Thermodynamic Properties of the NaCl+H₂O System. II. Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl(aq), NaCl·2H₂(cr), and Phase Equilibria

Cite as: Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data **21**, 793 (1992); https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555915 Submitted: 19 November 1991 . Published Online: 15 October 2009

Donald G. Archer



ARTICLES YOU MAY BE INTERESTED IN

Thermodynamic Properties of Aqueous Sodium Chloride Solutions Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data **13**, 1 (1984); https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555709

Thermodynamic Properties of the NaCl+H₂O System I. Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl(cr) Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data **21**, 1 (1992); https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555913

Volumetric Properties of Aqueous Sodium Chloride Solutions Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data 11, 15 (1982); https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555660



Where in the world is AIP Publishing? Find out where we are exhibiting next



Thermodynamic Properties of the NaCl + H₂O System II. Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl(aq), NaCl·2H₂O(cr), and Phase Equilibria

Donald G. Archer

Chemical Kinetics and Thermodynamics Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899

Received November 19, 1991; revised manuscript received February 26, 1992

Equations that described the thermodynamic properties of the NaCl + H₂O system were obtained from a fit to experimental results for this system. The experimental results included in the fit spanned the range of temperature of approximately 250 to 600 K and, where available, the range of pressure from the vapor pressure of the solution to 100 MPa. New equations and/or values for the following properties are given in the present work: 1) $\Delta_f G_m^\circ$ and $\Delta_t H_m^\circ$, for formation from the elements, for NaCl(cr) for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa, 2) $\Delta_f G_m^\circ$ and $\Delta_t H_m^\circ$ from the elements, as well as S_m° and $C_{p,m}$, all for 298.15 K, 0.1 MPa, for NaCl·2H₂O(cr), 3) the change in chemical potential for both NaCl and H₂O in NaCl(aq) as a function of temperature, pressure, and molality, valid from 250 to 600 K and, where available, from the vapor pressure of the solution to 100 MPa. Comparison of the accuracies of experimental methods, where possible, has also been performed.

Keywords: activity coefficient; apparent molar properties; aqueous; compressibility; dehydration; density; enthalpy; equation of state; expansivity; formation properties; Gibbs energy; heat capacity; osmotic coefficient; partial molar properties; sodium chloride; sodium chloride dihydrate; solubility; thermodynamics; vapor pressure.

Contents

1.	Introduction	795
2.	Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl(cr)	796
3.	Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl·2H ₂ O(cr).	797
4.	Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl(aq)	797
	4.1. Description of Equations	797
	4.2. Agreement with the Experimental Re-	
	sults for NaCl(aq)	801
	4.2.1. Volumetric Results	802
	4.2.2. Activity Results	809
	4.2.3. Enthalpy of Dilution Results	811
	4.2.4 Enthalpy of Solution Results	812
	4.2.5 Heat Capacity Results	813
5.	Invariant and Univariant Equilibria	815
6.	Formation Properties.	818
7.	Acknowledgment	819
8.	References	819
Λp	opendix 1	822
Λŗ	ppendix 2	828

List of Tables

. . .

1.	Parameters for	Eq. (1)	•••••	• • • • •	796
2.	Least-squares	estimated	parameters	for	
	Eqs. (3-37)				801

 \oplus 1992 by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce on behalf of the United States. This copyright is assigned to the American Institute of Physics and the American Chemical Society.

Reprints available from ACS; see Reprints List at back of issue.

3.	. Literature sources for the volumetric proper-	
	ties of NaCl(aq)	803
4	. Literature sources for the activity and thermal	
	properties of NaCl(aq)	804
5	. The invariant equilibria NaCl(cr) +	
	$NaCl(aq) + NaCl 2H_2O(cr) + H_2O(g)$ and	
	$NaCl \cdot 2H_2O(cr) + NaCl(aq) + H_2O(g) +$	
	H ₂ O(cr, I)	816
6	. The Gibbs energy of formation, the enthalpy of	
	formation and the molar entropy of NaCl(cr)	
	and NaCl·2H ₂ O(cr) for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa	
	calculated from the least-squares estimated	
	parameters.	818
7	. Calculated values of A_{ϕ} , $\beta_{MX}^{(0)}$, $\beta_{MX}^{(1)}$, $C_{MX}^{(0)}$, and	
	C ⁽¹⁾	818
8	. Calculated values of $G_{m,2}^{\circ} - G_{m,2,T_n,P_n}^{\circ} H_{m,2}^{\circ} -$	
	$H_{m,2,T_{1},P_{1}}^{\circ}, S_{m,2}^{\circ} - S_{m,2,T_{1},P_{1}}^{\circ}, C_{p,\phi}^{\circ}, V_{\phi}^{\circ}, \dots$	819
9	. Calculated values of the osmotic coeffi-	
	cient, φ	819
1	0. Calculated values of the stoichiometric activity	
	coefficient, $\gamma \pm \ldots$	819
A	1–1. Literature sources for the volumetric prop-	
	erties of NaCl(aq)	823
A	1-2. Literature sources for the activity and	
	thermal properties of NaCl(aq)	824
A	1-3. Least-squares estimated parameters for	
	Eqs. (3-37) using an alternate equation for the	
	dielectric constant for water	827

J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1992

List of Figures

1.	Difference of experimental densities from the fitted equation	807
2.	Difference of experimental densities, obtained	007
	from vibrating-tube densimeters, from the fit-	
	ted equation	807
3.	Difference of experimental densities, obtained	
	from two slightly different densimeters, for	
	323 K	808
4.	Difference of experimental densities, obtained	
	from two slightly different densimeters, for	000
5	450 K	808
э.	from the fitted equation	800
6	Experimental and calculated values of the ex-	009
0.	nansivity of NaCl(aq)	809
7.	Differences of osmotic coefficients obtained	005
••	from solvent freezing point depressions from	
	the fitted equation	810
8.	Differences of osmotic coefficients obtained	
	from vapor pressure measurements from the	
_	fitted equation	810
9.	Differences of osmotic coefficients calculated	
	from the equations of Clarke and Glew and	011
10	Differences of observed antholpies of solution	911
10.	from the fitted equation for 208 15 K	817
11	Differences of observed enthalpies of solution	012
11.	from the fitted equation near 275 K	813
12.	Differences of observed heat capacities from	010
	the fitted equation	814
13.	Differences of observed heat capacities, ob-	
	tained with mass-flow calorimeters for which	
	calibrations were performed by a flow-rate	
	variation method, from the fitted equation	814
14.	Differences of observed heat capacities, ob-	
	tained with commercial mass-flow calorime-	
	from the fitted equation	815
15	Annarent molar heat canacities at low temper-	015
1	atures	815
16.	Differences between some of the observed sol-	
	ubilities and the fitted equation against tem-	
	perature	817
17.	Values for the equilibrium NaCl(cr) +	
	$NaCl \cdot 2H_2O(cr) + NaCl(aq)$	817
18.	Values for the equilibrium NaCl(cr) +	~ ~
	$NaCl^{2}H_{2}O(cr) + H_{2}O(g)$	817
Δ1	-1 Compressibility of NaCl(ag) against pres-	
~I-	sure for 573.15 K and 1.0 molegr ⁻¹	877
A7-	-1. Differences in enthalpies of dilution from	0 <i>616</i>
	different calorimeters	828
A2-	-2. Enthalpy of dilution of NaOH(aq), for	
	523.15 K and 4.5 MPa, from Izzatt et al. ¹⁷³ The	
	squares are dilutions from 1.93 mol·kg ⁻¹ ; the	
	circles are dilutions from $1.84 \text{ mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$. The	
	triangles are dilutions from 9.82 mol·kg ^{-1}	829

List of Symbols

$A_{\phi}, A_{H}, A_{C}, A_{V}$	Debye-Hückel coefficients for osmotic coefficient, apparent molar enthalpy, apparent molar constant-pressure heat capacity and apparent molar volume.
a _w	Activity of water in a solution.
b	A constant in Pitzer's ion-interaction
<u></u>	$10 \text{ kLmol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$
C _p	
$C_{p, \phi}$	Apparent molar constant-pressure
~	neat capacity.
$C_{p,m,2}$	Standard-state constant-pressure mo-
<i>a</i> n	lar near capacity of the solute.
$C_{p, m, cr}$	Standard-state constant-pressure mo-
	lar neat capacity of a crystalline phase.
С _{р, s}	Specific constant-pressure heat capac-
	ity of a solution.
С _{р. w}	Specific constant-pressure heat capac-
	ity of one kg of water.
$C_p(m_r)$	Constant-pressure heat capacity of a
	quantity of solution of molality m_r and
	containing one kg of solvent.
C_{MX}, C_{MX}, C_{MX}	Ion-interaction parameters for Pitzer's
	equation.
G	Gibbs energy (extensive).
Ger	Excess Gibbs energy of a solution (ex-
	tensive).
$G^{\circ}_{\mathfrak{m}, 1}, G^{\circ}_{\mathfrak{m}, 2}$	Standard-state molar Gibbs energy of
	the solvent and the solute, respectively.
$G^{\circ}_{m, cr}$	Standard-state molar Gibbs energy of a
	crystalline phase.
$G_{m, 1, g}^{o}$	Standard-state molar Gibbs energy of
* * *	the solvent gas phase.
$H^{\circ}_{m, cr}$	Standard-state molar enthalpy of a
*	crystalline phase. $\int (f - 0.5)^{2} df$
I Ko	$10 \text{ nic strength } (I = 0.52, m_i z_i^{-1}).$
К _{ф, S}	Apparent molar isentropic compress-
* •	
	I.U KJ·mol ⁻ .
L_{ϕ}	Relative apparent molar enthalpy.
$L_{m,1}$	Partial molar eninalpy of the solvent.
M_1	Molar mass of the solvent, 10.0150×100^3 k 10^{-1}
	18.0153×10^{-5} kg·mol ⁻¹ .
m	
m	1.0 mol·kg ⁻ .
m _r	Reference molality.
n_i	Moles of the <i>i</i> th substance.
p "°	
Р "	LU MI d. Vanor pressure of pure water
Pw n	Patarance pressure as a subcorint to a
p,	neuroperty it denotes that the value of
	the property is that for the reference
	me property is that for the reference
D	μ_{10}
л Са	Uas constant, 0.5144 × 10 KJ-11101 .
ک	size)
	Sivej.

7	9	5
-	-	-

S _{m, cr}	Standard-state molar entropy of a crys-
	talline phase.
S _{1, m} , S _{2, m}	Standard-state molar entropy of the
	solvent and the solute.
Т	Temperature.
T°	1.0 K.
Tr	A reference temperature; as a sub-
	script to a property it denotes that the
	value of the property is that for the ref-
	erence temperature.
u	Speed of sound.
V°	$1.0 \text{ cm}_3 \text{ mol}^{-1}$.
Vo	Apparent molar volume.
Vm 2	Standard-state molar volume of the so-
	lute.
V ^o _{m, cr}	Standard-state molar volume of a crys-
	talline phase.
$V(m_{\rm r})$	Volume of a quantity of solution of mo-
· · · ·	lality $m_{\rm f}$ and containing 1 kg of solvent.
ζ _Μ , Ζχ	The charges of ions M and X.
a	A constant in Pitzer's equation, chosen
	to be 2.0 $kg^{1/2} mol^{-1/2}$.
(1)	A constant in revised Pitzer's equation,
	chosen to be $2.5 \text{ kg}^{1/2} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1/2}$.
<i>(</i>) .	Expansivity of a solution.
R	Isothermal compressibility.
Р В.	Isentropic compressibility.
R(2) B(2)	Ion-interaction parameters in Pitzer's
PMA, PMA	ion interaction equation.
$\Lambda_{i}G^{\circ}$	The standard-state molar Gibbs energy
	change for formation from the ele-
	ments
A. 6º	The standard-state molar Gibbs energy
iddee O m	change for decomposition of a mate-
	rial
A Gou	The standard-state molar Gibbs energy
dui O annydrous	change for solution of an anhydrous
	colute
1 C	The standard state maler Gibbs energy
Asol O'dihydrate	the standard-state motal Oldos chergy
	change for solution of a dinydrate
1. 110	The standard state malor entheling
$\Delta_{f}m$	the standard-state motal entitalpy
	monte
A T	The difference in freezing point tom
Afus I	The unterence in neezing point tem-
	perature for a solvent from a solution
4 17	The change is supercent moles are have
Δ _{dil} V _φ	The change in apparent molar volume
	for a change in molality.
n	The average deviation (unweighted) of
	a set of experimental results from the
	itted equation.
γ,	Stoichiometric activity coefficient of
	the solute.
ф	Osmotic coefficient.
ρ	Density.
P	1.0 g-cm^{-3} .
(T _{fit}	The root mean square difference (un-

S-		weighted) of a set of experimental re- sults from the fitted equations.
e	ν	$\nu_{\rm M}$ + $\nu_{\rm X}$
	ν _M , ν _X	The stoichiometric number of M and X
		ions in the electrolyte $M\nu_M X\nu_X$.
	υ _w	Volume of one kg of water.

1. Introduction

Two recent treatments of the thermodynamic properties of NaCl(aq) have been given by Pitzer et al.¹ (which incorporated the volumetric-property equation of Rogers and Pitzer¹⁶) and by Clarke and Glew.² The Pitzer et al. equation was a representation of experimental values ranging from the freezing point of the solution to 573 K and to pressures of 100 MPa. Their equation used two sets of parameters, one for low temperatures, the other, comprised of 53 least-squares estimated parameters, for the entire range of temperature. The Pitzer et al. treatment represented the available results, for temperatures greater than 373 K, within reasonable agreement of the experimental uncertainties. However, as Clarke and Glew noted, various measurements at near-ambient temperatures, primarily enthalpy and free energy results, were not represented within experimental errors. Clarke and Glew gave a representation of experimental results for temperatures less than 423 K that represented these lower temperature results more accurately than did the Pitzer et al. equation. The Clarke and Glew equation contained 35 variable parameters and did not attempt to represent the pressure dependence of the thermodynamic properties, i.e. volumetric results. Clarke and Glew obtained this improvement over the Pitzer et al. treatment. in part, by including terms of Dm⁴ and Em⁵ to the Pitzer equation for excess Gibbs energy. Both of these representations satisfied their respective authors' goals. Since the time the Pitzer et al. equation was published, a significant number of experimental results for temperatures greater than 373 K, many of them of significantly greater accuracy than the previously available results, has become available. Not all of these high-temperature results agreed with the Pitzer et al. equation within expected experimental uncertainties. For many purposes, but not all, the small discrepancies of the Pitzer et al. equation from the experimental results is not a significant problem.

One purpose for which these discrepancies are important is the determination of instrument accuracies by comparison with previous experiment. With the vast T, pspace available to high-temperature experiments today, comparison at specific T, p, m points, as is done with experimental methods that provide values only for verynear-ambient conditions, is unnecessarily cumbersome. What is desired is an equation that represents all of the best measurements within their accuracies and that spans this T, p space so that comparisons with new experiments may be made without a constant fussing with exact temperature and pressure settings. A second purpose is to supply values with which instruments that require a chemical standard for calibration may be so calibrated. Often a chemical-standard calibration may consume less resource than an absolute calibration and give an adequate degree of experimental accuracy, provided sufficiently accurate values for the properties of the chemical standard are available.

A few examples are described here. In mass-flow relative heat-capacity calorimeters it is fairly well known that systematic errors arise from unaccounted heat transfers between calorimeter and surroundings. Because the time and costs of determining the heat losses in this type of calorimeter are far from trivial, calls for chemical standard calibrations of these calorimeters have appeared throughout the literature. Less well known are systematic differences that can appear in results obtained with hightemperature enthalpy of dilution calorimeters. An example of systematic differences between high-temperature enthalpy of dilution calorimeters is given in Appendix 2.

Because NaCl(aq) is an ubiquity in many realms of nature, and is inexpensive and easy to purify, it is often chosen as the first system with which to demonstrate a new instrument. As such, there is an extent of reported experimental measurements for NaCl(aq) that is greater and more accurate than that available for any other two-component chemical system. (This is the author's perception and so could be entirely incorrect.) In the present work it was desired to generate a representation for NaCl(aq) that represents the best available experimental results for NaCl(aq) within their uncertainties, so that the above two purposes, these being perhaps the most demanding uses of such a representation, may be satisfied.

Three equations were used to represent experimental results for the NaCl + H_2O system. These were: 1) the equation of state for water given by Hill³; 2) a representation for the change in chemical potential of NaCl(cr) as a function of temperature,⁴ the pressure dependence of which is described here; and, 3) an equation for the changes in chemical potentials for the components of the aqueous solution. Section 2 describes the representation of the chemical potential for NaCl(cr). Section 3 gives a value of the density of NaCl·2H₂O, obtained from fitting experimental observations of a univariant equilibria, a value of the compressibility, and an estimate of the heat capacity of NaCl-2H₂O(cr). The equation for the changes in chemical potentials of the solution components with respect to temperature, pressure, and molality for NaCl(aq) was obtained from a global fit to values from thermodynamic measurements for the aqueous system. The matrix of experimental values contained measurements of volumetric properties, solvent and solute activities, enthalpy changes, heat capacities, and solubilities from the solid phases. Because one of the intended purposes of the present work is to provide assistance in the calibration of instruments, certain types of data have not been included in the representation for NaCl(aq). Generally, these are results of measurements that can be termed relative, in other words, the measurement of a

property for NaCl(aq) relative to another aqueous electrolyte. The equation for NaCl(aq) and its agreement with experimental values is described in Sec. 4. Section 5 describes the thermodynamic properties for some of the invariant and univariant equilibria of the NaCl + H_2O system. A program that calculates values of the thermodynamic properties of NaCl(aq) will be available from the author for a reasonable period of time. A few calculated values, presented only as a means to test the validity of coding, (Tables 7 through 10) may be found at the end of the paper.

2. Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl(cr)

Calorimetric results for NaCl(cr), for a 0.1 MPa nominal isobar, were recently reviewed and represented.⁴ That review was performed because of the significant differences of "critically evaluated" values of the heat capacity of NaCl(cr) from the experimental results. Because the difference between the different sets of heat capacities was about 1 per cent near 270 K, and larger at lower temperatures, the 298.15 K molar entropy of NaCl(cr), 72.27 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹, cannot be claimed to be more accurate than ± 1 per cent. Details of the NaCl(cr) representation were given in Ref. 4.

