#### Table III. Properties of Trinitromethane Compounds

	$(NO_2)_3CH$	$(NO_2)_3 CF$	$(NO_2)_3CCl$	$(NO_2)_3CBr$
Density, g/ml	1.59 (24° C)	1.595 (20° C)°	1.66 (20° C)	2.034 (20° C)
Melting point, °C	+27-28	-29	+5.7	+18
Heat of vaporization, kcal per mole	13.1 (25°)	8.171 (25°)	10.86 (25°C)	11.41 (25°C)
Enthalpy of formation, kcal per mole	$-16.25\pm0.75$	$-51.99 \pm 0.48$	$-5.57 \pm 0.18$	$+3.22 \pm 0.24$
Estimated halogen-carbon bond energy, kcal		10.35	73.2	52.63

<sup>a</sup> Through oversight densities of trinitrofluoromethane are reported incorrectly in (11). The first digits (.7 and .6) in the density series should read 5 and 4-i.e., 1.595 instead of 1.795; 1.489 instead of 1.689.

#### NOMENCLATURE

m	=	mass of (')compound, ('')auxiliary material,				
		(")polyethylene film, and ("")fuse, grams				
n	=	number of moles of (')compound, ('')auxiliary				
		material, (''')polyethylene film, and ('''')fuse				
n'	=	initial number of moles of water in bomb				
$t_i$	=	initial temperature of calorimeter, °C				
t,	=	final temperature of calorimeter, °C				
t,	=	reference temperature to which combustion				
		reaction is referred (25° C)				
$\Delta t$	=	rise in temperature of calorimeter due to ther-				
corr		mal leakage of outer jacket				
$\Delta t_{\rm c}$	=	$t_i - t_i + \Delta t_{\rm corr}$				
ξ(calor.)	=	energy equivalent of calorimeter, cal per deg				
ξ(cont.)	=	energy equivalent of contents, cal per deg				
		$[\xi^{t}(\text{cont.})(t_{t}-25) + \xi^{t}(\text{cont.})(25 - t_{t} + \Delta t_{\text{corr}})$				
		where $\xi'$ (cont.) and $\xi'$ (cont.) are energy				
		equivalents of contents before and after com-				
		bustion respectively				
. 17		bustion, respectively]				
$\Delta E_{ign}$	=	energy released due to ignition, cal				
$\Delta E_{\rm corr}$ st states	=	energy reduction to standard states, cal $(5, 7)$				
$\Delta E_{dec}$ (HNO <sub>3</sub> )	=	energy released from formation of nitric acid,				
uet (		cal				
$\Delta E_{\rm dec}$ (As <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> )	=	energy released from formation of $As_2O_5$ , cal				
1 Fo	_	standard anarous of idealized combustion roos				

- $\Delta E_c^{\circ}$ standard energy of idealized combustion reaction, calories per mole
- $\Delta H_c$  = heat of reaction between 1 mole of diethyl phthalate + 1 mole of bromotrinitromethane, oxygen, and water as given in Equation 1 at constant pressure, kcal

- $\Delta E_c$  = energy of reaction between 1 mole of diethyl phthalate + 1 mole of bromotrinitromethane, oxygen, and water as given in Equation 1 at constant volume kcal
- $\Delta H_{l}^{a}$  = enthalpy of formation of bromotrinitromethane, kcal per mole

