This article was downloaded by: On: 28 January 2011 Access details: Access Details: Free Access Publisher Taylor & Francis Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37- 41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



# Physics and Chemistry of Liquids

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713646857>

## The Role of Size Effects on Surface Properties

L. C. Prasadª; R. N. Singh<sup>b</sup>; G. P. Singhª <sup>a</sup> Dept. of Chemistry, T. N. B. College, Bhagalpur, India b Physics Dept., Sultan Qaboos University, Al-Khod, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman

To cite this Article Prasad, L. C. , Singh, R. N. and Singh, G. P.(1994) 'The Role of Size Effects on Surface Properties', Physics and Chemistry of Liquids, 27: 3, 179 — 185

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/00319109408029523 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00319109408029523>

# PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use:<http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

*Phys. Chem. Liq.,* **1994,** Vol. **27,** pp. **179-185**  Reprints available directly from the publisher Photocopying permitted by license only

# **THE ROLE OF SIZE EFFECTS ON SURFACE PROPERTIES**

L. C. PRASAD\*, R. N. SINGH<sup>†</sup>, G. P. SINGH<sup>§</sup>

\* *Dept. of Chemistry, i? N. B. College, Bhagalpur 812007 (India)*  t *Physics Dept. Sultan Qaboos University, P. 0. Box 32486, Al-Khod, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman*  **4** *Dept. of Chemistry, i? N. B. College, Bhagalpur 812007 (India)* 

*(Received 9 July 1993)* 

**A** theoretical model based on the grand partition function has been developed to investigate the role of size effects on surface tension and surface segregation of liquid binary alloys. The necessary relation, which connects the surface composition with surface tension through order potential, surface coordination and volume ratio, is obtained. This has been applied to liquid Na-Cs alloys. Likewise bulk properties, surface segregation and surface tension of Na-Cs liquid alloys are also affected appreciably by the size difference and are anomalous around  $C_{\text{Na}} = 0.8$ .

**KEY WORDS:** Surface segregation, grand natition function.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of surface segregation and surface tension in binary liquid alloys are important from the point of view of understanding many properties of physical significance such as catalytic activity of alloy catalyst, mechanical behaviour, kinetics of phase transformation etc. It is well known that the bulk properties are sensitive to size effect. Therefore we made an attempt to investigate the implications of size effect on the surface properties. A statistical mechanical approach<sup> $1-3$ </sup> based on the concept of layered structure near the interface has been found very useful for explaining surface properties of binary liquid alloys. The earlier approach of Prasad and Singh<sup>1</sup> has been improved upon to incorporate the effect of size difference on surface properties.

Na–Cs is a typical example of size effect (Cs-atom is 2.986 times bigger than Na-atom). Though the liquidus line is simply a deep eutectic but the free energy of mixing and concentration fluctuations<sup>4-6</sup>  $(q \rightarrow 0)$  are quite asymmetric and exhibit anomalous variation around  $C_{\text{Na}} = 0.8$ . The X-ray and neutron diffraction experiments<sup>7</sup> and electrical resistivity<sup>8</sup> also indicate such behaviour around the same composition. In the context of such informations, the surface concentrations and surface tension of liquid Na-Cs alloys are studied as a function of bulk concentrations. The necessary formalism is given in sections-2, which follows, discussions and conclusion in sections **3** and **4** respectively.

### *2.* **FORMALISM**

#### *2.1 Construction of grand partition function at the surface and its solution*

Let us consider a binary alloy  $A-B$ , which consists of  $N_A$  number of A atoms  $[-NC_A]$ and  $N_B$  number of *B* atoms  $[= NC_B]$  in the bulk phase; *N* being the total number of atoms,  $C_A$  and  $C_B$  are concentrations expressed in mole fractions such that  $C_A + C_B = 1$ . Following Prasad and Singh<sup>1</sup>, the grand partition function at the surface, **Es** can be constructed as

$$
\Xi^{s} = \sum_{E_{s}} q_{As}^{N_{s}^{s}}(T) q_{Bs}^{N_{s}^{s}}(T) \exp(\mu_{A}^{s} N_{A}^{s} + \mu_{B}^{s} N_{B}^{s} - E_{s}) / K_{B} T
$$
 (1)

where  $\mu_i^S$  are chemical potentials of i (A or B atom) atom at the surface and  $E_S$  is the surface configurational energy.  $q_{i}$ ,  $(T)$  is atomic partition function of *i*  $(A \text{ or } B)$  atom at the surface and  $N_A^S$ ,  $N_B^S$ ,  $N_S^S$ ,  $C_A^S$  and  $C_B^S$  refer to the quantities at the surface. It has been assumed that the species in the bulk and surface phases are in thermodynamic equalibrium. In the case of thermodynamic equilibrium,

