P or P and P or P is the Equilibration of P on the P on the Equilibration of P Species in HCl Solutions

SADAYUKI HIMENO, ATSUYOSHI SAITO and MASATOMO HASEGAWA

Department of Chemistry, College of General Education, Kobe University, Nada-ku, Kobe 657, Japan Received January 4,1984

The equilibration of Mo(V) species has been investhe equilibration of Mo(Y) species has been invesiigated in 0.5-5 M HCl $(I = 5.0)$ *. The equilibria involve the dimer* (D_1) -dimer (D_2) interconversion, *followed by the decomposition of* D_2 *to a monomeric form at greater acidities:*

$$
[Mo_{2}O_{4}Cl_{4}(H_{2}O)_{2}]^{2-}(D_{1})+2H^{*}+4Cl^{-} \xleftrightarrow{K_{1}}
$$

$$
Mo_{2}O_{3}Cl_{8}^{4-}(D_{2})+3H_{2}O
$$

$$
Mo_{2}O_{3}Cl_{8}^{4-}+6H^{*}+2Cl^{-} \xleftrightarrow{K_{2}} 2H_{2}MoOCl_{5}+H_{2}O
$$

The equilibrium constants have been determined as ne equitorium constants nave been

Introduction

A number of studies have been carried out of the Behavior of Studies have been carried out of the behavior of $Mo(V)$ in HCl solutions, and monomerdimer equilibria have been proposed $[1-4]$. It is generally agreed that the principal species in fairly concentrated HCl $(> 8 \text{ M})$ is the monomeric ion MoOCl_s²⁻. In 5-6 *M* HCl, a dimer is formed for which structures A and B are suggested:

Haight favors structure A [2] while Colton and Rose aignt favors structure A [2]. While Colton and Rose favor structure B [4]. According to Colton and Rose [4], a dimer with structure A exists at lower acidities $(1-3 \t M)$. On the other hand, Ardon and Pernick have postulated that a dimer with the

 ~ 0 **0** \sim ⁰ \sim ^{11 \sim}

predominates in $1 M$ HCl $[5]$.

0020-l 693/84/\$3.00

Our recent Raman studies have shown that a Unit recent Kantan studies have shown that a monomer with the Mo=O core, and two dimers with
the

$$
\begin{array}{c}\nM_0 - O - Mo \text{ and } M_0 \\
\parallel \\
O & O\n\end{array}
$$

are present according to the HCl concentration; all the present according to the first concentration, an the species are chloro-complexes $[6]$. However, the detailed structures of the complexes have not been deduced from the Raman results.

In the present work the solution equilibria of the $Mo(V) - HCl$ system are studied in detail, and structural features of the $Mo(V)$ species are considered. The data were obtained by polarographic
and ultraviolet (UV) spectrophotometric methods.

Experimental

UV spectra were recorded with a Hitachi Model 220-A spectra were recorded with a mitachi model 220-A spectrophotometer. Polarographic measurements were made with a PAR Model 174-A polarographic analyzer equipped with a Model 172-A droptime controller and a Riken Denshi Model D-8CP
X-Y recorder. The capillary had an $m^{2/3}t^{1/6}$ value ϵ - i recorder. The capillary had an in ϵ value $\frac{11}{100}$ mg⁻¹ s in 1 *M* FICI with an open circuit. All potentials were measured against a saturated calomel electrode (SCE) with the use of a Kikusui Model 156-A digital voltmeter. Measurements were made at $25 \pm 0.1^{\circ}C$. \mathcal{A} call chemical grade. Molyb-

All chemicals were of analytical grade. Moryodenum(V) solutions were prepared by dissolving $(NH_4)_2$ MoOCl₅ [7], and stored under nitrogen; $Mo(VI)$ solutions were prepared from $Na₂MoO₄$. $2H₂O$; Mo(IV) solutions were prepared by heating an equimolar mixture of $(NH_4)_2$ MoOCl₅ and K_3 MoCl₆ (Climax Molybdenum Co.) under nitrogen at 90 °C in $3 M$ HCl [8].

Results

Polarographic Behavior

 $\frac{1}{2}$ shows Denavior Figure 1 shows DC polarograms of 0.4 m/m $MQ(VI)$

Fig. 1. DC polarograms of 0.4 mM $Mo(VI)$ in 0.1 M HCl: a, with natural drop; b, with forced drop $(t = 0.5 s)$.