#### LITERATURE CITED

- (1) Baroody, E.E., Wynne, J., Zimmer, M.F., U.S. Naval Propellant Plant, NavWeps Rep. 8686, Tech. Rep. 154 (1964). Good, W.D., Scott, D.W., Waddington, G., J. Phys. Chem.
- (2)68, 1080 (1959).
- (3)"Handbook of Chemistry and Physics," 43rd ed., p. 1164, Chemical Rubber Publishing Co., Cleveland, Ohio, 1961-62. Kerr, J.A., Chem. Rev. 66 (5), 465-500 (1966).  $(\mathbf{4})$
- Rossini, F.D., "Experimental Thermochemistry," Vol. I, pp. (5)90, 107, Interscience, New York, 1962.
- Schmidt, E., Schumacher, R., Kuhlmann, H., Ber. 54, 1483 (6) (1921).
- Skinner, H.A., "Experimental Thermochemistry," Vol. II, pp. (7)25-8, Interscience, New York, 1962.
- Smith, A., Menzies, A.W.C., J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 32, 1412-(8)34 (1911).
- Wilkins, R.L., "Theoretical Evaluation of Chemical (9)Propellants," Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1963.
- Zimmer, M.F., Baroody, E.E., Schwartz, M., McAllister, M.P., (10)J. CHEM. ENG. DATA 9, 527 (1964).
- (11)Zimmer, M.F., Robb, R.A., Baroody, E.E., Carpenter, G.A., Ibid., 11, 577-9 (1966).

RECEIVED for review February 18, 1970. Accepted July 3, 1970.

# Natural Convection Heat Transfer from a Horizontal Cylinder to a Reacting Gas

### $N_2O_4 \rightleftharpoons 2NO_2$ System

FRANK T. BROWN<sup>1</sup>, BOO-GOH ONG, and DAVID M. MASON Department of Chemical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. 94305

 $\mathbf{T}$  he transfer of heat between a solid surface and a fluid may be significantly affected by the occurrence of a homogeneous chemical reaction in the fluid and/or a heterogeneous reaction on the surface of the solid. The general problem of transport in reacting systems is discussed by Brokaw (3), Brokaw and Butler (4), and Rosner (8). In a reacting medium, temperature gradients induce concentration gradients, causing diffusion of the reacting species. In this

diffusional process, the enthalpy of each species is transported, making a major contribution to the thermal conductivity, and thus to heat transfer when the enthalpy of reaction is large.

Values of the equilibrium thermal conductivity of the  $N_2O_4$  system, which is a nonmonotonic function of temperature, are presented by Svehla and Brokaw (9). The rate of dissociation of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> is so large that for all subsonicflow regimes at pressures above 0.1 atm the system is effectively at equilibrium and thus the equilibrium proper-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Present address, Monsanto Co., Springfield, Mass. 01101.

Natural convection heat-transfer rates from horizontal electrically heated cylinders were measured in the equilibrium, homogeneously reacting gaseous  $N_2O_4 \rightarrow 2NO_2$  system from 0.1 to 1.0 atm and at a bulk temperature of approximately 25°C. The maximum cylinder surface temperature was 150°C. Values of the Nusselt number ranged from about 0.5 to 1.5, corresponding to Grashof numbers of about  $10^{-2}$  to  $10^2$ . These Grashof number values are below those for the laminar flow regime. Because of the marked sensitivity of properties to temperature in reacting systems, ways of handling properties appearing in the Nusselt and Grashof numbers had to be developed in order to obtain a single empirical correlation between the Nusselt number and the Grashof number that was applicable to both reacting or nonreacting systems. Heat-transfer measurements on nonreacting nitrogen and air were made over the same range of Nusselt and Grashof numbers for comparison with the N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> data.

ties tabulated by Svehla and Brokaw may be utilized in treating experimental data. Because of the existence of molecular weight gradients when heat is transferred to reacting systems, density gradients and thus buoyancy forces in natural convection heat transfer can be markedly affected, causing velocity, temperature, and concentration distributions to be interrelated. Thus, a numerical or analytical solution of the equations of change under these conditions becomes extremely complicated, if not impossible, and experimentation must be resorted to.

There have been few experimental studies in the field of natural convection heat transfer in reacting systems since the work of Langmuir (6). Beer (1) and Beer and Deubel (2) measured natural convection heat-transfer rates in the  $N_2O_4$  system for a few Grashof numbers in the range  $10^2$ to  $10^5$ . The bulk and surface temperatures were similar to those employed in this study. Experimental data were compared with relationships obtained from laminar boundary layer theory instead of with correlations obtained with other experimental data on nonreacting systems.