Bockris *et al.*³ measured the expansion of NaCl(cr) from 300 K to near the melting point. They gave the density of NaCl(cr) as:

$$\rho/\rho^{\circ} = a + b(T - 273.15 \text{ K})/T^{\circ} - c[(T - 273.15 \text{ K})/T^{\circ}]^{2}$$
 (1)

where T° and ρ° are 1.0 K and 1.0 g·cm⁻³, respectively, and *a*, *b*, and *c* are given in Table 1. The compressibility of NaCl(cr) was taken to be 4.2×10^{-5} MPa^{-1.6} The calculations disussed in this paper were not very sensitive to this value.

TABLE 1. Parameters for Eq. (1)

Parameter	Value
a	2.168
Ь	$-1.267 \times 10 - 4$
с	$-1.754 \times 10 - 7$

The equation for the molar Gibbs energy of NaCl(cr)

is:

$$G_{m, cr}^{\circ} = G_{m, cr, T_r, p_r}^{\circ} - (T - T_r) S_{m, T_r, p_r}^{\circ} + \int_{T_r}^{T} C_{p, m, cr, p_r}^{\circ} dT - T_{T_r}^{T} (C_{p, m, cr, p_r}^{\circ} / T) dT + \int_{p_r}^{p} V_{m, cr}^{\circ} dp$$
(2)

where T_r and p_r were chosen as 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa. The integrals of the molar heat capacity were calculated from the spline given in Ref. 4 and the molar volume was calculated from Eq. (1) and the compressibility. $G_{m,cr,T_nP_T}^{\circ}$ is, of course, not experimentally accessible. (The value of $S_{m,T_nP_1}^{\circ}$ used in the calculations was 72.2653 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹ as obtained from the equations described in Ref. 4.) The thermodynamic properties for formation

797

 $(\Delta_f G_m^\circ, \Delta_f H_m^\circ)$ of both NaCl(cr) and NaCl·2H₂O(cr) for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa are discussed in a subsequent section.

3. Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl·2H₂O(cr)

There are few accurate measurements of the thermodynamic properties of NaCl-2H2O(cr). A value for C^o_{p, m, NaCl-2H₂O(cr)} for 298.15 K, 0.1 MPa was estimated to be 137 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹ by combining the value of $C_{p, m, cr}^{\circ}$ for NaCl(cr) with 87 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹, an approximate value for the heat capacity contribution for two waters of hydration. This value was obtained by comparison with other clectrolytes; the dihydrates of MgCl₂, BaCl₂ and CaSO₄, the monohydrates of MgCl₂ and MgSO₄ and the hemihydrate of CaSO4 were used to obtain this value. This value was slightly larger than that used by Pabalan and Pitzer¹⁷¹ in their treatment of mineral solubilities. Pabalan and Pitzer obtained their value, 83 $J \cdot K^{-1} \cdot mol^{-1}$, from the heat capacity values for the mono-, di-, tetra- and hexa-hydrates of MgCl₂ and the mono- and hexa-hydrates of MgSO₄. The more hydrated salts were not used to obtain the value used here because of the possibility of a nonidentical increment for each additional stoichiometric mole of water. A value for S^o_{m, NaCl-2H2O(cr)} for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa, 162.5 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹, was determined from fitting to the experimental solubilities of the dihydrate phase, decomposition pressures, and thermodynamic results for NaCl(aq). The density of NaCl-2H₂O(cr), for 273.15 K and 0.1 MPa, 1629 kg·m⁻³, was determined from the experimental determinations of the univariant equilibrium: $NaCl(cr) + NaCl + 2H_2O(cr) + NaCl(aq)$. The compressibility of NaCl-2H₂O(cr) was taken to be 4.8×10^{-5} MPa^{-1,7} Only the dihydrate appears in the literature; this, of course, cannot be taken to mean that other hydrates do not exist.

4. Thermodynamic Properties of NaCl(aq) 4.1. Description of Equations

A modified form⁸ of the ion-interaction model described by Pitzer⁹ was used in the present work to express the thermodynamic properties of the solution. Description of Pitzer's equation can be found elsewhere¹⁰ and so only sufficient exposition to allow use of the present equations is presented here. Pitzer's equation for the excess Gibbs energy per kg of water, n_{w} , is:

$$\frac{G^{\alpha}}{n_{\rm w}RT} = -4|z_{\rm M}z_{\rm X}|A_{\phi}\ln(1+bI^{1/2}) + 2\nu_{\rm M}\nu_{\rm X}(m^2B_{\rm MX}+m^3\nu_{\rm M}z_{\rm M}C_{\rm MX})$$
(3)

$$B_{MX} = \beta_{MX}^{(0)} + 2\beta_{MX}^{(1)} [1 - (1 + \alpha I^{1/2}) \exp(-\alpha I^{1/2})]/(\alpha^2 I).(4)$$

In Eqs. (3, 4), $\beta_{MX}^{(M)}$, $\beta_{MX}^{(1)}$, and C_{MX} are adjustable parameters (ion-interaction parameters) that are dependent on temperature and pressure, z_M and z_X are the

charges of the cation and the anion, respectively, α and b were chosen to be constants with the values 2.0 kg^{1/2}·mol^{-1/2} and 1.2 kg^{1/2}·mol^{-1/2}, respectively, and $\nu_{\rm M}$ and $\nu_{\rm X}$ are the stoichiometric numbers of cations and anions formed upon dissociation. A_{ϕ} is the Debye-Hückel coefficient for the osmotic coefficient.

In the present work, as in previous work for NaBr(aq),⁸ an ionic-strength dependence of the third virial coefficient was assumed. It was further assumed that the functional form of the ionic-strength dependence of the third virial coefficient was similar in nature to that for the second virial coefficient, for the osmotic coefficient. In other words, the third virial coefficient contribution for the osmotic coefficient, was taken to have the an ionic-strength dependence given by the general form:

$$(C_{MX}^{(0)} + C_{MX}^{(1)} \exp(-\alpha_2 I^{1/2})).$$

This assumption results in an ionic-strength dependent C_{MX} that is expressed as:

$$C_{\rm MX} = C_{\rm MX}^{(0)} + 4C_{\rm MX}^{(1)} [6 - (6 + 6\alpha_2 I^{1/2} + 3\alpha_2^2 I + \alpha_2^3 I^{3/2}) \exp(-\alpha_2 I^{1/2})]/(\alpha_2^4 I^2),$$
(5)

where $C_{MX}^{(0)}$ and $C_{MX}^{(1)}$ are adjustable parameters, dependent on temperature and pressure. This ionic-strength dependence of the third virial coefficient significantly improved the quality of fit for NaCl(aq) compared to that obtained with Eqs. (3, 4). As will be shown below, the quality of fit of the near-ambient results was similar to that obtained by Clarke and Glew,² but was achieved without the added difficulty of controlling the behavior of terms in $D_{MX}m^4$ and $E_{MX}m^5$ appended to Eq. (3), especially as the solubility of NaCl(aq) approximately doubles from near ambient to 600 K. The difficulties associated with representations obtained by means of high-order polynomials is well recognized.¹¹

For NaCl(aq), the optimum value of α_2 was found to be near 2.5 kg^{1/2}·mol^{-1/2}. This value gave the best results for fitting the experimetal results for temperatures from the freezing point to the 0.1 MPa boiling point of the solution. This value of α_2 can also be shown to improve representation of the experimental osmotic coefficient results from Rard and Miller¹² for Na₂SO₄ (aq). The systematic pattern of residuals that was present when the Na₂SO₄ (aq) results were fitted using α equal to either 2.0 kg^{1/2}·mol^{-1/2}, or 1.4 kg^{1/2}·mol^{-1/2} as in Ref. 13, and not using the ionic-strength dependence of the third virial coefficient was not present when using Eqs. (3-5) and the values for α_2 and α of 2.5 and 2.0 kg^{1/2} mol^{-1/2}, respectively, for the representation. A value of 2.0 kg^{1/2}·mol^{-1/2} was used for α_2 in a previous representation for NaBr(aq).⁸ However, the quality of representation of the experimental results for NaBr(aq) was approximately the same when refitted using 2.5 kg^{1/2} mol^{-1/2} for α_2 . The lack of sensitivity of the quality of fit for NaBr(aq) on the exact value of α_2 reflected, in part, the lesser accuracies of the experimental results for NaBr(aq) as compared to NaCl(aq) and Na₂SO₄(aq).

The excess Gibbs energy, G^{ex} , is related to the Gibbs energy of the solution, G, as:

$$G^{ex} = G - n_1 G^{\circ}_{m,1} - n_2 G^{\circ}_{m,2} + RT \nu n_2 (1 - \ln m/m^{\circ}) \quad (6)$$

where n_1 and n_2 are the number of moles of solvent and solute, respectively, *m* is the stoichiometric molality, ν is the number of ions formed upon complete dissociation of the electrolyte and m° is 1.0 mol·kg⁻¹. The standard-state molar Gibbs energy for solvent and solute are $G^\circ_{m,1}$ and $G^\circ_{m,2}$, respectively. The standard states were chosen to be pure liquid for the solvent and the hypothetical one molal ideal solution for the solute, at the temperature and pressure of interest, rather than at the temperature of interest and an arbitrary pressure. The Debye-Hückel coefficients used in the present work were calculated from the equation of state for water from Hill,³ the dielectric-constant equation from Archer and Wang,¹⁴ and the definitions given by Bradley and Pitzer.¹⁵

Appropriate differentiation of Eq. (3-5) leads to the osmotic coefficient, ϕ , and the stoichiometric activity coefficient, γ_{\pm} :

$$\phi - 1 = -|z_{M}z_{X}|A_{\phi} \frac{I^{1/2}}{1 + bI^{1/2}} + m \frac{2\nu_{M}\nu_{X}}{\nu} \left(\beta_{MX}^{(0)} + \beta_{MX}^{(1)} \exp(-\alpha I^{1/2})\right) + m^{2} \frac{4\nu_{M}^{2}\nu_{X}}{\nu} \left(C_{MX}^{(0)} + C_{MX}^{(1)} \exp(-\alpha_{2} I^{1/2})\right)$$
(7)

$$\ln \gamma \pm = -|z_{M} z_{X}| A_{\phi} \left(\frac{I^{1/2}}{1 + bI^{1/2}} + \frac{2}{b} \ln(1 + bI^{1/2}) \right) +$$

$$m \frac{2\nu_{M}\nu_{X}}{\nu} \left\{ 2\beta_{MX}^{(0)} + \frac{2\beta_{MX}^{(1)}}{\alpha_{2}I} \left[1 - \left(1 + \alpha I^{1/2} - \frac{\alpha^{2}I}{2} \right) \exp(-\alpha I^{1/2}) \right] \right\}$$

$$+ m^{2} \frac{2\nu_{M}^{2}\nu_{X} z_{M}}{\nu} \left\{ 3C_{MX}^{(0)} + 4C_{MX}^{(1)} \left[6 - (6 + 6\alpha_{2}I^{1/2} +$$

+
$$3\alpha_2^2 I$$
 + $\alpha_2^3 I^{3/2}$ - $\alpha_2^4 I^2/2$) exp $(-\alpha_2 I^{1/2})]/(\alpha_2^4 I^2)$ }. (8)

The osmotic coefficient is related to the activity of water as: $\phi = -\ln a_w (M_1 \nu m)^{-1}$, where M_1 is the molar mass of the solvent. The relative apparent molar enthalpy, L_{ϕ} , is:

$$L_{\phi} = \nu |z_{\rm M} z_{\rm X}| A_H \ln(1 + bI^{1/2})/2b - 2\nu_{\rm M} \nu_{\rm X} R T^2 (m B_{\rm MX}^{\rm L} + m^2 \nu_{\rm M} z_{\rm M} C_{\rm MX}^{\rm L})$$
(9)

where:

$$B_{MX}^{L} = \left(\frac{\partial \beta_{MX}^{(0)}}{\partial T}\right)_{p} + 2 \left(\frac{\partial \beta_{MX}^{(1)}}{\partial T}\right)_{p} \times [1 - (1 + \alpha I^{1/2})\exp(-\alpha I^{1/2})]/\alpha^{2}I \quad (10)$$

$$C_{MX}^{L} = \left(\frac{\partial C_{MX}^{(0)}}{\partial T}\right)_{p} + 4\left(\frac{\partial C_{MX}^{(1)}}{\partial T}\right)_{p} \times [6 - (6 + 6\alpha_{2}I^{1/2} + 3\alpha_{2}^{2}I + \alpha_{2}^{3}I^{3/2})\exp(-\alpha_{2}I^{1/2})]/(\alpha_{2}^{4}I^{2})$$
(11)

and where A_H is the Debye-Hückel coefficient for apparent molar enthalpy. The constant-pressure apparent molar heat capacity, $C_{p, \phi}$, is:

$$C_{p,\phi} = C_{p,m,2}^{\circ} + \nu |z_M z_X| A_C \ln(1 + bI^{1/2})/2b$$
$$- 2\nu_M \nu_X R T^2 (m B_{MX}^C + m^2 \nu_M z_M C_{MX}^C) \quad (12)$$

where:

$$B_{MX}^{C} = \left(\frac{\partial^{2}\beta_{MX}^{(0)}}{\partial T^{2}}\right)_{p} + \frac{2}{T} \left(\frac{\partial\beta_{MX}^{(0)}}{\partial T}\right)_{p}$$
$$+ 2\left\{ \left(\frac{\partial^{2}\beta_{MX}^{(1)}}{\partial T^{2}}\right)_{p} + \frac{2}{T} \left(\frac{\partial\beta_{MX}^{(1)}}{\partial T}\right)_{p} \right\}$$
$$[1 - (1 + \alpha I^{1/2})\exp(-\alpha I^{1/2})]/\alpha^{2}I \quad (13)$$

$$C_{\text{Mx}}^{\text{C}} = \left(\frac{\partial^2 C_{\text{MX}}^{(0)}}{\partial T^2}\right)_p + \frac{2}{T} \left(\frac{\partial C_{\text{MX}}^{(0)}}{\partial T}\right)_p$$
$$+ 4\left\{ \left(\frac{\partial^2 C_{\text{MX}}^{(1)}}{\partial T^2}\right)_p + \frac{2}{T} \left(\frac{\partial C_{\text{MX}}^{(1)}}{\partial T}\right)_p \right\} \times \left[6 - (6 + 6\alpha_2 I^{1/2} + 3\alpha_2^2 I + \alpha_2^3 I^{3/2}) \exp(-\alpha_2 I^{1/2})\right] (\alpha_2^4 I^2) \quad (14)$$

and where A_c is the Debye-Hückel coefficient for apparent molar heat capacity and $C_{p, m, 2}^{\circ}$ is the standard-state molar heat capacity of the solute. The apparent molar volume of a solution, V_{ϕ} , is:

$$V_{\phi} = V_{m,2}^{\circ} + \nu |z_M z_X| A_{\nu} \ln(1 + bI^{1/2})/2b + 2\nu_M \nu_X RT(mB_{MX}^{\vee} + m^2 \nu_M z_M C_{MX}^{\vee})$$
(15)

where:

$$B_{MX}^{v} = \left(\frac{\partial \beta(M_{X})}{\partial p}\right)_{T} + 2\left(\frac{\partial \beta(M_{X})}{\partial p}\right)_{T} \times [1 - (1 + \alpha I^{1/2})\exp(-\alpha I^{1/2})]/\alpha^{2}I \quad (16)$$

$$C_{MX}^{v} = \left(\frac{\partial C_{MX}^{WX}}{\partial p}\right)_{T} + 4\left(\frac{\partial C_{MX}^{WX}}{\partial p}\right)_{T}$$
$$[6 - (6 + 6\alpha_{2}I^{1/2} + 3\alpha_{2}^{2}I + \alpha_{2}^{3}I^{3/2})$$
$$\exp(-\alpha_{2}I^{1/2})]/(\alpha_{2}^{4}I^{2})$$
(17)

and where A_V is the Debye-Hückel coefficient for apparent molar volume and $V_{m,2}^{\circ}$ is the standard-state volume of the solute.

In order to avoid the complex temperature and pressure behavior of $V_{m,2}^{\circ}$ and $C_{p,m,2}^{\circ}$, Eqs. (15, 12) were rewritten, following, in part, the example of Rogers and Pitzer¹⁶. The analogous equation for a reference molality was subtracted from the appropriate equation for the molality of interest to obtain, in the case of V_{ϕ} ,

$$V_{\phi} = V_{\phi, m_{r}} + \nu |z_{M} z_{X}| A_{V} \ln\{(1 + bI^{1/2}) / (1 + bI_{r}^{1/2})\}/2b + 2\nu_{M} \nu_{X} RT\{(m - m_{r}) B_{MX}^{V} + (m^{2} - m_{r}^{2})\nu_{M} z_{M} C_{MX}^{V}\}$$
(18)

where m_r is the chosen reference molality and I_r , V_{ϕ,m_r} are the ionic strength and the apparent molar volume that correspond to m_r , respectively. V_{ϕ,m_r} has a less extreme temperature and pressure dependence than does $V_{m,2}^{\circ}$, however, this temperature and pressure dependence may be reduced further by rewriting Eq. (18) as:

$$V_{\phi} + v_{w}/n_{r} = V(m_{r})/n_{r} + v|z_{M}z_{X}|A_{v}\ln\{(1 + bI^{1/2}) / (1 + bI_{r}^{1/2})\}/2b + 2v_{M}v_{X}RT\{(m - m_{r})B_{MX}^{v} + (m^{2} - m_{r}^{2})v_{M}z_{M}C_{MX}^{v}\}$$
(19)

where v_w is the volume of 1 kg of water, $V(m_r)$ is the volume of a quantity of solution of molality m_r which contains 1 kg of water and n_r is the number of moles of solute in this quantity of solution. This rearrangement requires the definition of the apparent molar property, which is:

$$X_{\phi} = \frac{X - n_1 X_{m,1}^{\circ}}{n_2}$$
(20)

where X is the measured property for a quantity of solution containing n_1 moles of solvent and n_2 moles of solute. $N(m_t)$ is the desired slowly changing function, if m_t is chosen to be sufficiently large. In the present work m_t was chosen to be 6 mol·kg⁻¹. Equations similar to Eq. (19) may be written for the other apparent molar properties. The analogous equation for apparent molar heat capacity is:

$$C_{p,\phi} + c_{p,w}/n_{r} = C_{p}(m_{r})/n_{r} + \nu |z_{M}z_{X}|A_{C}\ln \{(1 + bI^{1/2})/(1 + bI_{r}^{1/2})\}/2b - 2\nu_{M}\nu_{X}RT^{2}\{(m - m_{r})B_{MX}^{C} + (m^{2} - m_{r}^{2})\nu_{M}z_{M}C_{MX}^{C}\}$$
(21)

where $C_p(m_r)$ is the heat capacity of a quantity of solution containing one kg of solvent at the desired temperature and pressure and $c_{p, w}$ is the heat capacity of one kg of water. The pressure dependence of $C_p(m_r)/n_r$ is contained in $V(m_r)/n_r$ and so the only additional variable parameters introduced were those that described the behavior of $C_p(m_r)/n_r$ along an isobar. This isobar was chosen to be 0.1 MPa. $C_p(m_r)/n_r$ along this 0.1 MPa isobar will be referred to as $C_{p, p, r}(m_r)/n_r$.