$$
\mu_A = \mu_A^s, \quad \mu_B = \mu_B^s \tag{2}
$$

The terms without subscript and superscript 'S' represent the bulk. The basic problem, that is faced out in the solution of Eq. (l), lies in the definition of surface configurational energy, *E,.* Prasad and Singh' in a very simple manner have expressed  $E_S$  as the product of order potential  $W[W = Z(\epsilon_{AB} - \frac{\epsilon_{AA} + \epsilon_{BB}}{2})]$ ; where  $\epsilon_{AA}$ ,  $\epsilon_{BB}$ and  $\varepsilon_{AB}$  are bond energies of  $A-A$ ,  $B-B$  and  $A-B$  bonds respectively and Z is the coordination number] and effective number of *A-B* contacts at the surface. It is given as  $\left(\varepsilon_{AB} - \frac{\varepsilon_{AA} + \varepsilon_{BB}}{2}\right)$ ; wh

$$
E_s = N^s W \left[ p C_A^s C_B^s + q C_A C_B^s + C_B (C_A^s - C_A) \right]
$$
 (3)

where *p* and *q* are the fractions of total number of nearest neighbours made by an atom within its own layer and that in the adjoining layer, such that  $p + 2q = 1$ . As earlier<sup>1</sup>, p where *p* and *q* are the fractions of total number of nearest neighbours made within its own layer and that in the adjoining layer, such that  $p + 2q = 1$ .<br>and *q* have been treated as parameter and taken as  $p = \frac{1}{2}$  an

Substituting  $E_s$  from Eq. (3) in Eq. (1), replacing the sum by its greatest term, differentiating the equation with respect to  $C_A$  and equating it to zero  $(\partial \Xi^S / \partial C_A = 0)$ , we obtain a pair of equations for grand partition function at the surface  $E^s$ , as

$$
\Xi^s = \left[ (q_{A_s}(T)/C_A^s) \exp\left(\frac{\mu_A - \{p(C_B^s)^2 + q(C_B)^2\}W}{K_B T}\right) \right]^{N_s}
$$
(4a)

$$
= \left[ (q_{B_s}(T)/C_B^s) \exp\left(\frac{\mu_B - \{p(C_A^s)^2 + q(C_A)^2\}W}{K_B T}\right) \right]^{N_s}
$$
(4b)

### 2.2 *Standard thermodynamic relations*

The grand partition function at the surface,  $\Xi^s$ , is related to surface tension of the alloy, **o,** and surface area *A,* through the relation

$$
\Xi^s = \exp\left(\frac{-\sigma A}{K_B T}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{-\sigma \cdot \alpha N^s}{K_B T}\right) \tag{5}
$$

where  $\alpha\left(=\frac{A}{N^s}\right)$  is the mean atomic surface area.

Further the chemical potential  $\mu_i$  of *i*( $A$  or  $B$ ) atom is related to activity  $a_i$ , though the relation

$$
\mu_i = \mu_i^0 + K_B T \ln a_i \tag{6}
$$

where  $\mu_i^0$  refers to pure component. Activity  $a_i$  and activity coefficient,  $\gamma_i$ , of *i* (*A* or *B*) component are connected through the relation

$$
a_i = C_i \gamma_i \tag{7}
$$

where  $C_i$  is the concentration of the components.

### *2.3 Expression for surface tension* of *the alloy*

All the equations of section (2.2) [Eq. (5) to **(7)]** have been used in Eq. **(4)** to obtain a pair of equations for the surface tension of the alloy  $\sigma$  *i.e.* 

$$
\sigma = \sigma_A + \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \frac{C_A^s}{C_A} - \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \gamma_A + \left[ p (C_B^s)^2 + q (C_B)^2 \right] \frac{W}{\alpha}
$$
 (8a)

$$
= \sigma_B + \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \frac{C_B^s}{C_B} - \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \gamma_B + \left[ p (C_A^s)^2 + q (C_A)^2 \right] \frac{W}{\alpha}
$$
 (8b)

where  $\sigma_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  are surface tension of pure components *A* and *B* respectively.