Applied problems where natural convection from small horizontal cylinders is of importance occur in chemical regeneration of metal surfaces such as incandescent light filaments, discussed by Tower (11) and Fast (5); and manufacture of metal fibers, such as boron, which are used as composite structures in the aerospace industry, described by Talley and Lasday (10). In the first application, a light bulb is filled with a gaseous halide compound of tungsten which dissociates on the electrically heated tungsten filament to regenerate tungsten. In the second case, a mixture of gaseous boron trichloride and hydrogen reacts on an electrically heated substrate such as tungsten to deposit solid boron on the substrate. In both cases, the reaction takes place at steady state in the presence of free-convection motion.

Since the Prandtl number in reacting gases is relatively constant at about 0.7, similar to nonreacting gases (cf. Svehla), correlations may be obtained directly between the Nusselt number and the Grashof number without the Prandtl number appearing. There is, however, a complication in correlating data in reacting systems due to the fact that all physical properties are sensitive to temperature, particularly thermal properties such as thermal conductivity. Density and viscosity are unusual, in that they are affected not only by temperature but by the change in molecular weight with temperature peculiar to reacting systems. Thus the main problem in obtaining a good engineering correlation is finding the appropriate way of handling the variable properties. In reacting gaseous systems the buoyancy driving force in the Grashof number is expressed correctly as  $(\rho_w/\rho_w - 1)$  and not as  $(T_w/\rho_w)$  $T_{\infty}$  - 1). These terms are not identical even for a perfect reacting gas where

$$\left(\frac{\rho_{\infty}}{\rho_{w}} = \frac{T_{w}}{T_{\infty}} \frac{M_{\infty}}{M_{w}}\right)$$

since the molecular weight varies with temperature.



- 1. Electrically heated cylinder
- 2. Voltage taps
- 3. Thermocouple for bulk temperature measurement