The partial molar Gibbs energy of the solute in its standard state at temperature T and pressure p, $G_{m,2,T,p}^{\circ}$, may be written in terms of the above equations as:

~

0

$$G_{m,2,T,p}^{\circ} = G_{m,2,T_{r},p_{T}}^{\circ} + \frac{n_{1}G_{m,1,T_{1},p_{T}}^{\circ} - n_{1}G_{m,1,T,p}^{\circ}}{n_{r}} + \frac{G_{T_{r},p_{r},m_{T}}^{\circ}}{n_{r}} - (T - T_{r}) \Big(S_{2,m,T_{r},p_{T}}^{\circ} + \frac{n_{1}S_{1,m,T_{1},p_{T}}^{\circ}}{n_{r}} + \frac{S_{T_{r},p_{T},m_{T}}^{\ast}}{n_{r}} \Big) - T \int_{T_{T}}^{T} \frac{1}{T^{2}} \int_{T_{r}}^{T} C_{p,p_{r}}(m_{r})/n_{r} \, dT \, dT + \int_{P_{r}}^{P} V(m_{r})/n_{r} \, dp \quad (22)$$

where:

$$S_{T_{1},p_{1}}^{\mathrm{ex}} = -\left(\frac{\partial G_{T,p_{1}}^{\mathrm{ex}}}{\partial T}\right)_{p}, \qquad (23)$$

evaluated at T_r . (Eq. 25 of Ref. 8 is typed incorrectly, it should appear as Eq. (23) above.) T_r and p_r were chosen to be 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa, respectively. The value of S_{1,m,T_r,p_r}° was taken from Cox *et al.*¹⁷ to be 69.95 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹.

The equations describing the solubility of the anhydrous and dihydrate solid phases are:

$$\Delta_{\rm sol} G^{\circ}_{\rm anhydrous} = G^{\circ}_{\rm m, 2} - G^{\circ}_{\rm m, \, cr, \, anhydrous}$$
$$= -2RT \ln(m_s \gamma_{\pm, s}/m^{\circ}) \quad (24)$$

and

$$\Delta_{\rm sol}G^{\circ}_{\rm dihydrate} = G^{\circ}_{\rm m, 2} + 2G^{\circ}_{\rm m, 1} - G^{\circ}_{\rm m, \, cr, \, dihydrate}$$

$$= -2RT\ln(m_s\gamma_{\pm,s}/m^\circ) - 2RT\ln a_{w,s} \quad (25)$$

where $G_{m,2}^{\circ}$, $G_{m,1}^{\circ}$, and $G_{m,er,i}^{\circ}$ are the molar Gibbs energies for the solute, the pure liquid, and the *i*th crystal phase all at a given *T* and *p*, respectively, $\Delta_{sol}G_i^{\circ}$ is the standard-state molar Gibbs energy for the solution process of the *i*th crystal phase and m_s , $\gamma_{\pm,s}$ and $a_{w,s}$ are the saturation molality, the mean stoichiometric activity coefficient for the solute at saturation, and the activity of water for the saturation molality, respectively. Of course, $G_{m,2}^{\circ}$, $G_{m,1}^{\circ}$ and $G_{m,er,i}^{\circ}$ cannot be evaluated and so Eqs. (24, 25) were rewritten as:

J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1992

$$\Delta_{\text{sol}} G_{\text{anhydrous}, T}^{\circ} = \Delta_{\text{sol}} G_{\text{anhydrous}, T}^{\circ} + \{G_{\text{m}, 2, T}^{\circ} - G_{\text{m}, 2, T}^{\circ}\} \\ - \{G_{\text{m}, \text{cr, anhydrous}, T}^{\circ} - G_{\text{m}, \text{cr, anhydrous}, T}^{\circ}\} \\ = -2RT \ln(m_s \gamma_{\pm, s}/m^{\circ}) \quad (26)$$

and

$$\Delta_{sol}G^{\circ}_{dihydrate, T} = \Delta_{sol}G^{\circ}_{dihydrate, T_r} + \{G^{\circ}_{m, 2, T} - G^{\circ}_{m, 2, T_r}\}$$

$$- \{G^{\circ}_{m, cr, dihydrate, T} - G^{\circ}_{m, cr, dihydrate, T_r}\}$$

$$+ 2\{G^{\circ}_{m, 1, T} - G^{\circ}_{m, 1, T_r}\}$$

$$= -2RT\ln(m_s \gamma_{\pm, s}/m^{\circ}) - 2RT\ln a_{w, s} \quad (27)$$

The first braced term of Eqs. (26, 27) was obtained from Eq. (22), the second braced term of Eq. (26) was obtained from Eq. (2), the third braced term of Eq. (27) was obtained from the equation of Hill.¹ The second braced term of Eq. (27) was expressed as:

$$\{G_{m, cr, dihydrate, T}^{\circ} - G_{m, cr, dihydrate, T_r}^{\circ}\} = -(T - T_r)$$

$$S_{m, cr, dihydrate, T_r, p_r}^{\circ} + 137 \, \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{K}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{mol}^{-1}\{(T - T_r) - T \ln(T/T_r)\}.$$
(28)

Solubility measurements were included in the global data fit. The two Gibbs energies of solution at the reference temperature, T_r , and reference pressure, p_r , were treated as adjustable parameters, as was $S_{m, cr, dihydrate, T_r, p_r}^{\circ}$ and $S_{2,m, T_r, p_r}^{\circ}$. In addition, the experimental solubility results make some contribution to the determination of the parameters for the excess Gibbs energy for the solution through Eq. (22).

For the dehydration (decomposition) reaction:

$$NaCl 2H_2O(cr) = NaCl(cr) + 2H_2O(g), \qquad (29)$$

the Gibbs energy of reaction for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa, per mole of H_2O , is:

$$\Delta_{dec} G^{\circ}_{m, T_r, p_r} = (\Delta_f G^{\circ}_{anhydrous, T_r, p_r} + 2\Delta_f G^{\circ}_{H_2O(g), T_r, p_r} - \Delta_f G^{\circ}_{dihydrate, T_r, p_r})/2$$
(30)

where $\Delta_f G_{anbydrous, T_n, p_r}^{\circ}$ and $\Delta_f G_{ditydrate, T_n, p_r}^{\circ}$ are the standard-state Gibbs energies of formation of the anhydrous and dihydrate sodium chloride phases at T_r and p_r . The standard-state Gibbs energy of formation of H₂O at T_r and p_r , $\Delta_f G_{H_2O(g), T_n, p_r}^{\circ}$, was taken from Cox *et al*. At any given temperature, the Gibbs energy of decomposition, $\Delta_{dec} G_{m, T, p, r}^{\circ}$, is:

$$\begin{split} \Delta_{dec} G^{\circ}_{m, T, p_{T}} &= \Delta_{dec} G^{\circ}_{m, T_{r}, p_{T}} \\ &+ (S^{\circ}_{m, H_{2}O(g), T_{r}, p_{T}} + 0.5S^{\circ}_{m, antydrous, T_{r}, p_{T}} \\ &- 0.5S^{\circ}_{m, dihydrate, T_{r}, p_{T}})(T_{r} - T) \\ &+ \int_{T_{r}}^{T} (C^{\circ}_{p, m, H_{2}O(g), p_{T}} + 0.5C^{\circ}_{p, m, anhydrous, p_{T}} \\ &- 0.5C^{\circ}_{p, m, dihydrate, p_{T}}) dT \\ &- T\int_{T_{r}}^{T} (C^{\circ}_{p, m, H_{2}O(g), p_{T}} + 0.5C^{\circ}_{p, m, anhydrous, p_{T}} \\ &- 0.5C^{\circ}_{p, m, dihydrate, p_{T}})/T dT), \quad (31) \end{split}$$

again per mole of water. The heat capacities and entropies for Eq. (31) have been referred to previously. The vapor pressures of water over the dihydrate solid, from 233.15 to 273.3 K were included in the global data fit.

The ion-interaction parameters for the excess Gibt energy for the NaCl(aq) solution were expressed as:

$$\beta_{MX}^{(0)} = f(1, p, T)/m^{\circ}$$
 (32)

$$\beta_{MX}^{(1)} = f(2, p, T)/m^{\circ}$$
 (33)

$$C_{MX}^{(0)} = f(3, p, T)/m^{\circ 2}$$
 (34)

(35

$$C_{\rm MX}^{(1)} = f(4, p, T)/m^{\circ 2}$$

$$f(i, p, T) = [b_{i,1} + b_{i,2}T/(1000T^{\circ}) + b_{i,3}\{T/(500T^{\circ})\}^{2} + b_{i,4}T^{\circ}/(T - 200 \text{ K}) + b_{i,5}T^{\circ}/T + b_{i,6}\{100 T^{\circ}/(T - 200 \text{ K})\}^{2} + b_{i,7}(200 T^{\circ}/T)^{2} + b_{i,8}\{T/(500T^{\circ})^{3} + b_{i,9}\{T^{\circ}/(650 \text{ K} - T)\}^{1/2} + b_{i,10}1 \times 10^{-5}(p/p^{\circ}) + b_{i,11}2 \times 10^{-4}(p/p^{\circ}) \{T^{\circ}/(T - 225 \text{ K})\} + b_{i,12}100 (p/p^{\circ}) \{T^{\circ}/(650 \text{ K} - T)\}^{3} + b_{i,13}1 \times 10^{-5}(p/p^{\circ})\{T/(500T^{\circ})\} + b_{i,13}1 \times 10^{-5}(p/p^{\circ})\{T'(500T^{\circ})\} + b_{i,14}2 \times 10^{-4}(p/p^{\circ})^{2}\{T^{\circ}/(650 \text{ K} - T)\} + b_{i,15}1 \times 10^{-7}(p/p^{\circ})^{2}\{T^{\circ}/(T - 225 \text{ K})\} + b_{i,15}1 \times 10^{-7}(p/p^{\circ})^{2}\{T^{\circ}/(T - 225 \text{ K})\} + b_{i,19}1 \times 10^{-7}(p/p^{\circ})^{2}\{T/(500T^{\circ})\}^{2} + b_{i,20}4 \times 10^{-2}(p/p^{\circ})\{T^{\circ}/(T - 225 \text{ K})\}^{2} + b_{i,21}1 \times 10^{-5}(p/p^{\circ})\{T^{\circ}/(T - 225 \text{ K})\}^{2} + b_{i,22}2 \times 10^{-8}(p/p^{\circ})^{3}\{T^{\circ}/(T - 225 \text{ K})\} + b_{i,23}1 \times 10^{-2}(p/p^{\circ})^{3}\{T^{\circ}/(650 \text{ K} - T)\}^{3} + b_{i,24}200\{T^{\circ}/(650 \text{ K} - T)\}^{3}$$

and where T° is 1.0 K, ρ° is 1.0 g·cm⁻³ and m° is 1.0 mol·kg⁻¹. $V(m_r)/n_r$ and $C_p(m_r)/n_r$ were taken as functions of T and p as:

$$V(m_t)/n_t = [0.1b_{5,1} + b_{5,2}T/(3 \times 10^4 T^\circ) + b_{5,3}1 \times 10^{-7}T\{(p+10 \text{ MPa})/p^\circ\}^{1.5}/(300T^\circ) + b_{5,4}1 \times 10^{-3}\{T/(300T^\circ)\}^3 + b_{5,5}1 \times 10^{-3}p/p^\circ + b_{5,6}pT/(p^\circ3000T^\circ) + b_{5,7}1 \times 10^{-3}pT^2/\{p^\circ(300T^\circ)^2\} + b_{5,8}1 \times 10^{-3}p^2T/(p^{\circ2}300T^\circ)]V^\circ$$
(37)

THERMODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF THE NaCI + H₂O SYSTEM

$$C_{p,p_r}(m_r)/n_r = [b_{6,1} + b_{6,2}T/(300 \text{ K}) + b_{6,3}(T/300 \text{ K})^2 + b_{6,4}(100T^\circ/T)]C_p^\circ (38)$$

where V° is 1.0 cm³·mol⁻¹, C_p° is 1.0 kJ·mol⁻¹·K⁻¹, p° is 1.0 MPa. The functions of Eqs. (36–38) were scaled, in the fitting procedure, so that all of the least-squares estimated parameters would be of approximately the same order of magnitude. The least-squares estimated parameters

ters, $b_{i,j}$, are found in Table 2. The absence of a value for a particular $b_{i,j}$ from Table 2 indicates that it was not used in the final least-squares procedure.

4.2. Agreement with Experimental Results for NaCl(aq)

The weighting of experimental results to reflect their different variances is essential for the correct application

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
b _{1.1}	0.242408292826506	b _{2,1}	-1.90196616618343	b _{3.1}	
b, 7		$b_{2,2}$	5.45706235080812	b3 2	-0.0412678780636594
b. 1	-0.162683350691532	b2 3		b1 3	0.0193288071168756
h	1.38092472558595	b. 4	- 40.5376417191367	b	0.338020294958017
h		b2 5		b2 5	
h		b. 4		ba 6	0 0426735015911910
h	-67 2829389568145	b	485 065273169753	b, -	4 14522615601883
h	0/1202/00/00110	b.,	-0.661657744698137	b., ,	-0.00206587320276653
h	0 625057580755179	ba a	0.001027744070127	<i>b</i> , a	- 0.00250507525270055
h	-21 2229227815693	b2, 9		b	1 30607/07853107
h 10	81 8A7A7356A8603	b2,10	242 206102027000	b	- 2 2014051025645
124, 11 A	1 50406444547017	D2, 11	242.200192927009	D3, 11	- 3.80140319883043
D1, 12 1.	- 1.394(8)444.347912	1)2, 12 L	00 0299002975242	D3, 12	
P1, 13 6		<i>D</i> _{2,13}	- 99.0388993873343	<i>U</i> _{3, 13}	14 00000 41 40 4000
P1, 14	00 (050510500(11	D _{2, 14}		D _{3, 14}	- 16.8888941636379
P1, 15	28.6950512789644	D _{2, 15}		D3, 15	- 2.49300473562086
P1, 16	-44.33/02503/32/0	D _{2, 16}	- 59.5815563506284	D _{3, 16}	3.14339757137651
D1, 17	1.92540008303069	b _{2, 17}		b _{3, 17}	
b _{1, 18}	- 32.7614200872551	b _{2, 18}		b _{3, 18}	2.79586652877114
b _{1, 19}		b _{2, 19}		b _{3, 19}	
b1. 20		b _{2.20}		b _{3. 20}	
b _{1.21}	30.9810098813807	b _{2, 21}		b _{3, 21}	
b _{1, 22}	2.46955572958185	b _{2, 22}		b _{3, 22}	
h _{1, 23}	- 0.725462987197141	b _{2, 23}		b _{3, 23}	
b1, 24	10.1525038212526	b _{2, 24}		b _{3, 24}	-0.502708980699711
h _{4,1}	0.788987974218570	b _{6, 1}	1.62690371649145	$\Delta_{\rm sol}G^{\circ}_{\rm anbydrous, T_{f}, P_{f}}$	$-9.040721 \pm 0.0062 \text{kJ·mol}^{-1}$
h4. 2	-3.67121085194744	b6, 2	-0.767143070769565	Asol Gdihydrate, Tr.P.	$-8.953775 \pm 0.041 \text{kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$
b4, 1	1.12604294979204	b _{6,3}	0.211473310430416	Sm, cr. dihydrate, Tr. Pr	$162.5115 \pm 1.1 \text{ J}\cdot\text{K}^{-1}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$
b4.4		b _{6,4}	- 1.00267947284134	Sm. NaCl(ag), Tr. Pr	$115.5108 \pm 0.029 J \cdot K^{-1} \cdot mol^{-1}$
ba, s					
b4. a	- 10.1089172644722	b _{5.1}	1.73695617448715		
b4.7		b _{5.2}	0.966200843424027		
ba. N		bs 3	5.65834170020827		
big		bs a	5.29304128387387		
b. 10		bss	-11.4549171718081		
5		be e	0 139613287266584		
DA 13		bs 7	-8.04750349624935		
b		- 3, 7 be n			
b		-2,8	0 189614646216723		
			0.109014040210729		
14 15 h					
-, 15 b					
··•. 17 h					
*4, 18 h					
74, 19 L					
74, 20 L					
4, 21					
4. 22					
74, 21					
04, 24	16.6503495528290				

TABLE 2. Least-squares estimated parameters for Eqs. (3-37)

"The \pm values are 95% confidence intervals within the global data representation.

of the usual least-squares method.¹⁸ However, the assignment of estimated variances to the observations is usually not a simple matter. The investigator's description of the accuracy of his measurements might not always be reliable. Some investigators report extremely optimistic error estimates that are not truly representative of the measurements. Others adopt overly conservative error estimates (this occurs less frequently than the former, but it does occur). It also sometimes happens that an investigator's accuracy estimate is actually a description of the precision of the measurement and thus is not particularly useful for the assignment of weighting factors. The process of assignment of variances to a large number of sets of experimental data legitimately implores the critical question: "At what point does the subjectivity involved in the assignment of variances to observations reduce the nominally objective least-squares process into a non-objective enterprise?"