 $(t = 0.5 \text{ s})$ methods. There are no well-defined waves at more positive potentials than -0.20 V with both methods. With natural drop, two reduction waves are defined with half-wave potentials (E_{12}) of -0.27 and -0.74 V, while the latter wave is not found with a drop time of 0.5 s or for Mo(V1) concentrations $\leq 8 \times 10^{-5}$ M. This is analogous to the behavior observed in 0.1 M H₂SO₄ [9], which suggests that the former and latter reduction waves are ascribed to the reduction of a monomeric and a dimeric $Mo(V)$ to Mo(II1) respectively. Wittick and Rechnitz have postulated that the former wave is due to the reduction of $Mo(VI)$ to $Mo(IV)$, and the latter wave to the reduction of $Mo(V)$ to $Mo(HI)$ in 0.1 M HCl $[10]$. According to them, the Mo(IV) species disproportionates rapidly to $Mo(V)$ and $Mo(III)$. However, Souchay *et al.* have prepared pure Mo(IV) which is very stable; it does not undergo disproportionation in acidic solutions [8]. In addition, Lamache-Duhameaux and Souchay have shown that no polarographic waves are ascribed to the reduction of $Mo(VI)$ or $Mo(V)$ to $Mo(IV)$ [11]. A DC polarogram of Mo(IV) exhibits a reduction wave with $E_{1/2}$ of -0.48 V in 0.1 M HCl. According to Lamache-Duhameaux $[12]$, the wave represents the reduction of Mo(IV) to Mo(II1). As shown in Fig. 1, the polarographic reduction of Mo(V1) does not produce the reduction wave at -0.48 V, which indicates that no Mo(IV) species is formed at the electrode.

As the HCl concentration is increased, $E_{1/2}$'s of both waves become more positive. Simultaneously, the wave due to the reduction of the dimeric $Mo(V)$ decreases in height, which may be due to the lower tendency of $Mo(V)$ to dimerize at greater acidities. In trifluoromethanesulfonic acid, similar observations have been reported by Chalilpoyil and Anson [13], who have concluded that both monomeric and dimeric $Mo(V)$ species are reduced to dimeric Mo(III), $Mo₂(III)$. It is shown that Mo(V) formed by the reduction of Mo(V1) adsorbs onto the electrode surface in acidic solutions, which may make the reduction of $Mo(VI)$ to $Mo(V)$ less defined [13-151.

TABLE I. Peak-potentials in Differential Pulse Polarography.^a

[HCl]/M	Mo(VI) $(V \nu s.$ SCE)	Mo(V) $(V \nu s. SCE)$
0.1	$-0.29 -0.75$	-0.75
0.5	$-0.18 - 0.73$	-0.73
1.0	$-0.14 - 0.68$	-0.68
2.0	-0.10 $\overline{}$	-0.56

 $^{\text{a}}$ Drop time, 1 s; Δ E, 25 mV.

Fig. 2. DC polarograms of 1.0 m*M* Mo(V) in HCl. [HCl] $/M$: a, *2;* b, 3.4.

A DC polarogram of MO(V) in 0.1 *M* HCl shows a reduction wave, denoted as wave A, with *E1p* of -0.74 V. In differential pulse polarography, as shown in Table I, the peak-potentials (E_p) of wave A are identical with those of the reduction waves of a dimeric $Mo(V)$ to $Mo(III)$. It is therefore reasonable to attribute wave A to the reduction of a dimeric $Mo(V)$ to $Mo(III)$. It is interesting to note that E_p of wave A is independent of the Mo(V) concentration in the range of $0.01-1.0$ mM in 0.1 M HCl, which suggests that $Mo(V)$ exists as a dimer even in the concentration of 0.01 mM. By the polarographic reduction of Mo(VI), as mentioned above, the monomeric $Mo(V)$ is formed in the vicinity of the electrode. This result shows that no dimerization equilibrium is attained at the electrode surface during the drop life, which is similar to the behavior observed in $0.1 - 1 M H_2SO_4$ [16].

Figure 2 shows DC polarograms of 1.0 mM $Mo(V)$ in 2 and 3.4 *M* HCl adjusted to $I = 5.0$ with NaClO₄. Above 2 *M* HCl a new wave, denoted as wave B, appears at more positive potentials than wave A (curve b). Both waves are diffusion-controlled, which suggests that two species are present under these conditions. With an increase in the HCl concentration, the current of wave B increases at the expense of wave A (Fig. 3). The results can be interpreted in terms of the monomer-dimer interconversion $[1-4]$; wave B is due to the reduction of a monomeric $Mo(V)$ to $Mo(HI)$. This is in agreement with earlier observations that the reduction potential for the monomeric $Mo(V)$ is more positive than that for the dimeric $Mo(V)$.

 Fig. 3. Relationship between limiting currents of 1.0 mM fo (V) and HCl concentrations, a, wave $A: b$, wave $B: c$, total wave. $I = 5.0$.

