{-17}$ M³ and $\beta_{6,4}=6\times10^{-20}$ M³.

By means of the computer program LETAGROPVRID we tried to find the enthalpies ΔH_{pq} , and the corrections, δH_0 , to the analytical hydrogen excess H_0 in the initial solutions, that minimized the error square sum:

$$U=\sum (Q_{\mathrm{calc}}-Q_{\mathrm{exp}})^2$$

 $Q_{\rm exp}$ is the measured heat. The results of the LETAGROPVRID treatment are summarized in Table 1. The deviations given in the table are σ , the standard deviation calculated by LETAGROPVRID. σ_Q is the standard deviation in the measured quantity, $Q_{\rm exp}$.

Table 1. Results of LETAGROPVRID treatment.

	a) ΔH_{pq} , eta_{pq} and σ_Q				
Calculation No.	I	II	III	IV	Schlyter (1962)
ΔH_{53} , keal	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	24.4 ± 0.4	$\begin{array}{c} 9.47 \pm 0.01 \\ 24.6 \pm 0.5 \\ - \\ 22.6 \pm 1.5 \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} 9.46 \pm 0.02 \ 24.6 & \pm 0.1 \ & - \ \end{array}$	$egin{array}{ccc} 9.44 \pm 0.1 \ 25 & \pm 2 \ 18 & \pm 5 \ 24 & \pm 5 \ \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} 10^{7}\beta_{22} \\ 10^{17}\beta_{53} \\ 10^{14}\beta_{43} \\ 10^{20}\beta_{64} \end{array}$	$9.6 \\ 2.9 \\ 1.5 \\ 6$	9.2 2.9 9	9.6 2.9 7	$\begin{array}{ccc} \textbf{9.5} & \pm \ \textbf{0.3} \\ \textbf{2.9} & \pm \ \textbf{0.2} \\ - & - \end{array}$	9.3 2.8 6.3 3.8
σ_Q , cal	0.055	0.055	0.056	0.056	
xpt. No.	1	2	b) δH_0 4	5	6
•	$-1.7 \pm 0.1 -1$	$.3 \pm 0.1 - 0.8$	$\pm 0.05 - 0.5 \pm$	$0.05 - 0.3 \pm 0.$	$05-0.2 \pm 0$

DISCUSSION

When all four ΔH_{pq} were treated as unknown constants together with the δH_0 , then ΔH_{43} and ΔH_{64} came out with high σ (column I, Table 1a). Calculations were then performed with different combinations of the complexes, leaving out one or both of the minor species (4,3) and (6,4). In these calculations the β_{pq} of the remaining complexes were either taken from the LETAGROPVRID treatment of the emf data in Ref. 8 or were treated as unknown parameters. The results are given in columns II, III, and IV in Table 1a. It should be noted that the equilibrium constants β_{22} and β_{53} could be determined independently from the enthalpy titrations (column IV) when the species (4,3) and (6,4) were neglected.

The corrections δH_0 obtained from the LETAGROPVRID treatment are given in Table 1b. They agree very well with those estimated graphically by Schlyter.

From the results in Table 1a we may conclude that ΔH_{22} and ΔH_{53} have the values $\Delta H_{22} = 9.5 \pm 0.1$ kcal/mole and $\Delta H_{53} = 24.4 \pm 1.5$ kcal/mole (with 3σ), irrespective of what assumptions are made about the presence of additional minor species. These values agree very well with those reported in 1962. Further Baes and Meyer 7 have obtained $\Delta H_{22} = 10.2$ and $\Delta H_{53} = 25.1$ kcal/mole from the temperature coefficient between 25°C and 94.4°C in 0.5 M $(K)NO_3$ medium.

Before discussing the values for ΔH_{43} and ΔH_{64} it should be pointed out that the emf data on uranyl hydrolysis 6 could be interpreted in several alternative ways with approximately the same fit (for discussion see Ref. 8): with only the (4,3) species, with only the (6,4) species, or with both (4,3) and (6,4). In this situation it is of course somewhat dubious to try to calculate ΔH_{43} and ΔH_{64} . The values $\Delta H_{43} = 15.9$ kcal and $\Delta H_{64} = 22.6$ kcal obtained in calculations II and III in the table could perhaps be regarded as minimum values; ΔH_{43} was calculated neglecting (6,4) and ΔH_{64} was calculated neglecting (4,3). Considering that the values for ΔH_{22} and ΔH_{53} suggest a constancy of ΔH per OH⁻ bound (or H⁺ ion produced) of about 5 kcal/mole for the uranylhydroxocomplexes we might perhaps expect $\Delta H_{43} \approx 20$ kcal and $\Delta H_{64} \approx 30$ kcal.

. The thermochemical data for the two main hydrolytic reactions of the uranyl ion in 3 M (Na)ClO₄ at 25°C are:

 ΔG° , keal ΔH° , kcal ΔS° , e.u. Reaction $2UO_2^{2+} + 2H_2O \rightleftharpoons (UO_2)_2(OH)_2^{2+} + 2H^+$ 8.21 ± 0.03 9.5 ± 0.1 4.3 ± 0.3 $3UO_2^{2+} + 5H_2O \rightleftharpoons (UO_2)_3(OH)_5^+ + 5H^+$ 22.56 ± 0.04 24.4 ± 1.5 6 ± 5

The entropy changes associated with the reactions above are small; the position of the equilibria are almost entirely determined by the enthalpy terms.

Acknowledgements. The authors wish to express their gratitude to Professor Lars Gunnar Sillén for valuable discussions.

This work was financially supported by Statens Naturvetenskapliga Forskningsråd (Swedish Natural Science Research Council).

Dr. George Baldwin was kind enough to revise the English text.

REFERENCES

- 1. Arnek, R. and Schlyter, K. Acta Chem. Scand. 22 (1968) 1327.
- 2. Schlyter, K. Trans. Roy. Inst. Technol. Stockholm, No. 195 (1962).

- Senryter, R. Itals. Roy. Inst. Technol. Stockholl, No. 133 (1962).
 Hietanen, S. Personal communication, quoted by Schlyter (Ref. 2).
 Sillén, L. G. Acta Chem. Scand. 18 (1964) 4085.
 Ingri, N. and Sillén, L. G. Arkiv Kemi 23 (1964) 97.
 Hietanen, S., Row, B. R. L. and Sillén, L. G. Acta Chem. Scand. 17 (1963) 2735.
 Baes, C. F., Jr. and Meyer, N. J. Inorg. Chem. 1 (1962) 780.
 Dursmore H. S. Hietanen, S. and Sillén, L. G. Acta Chem. Scand. 17 (1962) 26
- 8. Dunsmore, H. S., Hietanen, S. and Sillén, L. G. Acta Chem. Scand. 17 (1963) 2644.

Received December 1, 1967.