Clarke and Glew² described a method by which they attempted to remove the subjective component of the assignment of variances. Their procedure (for brevity, details such as the concentration dependence of the variance are omitted here) was to assign unit weighting to all measurements, apply a least-squares regression, calculate the root-mean-square (r.m.s.) deviations from the fitted function for groups of observations, calculate weighting factors assuming that the r.m.s. deviations approximated the square root of the variances of the groups of data and iterate this process until convergence. Their converged variances for most data sets were very reasonable when compared to experiment. However, an occasional data set may have been overweighted. The cause of this overweighting can be explained with a simple one parameter case. (For heuristic purposes our simple explanation will apply the method of Clarke and Glew to a problem to which they clearly would not apply it.) Consider five observations of a single point for which, unbeknownst to us, each observation has the same variance. A weighted average of the five measurements is desired. If the method of Clarke and Glew is applied to this set of five measurements, each measurement eventually possesses a converged variance. The observed value closest to the final average would have the smallest converged variance; that furthest away would have the largest. Yet all of the observations had the same variance. In this case, the converged variances clearly are not the same as the actual variances.

The differences between the best few enthalpy of solution data sets, for 298.15 K, in Clarke and Glew's represented database can be described as mostly independent of concentration and offset from one another, in other words, for the six lowest variance data sets the absolute value of the average error was close to the r.m.s. error. Of these six data sets there was a pair of enthalpy of solution data sets obtained in the same laboratory, with essentially the same instrument, yet they had quite different converged variances. The smaller of these two sets of converged variances appeared to be significantly smaller than what would be expected from the reproducibility of the measurements between the two data sets. This situ tion with the enthalpy of solution data sets is analogo to the above described heuristic example. This is a rel tively minor difficulty in Clarke and Glew's method. might have been avoided by establishing a minimum va ance for a data set, below which the converging varian would not have been reduced. The previous observatio were presented because it was desired to use many Clarke and Glew's variances in the present work. How ever, an estimate of a minimum variance for a particul experiment was used here if it was larger than Clarke ar Glew's converged variance for that data set.

Clarke and Glew's method of determining variance for sets of data worked well, in large part, because th large number of sets and types of experimental resul was sufficient for the central limit theory¹⁸ to be applic: ble. For temperatures greater than 370 K, the same scop of experimental results does not yet exist. Thus, th method described by Clarke and Glew for assigning var ances was not used for those results that were considere here but not included in Clarke and Glew's representa tion. For these results, which included the volumetric results, the weighting factors for a set of data were firs calculated from an expected experimental uncertainty fo the actual measurement. These variances were then ad justed to bring the weighted r.m.s. error for a data set ta value near unity.

As in previous work for NaBr(aq),⁸ reported experimental results were reduced to forms that were a compromise between values that were as close to the actually measured experimental quantity as possible and convenience. This reduction was used so as to remove the influence of changes in the properties of water on the inpudata set (i.e. the effect of a chosen value for a water property on the calculation of an apparent molar property, the effect of a water property on calibration of an instrument etc.) and to simplify the weighting of experimental results. At the time the least-squares procedure was executed these experimental values were converted into the appropriate quantities for fitting.

Experimental results included in the present data representation for NaCl(aq) spanned the temperature and pressure ranges of 248 to 600 K and, where available, from near the vapor pressure of water to 100 MPa. Literature sources for volumetric results considered for the global data fit, and the quality of representation of these results are listed in Table 3. Similar information for the activity and thermal properties of NaCl(aq) and for the relation of NaCl(cr) and of NaCl·2H₂O(cr) to NaCl(aq) is given in Table 4. The estimated square root of the variance, σ_{est} , used for calculating weighting factors are given in Tables 3 and 4.

4.2.1. Volumetric Results

The reported experimental volumetric measurements for NaCl(aq) were classified in one of several different categories. Pycnometric and other results in which a calibration with a single reference fluid (water) was per-

THERMODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF THE NaCI + H₂O SYSTEM

TABLE 3. Literature	e sources for	the volumet	ic properti	es of NaCl(aq)
---------------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	----------------

Kcference	Temperature range (K)	Pressure range ^a (MPa)	Molality range (mol·kg ⁻¹)	n	Туре	σ_{est}^{b}	σ _{fit}	δ _{fit}
19	273.95	0.1	0.015-0.126	11	ρs ^c	5×10 ⁻⁶	4×10 ⁻⁶	$0.6 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
20	278.15	0.1	0.05-3.5	19	V_{ϕ}	0.028	0.030	-0.013°
21	298.15	0.1	0.17 - 5.86	13	ρ./ρ.,	40×10^{-6}	14×10 ⁻⁶	$2 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
22	298.15	0.1	0.0026 - 0.75	15	ps/pw	3×10 ⁻⁶	4×10 ⁻⁶	$-2 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
23	298.15	0.1	0.04 - 6.14	11	p₅/p _w	30 × 10⁻⁶	24 × 10-6	$16 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
24(set 1)) 298.15	0.1	0.06 - 2.1	21	₽₅ ~ ₽w	U	29×10^{-6}	$-26 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
24(set 2)) 298.15	0.1	0.06 - 2.8	18	ps-pw	U	60×10 ⁻⁶	$43 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
25	298.15	0.1	0.05 - 3.5	19	Va	0.017	0.016	-0.002°
26	298.15	0.1	0.02 - 0.31	5	ps-pw	5×10-6	3×10-6	$0 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
27	298.15	0.1	1.0 - 6.0	7	ρ₅/ρ _w	U	416×10 ⁻⁶	$-230 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
28	298.15	0.1	0.21 - 0.82	2	ρ./ρ.	10×10^{-6}	9×10-6	$0.5 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
28	298.15	0.1	0.004 - 0.82	1	$\Delta_{\rm dil} V_{\rm d}$	0.02	0.006	-0.006°
29	323.15	0.1	0.005 0.98	10	ρ _s ρ _w	20×10^{-6}	22×10-6	$9 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
30	298.15	0.1	0.01 - 1.0	12	ρρ	3×10 ⁻⁶ ; 0.064%	15×10^{-6}	$-12 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
31	298.15	0.1	0.17-5.0	9	0./0w	U	193×10 ⁻⁶	$137 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
32	298.15	0.1	0.1 - 0.5	10	ρ <u>.</u>	Ū	85×10^{-6}	$49 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
33	298.15	0.1	0.28 - 5.10	10	Ps-Pw	Ū	108×10^{-6}	$-74 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
34	298.15	0.1-40	0.06 - 5.0	40	ρs⊷ρ _w	20×10 ⁻⁶ ; 0.1%	93×10-6	$-13 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
33	298.15	0.1	0.28 - 5.10	10	αα_	$\sigma E_{\pm} = 2 \times 10^{-6} m_1 = 2.0$	3.2×10^{-6}	$1.8 \times 10^{-6^{f}}$
35	303.15	0.1	0.1 - 1.0	8	V _a	0.3	0.31	- 0.29°
36	308.15	0.1	0.002 - 1.08	13	P.JP.	30×10^{-6} ; 1.3%	81×10^{-6}	$-52 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
37	280.15-306.19	0.1	0.25 - 5.7	21	p./p.	100×10^{-6}	96×10 ⁻⁶	$59 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
38	273.15-323.19	0.1	0.25 - 5.9	15	p./p.	100×10^{-6}	104×10^{-6}	$-70 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
39	273.15-298.15	0.1	0.002 - 1.02	18	0./0.	15×10^{-6}	15×10^{-6}	$3 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
40	273.2-338.15	0.1	0.23-0.9	27	$\Delta_{dij}V_{\star}$	0.12	0.16	~ 0.10°
40	273.2-338.15	0.1	0.21 - 1.0	17	ρ _* /ρ _*	30×10 ⁻⁶	40×10^{-6}	$24 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
41	273.15-328.15	0.1	0.01 - 0.96	83	00-	5×10^{-6} ; 0.14%	21×10^{-6}	$-3 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
42	273.15-318.15	0.1	0.25 - 5.0	34	8B	0.6×10^{-6}	0.54×10^{-6}	$0.02 \times 10^{-6^8}$
43	273.15-308.15	0.1	0.01 - 1.5	47	00w	4×10^{-6} ; 0.085%	10×10-6	$-4 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
44	274.65-318.15	0.1	0.03 - 3.0	58	00.	7.5×10 ⁻⁶ : 0.15%	45×10^{-6}	$4 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
45	283.15-313.15	0.1	0.19 - 1.89	20	aa	$\sigma E_{\star} = 2 \times 10^{-6} m_{\rm T} = 2.0$	3.2×10-6	$-0.3 \times 10^{-6^{f}}$
46	288.15-318.15	0.1	0.17-5.9	58	00.	0.045%	20×10^{-6}	$1 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
47	288.15-313.15	0.1	0.06-2.9	55	00-	U	25×10-6	5 x 10-6d
48	293.15-313.15	0.1	0.114	21	V.	Ŭ	0.13	0.08°
49	273.15-323.15	10-100	0.03 - 2.0	178	$\Delta \rho (P_2 - P_1)$	$\sigma V_{\rm ch} = 0.1; m_{\rm L} = 1.0$	0.44	0.2°
50	293.15 - 571.65	10-100	0.017 - 5.7	216	ρ _s	860×10 ⁻⁶	800×10^{-6}	$420 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
51, 52	298.15 - 358.15	0.1 - 100	0.89 - 5.68	104	p./p.,	40×10^{-6}	35×10^{-6}	$-2.5 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
53	323.16-548.05	***-40	0.056 - 5.0	250	ρs−-ρw	50×10 ⁻⁶ ; 0.5%	290×10^{-6}	$-120 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
53	321.6-549.7	*** - 32	0.01 - 3.09	163	ρ.−ρ.,	36×10 ⁻⁶ ; 0.36%	277×10-6	$7 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
54	348.15 - 473.15	2.03	0.1 - 1.0	24	D.	b	159×10-6	$-116 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
55	348.15-473.15	2.03	0.053-4.39	48	0./D.	b	180×10^{-6}	$-2 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
56	450-600	20.	0.1 - 4.0	59	ρ _s	U	0.016	0.0057 ^d
57	473.15 - 573.15	1.5 - 100	1.1-4.3	30	ρ.	3×10^{-3}	3.7×10^{-3}	$2.0 \times 10^{-3^{d}}$
58	448.15-573.15	D.	0.5-3.0	24	0.	10×10^{-3}	5.6 × 10 ⁻³	$-4.6 \times 10^{-3^{d}}$
53	597.45	21-39	0.01 - 5.05	30	60	130×10 ⁻⁶ : 1.3%	1.03×10^{-3}	$-0.47 \times 10^{-3^{d}}$
59	604.4	27-38	0.01 - 3.1	87	F* F*	480×10^{-6} ; 1.2%	1.27×10^{-3}	-014×10~3d
169	308.15-368.15	0.101	0.26-6.2	141	ρsρw	50×10 ⁻⁶ ; 0.1%	73×10 ⁻⁶	16×10-6d

***indicates that the lowest pressure for the data set changed with the experimental temperature.

^b The letter U indicates that these points were given an insignificant weight in the least-squares procedure. When two values are given the σ_{exp} was taken to be the larger of the two values given. In the cases where a value is given for m_L ; the expected square root of variance is taken to be the first value for $m > m_L$ and taken to be the first value divided by m_L for $m < m_L$.

Values of density were calculated from the data given only as a figure.

¹ Units are g·cm⁻³. ¹ Units are cm³-mol⁻¹.

'Units are K⁻¹.

⁴ Units are MPa⁻¹.

^h Values of σ_{exp} depended on temperature. Values were 2×10⁻⁴, 2.8×10⁻⁴, 3.5×10⁻⁴, 4.2×10⁻⁴, and 5×10⁻⁴ g·cm⁻³, for temperatures of 348.15 and 373.15, 398.15, 423.15, 448.15, and 473.15 K, respectively.

formed were recorded as the ratio of solution density to water density, ρ_s / ρ_w , where the water density value was that reported as having been used in the calibration of the apparatus. Vibrating-tube densimeter and magneticfloat densimeter results were used as the difference in density between solution and water, $\rho_s - \rho_w$. Vibratingtube densimeters require a calibration with, at least, two reference fluids of known densities and so are not as amenable to reduction as pycnometric results. Results from vibrating-tube densimeters, including those designed for operation at near-ambient conditions, are subject to systematic errors in the calibration constant. These errors appear to be dependent on, among other things the choice of calibrating fluid. Another possible source of systematic error in results obtained from vibrating-tube densimeters may arise from adsorption of solute on the inner wall of the densimeter tube. Indications of adsorption effects for vibrating-tube densimeters, as well as methods which may be used to correct for such effect have been reported by Archer et al.⁶⁰ for aqueous surfac tants and by Majer et al.⁵³ for aqueous electrolytes. Thu: the potentially lower accuracy of these instruments, fc concentrated solutions, does not warrant reduction c these values for water calibration errors. Values obtaine by means of a dilatometer are the change in volume fo a given change in concentration and were described a $\Delta_{\rm dil}V_{\phi}$. These values were treated in the same way as en thalpy of dilution values, $\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$. Values of V_{ϕ} and ρ_s fo which insufficient information existed with which to re duce these values to their experimentally measured quan tities were recorded as such. These values were usually but not always, given lesser weight for the least-square procedure. Measurements of the expansivity and the compressibility of a solution were treated as the differ ences in the property for the solution and the propert for water.

TABLE 4. Literature sources for the activity and thermal properties of NaCl(aq)

Reference	Temperature range (K)	Pressure range ^a (MPa)	Molality range (mol·kg ⁻¹)	n	Туреь	σ _{est} c	σ _{fit}	$\Delta_{\rm fit}$
70	273.15	0.1	m _s	1	m _s (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.022	0.006	0.006 ^d
71	251.55-269.15	0.1	m _s	4	m _s (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.024	0.027	0.007 ^d
72	252.05 - 273.25	0.1	m _s	2	ms (NaCl-2H ₂ O)	0.022	0.003	0.0024
73	252.05 - 273.15	0.1	m _s	7	m_1 (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.015	0.016	0.003 ^d
74	252.15-271.15	0.1	m _s	5	m _s (NaCl-2H ₂ O)	0.040	0.038	0.035 ^d
75	252.34	0.1	m _s	1	m _s (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.3	0.03	-0.03 ^d
76	273.15 - 380.15	$0.1, p_{s}$	ms	8	m _s (NaCl)	0.040	0.028	- 0.020 ^d
77	298.15	0.1	m _s	2	m _s (NaCl)	0.010	0.014	0.014 ^d
70	278.15 - 356.15	0.1	m _s	16	m _s (NaCl)	0.010	0.009	0.000 ^d
78	293.6-323.15	0.1	ms	6	m _s (NaCl)	0.010	0.004	0.000 ^d
79	288.15 - 298.15	0.1	m _s	3	m _s (NaCl)	0.020	0.010	- 0.009 ^d
71	273.15 - 381.95	0.1, <i>p</i> s	m _s	13	m _s (NaCl)	0.030	0.028	-0.020^{d}
80	273.15 - 373.15	0.1	m _s	5	m _s (NaCl)	0.063	0.062	- 0.055 ^d
72	273.25 - 373.15	0.1	m _s	6	m, (NaCl)	0.010	0.008	0.005 ^d
72	393.15 - 462.55	p,	m,	4	m _s (NaCl)	0.040	0.042	- 0.006 ^d
81	423.15 - 573.15	p_s	m _s	6	m _s (NaCl)	0.100	0.098	0.037 ^d
82	375.5 - 441.45	p_s	m _s	2	m _s (NaCl)	0.050	0.048	0.039 ^d
74	273.15 - 333.15	0.1	m _s	4	m _s (NaCl)	0.025	0.015	-0.002 ^d
83	348.15-573.15	p .,	m,	11	m, (NaCl)	0.030	0.033	0.006 ^d
84	422 - 603	p_s	m _s	13	m _s (NaCl)	0.064	0.044	0.012 ^d
85	283.15 - 308.15	0.1	m _s	4	m _s (NaCl)	0.010	0.008	0.007 ^d
86	290.8-373.14	0.1	m _s	13	m _s (NaCl)	0.05	0.042	0.037 ^d
87	235 - 256			11	pdec	6%	7%	-2%
88	251.95 - 273.3			5	Pdec	20	21	-3.8°
89	$T_{\rm fus}$	0.1	1.0 - 5.2	12	$\Delta_{fus}T$	U	0.010	-0.010 ^r
73	$T_{\rm fus}$	0.1	2.24 - 5.13	5	$\Delta_{\rm fus}T$	0.005	0.005	0.0042 ^f
90	Tfus	0.1	0.0008 - 1.3	28	$\Delta_{fus}T$	$0.00075, m_{\rm L} = 0.2$	0.0038	0.0017 ^r
74	$T_{\rm fus}$	0.1	1.5-5.12	4	$\Delta_{\rm fus}T$	$0.005, m_{\rm L} = 5.0$	0.012	- 0.0059
91	Tfus	0.1	0.02-3.07	21	$\Delta_{fus}T$	$0.0007, m_{\rm L} = 1.0$	0.0057	0.002 ^f
92	T _{fus}	0.1	0.14-3.6	32	$\Delta_{fus}T$	$0.002, m_{\rm L} = 1.0$	0.0018	0.0013 ^f
93	$T_{\rm fus}$	0.1	0.007-4.2	32	$\Delta_{\text{fin}}T$	$0.0008, m_1 = 0.2$	0.0026	-0.0014 ^f
94	373	0.1	0.07 - 2.8	15	$\Delta_{\rm vap}T$	0.003	0.0032	-0.0021 ^f
95	333 - 343	0.1	0.05 - 1.0	24	$\Delta_{\rm vap}T$	0.0006	0.00060	-0.00021 ^r
95	353 - 373	0.1	0.05 - 1.0	36	$\Delta_{\rm vap}T$	0.00037	0.00039	0.00006 ^r
96	333.15	0.05	1.5-3.5	10	$\Delta_{\rm van} T$	0.005	0.0049	0.0039
96	343.15 - 373.15	0.07	1.5-3.5	43	$\Delta_{vap}T$	0.003	0.0023	0.00005 ^f
97	298.15 - 373.15	0.1	1.0-6.1	56	ф [.] .	0.0039	0.0044	- 0.0034 ^r
98	293.15 - 303.15	0.1	2.4 - 6.1	36	¢	0.0036	0.0034	- 0.0023ť
99	298.15	n.	4.0-5.9	9	n n	0.0023	0.0021	0.0001 ^f

THERMODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF THE NaCI + H₂O SYSTEM

TABLE 4. Literature sources for the activity and thermal properties of NaCl(aq) - Continued

	Temperature	Pressure	Molality		715	. E		
Reference	range (K)	range* (MPa)	range (mol·kg ⁻¹)	n	Туре	σ _{est}	$\sigma_{\rm fit}$	Δ_{fit}
100	293.43	<i>p</i> ₃	6.1	2	$p_s - p_w$	0.0020	0.0022	-0.0017 ^r
100	298.15	0.1	4.3-6.0	6	$p_s - p_w$	0.007	0.0056	0.0042 ^f
101	293.43 - 298.15	p_s	4.7-6.1	3	$p_s - p_w$	0.002	0.0027	0.00030 ^r
102	298.15	p s	0.76-5.9	12	$p_s - p_w$	0.0046	0.0043	-0.0027^{f}
83	348.15 - 423.15	$p_{\rm s}$	3.8-7.2	7	$p_{s}-p_{w}$	0.0075	0.0054	0.0040 ^r
83	473.15 - 498.15	p s	3.9-8.4	13	$p_s - p_w$	0.005	0.0033	0.0030 [×]
8,5	323.13 - 3/3.13	p _s	4.1 - 10.4	10	$p_s - p_w$	0.003	0.0026	0.0009
103	422 - 341 440 - 512 4	p_s	1.0 - 3.0		$p_s - p_w$	0.01	0.0098	
105	398.15 - 573.15	ps D	0.25 - 1.0	38	Ps Pw $D_r = D_r$	11	0.013	-0.0072
106	423.15 - 573.15	р, D,	1.2-5.55	20	$p_s - p_w$	Ũ	0.030	-0.010°
107	273.15-323.15	0.1	0.001 - 4.0	60	$\ln(\gamma_2/\gamma_1)$	0.005	0.0044	0.00018
108	288.15-323.15	0.1	0.02-1.0	32	$\ln(\gamma_2/\gamma_1)$	U	0.0041	0.0010
109	298.15 - 343.15	0.1	0.03 - 5.0	48	$\ln(\gamma_{\pm})$	U	0.019	- 0.00056
110	273.45 - 313.15	0.1	0.05 - 4.0	76	$\ln(\gamma_2/\gamma_1)$	0.005	0.0049	-0.0013
111	298.15	0.1	0.03 - 2.97	4	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\phi}$	80	51	- 22 ⁸
112	298.15	0.1	0.4 - 1.23	66	$\Delta_{au}L_{\phi}$	$0.09, m_{\rm L} = 0.8$	0.13	0.007 ^z
113	298.15	0.1	0.1 - 0.83	21	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	15	15	- 8.4 ^g
114	348.33 - 372.83	0.0 - 41.	0.03 5 3	33	$\Delta_{\rm dil} L_{\phi}$	2%, 20.	24	- 4.4*
114	423.23 - 473.03	66 - 41.0	0.03 - 5.2	47	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	2%, 20.	52	135
114	572.85	10.5 - 41.7	0.03-52	141		270	517	- 3 <i>4</i> 8
115	283.15 - 298.15	0.1	0.0003 - 0.40	56		8.0	81	
116	298.15	0.1	0.005 - 1.0	23		2.5	2.2	1.38
117	303.15	0.1	0.2 - 1.0	7	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\bullet}$	3.0	2.3	-2.04
118	298.15	0.1	0.04-5.0	19	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{igap}$	6.0	6.3	- 3.8 ^s
118	323.15	0.1	0.04 - 5.0	23	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\Phi}$	10	10.3	-2.7 ^g
118	348.15	0.1	0.04 - 5.0	18	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\phi}$	10	7.4	2.7 ⁸
119	298.15	0.1	0.0008-0.1	24	$\Delta_{\oplus}L_{+}$	5	4.7	- 0.4 ⁸
120	298.08	0.1	0.046 - 0.45	17	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\phi}$	12	12.0	12.0 ^g
120	290	0.1	0.44 - 0.14	1/	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	1	0.81	0.42 ^g
121	273.4	0.1	0.09 - 0.1	21 18		$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 0.5$	0.82	0.06*
121	298.2	0.1	0 19 - 6 1	17		$0.3, m_1 = 0.5$	0.31	
122	298.15	0.1	0.00025 - 1.0	7		2.5	26	1 06
123	348.15	0.1	0.035 - 6.0	21	$\Delta_{dil}L_{dil}$	$5.0, m_1 = 0.3$	5.4	-0.25
123	373.15	0.11	0.0096.0	28	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	10.0	6.6	4.38
123	423.65	0.5	0.007 - 6.0	46	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{igar}$	h	16.5	10.5*
123	450.95	0.9	0.04 - 6.0	25	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\phi}$	h	15.0	12.2 ^g
123	472.95	1.55	0.20 - 6.0	11	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{igaple}$	30	29	14 ^g
124	349.2	1.03	0.03 - 3.0	18	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\phi}$	20	16	-12 ^s
124	398.3	1.03	0.03 - 3.0	19	$\Delta_{dij}L_{\phi}$	h	34	- 26 ^s
124	448.3	1.03	0.01 - 3.0	22	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\phi}$	л Ь	80	598
124	490.5	5.55 0 1	0.01 - 3.0	42		20	78	26 ⁸
125	323.15	0.1	0.004 5.7	31		20	10	10*
125	333.15	0.1	0.008 - 5.7	32	$\Delta_{dii}L_{A}$	20	16	11- 98
125	343.15	0.1	0.007 - 5.7	32	$\Delta_{dil}L_{di}$	20	21	-1.08
125	353.15	0.1	0.007 - 5.7	29	$\Delta_{dil}L_{b}$	U	68	26
126	298.15	0.1	0.27 - 3.0	6	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\rm d}$	20	15	- 58
127	293.15	0.1	0.02 - 0.04	9	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_{\rm m}$	250	168	- 49 ⁸
128	298.15	0.1	0.05 - 1.3	24	$\Delta_{\rm soi}H_{\rm m}$	40	21	19 *
129	278.15 - 348.15	0.1	0.46	5	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_{\rm m}$	40	40	39*
130	298.15	0.1	0.5-5.6	14	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_{\rm m}$	40	30	28 ^g
129	2/8.15 - 313.15	0.1	0.0003 - 4.1	41	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_{\rm m}(m_2-m_1)$	120	126	98 [#]
13) 130	213.13 297 A - 472 65	0.1	0.06-6.0	18	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_{\rm m}$	230	230	
132	38/.4-4/2.03 273 2-368 3	p s	0.01-0.04	17	$\Delta_{sol}H_m$	300	296	1068
134	213.2-300.3	0.1	0.003 - 0.02	30 72	$\Delta_{sol} n_m$	00	140	100=
135	298.15	0.1	0.01 - 0.03	5	$\Delta_{so} H_m$	40	22	12"
136	278.15 - 298.15	0.1	0.05 - 5.0	88	$\Delta_{sol} H_m$	170	169	23" 80#
137	303 - 313	0.1	0.006-0.12	48	$\Delta_{\rm spi}H_{\rm m}$	190	182	1428
138	298.15	0.1	0.01 - 0.12	16	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_{\rm m}$	100	101	18#

$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Reference	Temperature range (K)	Pressure range ^a (MPa)	Molality range (mol·kg ⁻¹)	n	Туреь	σ _{est} c	σ _{fit}	$\Delta_{\rm fit}$
	140	298.15	0.1	0.07 - 5.5	20	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_{\rm m}$	40	10	- 2 ^g
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	141	298	0.1	0.25 - 0.5	4	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_{\rm m}$	40	5	3 ^g
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	142	323.14 - 573.15	7-36	1.0 - 6.0	127	$c_{n,s}/c_{n,w}$	0.00125	2.1	0.8 ^h
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	142	598.01	20.1	1.0-6.0	24	$C_{p,s}/C_{p,w}$	0.005	18.7	11.2 ^h
146 597.8 17.9 0.085-3.0 18 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ * 83 52i 147 348.2-598.6 17.7 3.0 7 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ * 4.3 -2.7i 148 358.3, 573.95 17.7 1.0-3.0 6 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ * 2.3 1.6i 150 598.11 17.7 1.0-3.0 6 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ * 5.0 -3.3i 149 353.15-473.15 *** 0.35-2.13 35 $c_{p,s}$ 0.012 5.4 -0.02i 143 278.15 0.1 0.076-6.0 20 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.8 -0.3k 143 318.15 0.1 0.04-6.0 26 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.8 -0.3k 143 338.15 0.1 0.08-6.0 22 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.4 0.3k 143 358.15 0.1 0.06-2.5 11 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.4, $m_L = 2.5$ 0.6 -0.1k 144 298.15 0.1 1.0-3.2 <	146	349 - 573	***-17.9	0.08 - 5.0	402	Cp. s/Cp. w	*	12.3	- 0.8 ⁱ
147 348.2 - 598.6 17.7 3.0 7 $c_{p,z}/c_{p,w}$ * 4.3 -2.7 ⁱ 148 358.3, 573.95 17.7 1.0 - 3.0 6 $c_{p,z}/c_{p,w}$ * 2.3 1.6 ⁱ 150 598.11 17.7 1.0 - 3.0 6 $c_{p,z}/c_{p,w}$ * 5.0 -3.3 ⁱ 149 353.15 - 473.15 *** 0.35 - 2.13 35 $c_{p,z}$ 0.012 5.4 -0.2 ^j 143 278.15 0.1 0.076 - 6.0 20 $C_{p,z}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.7 -0.9 ^k 143 318.15 0.1 0.04 - 6.0 30 $C_{p,z}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.8 -0.3 ^k 143 318.15 0.1 0.08 - 6.0 17 $C_{p,w}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.4 0.3 ^k 143 358.15 0.1 0.08 - 6.0 17 $C_{p,w}$ 0.4, $m_L = 2.5$ 0.6 -0.1 ^k 144 298.15 0.1 0.01 - 5.2 11 $C_{p,w}$ 0.4, $m_L = 2.5$ 0.6 -0.1 ^k 15 298.15	146	597.8	17.9	0.085 - 3.0	18	$C_{p,s}/C_{p,w}$	*	83	52 ⁱ
148 358.3, 573.95 17.7 $1.0-3.0$ 6 $c_{p,x}/c_{p,w}$ * 2.3 1.6^i 150 598.11 17.7 $1.0-3.0$ 6 $c_{p,x}/c_{p,w}$ * 5.0 -3.3^i 149 353.15-473.15 *** $0.35-2.13$ 35 $c_{p,x}$ 0.012 5.4 -0.2^j 143 278.15 0.1 $0.076-6.0$ 20 $C_{p,\phi}$ $0.5, m_L = 1.5$ 1.7 -0.9^k 143 298.15 0.1 $0.04-6.0$ 26 $C_{p,\phi}$ $0.5, m_L = 1.5$ 1.8 -0.3^k 143 338.15 0.1 $0.04-6.0$ 26 $C_{p,\phi}$ $0.5, m_L = 1.5$ 1.9 -0.2^k 143 338.15 0.1 $0.08-6.0$ 22 $C_{p,\phi}$ $0.5, m_L = 1.5$ 0.4 0.3^k 144 298.15 0.1 $1.0-3.2$ 13 $C_{p,\phi}$ $0.4, m_L = 2.5$ 0.6 -0.1^k 144 298.15 0.1 $0.01-5.25$ 11 $C_{p,\phi}$ $0.4, m_L = 0.6$ 3.4 -1.9^k	147	348.2 598.6	17.7	3.0	7	$c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$	*	4.3	-2.7 ⁱ
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	148	358.3, 573.95	17.7	1.0 - 3.0	6	cp, s/cp, w	*	2.3	1.6 ⁱ
149353.15 - 473.15***0.35 - 2.1335 $c_{p,x}$ 0.0125.4 -0.2^{j} 143278.150.10.076 - 6.020 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_{L} = 1.5$ 1.7 -0.9^{k} 143298.150.10.04 - 6.030 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_{L} = 1.5$ 1.8 -0.3^{k} 143318.150.10.04 - 6.026 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_{L} = 1.5$ 1.9 -0.2^{k} 143338.150.10.08 - 6.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_{L} = 1.5$ 0.9 0.3^{k} 143358.150.10.08 - 6.017 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_{L} = 1.5$ 1.4 0.3^{k} 24298.150.11.0 - 3.213 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_{L} = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^{k} 144298.150.10.01 - 5.3222 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_{L} = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^{k} 145298.150.10.01 - 5.3222 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_{L} = 0.6$ -1.9^{k} 27298.150.11.0 - 6.08 $c_{p,x}/c_{p,w}$ U1.1 0.6^{k} 27298.150.10.07 - 1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.2 -0.5^{k} 44278.150.10.03 - 3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.1 2.9^{k} 44278.150.10.03 - 2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.1 2.9^{k} 44278.150.10.03 - 3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.1 2	150	598.11	17.7	1.0 - 3.0	6	Cp. x/Cp. w	*	5.0	- 3.3 ⁱ
143278.150.10.076-6.020 $\dot{C}_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.7 -0.9^k 143298.150.10.04-6.030 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.8 -0.3^k 143318.150.10.04-6.026 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.9 -0.2^k 143338.150.10.08-6.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.4 0.3^k 143358.150.10.08-6.017 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.4 0.3^k 24298.150.11.0-3.213 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.4, $m_L = 2.5$ 0.6 -0.1^k 144298.150.10.01-5.3222 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^k 145298.150.10.05-2.511 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.6$ 3.4 -1.9^k 27298.150.11.0-6.08 $c_{p,f/p,w}$ U1.10.6^k15298.150.10.07-1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.2 -0.5^k 44274.650.10.03-1.011 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.1 2.9^k 44288.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 44288.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 44288.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.03-2.5<	149	353.15 - 473.15	***	0.35 - 2.13	35	C _{P,S}	0.012	5.4	- 0.2 ^j
143298.150.10.04-6.030 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.8 -0.3^k 143318.150.10.04-6.026 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.9 -0.2^k 143338.150.10.08-6.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.9 -0.2^k 143358.150.10.08-6.017 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.4 0.3^k 143298.150.11.0-3.213 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^k 144298.150.10.011-5.3222 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^k 145298.150.10.05-2.511 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.6$ 3.4 -1.9^k 27298.150.11.0-6.08 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U1.1 0.6^k 115298.150.10.01-3.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ U4.9 -2.4^k 44274.650.10.07-1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U4.9 -2.4^k 44278.150.10.03-3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 0.3^k 44288.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 44288.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 44288.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.08-0.510	143	278.15	0.1	0.076-6.0	20	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.5, m_L = 1.5$	1.7	- 0.9 ^k
143318.150.10.04-6.026 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.9 -0.2^k 143338.150.10.08-6.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 0.90.3^k143338.150.10.08-6.017 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.40.3^k24298.150.11.0-3.213 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.4, $m_L = 2.5$ 0.6 -0.1^k 144298.150.10.01-5.222 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^k 145298.150.10.05-2.511 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^k 27298.150.10.01-3.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.10.6^k115298.150.10.07-1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U4.9 -2.4^k 44274.650.10.07-1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.2 -0.5^k 44278.150.10.03-3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 0.3^k 44308.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.08-0.510 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.08-0.510 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.06-2.121 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.0 0.1^k 24298.150.10.07-2.819 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1	143	298.15	0.1	0.04 6.0	30	$C_{p, \phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 1.5$	1.8	-0.3 ^k
143 338.15 0.1 0.08-6.0 22 $C_{p,\phi}^{-}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 0.9 0.3 ^k 143 358.15 0.1 0.08-6.0 17 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.4 0.3 ^k 24 298.15 0.1 1.0-3.2 13 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.4, $m_L = 2.5$ 0.6 -0.1 ^k 144 298.15 0.1 0.011-5.32 22 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3 ^k 145 298.15 0.1 0.05-2.5 11 $C_{p,\phi}$ 1.0, $m_L = 0.6$ 3.4 -1.9 ^k 27 298.15 0.1 0.01-3.0 22 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 1.1 0.6 ^k 115 298.15 0.1 0.07-1.8 12 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 4.9 -2.4 ^k 44 278.15 0.1 0.03-3.0 16 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 1.3 0.3 ^k 44 288.15 0.1 0.03-2.5 15 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 1.3 0.3 ^k 44 308.15 0.1 0.03-2.5 15	143	318.15	0.1	0.04 - 6.0	26	$C_{p, \phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 1.5$	1.9	-0.2 ^k
143358.150.10.08-6.017 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.5, $m_L = 1.5$ 1.40.3 ^k 24298.150.11.0-3.213 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.4, $m_L = 2.5$ 0.6 -0.1^k 144298.150.10.011-5.3222 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^k 145298.150.10.05-2.511 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.6$ 3.4 -1.9^k 27298.150.11.0-6.08 $c_{p,x}/c_{p,w}$ U1.10.6 ^k 115298.150.10.01-3.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ U2.82.4 ^k 44274.650.10.07-1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U4.9 -2.4^k 44278.150.10.03-1.011 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.2 -0.5^k 44288.150.10.03-3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 0.3^k 44308.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.1 2.9^k 32298.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.1 2.9^k 32298.150.10.06-2.121 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.1 2.9^k 32298.150.10.07-2.819 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.07-2.819 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.0 0.1^k 33298.150.10.28-5.110 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.0 0.1^k <	143	338.15	0.1	0.08-6.0	22	$C_{p, \phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 1.5$	0.9	0.3 ^k
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	143	358.15	0.1	0.08-6.0	17	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 1.5$	1.4	0.3 ^k
144298.150.10.011-5.3222 $C_{p,\phi}$ 0.75, $m_L = 0.1$ 1.0 -0.3^k 145298.150.10.05-2.511 $C_{p,\phi}$ 1.0, $m_L = 0.6$ 3.4 -1.9^k 27298.150.11.0-6.08 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U1.10.6^k115298.150.10.01-3.022 $C_{r,+}$ U2.82.4^k44274.650.10.07-1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U4.9 -2.4^k 44278.150.10.03-1.011 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.2 -0.5^k 44288.150.10.03-3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 0.3^k 44308.150.10.03-2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.1 2.9^k 32298.150.10.08-0.510 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.06-2.121 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.07-2.819 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.04-2.953 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.0 0.1^k 33298.150.10.28-5.110 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.7 1.3^k 152423.15-573.15 p_s 0.4-6.0424 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U70 37^k 163248.150.12.0-6.06 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ 10 m_s 10 m_s </td <td>24</td> <td>298.15</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>1.0 - 3.2</td> <td>13</td> <td>$C_{p, \phi}$</td> <td>$0.4, m_{\rm L} = 2.5$</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>-0.1^k</td>	24	298.15	0.1	1.0 - 3.2	13	$C_{p, \phi}$	$0.4, m_{\rm L} = 2.5$	0.6	-0.1 ^k
145298.150.10.05 - 2.511 $C_{p,\phi}$ 1.0, $m_L = 0.6$ 3.4 -1.9^k 27298.150.11.0 - 6.08 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U1.10.6^k115298.150.10.01 - 3.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ U2.82.4^k44274.650.10.07 - 1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U4.9 -2.4^k 44278.150.10.03 - 1.011 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.2 -0.5^k 44288.150.10.03 - 3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 0.3^k 44308.150.10.03 - 3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.12.9^k44318.150.10.03 - 2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.12.9^k32298.150.10.06 - 2.121 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3 -0.5^k 24298.150.10.07 - 2.819 $C_{p,\phi}$ U2.42.4^k24298.150.10.07 - 2.819 $C_{p,\phi}$ U2.42.4^k24298.150.10.07 - 2.819 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.00.1^k33298.150.10.28 - 5.110 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.71.3^k152423.15 - 573.15 p_s 0.4 - 6.0424 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U1.71.3^k163248.150.12.0 - 6.06 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ 100.179^k	144	298.15	0.1	0.011-5.32	22	$C_{p, \phi}$	0.75, $m_{\rm L} = 0.1$	1.0	-0.3 ^k
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	145	298.15	0.1	0.05 - 2.5	11	$C_{p,\phi}$	1.0, $m_{\rm L} = 0.6$	3.4	-1.9 ^k
115298.150.10.01 - 3.022 $C_{p,\phi}$ U2.82.4k44274.650.10.07 - 1.812 $C_{p,\phi}$ U4.9-2.4k44278.150.10.03 - 1.011 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.2-0.5k44288.150.10.03 - 3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.30.3k44308.150.10.03 - 3.016 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.12.9k44318.150.10.03 - 2.515 $C_{p,\phi}$ U3.12.9k32298.150.10.08 - 0.510 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.3-0.5k24298.150.10.06 - 2.121 $C_{p,\phi}$ U2.42.4k24298.150.10.07 - 2.819 $C_{p,\phi}$ U5.55.2k47283.15 - 313.150.10.04 - 2.953 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.00.1k33298.150.10.28 - 5.110 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.71.3k152423.15 - 573.15 p_s 0.4 - 6.0424 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U7037k163248.150.12.0 - 6.06 $c_{p,s}$ 10, $m_L = 6.0$ 179k	27	298.15	0.1	1.0 - 6.0	8	Cp. s/Cp. w	U	1.1	0.6 ^k
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	115	298.15	0.1	0.01 - 3.0	22	$C_{p,\psi}$	U	2.8	2.4 ^k
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	44	274.65	0.1	0.07 - 1.8	12	$C_{p, \phi}$	U	4.9	-2.4 ^k
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	44	278.15	0.1	0.03 - 1.0	11	$C_{p, \phi}$	U	3.2	0.5 ^k
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	44	288.15	0.1	0.03 - 3.0	16	$C_{p, \phi}$	U	1.3	0.3 ^k
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	44	308.15	0.1	0.033.0	16	$C_{p,+}$	U	4.2	4.0 ^k
32 298.15 0.1 0.08-0.5 10 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 1.3 -0.5^k 24 298.15 0.1 0.06-2.1 21 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 2.4 2.4k 24 298.15 0.1 0.07-2.8 19 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 5.5 5.2k 47 283.15-313.15 0.1 0.04-2.9 53 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 1.0 0.1k 33 298.15 0.1 0.28-5.1 10 $C_{p,\phi}$ U 1.7 1.3k 152 423.15-573.15 p_s 0.4-6.04 24 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U 70 37k 163 248.15 0.1 2.0-6.0 6 $c_{p,s}$ 10, $m_L = 6.0$ 17 9k	44	318.15	0.1	0.03 - 2.5	15	$C_{p, \phi}$	U	3.1	2.9 ^k
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	32	298.15	0.1	0.08 - 0.5	10	$C_{p,\phi}$	U	1.3	-0.5 ^k
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	24	298.15	0.1	0.06 - 2.1	21	$C_{p, \phi}$	U	2.4	2.4 ^k
47283.15 - 313.150.10.04 - 2.953 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.00.1k33298.150.10.28 - 5.110 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.71.3k152423.15 - 573.15 p_s 0.4 - 6.0424 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U70 37^k 163248.150.12.0 - 6.06 $c_{p,s}$ 10, $m_L = 6.0$ 179k	24	298.15	0.1	0.07 - 2.8	19	$C_{p, \phi}$	U	5.5	5.2 ^k
33298.150.10.28-5.110 $C_{p,\phi}$ U1.71.3k152423.15-573.15 p_s 0.4-6.0424 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U70 37^k 163248.150.12.0-6.06 $c_{p,s}$ 10, $m_L = 6.0$ 179k	47	283.15 - 313.15	0.1	0.04 - 2.9	53	$C_{p,\phi}$	U	1.0	0.1 ^k
152423.15-573.15 p_s 0.4-6.0424 $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ U70 37^k 163248.150.12.0-6.06 $c_{p,s}$ 10, $m_L = 6.0$ 17 9^k	33	298.15	0.1	0.28 - 5.1	10	$C_{p, \phi}$	U	1.7	1.3 ^k
163 248.15 0.1 2.0-6.0 6 $c_{p,s}$ 10, $m_L = 6.0$ 17 9 ^k	152	423.15 - 573.15	p _s	0.4 - 6.04	24	Cp, s/Cp, w	U	70	37 ^k
	163	248.15	0.1	2.0-6.0	6	C _{p. s}	$10, m_{\rm L} = 6.0$	17	9k