Raman measurements have shown that the following reactions occur in HCl solutions [6] :

$$
D_1 + aH^* + bCl^- = D_2 \tag{1}
$$

$$
D_2 + cH^+ + dCl^- = 2M
$$
 (2)

where D_1 and D_2 are dimers with the Mo₂O₄ and $Mo₂O₃$ cores respectively and M represents a monomer. The equilibrium constants are given by

$$
K_1 = \frac{[D_2]}{[D_1] [H^+]^a [Cl^-]^b}
$$
 (3)

$$
K_2 = \frac{[M]^2}{[D_2] [H^+]^c [Cl^-]^d}
$$
 (4)

It is unlikely that the reduction potentials for both dimers are identical. With the reasonable assumption that only a monomer and a dimer are present under the conditions of Fig. 3, eqn. (4) can be written as

$$
\log([M]^2/[D_2]) = c \log[H^+] + d \log[C]^{-} + \log K_2
$$
\n(5)

Measurements to determine the stoichiometric coefficient, c were made by keeping $\lbrack C \rbrack$ at 5 M while varying $[H^+]$ from 2 to 5 M. The value of d was determined by measuring solutions in which $[H⁺]$ was kept constant at 3 *M* while $[CI⁻]$ was varied from 1 to 5 M . The Mo(V) concentration of 1.0 mM was employed, and the ionic strength of the solutions was kept constant at 5.0 with NaClO₄. The results are given in Fig. 4. In Figs. 3 and 4, the limiting current of wave B (i_B) was measured at

Fig. 4. Limiting currents with variation of $[H^+]$ (a, b) or $[CI^{-}]$ (c, d). a, c, wave A; b, d wave B. $[Mo(V)]$; 1.0 mM, I $= 5.0.$

 -0.20 V while the current of wave A (i_A) was taken as equal to the total current minus i_{R} .

The currents can be given by

$$
i_{A} = 607 \text{n} D_{D}^{1/2} \text{m}^{2/3} \text{t}^{1/6} \cdot 2 \left[D_{2} \right] \tag{6}
$$

$$
i_{\mathbf{B}} = 607 \text{n}D_{\mathbf{M}}^{1/2} \text{m}^{2/3} \text{t}^{1/6} \cdot \text{[M]} \tag{7}
$$

where $D_{\mathbf{D}}$ and $D_{\mathbf{M}}$ are diffusion coefficients of the dimer and the monomer respectively.

The concentration terms are related by

$$
C_{\mathbf{t}} = [M] + 2[D_2] \tag{8}
$$

where C_t represents the total Mo(V) concentration (1.0 mM) .

On the basis of the assumption that wave A is due to the reduction of the dimer, $Mo_{2}(V)$ to Mo_{2} . (III), the following equation can be obtained by combining eqns. $(6)-(8)$ and solving for i_A .

$$
i_{A} = -D_{D}^{1/2}/D_{M}^{1/2} \cdot i_{B} + 2140C_{t}D_{D}^{1/2}
$$
 (9)

A discussion on the validity of this assumption is presented in a later part of this paper. By applying a least squares method to the data given in Figs. 3 and 4, the unknown values, $D_{\rm D}$ and $D_{\rm M}$ were determined to be 4.28 \times 10⁻⁶ and 7.95 \times 10⁻⁶ cm²/s respectively.

The term in the left side of eqn. (5) can thus be calculated at a particular $[H^{\dagger}]$ or $[CI^{-}]$ value with the use of eqns. (6) and (7). A plot of $log([M]^2)$ $[D_2]$) against $\log[H^+]$ gave a straight line with a slope of 6.20. Similarly a plot of $log([M]^2/[D_2])$ against log^[Cl-] was linear with a slope of 1.94. In order to confirm the results, tests of eqn. (5) were made with the data given in Fig. 3. A plot of $log([M]^2)$ $[D_2]$) against log[HCl] was linear with a slope of $(c + d) = 7.90$, indicating $c = 6$ and $d = 2$. From the

ig. 3. ϵ_{obs} values with

 μ . O. $\epsilon_{\rm obs}$ value

 p_1 is the value for p_1 and p_2 averaged 1.19×10^{-8} The 1.9×10^{-8} $\frac{1}{10000}$, the value for Λ_2 averaged 1.17 \land 10 \Box 1110 dimer-dimer interconversion was not detected
polarographically.