Table	Table I. Natural Convection Heat Transfer to $N_2O_4$					Table II. Natural Convection Heat Transfer to Nitrogen and Air			
$T_w$ , ° K	<i>T</i> ∞, ° K	Watts/Cm <sup>2</sup>	$N_{ m Nu}$	$N_{ m Gr}$			q,		
	Run 1 (	D = 0.0127  C	m, 1 Atm)		$T_w, \circ \mathbf{K}$	$T_{\cdot \cdot}, \circ \mathbf{K}$	Watts/Cm <sup>2</sup>	$N_{ m Nu}$	
307.7	299.0	0.554	0.647	0.0861		Run 7 ( $D =$	0.0127 Cm, 3.0	5 Atm Nitrogen)	
322.6	299.0	1.875	0.721	0.204	229.1	206.5	0.406	0.530	
322.9	299.4	1.871	0.719	0.201	351.6	250.5	0.400	0.550	
325.5	299.2	2.528	0.854	0.219	380.2	299.0	1 141	0.612	
346.7	299.4	4.114	0.749	0.288	402.5	256.6	1.141	0.612	
355.6	299.5	4.764	0.751	0.296	402.5	200.0	2 555	0.662	
366.4	299,9	5.338	0.749	0.294	599.7	300.0	4 999	0.683	
382.2	300.0	5.998	0.753	0.287	602.4	300.8	6.008	0.692	
415.0	300.4	6.870	0.765	0.265	659.6	299.0	7 592	0.698	
	Bun 2 (	D = 0.0127 C	m 1 Atm)		664.9	302.3	7.639	0.694	
	ituli 2 (	D = 0.0127 C	in, i Atin)		699.0	302.0	8.592	0.694	
303.8	297.9	0.305	0.554	0.0607	860.0	302.9	13.739	0.705	
314.2	297.9	1.212	0.723	0.155					
336.6	298.2	3.165	0.712	0.278		Run 8 $(D =$	0.200 Cm. 1.9	5 Atm Nitrogen)	
350.6	298.2	4.305	0.718	0.304		- (			
369.3	299.0	5.520	0.747	0.301	528.9	494.2	0.067	0.959	
388.4	298.7	6.292	0.755	0.293	554.5	494.5	0.137	1.11	
413.5	298.5	6.993	0.767	0.278	576.2	495.3	0.236	1.40	
	Dun 2 (	D = 0.0197 C			610.2	495.9	0.342	1.40	
	ituli 5 (	D = 0.0127 C	m, i Atm)		655.7	496.6	0.495	1.41	
304.5	298.2	0.317	0.533	0.0643		Bun 9 (	D = 0.0127 Cm	1 Atm Air)	
316.1	298.2	1.236	0.656	0.167		Train 0 (		,	
336.1	297.7	3.116	0.704	0.282	311.6	298.5	0.134	0.485	
350.8	297.7	4.405	0.727	0.309	327.4	298.5	0.301	0.483	
360.7	297.7	5.035	0.728	0.313	332.3	298.8	0.377	0.519	
373.7	297.7	5.816	0.749	0.310	346.6	298.4	0.572	0.537	
388.2	298.2	6.207	0.742	0.297	361.0	298.5	0.750	0.533	
					371.6	298.8	0.893	0.537	
	Run 4 ( $L$	0 = 0.200  Cm,	0.090 Atm)		385.2	299.5	1.100	0.552	
315.9	298.9	0 109	0 844	2.64	403.2	299.2	1.380	0.559	
315.0	200.0	0.100	0.830	2.04	425.2	299.2	1.722	0.560	
222.0	200.1	0.104	0.800	3 16	446.2	298.8	2.079	0.565	
327.3	200.0	0.147	0.000	3.05		<b>•</b> • • • •	D 0000 C		
248.2	290.0	0.201	0.890	4.16		Run 10 (	$D = 0.200 \mathrm{Cm},$	0.08 Atm Air)	
250.2	200.7	0.220	0.001	4.10	299.5	297.8	0.001	0.448	
350.3	290.0	0.225	0.905	4.17	302.6	201.0	0.003	0.516	
307.0	255.4	0.243	0.937	4.13	303.7	200.2	0.004	0.550	
371.2	290.4	0.273	0.947	4.42	310.9	200.2	0.001	0.589	
374.9	298.9	0.275	0.953	4.34	204 4	200.2	0.010	0.645	
379.2	298.9	0.287	0.977	4.30	349.0	200.2	0.020	0.040	
387.2	298.9	0.294	0.969	4.36	366.0	200.2	0.118	0.886	
	Run 5 $(L$	0 = 0.200 Cm.	0.100 Atm)		373.0	200.2	0.110	0.880	
			0.010		463.2	200.2	0.002	0.833	
305.6	300.0	0.044	0.919	1.34	400.2	200.2	0.222	0.000	
313.0	300.3	0.097	0.962	2.60		Run 11	(D = 0.200  Cm,	1.0 Atm Air)	
314.0	300.2	0.098	0.903	2.78	205 0	907 7	0.019	1 19	
316.8	300.3	0.118	0.936	3.13	303.8	297.7	0.012	1.12	
317.3	300.2	0.124	0.953	3.22	010.0 000.6	297.7	0.020	1.23	
318.2	300.3	0.121	0.898	3.30	322.0	297.7	0.043	1.27	
322.7	300.4	0.145	0.912	3.73	332.4	291.7	0.005	1.52	
325.5	300.4	0.173	1.000	3.96	360.2	298.2	0.128	1,40	
326.3	300.5	0.174	0.992	3.99	381.Z	298.2	0.191	1.07	
327.2	300.6	0.177	0.991	4.03	412.7	298.4	0.280	1.61	
338.3	300.7	0.234	1.070	4.58	433.2	298.4	0.335	1.59	
340.1	300.7	0.248	1.110	4.64		Run 12	(D = 0.200  Cm)	1.0 Atm Air)	
346.9	300.8	0.250	1.050	4.80					
369.9	301.1	0.297	1.080	5.04	302.7	297.4	0.007	0.100	
397.2	300.7	0.357	1.150	5.20	305.8	297.4	0.012	0.108	
	Dun 6 (I	-0.200 Cm	0.100.4 tm)		311.1	297.7	0.027	0.151	
	Ituli 0 (I	= 0.200  Cm,	, 5.100 Atlii)		328.9	297.9	0.057	0.134	
280.1	274.2	0.034	0.800	3.58	340.7	297.9	0.083	0.139	
286.3	275.0	0.076	0.867	6.40	322.0	297.7	0.042	0.127	
291.4	274.9	0.122	0.927	8.81	357.9	298.2	0.124	0.146	
298.0	279.2	0.162	1.020	8.49	358.7	298.2	0.125	0.145	
300.0	280.5	0.184	1.100	8.32	376.2	298.2	0.172	0.151	
298.7	276.7	0.169	0.920	10.30	402.4	298.4	0.246	0.157	
306.3	280.7	0.221	1.010	9.76		Run 19	(D = 0.200  Cm)	10 Atm Air)	
309.2	279.9	0.262	1.060	10.80		TUIL 10	-0.200 OIII,	1.0 I LUIII / LII /	
314.9	280.2	0.269	0.943	11.40	529.5	490.9	0.065	0.820	
314.2	278.8	0.311	1.070	12.10	566.9	<b>496.</b> 3	0.142	0.948	
313.7	276.6	0.305	1.000	13.30	587.2	493.2	0.243	0.120	
327.4	279.9	0.378	1.060	12.30	591.7	496.0	0.245	0.119	
336.7	280.3	0.410	1.060	12.20	572.2	492.0	0.206	0.121	