TABLE 4. Literature sources for the activity and thermal properties of NaCl(aq) - Continued

*** indicates that the lowest pressure for the data set changed with the experimental temperature

^b Type *m*, refers to solubility of the indicated substance; *p*_{dec} refers to the vapor pressure of water in equilibrium with the dihydrate; The symbol p_s - p_w . refers to the difference in vapor pressure between solution and solvent.

The letter U indicates that these points were given an insignificant weight in the least-squares procedure. When two values are given the σ_{exp} was taken to be the larger of the two values given. In the cases where a value is given for $m_{\rm L}$; the expected square root of the variance is taken to be the first value for $m > m_L$ and taken to be the first value divided by m_L for $m < m_L$.

^d Units are kJ·mol⁻³.

° Units are Pa.

^f Values given in terms of the osmotic coefficient.

^g Units are J-mol⁻¹.

^h Values of σ_{exp} were unitless, other values given in terms of $C_{p,\phi}$, units are J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹.

ⁱ Values of σ_{exp} were unitless and were those given in the sited reference, other values given in terms of $C_{p,\phi}$, units are J-K⁻¹ mol⁻¹.

ⁱ Values of σ_{exp} had units of J·K⁻¹·g⁻¹, other values given in terms of $C_{p,\phi}$, units are J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹. ^k Units are J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹.

All of the significantly weighted results included by Rogers and Pitzer¹⁶ in their representation of the volumetric properties of NaCl(aq) were included in the present work. They gave one or two standard deviations of fit for each of the 12 data sets that they included in their representation. Their two standard deviations corresponded to either their low-temperature or their hightemperature representation. The agreement of the present fitted equation with 11 of those 12 data sets was comparable to the better of their two listed standard deviations. The one data set for which the present equation showed poorer agreement was that of Hilbert.⁵⁰ The larger difference of Hilbert's results from the fitted equation is attributable to the inclusion of the results of Majer et al.,⁵³ Gehrig et al.,⁵⁷ and of Majer et al.;⁵⁹ none of these results were available to Rogers and Pitzer.

The error in experimental determinations of solution densities arises from errors in measurement of the concentration, the density itself, temperature and pressure. For 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa the determination of the temperature and pressure should introduce negligible errors into the determination of the density. Figure 1 shows the differences between experiment and fitted equation for density results, for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa, where the densities were determined by means of either a pycnometer, a dilatometer, or a magnetic-float densimeter. Six of the seven sets of results shown in the figure agree, for the most part, within 50×10^{-6} g·cm⁻³. At large molalites an uncertainty in molality determination of $\pm 0.02\%$ corresponds to an uncertainty of $\pm 50 \times 10^{-6}$ g cm⁻³ in the density and thus composition determination becomes a significant factor in the accuracy to which the density may be determined, for near-ambient conditions. Figure 2 shows the differences between experimental values of the density, obtained with vibrating-tube densimeters, from the fitted equation, again for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa. Comparison of Figs. 1 and 2 is a direct comparison of the accuracies of the respective experimental methods, assuming that solutions were prepared with the same accutacy in the vibrating-tube densimeter (VTD) studies as they were for the results shown in Fig. 1. The results from Gates and Wood³⁴ agreed with the fitted equation within their stated uncertainties. Their results showed a somewhat random pattern of residuals that would be related primarily to the accuracy of concentration determination. For most of the remainder of the data sets shown in Fig. 2, differences of the VTD results from the more accurate results, e.g. those shown in Fig. 1, can be described as possessing systematic errors that generally increase

with increasing concentration, a characteristic similar to what one expects for inaccuracies in the calibration of the VTD. These systematic errors corresponded to inaccuracies in the calibration constant that range to 0.1% or larger. Of special note are the results of Oloffson,²⁴ who gave values of V_{ϕ} for "calorimeter 1" and "calorimeter 2" that showed systematic biases of different sign from the fitted equation, relative to each other. The 298.15 K V_{ϕ} results of Allred and Woolley⁴⁷ showed a small systematic bias, however, their results for 313.15 K exhibited systematic differences from the equation that were as large as 0.8% of $\rho_{s} - \rho_{w}$. The differences of the results of Singh *et al.*³² from the fitted equation were significantly larger than the other VTD results.

Systematic differences were also found in the VTD results for higher temperatures. Figures 3 and 4 show the differences of the fitted equation from the experimental results for Majer *et al.*'s⁵³ "Set 1" and "Set 2" results for nominal temperatures of 323 and 448 K. These two sets of results were obtained with a VTD with different materials of construction for the vibrating tube and with different calibration methods. For 323 K, the fitted equation was determined primarily by the results of Gibson and Loeffler, ^{51,52} as well as, but to a lesser extent, by the results of Rogers *et al.*⁵⁵ and of Ellis.⁵⁴ From the present re-





1 (c. 1. Difference of experimental densities from the fitted equation for 298.15 K 0.1 MPa. The experimental results were from: Baxter and Wallace,³⁸ Hall,²¹ Jones and Christian,³⁹ Gibson and Loeffler,^{51,52} Wirth,²³ Kruis,²² and Vaslow.²⁵

FIG. 2. Difference of experimental densities, obtained from vibrating-tube densimeters, from the fitted equation for 298.15 K 0.1 MPa. The experimental results are: Olofsson "set 1",²⁴ Olofsson "set 2",²⁴ Millero,⁴¹ Chen et al.,⁴³ Allred and Woolley,⁴⁷ Gates and Wood,³⁴ Alary et al.,³³ Singh et al.³² and Connaughton et al.¹⁶⁹

sults it can be concluded that: 1) for near-ambient temperatures, the accuracy of densities determined with VTD's has been less than what can be obtained with other methods, *e.g.* pycnometers, magnetic-float densimeters and dilatometers; 2) for significantly non-ambient conditions and for dilute solutions, the greater resolution in measurement of $\rho_s - \rho_w$ by VTD provides for a significantly more accurate (orders of magnitude) determination of this quantity than that obtained with static-vessel type a *pVT* methods; 3) for non-ambient conditions and for concentrated solutions the accuracy of current VTD methods is a factor of two or three times more accurate than static-vessel type *pVT* methods.

Wirth and Bangert⁶¹ did not report their experimental values but reported obtaining density values from a combination of pycnometric and dilatometric methods that were 200×10^{-6} g·cm⁻³ larger than the results of Vaslow²⁵ for concentrations larger than 2.0 mol·kg⁻¹. The agreement of the several sets of results shown in Fig. 1 as well as the agreement of the expansivities and densities at other temperatures, indicated that Wirth and Bangert's results were probably in error. J. Rard supplied a copy of a correspondence with II. E. Wirth regarding the results of Ref. 61. This correspondence included the measured values. This additional information was not able to re-

solve the discrepancies between the Wirth and Banger results and the representation; both the dilatometric re sults and the one reference-solution density result dis agreed with the representation.

As in the work of Rogers and Pitzer,¹⁶ the results o Khaibullin and Borisov,⁶² of Fabuss and Korosi,^{63, 64} and of Zarembo and Federov⁶⁵ were given no significian weight in the representation due to their low accuracies The high-temperature results of Grant-Taylor⁵⁶ showed differences from the fitted equation that increased with increasing molality and increasing temperature and were not given a significant weight. Additionally, the very near-ambient density results of Epikhin and Stakhanova,²⁷ Olofsson,²⁴ Allred and Woolley,⁴⁷ Gucke: *et al.*,³¹ Alary *et al.*,³³ and Singh *et al.*,³² were given no significant weight in the least-squares procedure because o the presence of systematic biases of their results from other results in regions of the independent variables where more accurate results existed.

Figure 5 shows agreement of the isothermal compressibility measurements of Millero *et al.*⁴² with the fittec equation. Comparison of isentropic compressibilities for temperatures from 278.15 to 353.15 K and 0.1 MPa is also shown in Fig. 5. The agreement was reasonable. As in Rogers and Pitzer's¹⁶ work, the compressibility results of



***** Majer et al. set 1; 323 K 0.1 Mpa +++++ Majer et al. set 1; 323 K 30 MPa ×××× Majer et al. set 1; 323 K 37 MPa ococo Majer et al. set 2; 323 K 0.8 MPa DDDDD Majer et al. set 2; 323 K 32 MPa

0.001 /gcm⁻³ Peals.) a 0.000 ι (Pobs. * 24 A desire ŝ -0.0012.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 ${m / (mol/kg)}^{1/2}$

***** Ma +++++ Ma	jer jer	et et	al. al.	set	1;	450	K	3.3 Mpa 11 MPa
***** Ma ***** Ma	jer jer	et et	ai. al.	set	1; 1; 1;	450	K	38 MPa
00000 Ma 00000 Ma	jer jer	et et	al. al.	sei set	2;	448 448	ĸ	4.5 MPa 33 MPa

FIG. 3. Difference of experimental densities from Majer *et al.*,⁵³ obtained from two slightly different vibrating-tube densimeters for approximately 323 K.

FIG. 4. Difference of experimental densities from Majer *et al.*,⁵³ obtained from two slightly different vibrating-tube densimeters for approximately 450 K.

809

Rowe and Chou⁶⁶ showed large differences from the fittcd equation and were given no significant weight in the representation.

Figure 6 shows values of the expansivity of NaCl(aq) for 0.1 MPa. The dilatometric results of Gibson and Loeftlcr^{51, 52} and of Wirth and LoSurdo⁶⁷ agreed well with each other and with the fitted equation. The results of Alary $ct al.^{33}$ and of Fortier et al.⁴⁵ were obtained with a commercial mass-flow heat-capacity calorimeter. Their results showed a systematic bias that increased with increasing concentration for concentrations greater than 1.0 mol·kg⁻¹. Alary et al. claimed an accuracy of 2% in expansivity. Agreement is within this accuracy limit. The values in Fig. 6 indicated that expansivities obtained by the flow-calorimetric method of Fortier et al. were about a factor of two to three less accurate than those obtained with dilatometric apparati, for non-dilute solutions. The 1.m.s. errors for Rogers et al.'s⁵⁵ dilatometric values to 473.15 K was significantly smaller than their estimated accuracies. The r.m.s. error for Ellis's⁵⁴ dilatometric results was slightly smaller than that found in the representation from Rogers and Pitzer.¹⁶

4.2.2. Activity Results

Osmotic coefficients were calculated from the difference in vapor pressure between the solution and the solvent as:

$$\phi = \frac{(G_{m,1,g}^{\circ} - G_{m,1}^{\circ})}{RT\nu m M_1}$$
(45)

where the difference in chemical potentials for the vapor and the liquid at the temperature and pressure of the solution, $G_{m,1,g}^{\circ} - G_{m,1}^{\circ}$, was calculated from the equation of state for water. Osmotic coefficients were calculated from the difference in freezing temperature of water in the solution from that of pure water by means of the equation given by Scatchard *et al.*¹⁵³ The osmotic coefficients given by Gibbard *et al.*⁹⁷ and by Olynk *et al.*⁹⁸ were used as given as the original vapor pressures were not given. Values of the osmotic coefficient that were, in principle, determinable from isopiestic molalities were not included in the data representation for the following reason. Isopiestic molality determinations equate the ac-



1 IG. 5. Difference between experimental compressibilities for 0.1 MPa and values calculated from the fitted equation. The experimental isothermal compressibilities are from: Millero et al.,⁴² The adiabatic compressibilities are from: Gucker et al.,³¹ Millero et al.,³⁰ Sakurai et al.,⁶⁹ and Mikhailov and Shutilov.⁶⁸



FIG. 6. Experimental and calculated values of the 0.1 MPa expansivity of NaCl(aq). The experimental results are from: Gibson and Loeffler,^{51,52} Wirth and LoSurdo,⁶⁷ Alary *et al.*,³³ and Fortier *et al.*⁴⁵

tivity of water in a solution of one solute to the activity of water in a solution of a different solute. The measurement is a relative one; some solute, or solutes, must serve as a standard. NaCl(aq) is one of the few solutes that can serve as an accurate isopiestic standard, i.e. there are sufficient experimental results available to define the required thermodynamic properties with no recourse to measurements of a solution of NaCl(aq) relative to another solution of a different substance. Inclusion of relative measurements in the determination of the equation for the "standard" invalidates the original intent. This point has been observed by Rard and Platford¹⁵⁴ regarding equations for the isopiestic "standards" used for water activities less than those that can be obtained with NaCl(aq), namely, H₂SO₄(aq) and CaCl₂(aq).