Spectrophotometric Behavior \mathcal{F}_{i} shows the observed example example example \mathcal{F}_{i}

rigule $\frac{3}{2}$ shows the observed e-values per moryodenum at 300 nm obtained under the same conditions as in Fig. 4. For the equilibrium (2) , the absorbance of the solutions can be expressed as

$$
\epsilon_{\rm obs} C_{\rm t} = 2\epsilon_2 \,[\rm D_2] + \epsilon_3 \,[\rm M] \tag{10}
$$

where α are absorption coefficients per absorption where ϵ_2 and ϵ_3 are absorption coefficients per molybdenum for the dimer and the monomer respectively, and ϵ_{obs} is the observed ϵ value. By combining eqns. (8) and (10), eqn. (11) is obtained.

$$
\epsilon_{\text{obs}} C_{\text{t}} = \epsilon_3 C_{\text{t}} + 2(\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3)[D_2] \tag{11}
$$

Thus eqn. (4) can be written as

$$
K_2 = \frac{2C_{\rm t}(\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_{\rm obs})^2}{(\epsilon_{\rm obs} - \epsilon_3)(\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3)[H^*]^c [C^-]^d}
$$
(12)

Equation (12) is transformed into:

3000

E 2500 .!! .u

g 2000 ._

1500 0 1 2 3 4 5 Ω **[HCI) I M** Fig. 7. Eobs values as a function of HCI concentration. [MO(V)]. 1.0 m&f. The dots indicate experimental points. $[Mo(V)]$. 1.0 m*M*. The dots indicate experimental points.
The solid line is calculated from the constants obtained.

$$
2C_t\epsilon_2^2 + \epsilon_2(-4C_t\epsilon_{obs}) + K_2\epsilon_3(\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3)(\left[\text{H}^*\right]^c \left[\text{CI}^-\right]^d) +
$$

+
$$
K_2(\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_2)(\epsilon_{obs}[\text{H}^*]^c \left[\text{CI}^-\right]^d) = -2C_t\epsilon_{obs}^2 \qquad (13)
$$

where $[H^{\dagger}]$, $[CI^{-}]$ and $\epsilon_{\rm obs}$ are variables.

With the known values of $c = 6$ and $d = 2$, the unknowns in eqn. (13) can be obtained by applying a least squares method to the ϵ data given in Fig. 5. The values for ϵ_2 , ϵ_3 and K_2 were found to be 1980 ± 60, 3480 \pm 60 and (1.5 \pm 0.4) \times 10⁻⁸ respectively. The value for K_2 agrees well with that obtained polarographically, which confirms that the stoichiometry can be expressed as in eqn. (2').

$$
D_2 + 6H^* + 2Cl^- = 2M
$$
 (2')

In order to determine a and b in eqn. (1) , ϵ values were measured where $[HClO₄]$ was varied from 0.6 to 3 M at constant [NaCl] of 0.5 M, and [NaCl] was varied from 0.6 to 3 M at constant [HClO₄] of 0.5 M. The results are shown in Fig. 6. Making the assumption that only the two dimers exist in the solutions, it can be readily shown that

$$
K_1 = \frac{(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_{\text{obs}})}{(\epsilon_{\text{obs}} - \epsilon_2) [\text{H}^+]^a [\text{CI}^-]^b}
$$
(14)

If eqn. (14) is put into logarithmic form, we have the following equation:

$$
\log\left[(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_{\text{obs}})/(\epsilon_{\text{obs}} - \epsilon_2)\right] =
$$

= $a \log[H^+] + b \log[C]^{-} + \log K_1$ (15)

where ϵ_1 is the absorption coefficient per molybview of is the absorption coefficient per moryo- α and α uncertainty, α ₁, once eqn. (15) contains an unknown constant, ϵ_1 , the least-squares method was applied by substituting a provisional value for ϵ_1 . When ϵ_1 = 1660 \pm 30, the $\epsilon_{\rm obs}$ values given in Fig.

Fig. 8. Fraction of each species. a, $Mo_2O_4Cl_4(H_2O)_2^{2-}$; b, M_0 ₂O₃Cl₈⁴; c, H₂MoOCl₅.

6 are best fitted to eqn. (15), giving values of $a =$ 2.16, $b = 3.92$ and $K_1 = 2 \pm 0.3$ From the results it follows that the stoichiometry can be expressed as

$$
D_1 + 2H^+ + 4Cl^- = D_2 \tag{1'}
$$

Figure 7 shows the ϵ values at 200 nm in $0.5-5$ M HCl adjusted to $I = 5.0$. Using the constants obtain $d(K = 2, K = 1.5 \times 10^{-8}, \epsilon = 1660, \epsilon = 1080, \text{and}$ ϵ_3 = 3480), the absorption curve was constructed and shown by the solid line. The theoretical curve fits to the experimental data, which provides strong evidence that equilibria $(1')$ and $(2')$ describe well the $Mo(V)$ -HCl system in the HCl concentration range $0.5 - 5 M$ (I = 5.0).