 $N_{\rm Gr}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.0756\\ 0.0975\\ 0.133\\ 0.153\\ 0.178\\ 0.190\\ 0.187\\ 0.184\\ 0.178\\ 0.174\\ 0.147\\ \end{array}$ 

13.8 21.9 27.4 34.8 42.2

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.0033\\ 0.00667\\ 0.00751\\ 0.0101\\ 0.0121\\ 0.0133\\ 0.0146\\ 0.0162\\ 0.0177\\ 0.0189\\ \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.0130\\ 0.0329\\ 0.0409\\ 0.0907\\ 0.174\\ 0.296\\ 0.430\\ 0.388\\ 0.554 \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{r} 8.28 \\ 15.50 \\ 23.20 \\ 30.70 \\ 47.10 \\ 56.80 \\ 66.90 \\ 71.70 \end{array}$ 

5.538.61 13.3 27.9 36.1 22.7 45.9 54.7 64.0

> 4.05 6.38 8.10 8.02 7.29

#### EXPERIMENTAL

The natural convection cell used is shown in Figure 1. A platinum or gold cylinder was suspended horizontally in the borosilicate glass cell 30 cm long and 7.6 cm in i.d. The electrically heated cylinder served as a nearly isothermal heat source. In the case of the N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> system, the runs with platinum gave results identical to those with gold. However, at elevated cylinder temperatures (ca.  $800^{\circ}$  C) platinum behaved as a catalyst for the  $2NO_2 \rightarrow 2NO$ + O<sub>2</sub> nonequilibrium system, whereas gold proved to be noncatalytic. The results of an investigation of natural convection heat transfer to nonequilibrium dissociating NO<sub>2</sub> reacting homogeneously on gold and catalytically on platinum is being published.

The cylindrical elements were electrically heated in a direct current circuit and the heat loss from the surface was calculated from measurements of the voltage drop along and the current through the element. From these voltagecurrent measurements the resistance of the wire was established, which was related to wire temperature by calibration. Small wires (0.0025 cm in o.d.), used as voltage taps, were attached about 2 cm from the ends of the cylinder to minimize axial conduction effects.

The dissociating  $N_2O_4$  system was chosen for study because it contributes a large reacting effect to the heat transfer rate and because thermodynamic, reaction kinetics, and transport data are readily available from Svehla (9). The  $N_2O_4$  used in the experiments was obtained from the Matheson Co. and had a composition of 99.9 mole %  $N_2O_4$ . In each experiment to remove any traces of moisture or HNO<sub>3</sub> the gas was passed through a  $P_2O_5$  drying tube prior to entering the evacuated natural convection cell. The purity of the gas was confirmed by freezing a sample and noting the color of the solid, which for pure  $N_2O_4$ is white, even traces of NO giving the solid a bluish tinge.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The detailed experimental natural convection data for  $N_2O_4$ ,  $N_2$ , and air are shown in Tables I and II and are plotted in Figure 2. Values of the Nusselt number for air and  $N_2$  deviate from the solid line by about  $\pm 3\%$ , whereas the data points for  $N_2O_4$  deviate about  $\pm 7\%$ . To obtain a reasonable correlation, the Nusselt number had to be based on an integrated average of the thermal conductivity between  $T_{\infty}$  and  $T_{w}$ . If, as is commonly done in