Differences of the present equation from the osmotic and activity coefficient measurements, for temperatures less than 373 K and for molalities less than 6.2 mol·kg⁻¹, were nearly identical to that obtained with Clarke and Glew's equation. The results from Scatchard and Prentiss⁹⁰ were somewhat less well represented by the present equation than by Clarke and Glew's² equation, however comparison of the present equation with all of the freezing-point results, Fig. 7, indicates a substantial agreement. The results of Liu and Lindsay¹⁰⁵ (those greater than 4 mol·kg⁻¹ and greater than 348 K) were somewhat better represented by the present equation than by the equation of Clarke and Glew. For temperatures greater than 423 K, the representation of the results of Liu and Lindsay was comparable to that obtained by Pitzer et al.¹ The osmotic coefficents, calculated from the vapor pressures given by Mashovets et al.¹⁰⁶ did not agree well with the other results (Fig. 8) and thus were given no significant weight in the data representation. Similar differences of Mashovets et al.'s results were also found for NaBr(aq).⁸ The difference of the present equation from that of Clarke and Glew's, for the osmotic coefficient, is shown in Fig. 9. The differences shown in the figure for the combination of large molality and large temperature were directly attributable to the differences in representation of the vapor-pressure results of Lindsay and Liu. Because both equations gave very similar representa-



FIG. 7. Differences between osmotic coefficients calculated from solvent freezing-point measurements and values calculated from the fitted equation. The experimental results are from: Benzler,⁷³ Rodebush,⁸⁹ Momicchioli *et al.*,⁹¹ Craft and Van-Hook,⁹³ Gibbard and Gossman,⁹² Scatchard and Prentiss,⁹⁰ and Holmberg.⁷⁴ The dashed line is the difference of values calculated from Clarke and Glew's² representation from the present fitted equation.



FIG. 8. Values of the osmotic coefficient calculated from vapor pressure measurements and calculated from the fitted equation for 423 K, 473 K, 523 K and 573 K. The experimental results are: Lindsay and Liu,⁸³ Lindsay and Liu,¹⁰⁵ and Mashovets et al.¹⁰⁶

tions of the remainder of the experimental results, other differences observed in the figure were attributable to model biases between the two equations. The agreement of the present equation with Clarke and Glew's for 298,15 K, 0.1 MPa and for all molalities less than saturation, indicated that the differences of Clarke and Glew's cquation from that of Hamer and Wu,155 Pitzer et al.1 and Gibbard et al.,97 for these conditions, would also be observed with the present equation. Clarke and Glew showed that the difference of their equation from the others resulted from the differences of the osmotic coefficients calculated from isopiestic molalities as compared to the remainder of the fitted experimental results. Clarke and Glew gave these osmotic coefficients reduced weight in their representation; the present work has not included them. Because these osmotic coefficients appear to be less accurate than other sources of the solvent activity and because the other three equations are heavily based on these osmotic coefficients, the present equation, and that of Clarke and Glew, should be considered as more accurate.



Fig. 9. Difference in calculated values of the osmotic coefficient between the present equation and that of Clarke and Glew.²

4.2.3. Enthalpy of Dilution Results

For experimental enthalpies of dilution obtained for temperatures less than 343 K, the r.m.s. errors, the average deviations, and the pattern of residuals, obtained from the present representation, were comparable to those calculated from Clarke and Glew's² equation. Some of these data sets were slightly better represented by the present equation, others were slightly better represented by Clarke and Glew's equation.

Very accurate results exist for near-ambient temperatures. Young and co-authors^{120, 121} measured the enthalpy change for very small changes in solute molality. The results from Young and Machin¹²¹ spanned the tempera-

ture range of 273.3 to 298.15 K. The r.m.s difference for their measurements, for molalities greater than 0.4 mol·kg⁻¹, was approximately 0.35 J·mol⁻¹. The present equation represented Young and Machin's results for 285.8 K and 273.3 K with smaller residuals which also showed smaller variation with concentration than did the residuals calculated from the equation of Clarke and Glew.² Vaslow¹¹² also measured enthalpy changes for very short dilution chords for 298.15 K; his values showed a r.m.s. difference of $0.12 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ from the fitted equation. The enthalpy of mixing results obtained with a commercial mass-flow calorimeter,¹¹⁶ for 298.15 K, agreed with the equation and the other experimental results with a r.m.s. difference of 2.3 J·mol⁻¹. The 298.15 K enthalpy of dilution results of Millero et al.¹¹³ were obtained with a commercial batch-mixing calorimeter. The r.m.s. difference of their results from the fitted equation, 14.4 J·mol⁻¹, with individual residuals as large as 34 J·mol⁻¹, was somewhat greater than the claimed accuracy of 4 J·mol⁻¹. However, the subsequent measurements of Leung and Millero,¹¹⁷ performed with the same calorimeter and for 303.15 K, agreed with the representation to 2.2 J·mol⁻¹ (r.m.s.). The agreement of the results of Leung and Millero suggested that the larger differences of the Millero et al. study were not representative of the calorimetric method, but instead probably resulted from other laboratory errors. The equation showed a r.m.s difference from the results of Messikomer and Wood¹¹⁸ of $7 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$, which was within their expected experimental uncertainties.

The enthalpy of dilution results of Mayrath and Wood¹²³ agreed with the fitted equation within the authors' estimated errors. The r.m.s. difference of the pesent equation from their results was about one half of that calculated from the equation of Pitzer et al.¹ The average difference of Mayrath and Wood's results from the fitted equation was small and positive, indicating a calculated value that was slightly more exothermic than their observed values. The enthalpies of dilution of Busey et al.¹¹⁴ from 348 to 523 K were represented, for the most part, within their estimate of ± 2 per cent or 20 J·mol⁻¹, whichever was larger. Their three measurements for 332 K did not agree well with the remainder of the fitted results (average deviation = $160 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$) and were not significantly weighted. Their dilutions of a 0.2 mol·kg⁻¹ solution, for 573 K, showed differences from the fitted cquation of -8 to -10 pcr cent (approximately $-1 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$). These were the principal results from Busey et al. that disagreed by significantly more than their estimated errors. For temperatures less than 570 K, the agreement of the fitted equation to the results for Busey et al. was comparable to that calculated from the equation of Pitzer et al. For the 573 K results, the r.m.s. difference from the present equation was a factor of 2.5 smaller than that reported by Pitzer et al. The average deviation of the Busey et al. results from the fitted equation was near zero for 373 K, and was positive for results from 423 to 523 K. For 573 K, the average deviation was negative, however, if exclusion of the 0.2 mol·kg⁻¹ dilu-

tions was made, then the average deviation was also positive for this temperature. The fitted equation agreed with the enthalpies of dilution from Archer,¹²⁴ for 398 to 498 K, approximately within stated errors. Disagreement with the 349 K results (r.m.s. difference = $16 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$) was slightly greater than the estimated uncertainties, but was not a serious discrepancy. The average difference for the results of Archer was negative for all of the experimental temperatures. The agreement of the fitted equation with all three sets of enthalpies of dilution for temperatures greater than 373 K was within approximately ± 3 per cent (r.m.s.), indicating a good degree of reliability of the three different high-temperature calorimeters. The only exception was the 573 K, low-molality, enthalpies of dilution; the difference for these results could result from either a model bias or an experimental problem (Busey et al. described leakage of their solution-containment vessels).

4.2.4. Enthalpy of Solution Results

For near-ambient conditions, enthalpies of dilution can be determined with an accuracy of a few $J \cdot mol^{-1}$ or better. In order to obtain the same degree of accuracy for the concentration dependence of the apparent molar enthalpy from enthalpies of solution, the enthalpies of solution must be measured with an accuracy of 0.02 per cent at 298.15 K and of 0.01 per cent at 273.15 K. The inaccuracy of the best enthalpies of solution is an order of magnitude greater than this at 298.15 K. Thus, the concentration dependence of the apparent molar enthalpy is determined primarily by enthalpy of dilution measurements.

Figure 10 shows the differences of experimental enthalpy of solution results from the fitted equation for 298.15 K. The recent results of Sanahuja and Cesari¹³⁸ and of Taniewska-Osinska and Logwinienko¹³⁶ exhibited differences from the fitted equation that varied remarkably with concentration. This indicated that their results agreed with neither the earlier enthalpies of solution nor the enthalpies of dilution, and were thus inconsistent with a large portion of the results included in the representation. The difference between the results of Davies and Benson¹⁴¹ and the results of Benson and Benson,¹²⁸ approximately 20 J·mol⁻¹, is seen in the figure. The minimum variance for the enthalpy of solution data sets was taken to be twice this reproducibility. Figure 11 shows the differences of enthalpy of solution results from the fitted equation for temperatures within a few degrees of the 0.1 MPa freezing point of water. Clearly, the agreement is poor. This is because of substantial disagreement of these enthalpy of solution results with the heat capacity results and with the enthalpy of dilution results. Craft and Van Hook¹²⁹ reported the enthalpy of solution of NaCl into water obtained with a calorimeter of their own construction and the enthalpy of solution of NaCl into NaCl(aq) obtained with a commercial batch calorimeter. They reported a greater precision was available with the commercial instrument. However, their results obtained with the "home-made" calorimeter agreed significantly better with the fitted equation. Agreement of the results obtained with their "homemade" calorimeter was withir ± 50 J·mol⁻¹ at each temperature from 278 to 348 K whereas their results obtained with the commercial calorimeter showed a r.m.s difference of 120 J·mol⁻¹. The high-temperature enthalpy of solution results from Gardner and Mitchell¹³² did not show a large systematic bias relative to the fitted equation.

The 298.15 K, 0.1 MPa standard-state enthalpy of solution calculated from the least-squares estimated parameters is $3853 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$. This is in reasonable agreement with the value obtained by Clarke and Glew,² $3858 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$. The difference occurred primarily because of differences in the fitted results, the weighting of results and model biases. The difference was acceptable when compared to the differences of the 298.15 K enthalpy of solution results amongst themselves and from the fitted equation.



FIG. 10. Difference between experimental enthalpy of solution results for 298.15 K, 0.1 MPa and values calculated from the fitted equation. The experimental results are from: Benson and Benson;¹²⁸ Benjamin,¹³⁴ Davies and Benson,¹⁴¹ Lipsett *et al.*,^{139,140} Wst and Lange,¹³⁰ Criss and Cobble,¹³³ Craft and VanHook,¹²⁹ Taniewska-Osinska and Logwinienko,¹³⁶ and Sanahuja and Cesari.¹³⁷



1 Iti. 11. Difference between experimental enthalpy of solution results for conditions near 275 K, 0.1 MPa and values calculated from the fitted equation. The experimental results are from: Mishchenko and Yakovlov,¹³¹ Criss and Cobble,¹³³ Craft and VanHook,¹²⁹ and Taniewska-Osinska and Logwinienko,¹³⁶

4.2.5. Heat Capacity Results

For the sake of the current discussion, heat-capacity results will be divided into three categories. These categories are: 1) results obtained with calorimeters that pertormed measurements on static samples; 2) results obtained with mass-flow calorimeters, where the calorimeters were calibrated with an electrolyte solution (this solution usually has been NaCl(aq)); 3) results obtained with mass-flow calorimeters where the calibration was performed without the presumed knowledge of the heat capacity of a solution. The results of Simard *et al.*¹⁴⁴ were obtained with a commercial mass-flow enthalpy-ofmixing calorimeter and will be considered as members of the first group described above.

Mass-flow heat-capacity calorimeters that are designed for the measurement of the heat capacity of solutions usually measure the heat capacity of one fluid relative to another. These calorimeters possess, as do all calorimeters, the potential for systematic errors that arise from unaccounted heat-transfer within the calorimeter and to its surrounding environment. In the mass-flow heat-capacity calorimeters, heat-transfer from the calorimetric tubing and the heater, to the surroundings has been generally recognized as a principal source of systematic error in these measurements.^{147, 142, 150} Attempts to correct for these heat losses have generally fallen into two categories, those involving adoption and application of a particular solution(s) as a chemical standard and those unvolving more fundamental methods.

In general, a chemical-standard approach has been used for the mass-flow calorimeters used at near-ambient conditions. This calibration method entails knowledge of the heat capacity of one or more compositions of a particular solute-solvent pair. Desnovers et al.¹⁵⁶ recommended NaCl(aq) as the chemical standard for calibration of mass-flow heat-capacity calorimeters. They fitted an equation to three sets of experimental results for heat capacities at 298.15 K. These three sets of results were obtained in three different laboratories, but all were obtained with the same type of commercial instrument. The fitted equation was then used to "correct" their previous results for NaCl(aq),44,151 including those obtained for temperatures other than 298.15 K. Similar procedures were used by Allred and Woolley,47 and Olofsson.24 Such obtained results were not included in the data representation for a number of reasons: 1) The calibration method described by Desnoyers et al. only brings the NaCl(aq) calorimetric results into agreeement with an average value obtained from a subset of the calorimeters. Systematic errors that might be present in the subset would then be perpetuated in the other "calibrated" calorimetric results. Heat capacity results obtained for NaCl(aq) and the Desnoyers et al. calibration method are thus not independent observations for NaCl(aq). An analogy to the inclusion of such-corrected results in the present representation, is to calibrate an enthalpy-of-combustion calorimeter with benzoic acid, use the so-calibrated calorimeter to combust benzoic acid, and then use the final result as an independent measurement for the enthalpy of combustion of benzoic acid; 2) The results of Allred and Woollev and those of Desnovers and co-authors were obtained by assuming that the heat losses in their calorimeters were independent of temperature, or insignificantly dependent on temperature, over the small range of temperature available to the instrumentation. There is not an *a priori* reason to assume that the heat losses were independent of temperature; 3) Inclusion of these NaCl(aq) results would introduce correlated observations into the least-squares procedure and thus have an improper effect on the procedure.

Agreement of some of the near-ambient heat capacity results, from the first category, with the fitted equation is shown in Fig. 12. Above 1 mol·kg⁻¹, all of these results agreed with the fitted equation within $\pm 2 \text{ J} \cdot \text{K}^{-1} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$; below 1 mol·kg⁻¹ the residuals appeared relatively random. Because of the relation between the temperature dependence of the relative apparent molar enthalpy and the concentration dependence of the apparent molar heat capacity, it is clear that there also existed agreement of the enthalpies of dilution with these heat capacity results. Figure 13 shows the agreement of some near-ambient mass-flow calorimetric results, for which calibrations were performed by flow-rate fluctuation methods. Agreement above 1 mol·kg⁻¹ for these results was within $\pm 2-3$ $J \cdot K^{-1} \cdot mol^{-1}$, with an apparently random distribution of residuals for lower molalities. Figure 14 shows the agreement of some of the heat-capacity results from the commercial mass-flow calorimeters, without the authors'



FIG. 12. Difference between experimental heat capacity results and values calculated from the fitted equation. The experimental results are from: Tanner and Lamb,¹⁴³ Oloffson,²⁴ and Simard and Fortier,¹⁴⁴

changes due to chemical-standard corrections. The difference of the results of Perron et al. from the fitted equation appeared to be somewhat dependent on temperature. Clearly, the temperature-independent correction of these results, as described by Desnoyers et al.,156 would not improve the agreement of all of Perron et al.'s results with the remainder of the fitted experimental results. Rather, it would cause the 274.65 K and 278.15 K results to be in poorer agreement than would otherwise have been the case. From Fig. 14, it appears that the concentration dependence of the disagreement of the experimental heat-capacity results from the fitted equation, and thus also the remainder of the fitted reults, varied from calorimeter to calorimeter. This was evident in the results of Alary et al.³³ and the more recent of the two commercial calorimeters used by Olofsson et al.²⁴ This variation in the concentration dependence of the systematic difference of calorimeteric result and fitted equation suggests that the dependence of the "correction factor," described by Desnoyers et al., ¹⁵⁶ on $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$ should also be investigated when a chemical-standard calibration of these instruments is performed.

The results of Gates *et al.*¹⁴⁶ to 573.4 K were represented with an r.m.s. error somewhat smaller than their stated accuracies with the exception of the results for 0.9911 mol·kg⁻¹ solutions. The pattern of residuals sug-



FIG. 13. Difference between experimental heat capacity results, obtained with mass-flow calorimeters for which calibrations were performed by means of a flow-rate variation method, and values calculated from the fitted equation. The experimental values are from: Gates *et al.*,¹⁴⁶ Rogers and Duffy,¹⁴² and White and Downes.¹⁴⁸

gested the concentration determination for this solution was in error and thus these results were not included in the representation. The measurements of Rogers and Duffy¹⁴² to 573 K were fitted with a r.m.s. difference corresponding to 0.1% in the quantity $c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$. Heat capacities near 597 K from both of these groups disagreed with each other. The results of Carter and Wood¹⁵⁰ were given the most significant weight in this region, due to their improved method of calibration of the calorimeter. The heat-capacity results of Puchkov *et al.*¹⁵² were of significantly lower accuracy than the other results and were given no significant weight in the representation.

In an interesting experiment, Thurmond and Brass¹⁶³ measured heat flux through NaCl(aq) samples in a scanning calorimeter for temperatures from 298 K to approximately 233 K. The equation they used for treating their results:

$$\dot{Q} = c_p \dot{T} \tag{39}$$

where \dot{Q} was the observed heat flux and c_p was the calculated specific heat capacity of the sample, did not take into account changes in enthalpy due to changes in the vapor pressure of the solution (Ref. 164 describes treatment of the saturation heat capacity in scanning-



FIG. 14. Difference between experimental heat capacity results, obtained with commercial mass-flow calorimeters without chemical-standard calibrations, and values calculated from the fitted equation. Pressure is 0.1 MPa. The experimental results are from: Perron et al.,⁴⁴ Olofsson,²⁴ and Alary et al.,³³

calorimeter results.) Not including the vapor space contribution in Eq. (39) should lead to an observed heat capacity that is larger than the true heat capacity. This is indeed found; specific heat capacity values calculated from the equations given by Thurmond and Brass were systematically larger than those calculated from the measurements of Tanner and Lamb,¹⁴³ by amounts ranging from -5 percent for 0.5 mol·kg⁻¹ to -1 per cent for 6 mol·kg⁻¹ at both 298.15 K and 278.15 K. Because these uncertainties are large and because only fitted equations were given, a set of calculated results from 0.5 to 6 mol·kg⁻¹ and only for 248.15 K were included in the representation and were weighted according to the values given in Table 4. Values of the apparent molar heat capacity calculated from the equations of Thurmond and Brass are shown in Fig. 15. Error bars for the 248.15 K results were calculated assuming a ± 3 per cent uncertainty in the specific heat capacity results, the size of the error bar is only weakly dependent on temperature. Also shown are values calculated from the fitted equation and the 278.15 K results of Tanner and Lamb.