The fraction α of each species was calculated using the equilibrium constants, and is shown in Fig. 8.

Discussion

The present results demonstrate that the equilibria in the $Mo(V)$ -HCl system can be expressed in the most general form as in eqns. $(1')$ and $(2')$. It is found that the increase in the ionic strength results in the increase of the observed ϵ value at 300 nm and a corresponding increase in the values for both equilibrium constants. In the works of ref. [I] and [3], no indifferent electrolyte was added. In the spectrophotometric work [2], Haight studied the solution equilibria of $Mo(V)$ at the ionic strength of 6.0. As for the solution equilibria, no attempts were made to correlate the present results with the studies reported previously $[1-3]$.

Taking our Raman results into consideration [6], the most probable structures for the three species are :

On the basis of the equilibria $(1')$ and $(2')$, the monomer can be written as the undissociated form. The structures for D_2 and M are compatible with those reported by Haight [2]. According to Ardon and Pernick [5], the binuclear dipositive species exists in 1 *M* HCl. They have postulated the structure .
.

$$
\begin{matrix} & 0 & 0 \\ \parallel & \parallel & \\ [(H_2O)_3Mo\diagdown{\bigcirc} \diagdown{\bigcirc} \diagdown{\bigcirc} M_0(H_2O)_3]^{2^*} . \end{matrix}
$$

However, our Raman measurements have shown that the three $Mo(V)$ species are chloro-complexes in HCl solutions $(1 M\text{-conc.})$. In addition, the Raman results have excluded the possibility of the hydroxide-bridged structure postulated by Colton and Rose [4].

The value for K_2 obtained by polarography is in reasonable agreement with that obtained spectrophotometrically, which supports the assumption that D_2 is reduced not to the mixed oxidation state species such as $Mo_2(III, IV)$, but to $Mo_2(III)$ in HCl solutions. The results are consistent with those observed in trifluoromethanesulfonic acid by Chalilpoyil and Anson [9]. Recently, Richens and Sykes [17] and Paffett and Anson [18] have reported that trinuclear $Mo_{3}(IV)$ ions are reduced to trinuclear $Mo₃(III)$ species. It seems likely that the reduction of molybdenum species generally occurs with retention of an identical core structure.

The value for the diffusion coefficient, D_M is found to be greater than that for D_D . As shown in curve c of Fig. 3, therefore, total limiting currents increase as the HCl concentration is increased.

References

- 1 L. Sacconi and R. Cini, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 76, 4239 (1954).
- *2 G.* P. Haight, Jr., *J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., 24, 663* (1962).
- 3 C. R. Hare, I. Bernal and H. B. Gray, Inorg. Chem., 1. 831 (1962).
- $\overline{C_0}$ 5 M. Ardon and A. Pernick, *Inorg, Chem., 12, 2484* $\overline{A} \cdot \overline{A}$
- *6 S.* Himeno and M. Hasegawa, Inorg. *Chim. Acta, 83,* L17 $\overline{\mathbf{H}}$ ime
- $7.$ Here and Hereganic, the ground Here, σ , Δ (1984).
7 H. K. Soha and A. K. Bannerjee, 'Inorganic Syntheses',
- Vol. XV, p. 100, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974.
- 8 P. Souchay, M. Cadiot and M. Duhameaux, C.R. Acad. Sci. (Paris), 262, 1524 (1966).
- *Himeno* 163 (1983) 163 (1983).
10 J. J. Wittick and G. A. Rechnitz, Anal. Chem., 37, 816
- $(1965).$
- 11 M. Lamache-Duhameaux and P. Souchay, J. Chim. Phys., 2, 384 (1973).
- $\overline{1}$ 13 P. Chalilpoyil and F. C. Anson, *Irzorg. Chem., 17, 2418*
- C_{holi} 11 Change *and 11 Component India* Component and S. 11 Component and S. 11 Component and S. 12 Compone (1978).
14 K. Yokoi, T. Ozeki, I. Watanabe and S. Ikeda, *J. Electro-*
- anal. Chem., 132, 191 (1982).
- 15 M. N. Hull, *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, 51, 57 (1974).
- *263* (1981). 17 D. T. Richens and A. G. Sykes, *Inorg.* Chem., 21, 418
- T ¹⁹ 18 M. T. Patrick and T. C. By Res, *Inorg.* Chem., 21, ¹¹ (1982).
18 M. T. Paffett and F. C. Anson, *Inorg. Chem.*, 22, 1347
- $(1983).$