correlating heat transfer data in nonreacting systems, the value of the thermal conductivity employed in the Nusselt number is taken at a linear average of the bulk and surface temperature, the so-called film temperature, deviation in the Nusselt number as large as 300% can occur under the conditions of the present experiments. It is imperative in reacting systems to use the density driving force in the Grashof number and not temperature driving force times some average thermal expansion coefficient, as is presented by McAdams (7). Difficulty arises in the latter case because the thermal expansion coefficient is, like the thermal conductivity, a nonmonotonic function of temperature. The best correlation was obtained by using in the Grashof number values of kinematic viscosity based on the linear averaged bulk and surface temperature. Employing wall values of the kinematic viscosity leads to a maximum in the Grashof number, since the buoyancy term in the numerator and the kinematic viscosity term in the denominator increase with temperature at different rates, causing the Grashof number first to increase at low temperature driving forces and to decrease at sufficiently large temperature driving forces. This behavior occurs because under the condition of these experiments the surface temperature is varied with the bulk temperature maintained constant.

Values of the Nusselt number in the correlation represented by the curve in Figure 2 lay, for a given Grashof number, very close to the lower curve shown by McAdams.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Natural convection heat-transfer data in equilibrium reacting gases (where physical properties are not influenced by kinetics) may be correlated in the same fashion as for nonreacting systems, using the appropriate average values of the equilibrium properties. Because of the nonmonotonic dependence of thermal conductivity on temperature over certain temperature ranges, an integrated value of the thermal conductivity between the cylinder and bulk temperature has to be used in the Nusselt number. In the Grashof number, a linearly averaged value of kinematic viscosity suffices, since this property is a monotonic function of temperature over a wide temperature range.

In nonequilibrium systems, the processes of chemical kinetics and diffusion influence the over-all rate of heat transfer and the relative magnitude of the rate of reaction and diffusion must be taken into account, with the result that the simple treatment herein is not applicable.



Figure 2. Natural convection heat-transfer correlation — Air, N<sub>2</sub> O N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>

#### NOMENCLATURE

- D = diameter of cylindrical heating element, cm
- local acceleration due to gravity, cm/sec =
- M = molecular weight of gas, g/g mole
- Т = temperature, ° K
- q = wall heat flux density, cal/cm<sup>2</sup> sec  $N_{\rm Gr} = {\rm Grashof number}, g D^3 (\rho_w / \rho_w - 1) / \nu_\ell^2, {\rm dimensionless}$
- $N_{\rm Nu} = {\rm Nusselt \ number, \ } qD/\lambda(T_w T_w), \ {\rm dimensionless}$ 

  - = thermal conductivity, cal/cm sec  $^{\circ}$  K ⊼ ≈
  - integrated temperature average of thermal conductivity  $T_{\circ}$

$$= \frac{\int_T \lambda dt}{T_w - T_v}, \text{ cal/cm sec }^\circ \text{K}$$

 $v_f$  = kinematic viscosity at linear average temperature,  $\frac{1}{2}(T_w +$ T), cm<sup>2</sup>/sec