the surface respectively and under very simplified picture, we express, Further, we assume that  $\gamma_A^s$  and  $\gamma_B^s$  are activity coefficients of A and B components at

$$
\ln \gamma_A^s = p(\ln \gamma_A \text{ containing surface concentration in place of} \text{bulk concentration}) + q \ln \gamma_A \tag{9a}
$$

$$
\ln \gamma_B^s = p(\ln \gamma_B \text{ containing surface concentration in place of})
$$
  
bulk concentration) +  $q \ln \gamma_B$  (9b)

It is very simple to obtain expressions for activity coefficient at the surface  $(y_A^s \text{ and } y_B^s)$ if one has proper expressions for bulk activity coefficient ( $\gamma_A$  and  $\gamma_B$ ). In zeroth approximation, where distribution of constituent atoms is completely random,  $\gamma_A$  and  $\gamma_B$  are given as

$$
\ln \gamma_A = C_B^2 \frac{W}{K_B T} \tag{10a}
$$

$$
\ln \gamma_B = C_A^2 \frac{W}{K_B T}
$$
 (10b)

Using equations [Eq. (8) to Eq. (10)] one obtains a pair of equations for surface tension of the alloy  $\sigma$ , in terms of activity coefficient in the bulk and at the surface as

$$
\sigma = \sigma_A + \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \frac{C_A^s}{C_A} + \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \frac{\gamma_A^s}{\gamma_A}
$$
 (11a)

$$
= \sigma_B + \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \frac{C_B^s}{C_B} + \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \frac{\gamma_B^s}{\gamma_B}
$$
 (11b)

Size effect enters into Eq. (11) through  $\gamma_A$  and  $\gamma_B$ , for which we consider Flory's like expressions,

$$
\alpha \qquad C_B \qquad \alpha \qquad \gamma_B
$$
  
enters into Eq. (11) through  $\gamma_A$  and  $\gamma_B$ , for which we consider Flory's like  
,  

$$
\ln \gamma_A = -\ln \left[ C_A (1-r) + r \right] - \frac{C_B (1-r)}{C_A (1-r) + r} + \frac{C_B^2}{(1 - b C_A)^2} \cdot \frac{W}{K_B T}
$$
(12a)

$$
\ln \gamma_B = \ln r - \ln \left[ C_A (1 - r) + r \right] - \frac{C_A (1 - r)}{C_A (1 - r) + r} + \frac{C_A^2 (1 - b)}{(1 - b C_A)^2} \frac{W}{K_B T} \tag{12b}
$$

where  $b = (r - 1)/r$ ; *r* being the ratio of volumes of *B* atom to *A* atom  $(\Omega_B/\Omega_A;\Omega_A)$  and  $\Omega_B$  are atomic volumes).

Using Eqs. **(9),** (1 **1)** and (12), one arrives at a pair of equations for surface tension for alloys of different sizes i.e.

$$
\sigma = \sigma_A + \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \frac{C_A^s}{C_A} + p \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \left[ \ln \frac{1 - b C_A}{1 - b C_A^s} - \frac{C_B b}{1 - b C_A} + \frac{C_B^s b}{1 - b C_A^s} + \frac{W}{K_B T} \left( \frac{(C_B^s)^2}{(1 - b C_A^s)^2} - \frac{(C_B)^2}{(1 - b C_A)^2} \right) \right]
$$
  

$$
- q \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \left[ -\ln r (1 - b C_A) + \frac{C_B b}{(1 - b C_A)} + \frac{C_B^2}{(1 - b C_A)^2} \cdot \frac{W}{K_B T} \right] \qquad (13a)
$$
  

$$
= \sigma_B + \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \ln \frac{C_B^s}{C_B} + p \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \left[ \ln \frac{1 - b C_A}{1 - b C_A^s} - \frac{b C_A^s}{1 - b C_A^s} + \frac{b C_A^s}{1 - b C_A^s} + (1 - b) \frac{W}{K_B T} \left( \frac{(C_A^s)^2}{(1 - b C_A^s)^2} - \frac{(C_A^s)^2}{(1 - b C_A)^2} \right) \right]
$$
  

$$
- q \frac{K_B T}{\alpha} \left[ \ln r - \ln r (1 - b C_A) - \frac{b C_A}{1 - b C_A} + \frac{C_A^2 (1 - b)}{(1 - b C_A)^2} \cdot \frac{W}{K_B T} \right] \qquad (13b)
$$

Above equations can be solved numerically to determine the values of surface tension and surface composition.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The pair of equations **(13)** has been used to compute surface tension and surface composition of Na-Cs liquid alloys. The basic inputs for obtaining the solution of above equation are order potential *W,* surface coordination fractions *p* and *q,* surface tension of pure components, atomic surface area and atomic volumes of the constituent elements.

