DEPARTMENT OF MATERIALS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02139-4307

Donald R. Sadoway
John F. Elliott Professor of Materials Chemistry
MacVicar Faculty Fellow

3.53 ELECTROCHEMICAL PROCESSING OF MATERIALS

Test 1

April 12, 2001

USE OF Bard & Faulkner PERMITTED. NO NOTES ALLOWED.

1. (a) From the data given in Figure 3.4.5 in Bard & Faulkner (2nd ed.)[¶] estimate i_0 for the reduction of Mn(IV) to Mn(III) on platinum at 298 K in 7.5 M H₂SO₄ containing 0.353 M Mn(III) and 0.4 M Mn(IV). The platinum microelectrode is 0.8 mm in diameter.

40%

- (b) Estimate the limiting current density for the reduction of Mn(IV) to Mn(III) on platinum at 298 K in 7.5 M H₂SO₄ containing 10⁻² M Mn(III) and 10⁻³ M Mn(IV).
- (c) Estimate the overpotential at which the current for the reduction of Mn(IV) to Mn(III) on platinum at 298 K in 7.5 M H_2SO_4 containing 10^{-2} M Mn(III) and 10^{-3} M Mn(IV) has a value of 3.53 i_0 .
- (d) Estimate the overpotential at which the current density for the oxidation of Mn(III) to Mn(IV) on platinum at 298 K in 7.5 M H₂SO₄ containing 10⁻² M Mn(III) and 10⁻³ M Mn(IV) has a value 10⁻⁴ A/cm².

[¶] Figure 3.5.5 in B&F 1st edition.

2.

chronoamperometry, the following data were measured at a stationary planar microelectrode. At each potential, the current was recorded after an elapsed time, τ , of 3.53 seconds. The voltages are referenced against the NHE. 35% E(V) $i_{t=\tau}/i_{d}$

In a series of experiments involving the use of controlled step potential

-0.361	0.1	
-0.411	0.3	
-0.436	0.7	
-0.459	0.9	
The overall reaction is O +	$e \rightarrow \text{R. } C_0^* = 3.5$	3 mM, and initially there is no R

present in solution. From independent measurements E° is known to have a value of -0.22 V against the NHE. The reaction is totally irreversible.

- Estimate the charge transfer resistance, R_{ct} . (a)
- Without performing the numerical calculation, explain how to estimate the (b) mass transfer resistance, $R_{\rm mt}$, from these data. Include the necessary equations in your explanation.

DATA:

electrode area, $A = 0.01 \text{ cm}^2$ diffusion coefficient of O, $D_{\rm O} = 6.66 \times 10^{-5} \, \rm cm^2 \, s^{-1}$

3. Solutions of **X** in an appropriate supporting electrolyte were studied by cyclic voltammetry.

25%

It is found that X can be oxidized at ≈ 0.6 V to form the radical cation, X^+ , according to

$$X \rightleftharpoons X^{+} + e$$

and reduced at ≈ -1.4 V to form the radical anion, X^{-} , according to

$$X + e \rightleftharpoons X^{-}$$

All reaction products appear to be stable.

- (a) On the same graph, sketch cyclic voltammograms for the following experiments. In each case the system begins from the same initial condition: only **X** and no reaction products present in solution. All scans start at -0.1 V and move first in a positive direction.
 - (i) Pt working electrode, scan rate = 10 mV/s, oxidation and reduction peaks appear reversible
 - (ii) Pt WE, scan rate = 100 mV/s, oxidation peak appears reversible, reduction peak appears marginally sluggish (quasi reversible)
 - (iii) vitreous carbon WE, scan rate = 10 mV/s, oxidation and reduction peaks appear highly irreversible
- (b) Why should the choice of WE influence the kinetics of the electron transfer reaction when all reactants and products are soluble?