$$\rho = \text{density}, g/cm^3$$

#### Subscripts

2

- $\infty$  = state of bulk gas
- w = state of cylinder wall surface

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Beer, H., Chem. Ing.-Tech. 37, 1047 (1965c). (1)
- Beer, H., Deubel, W., Z. Flugwissenschaften 14, 281 (1966). (2)
- Brokaw, R.S., J. Chem. Phys. 35, 5, 1569 (1961). (3)
- Brokaw, R.S., Butler, J.N., Ibid., 26, 6, 1636 (1957). (4)
- (5)Fast, J.D., Chem. Tech. 2, 9 (1969).
- Langmuir, I., J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 34, 860 (1912). (6)
- McAdams, W.H., "Heat Transmission," 3rd ed., p. 176, Wiley, (7)New York, 1954. Rosner, D.E., "Convection Heat Transfer with Chemical
- (8)Reaction," Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, A.R.U. 99, August 1961.
- (9)Svehla, R.A., Brokaw, R.S., "Thermodynamic and Transport Properties for the  $N_2O_4 \overrightarrow{\leftarrow} 2NO_2 + O_2$  System," NASA Tech. Note NASA-TN-D-3327 (1966).
- Talley, C.P., Lasday, A.H., SAMPE J. 10, D-1 (1966). (10)
- Tower, L.K., "Analytical Study of the Continuous Chemical (11)Regeneration of Surfaces," NASA Tech. Note NASA-TN-D-**1194** (1962).

RECEIVED for review March 23, 1970. Accepted July 10, 1970.

### Enthalpy of Formation of Ammonium Hydrogen

## Monoamidophosphate, NH<sub>4</sub>HPO<sub>3</sub>NH<sub>2</sub>

ZACHARY T. WAKEFIELD<sup>1</sup>, BASIL B. LUFF, and ROBERT B. REED

Division of Chemical Development, Tennessee Valley Authority, Muscle Shoals, Ala. 35660

The enthalpy of formation from the elements in their standard states at  $25^\circ C$ of crystalline (monoclinic) ammonium hydrogen monoamidophosphate, NH4HPO3NH2, is  $-292.42 \pm 0.22$  kcal per mole. It was determined from its enthalpy of solution in 4m HCl and from published values for the enthalpies of formation of H<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, NH4H2PO4, and H2O.

In a continuing study of the thermal properties of compounds with potential application in fertilizer technology, measurements were made of the enthalpy of formation of ammonium hydrogen monoamidophosphate, NH4HPO3-NH2. This compound has a high plant nutrient content and good physical properties and was an excellent source of both nitrogen and phosphorus in greenhouse tests.

#### MATERIALS AND APPARATUS

Ammonium Hydrogen Monoamidophosphate.  $NH_4HPO_3$ -NH2 was prepared by adding 27.5 grams of phosphoryl trichloride (0.2 mole) slowly to 250 ml of a stirred, icecold 10% aqueous ammonia solution (1.5 moles of NH<sub>3</sub>). There was some fuming and evolution of heat, and the reaction was complete within several minutes to form a clear solution.

Paper chromatography with a neutral solvent showed that the phosphate in the solution was distributed as 63.4%monoamidophosphate, 33.1% diamidophosphate, and 3.5%

phosphoryl triamide. On dilution of the solution with 1 liter of acetone, two liquid phases were formed; the lower phase contained all the monoamidophosphate and the upper contained all the other species. The bottom layer was separated, neutralized with acetic acid, and cooled to induce crystallization. Additional product was obtained by dilution of the filtrate with an equal volume of ethanol.

The product was identified as NH<sub>4</sub>HPO<sub>3</sub>NH<sub>2</sub> by x-ray diffraction; the four strongest lines and their relative intensities were 5.77 (100), 4.22 (57), 4.30 (50), and 4.26 (51), corresponding, respectively, to 5.77 (100), 4.22 (46), 4.30 (35), and 4.26 (35) reported by Herzog (3). Similar agreement was found for the weaker reflections.

The calorimeter sample was a composite of four batches of about equal weight that were mixed thoroughly. Petrographic examination showed that all the individual batches had the same optical properties (monoclinic,  $N_{\alpha}$ = 1.495,  $N_{\beta}$  = 1.522,  $N_{\gamma}$  = 1.541)(4) as reference preparations whose identification was established by x-ray and chemical analysis. The composition of the composite was 24.6% total N, 12.4% ammoniacal N, and 27.15% P (stoichiometric: 24.56% total N, 12.28% ammoniacal N,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>To whom correspondence should be sent.