The order potential *W* has been chosen as equal to 1.278  $K<sub>B</sub> T$  at  $T = 383.15$ °K, so that the bulk properties including the concentration fluctuations are satisfactorily explained. The surface coordination fractions *p* and *q* are taken for closed packed structure  $(p = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $q = \frac{1}{4}$ ) and surface tension of pure components are taken from Smithel's reference book;  $\sigma_{Na} = 0.1937$  Nm<sup>-1</sup> and  $\sigma_{Cs} = 0.0651$  Nm<sup>-1</sup>. The atomic surface area,  $\alpha$ , has been computed by following relations<sup>9</sup>

$$
\alpha = 1.102 N^{-2/3} \Omega^{2/3} \tag{14}
$$

Experimentally obtained values<sup>4</sup> of  $\Omega$  have been used to compute  $\alpha$  at each concentration. Using these quantities, Eq. (13) has been solved numerically to obtain surface tension,  $\sigma$ , and surface composition,  $C_i^s$  of Na–Cs liquid alloys as a function of bulk concentrations, *Ci.* The variations of surface tension and surface concentration with bulk concentrations have been presented in figures **(1)** and **(2)** respectively.

From Figure **(I),** it is clear that surface tension of Na-Cs liquid alloys at **383.15"K** are always smaller than the ideal values  $\sigma_{id} = \sigma_{Na} C_{Na} + \sigma_{Cs} C_{Cs}$  for all bulk concentrations. The curvature is maximum around  $C_{\text{Na}} = 0.8$ .

The study of Figure (2) makes it clear that bigger atom (Cs) always segregate at the surface for all bulk concentrations of Cs. Even for small bulk concentrations of Cs, the surface seems to be quite enriched with the Cs atoms. For the alloy composition  $Na_{0.9}Cs_{0.1}$  (bulk composition of alloy is 90% Na and 10% Cs) the surface composition of the alloy becomes  $Na_{0.136}Cs_{0.864}$  (surface composition is  $86.4\%$  Cs and  $13.6\%$  Na). The surface composition  $(C_{\text{cs}}^s)$  rises steeply with respsect to bulk concentration.

Because of unavailability of experimental values, we could not compare out theoretical results.

### **4.** CONCLUSION

An expression for surface tension and surface composition of binary liquid alloys, whose components differ appreciably in their sizes (Na-Cs system) has been developed. The computed values of surface composition indicate that bigger atoms (Cs) always segregate to the surface for all bulk compositions. Surface tension of Na-Cs alloys is always smaller than the ideal values,  $\sigma_{id} = C_{Na}\sigma_{Na} + C_{Cs}\sigma_{Cs}$ . The study reveals that the surface composition is very sensitive to the size effect. Likewise the bulk properties,



**Figure 1** Surface tension,  $\sigma$ , of NaCs liquid alloy as a function of bulk concentration,  $C_{cs}$  -- and ---referto present theory and ideal values respectively.



**Figure 2** Surface concentration,  $C_{c}$ , of NaCs liquid alloys as a function of bulk concentration,  $C_{\text{cs}}$  - refers to present theory.

maximum deviation in surface properties (surface tension and surface segregation) has been found to occur at  $C_{Na} \approx 0.8$ .

*References* 

- I. L. C. Prasad and **R.** N. Singh, Phys. *Rev. B* **44,24, 13768 (1991).**
- **2.** K. **S.** Yeun, **R.** Speiser and D. R. Poirier, *Metall. Trans.* **20B, 693 (1989).**
- 3. D. R. Poirier and R. Speiser, *Metal. Trans.* **18A**, 1156 (1987).
- **4. F.** E. Neale and N. E. Cusack, J. Phys. F. *Met. Phys.* **12, 2839 (1982).**
- **5. R.** N. Singh and **A.** B. Bhatia, *J. Phys.* F. *Met. Phys.* **14, 2309 (1984).**
- **6.** R. **N.** Singh and S. Sinha, Phys. *Ofdisordered* Materiafs(Wor1d Sc. Pub. Comp. Singapore, p. **131** I)( **1987). 7. M. J.** Huijbeen, W. Vander Lugt, A. M. Reimert, J. Th. M. de Hosson and C Van Di jk; *Physica,* **97B, 338**
- **(1 979).**
- **8.** B. P. Singh, V. N. Chaudhary and R. N. Singh, *Phys. Chem. Liq.* **23,211 (1991).**
- **9.** P. Laty, **J.** C. Joud and P. Desre, *Surf:* Sc. **60, 109 (1976).**