5. Invariant and Univariant Equilibria

In the region of interest considered here there exist two invariant equilibria, NaCl(cr) + NaCl(aq) +



FIG. 15. Apparent molar heat capacities at low temperatures. The experimental results are from: Tanner and Lamb,¹⁴³ and Thurmond and Brass¹⁶³ Solid lines are values calculated from the fitted equation at each temperature. Error bars represent an uncertainty of ±3 per cent in the solution heat capacity.

NaCl·2H₂O(cr) + H₂O(g) and NaCl·2H₂O(cr) + NaCl(aq) + H₂O(g) + H₂O(cr, I). Table 5 gives the positions of the two invariant equilibria calculated from the fitted equations for the chemical potential of NaCl(aq), NaCl(cr), NaCl·2H₂O(cr), and H₂O. Also given in the table are experimental values; the agreement was considered reasonable. The invariant equilibria, NaCl·2H₂O(cr) + NaCl(aq) + NaCl(cr) + H₂O(cr, VI), lies well outside of the experimental conditions considered here (approximately 1600 MPa¹⁵⁶). There also exist other invariant equilibria, mostly involving two different phases of ice, dihydrate crystal, and aqueous solution.¹⁶¹ The thermodynamic variables (*T*, *p*, *m*) that describe these equilibria are not well known.

There are seven univariant equilibria in the T, p region considered here. The NaCl(aq) + H₂O(cr, I) + H₂O(g) equilibrium is experimentally observed as solvent freezing-point depressions and was discussed above. The two equilibria, NaCl(cr) + NaCl(aq) + H₂O(g) and NaCl·2H₂O(cr) + NaCl(aq) + H₂O(g) are characterized by solubility measurements performed at the vapor pressure of the solution. Figure 16 shows the difference of the fitted equation from some of the experimental results for these equilibria, also inluded are the results of Liu and Lindsay,⁸³ their solubilities corresponded to the saturation pressure of water, rather than solution. The solubilities given by Keevil,¹⁶² from 456 to 600 K, were

	Calculated			Rep	orted	
<i>Т/</i> К	p/kPa	$m/(\text{mol kg}^{-1})$	<i>T/</i> K	p/kPa	$m/(\text{mol kg}^{-1})$	Ref.
		NaCl(cr) + NaCl(aq)	+ NaCl·2H ₂ O(cr) +	H ₂ O(g)		
273.28	0.468	6.096	273.35	-	6.103	71
			273.20	_	-	7
			273.25	-	6.097	72
			273.30	-	6.097	159
			273.25	-	6.097	73
			273.35	-	5.89	158
			273.25	0.460	-	157
		NaCl·2H ₂ O(cr) + NaCi	$(aq) + H_2O(g) + H_2$	2O(cr, I)		
252.15	0.093	5.138	252.03	_	5.20	89
			251.55	-	5.08	71
			252.05	-	5.13	72
			251.85	-	5.26	159
			252.25	-	5.13	73
			251.95	-	5.17	158
			252.34	-	5.176	86

TABLE 5. The invariant equilibria NaCl(cr) + NaCl(aq) + NaCl²H₂O(cr) + H₂O(g) and NaCl²H₂O(cr) + NaCl(aq) + H₂O(g) + H₂O(cr, I)

systematically 2 per cent larger than values calculated from the fitted equation. The values given by Keevil probably were not measured by him.¹⁷²

The method for solubility measurement, for near ambient temperature to 373 K, described by Potter and Clynne⁸⁶ consisted of determining the temperature at which a known amount of solute completely dissolved. Their aqueous solubility values for NaCl, KCl, and the hydrates of CaCl₂, Na₂SO₄, and K₂SO₄ were smaller than the results of others. They attributed the difference of their results from the others to errors in the other studies. They mentioned the possibility of fluid inclusions having occurred in the dried salt crystals (these affecting the determination of the concentration of the saturated soluation for NaCl and KCl) or "small skeletal crystals" that remained suspended in the solution after equilibrium was reached (especially a problem in the concentrated and viscous solutions of CaCl₂). Their conclusion, that the other methods possessed significant and inherent errors as compared to their results, if true, should have a significant impact on the present work. If their conclusion was correct, then the other solubility results should have been deweighted in the present representation. Fortunately, the accuracy of Potter and Clynne's solubility values can be checked by comparison with other thermodynamic measurements. The equation for the standard-state enthalpy change for solution can be written as:

$$\Delta_{\rm sol}H^{\circ}_{\rm m} = -2RT^2[m_s^{-1}(\partial m_s/\partial T)_p + \gamma_s^{-1}(\partial \gamma_s/\partial T)_p]. (40)$$

or 298 K and 0.1 MPa, values of γ and $(\partial \gamma / \partial T)_{m,p}$ are essentially independent of solubility measurements and are

J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1992

dependent primarily on osmotic coefficient, enthalpy of dilution, and heat capacity results. Evaluation of these quantities may thus be performed at a given molality and, in the case of $(\partial \gamma / \partial T)_p$, along a given $(\partial m / \partial T)_p$ direction. The values of $(\partial m_s/\partial T)_p$ and m_s that correspond to the solubility measurements from Potter and Clynne can be calculated from Potter and Clynne's fitted equation for the saturation weight fraction of NaCl(aq). From Potter and Clynne's 298.15 K $(\partial m_s/\partial T)_p$ and m_s , the quantities γ_s and $(\partial \gamma_s / \partial T)_p$ were calculated using the present equations. Placing the four quantities, m_s , $(\partial m_s/\partial T)_p$, γ_s , and $(\partial \gamma_s / \partial T)_p$ in Eq. (40) allowed a comparison of standardstate enthalpy of solution values calculated from Potter and Clynne's solubilities to values obtained from experiment. The standard-state enthalpy change for solution calculated from Eq. (40) and the Potter and Clynne solubility results was approximately 4620 J·mol⁻¹ (298.15 K). This value was much larger than can be obtained from the observed enthalpies of solution. To accept that Potter and Clynne's method gave a more accurate solubility than did the other methods, at least for NaCl, one must dismiss not only the other solubility measurements but must also dismiss either the enthalpies of solution or the combination of osmotic coefficient and enthalpy of dilution results. Rejection of all of these measurements did not seem reasonable.

Adams and Gibson⁷ measured the T, p locus of the univariant equilibria NaCl·2H₂O(cr) + NaCl(cr) + Na-Cl(aq). The pressure dependence of this equilibria depends on the density, and its pressure dependence, of each of the three substances. In order to represent the



FIG. 16. Difference between experimental solubilities and values calculated from the fitted equations. The experimental results are from references 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 78, 81, 82, 83, 84, and 86.

results of Adams and Gibson, the density of NaCl·2H₂O(cr) was adjusted to give the agreement between experiment and calculation shown in Fig. 17. The error bars shown in the figure were the uncertainties given by Adams and Gibson. The optimized value for the 273 K density of NaCl·2H₂O(cr) was 1629 kg·m⁻³. The effect of an uncertainty of ± 2 kg·m⁻³ in the density of the dihydratc crystal is shown in the figure as dashed lines. Adams and Gibson gave a value of the density of NaCl·2H₂O(cr) determined from the change of volume for the reaction $NaCl \cdot 2H_2O(cr) = NaCl(cr) + NaCl(aq,$ sat.). The value they determined was 1628 kg·m⁻³; in excellent agreement with the present value. The equilibria $H_2O(g) + NaCl(cr) + NaCl \cdot 2H_2O(cr)$ is experimentally observed as the vapor pressure of water over the dihydrate. Figure 18 shows the calculated and experimental values for the vapor pressure of water over the dihydrate. The univariant equilibria, $H_2O(cr, I) + H_2O(g) +$ NaCl·2H₂O(cr) is simply the continuation of the T, p locus of the sublimation pressure of ice for temperature below that of the invariant equilibria $H_2O(cr, I) + H_2O(g)$ + $NaCl 2H_2O(cr)$ + NaCl(aq). This is because the sublimation pressure of ice is greater than the vapor pressure of water over the dihydrate. There does not appear to be experimental values with which to compare calculated values for the remaining univariant equilibria, $H_2O(cr, I)$ + NaCl(aq) + $NaCl \cdot 2H_2O(cr)$.







FIG. 18. Experimental values of the equilibrium NaCl(cr) + NaCl·2H₂O(cr) + H₂O(g) and values calculated from the fitted equations. The experimental results are from Illnsky *et al.*⁸⁸ and taken from a figure from Sommer.⁸⁷ The line is calculated from values given in the text.

6. Formation Properties

The 298.15 K, 0.1 MPa, standard-state Gibbs energy of solution, obtained from the present equation, -9.041kJ·mol⁻¹, is in excellent agreement with the value obtained by Clarke and Glew,² - 9.039 kJ·mol⁻¹. The differences in the standard-state enthalpy of solution and standard-state Gibbs energy of solution between the present work and that of Clarke and Glew can be taken to be representative of the uncertainties in these values, approximately 10 J·mol⁻¹, because the differences are obtained from fitting two somewhat different databases for NaCl(aq) with two somewhat different models. The uncertainty given in Table 2 for the entropy of NaCl(aq) is not truly the uncertainty in this value. It is more properly considered as the uncertainty in the entropy of solution of NaCl(cr). This is because the entropy of NaCl(cr), taken from Ref. 4, appears in the calculations in combination with the entropy of NaCl(aq) to give $\Delta_{sol}S_m^{\circ}$. The true uncertainty for the standard-state entropy of NaCl(aq) must contain the uncertainty in the entropy of NaCl(cr). Because of the discrepancies in experimental results discussed in Ref. 4 the uncertainty in the entropy of NaCl(cr) is non-negligible. The presently obtained value for the standard-state entropy of NaCl(aq), for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa, 115.51 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹ can be compared to the CODATA value of 115.05 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹. The difference in these two values, after adjusting for differences in the entropy of NaCl(cr), corresponds to a difference in the quantity $\Delta_{sol}G_m^\circ - \Delta_{sol}H_m^\circ$ of 97 J·mol⁻¹. This difference is significantly larger than the uncertainty in this value.

The 298.15 K, 0.1 MPa, standard-state enthalpy and Gibbs energy of formation of NaCl(cr) and NaCl·2H₂O(cr) can be calculated from the Gibbs energies of solution of NaCl(cr) and NaCl·2H₂O(cr) and the entropies of NaCl(aq), NaCl·2H₂O(cr), H₂O(1),¹⁷ and NaCl(cr),⁴ and the enthalpies of formation of NaCl(aq)¹⁷ and of H₂O(aq).¹⁷ The calculated enthalpies and Gibbs energies of formation are given in Table 6. The uncertainty in the formation property values listed in Table 6 for NaCl·2H₂O(cr) is estimated to be 300 to 500 J·mol⁻¹, and for NaCl(cr) are estimated to be 100 J·mol⁻¹. The uncertainty in the values for NaCl(cr) arises primarily from uncertainty in the entropy of NaCl(cr). The uncertainty in the entropy of NaCl(cr) is described elsewhere.⁴ Small round-off errors may occur using the values in Table 6. This type of round-off error may be minimized by using the equations given in Ref. 4 and in the present work.

The formation properties given in Table 6 for NaCl(cr) are not directly comparable to the values of Wagman *et al.*¹⁶⁵ because the values in Ref. 165 do not satisfy:

$$\Delta_{\rm sol}G^{\circ}_{\rm m} = \Delta_{\rm sol}H^{\circ}_{\rm m} - T\Delta_{\rm sol}S^{\circ}_{\rm m}. \tag{41}$$

Eq. (41) is out of balance by approximately $50 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ or 0.17 J·mol⁻¹·K⁻¹ in Ref. 165. This difference appears to be larger than the uncertainties in either the standard-state enthalpy of solution or the standard-state Gibbs energy of solution. The difference in the 298.15 K molar entropy of the dihydrate crystal from the anhydrous crystal, per mole of water, is calculated to be 45.1 J·mol⁻¹·K⁻¹. This value is in good agreement with values determined for other hydrates, for example, the corresponding value for NaBr was 45.4 J·mol⁻¹·K^{-1.8}

TABLE 6. The Gibbs energy of formation, the enthalpy of formation and the molar entropy of NaCl(cr) and NaCl·2H₂O(cr) for 298.15 K and 0.1 MPa calculated from the least-squares estimated parameters.

Substance	$\frac{\Delta_{\rm f}G_{\rm m}^{\rm o}}{\rm kJ}\cdot\rm mol^{-1}$	$\frac{\Delta_t H_m^{\circ}}{\mathbf{kJ} \cdot \mathbf{mol}^{-1}}$	$\frac{S_m^\circ}{\mathbf{J}\cdot\mathbf{K}^{-1}\cdot\mathbf{mol}^{-1}}$	$\frac{C_{\rho}^{\circ}, \mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{J}\cdot\mathrm{K}^{-1}\cdot\mathrm{mol}^{-1}}$
NaCl(cr)	- 384.28	-411.27	72.27	50.16
NaCl-2H ₂ O(cr)	- 858.75	- 997.24	162.51	137.

FABLE 7. Calculated	values	of A_{ϕ} ,	β _M χ,	β _M λ,	CAR,	and	CM	¥.
----------------------------	--------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------------	------	-----	----	----

$\frac{T}{K}$	 MPa	A_{ϕ}	β ^(l) _{Mx} kg·mol ⁻¹	βΜχ kg·mol ^{−1}	$\frac{10^{3}C_{MX}^{(0)}}{\text{kg}^{2} \text{-mol}^{-2}}$	$\frac{C_{\rm MX}^{\rm MX}}{\rm kg^2 \cdot mol^{-2}}$
273	0.1	0.3763	0.06542	0.2265	1.304	- 0.06719
298	0.1	0.3914	0.08055	0.2630	0.2682	-0.01022
323	0.1	0.4102	0.09139	0.2826	- 0.5856	0.00639
373	0.1	0.4597	0.1008	0.3218	- 1.725	0.01267
473	1.55	0.6168	0.0892	0.4031	- 1.441	0.04725
573	8.6	0.9563	0.0664	0.4073	-1.441	0.1642
598	12.	1.1329	0.0681	0.3862	- 1.380	0.2216

THERMODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF THE NaCI + H₂O SYSTEM

TABLE 8. Calculated values of $G^{\circ}_{m,2}$	$-G_{m,2,T_{r},P_{r}}^{\circ}, H_{m,2}^{\circ}-H_{m,2,T_{r}}^{\circ}$	$S_{m,2}^{\circ}, S_{m,2}^{\circ} - S_{m,2,T_{t},p_{t}}^{\circ}, C_{p,\phi}^{\circ}, V_{\phi}^{\circ}$
---	---	--

$\frac{T}{K}$	<u> </u>	$\frac{G_{m,2}^{\circ}-G_{m,2,T_{t,P,t}}^{\circ}}{kJ\cdot mol^{-1}}$	$\frac{H_{m,2}^{\circ}-H_{m,2,T_{1},p_{1}}^{\circ}}{\text{kJ}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}}$	$\frac{S_{m,2}^{\circ}-S_{m,2,T_{n,Pr}}^{\circ}}{J\cdot K^{-1}\cdot mol^{-1}}$	$\frac{C_p^{\circ}}{\mathbf{J}\cdot\mathbf{K}^{-1}\cdot\mathbf{mol}^{-1}}$	<u></u>
273	0.1	3.023	3.104	10.94	- 182.6	12.9
298	0.1	0.017	0.013	0.04	- 85.3	16.6
323	0.1	- 2.796	- 1.726	5.57	-60.1	17.9
373	0.1	- 8.071	- 4.861	- 14.57	74.1	16.9
473	1.55	- 16.766	- 18.898	- 47.21	- 253	-0.4
573	8.6	- 19.479	81.27	-163.2	1746	- 114
598	12.	- 17.754	- 137.71	258.5	- 4538	- 255

TABLE 9. Calculated values of the osmotic coefficient, ϕ

_				m/mol·kg~	1	
T K	<u> </u>	0.1	0.5	1.0	3.0	6.0
273	0.1	0.9316	0.9108	0.9157	1.0107	1.2466
298	0.1	0.9322	0.9218	0.9371	1.0486	1.2694
323	0.1	0.9302	0.9234	0.9431	1.0609	1.2648
373	0.1	0.9219	0.9139	0.9340	1.0459	1.2111
473	1.55	0.8893	0.8606	0.8667	0.9294	1.0163
573	8.6	0.8105	0.7302	0.7110	0.7125	0.7444

Table 10. Calculated values of the stoichiometric activity coefficient, γ_{\pm}

				m/mol·kg-	1	
$\frac{T}{K}$	<u>p</u> MPa	0.1	0.5	1.0	3.0	6.0
273	0.1	0.7796	0.6706	0.6340	0.6585	0.8990
298	0.1	0.7771	0.6805	0.6572	0.7177	0.9885
323	0.1	0.7697	0.6755	0.6569	0.7299	0.9933
373	0.1	0.7459	0.6443	0.6228	0.6801	0.8727
473	1.55	0.6666	0.5269	0.4818	0.4551	0.4864
573	8.6	0.5129	0.3258	0.2631	0.1912	0.1632

7. Acknowledgment

The author wishes to thank the reviewers for additional information. Dr. J. Rard supplied a copy of his correspondence with H. E. Wirth regarding Ref. 61. Prof. K. S. Pitzer provided information regarding the solubility measurements of Keevil and suggestions for clarifying portions of the text. Prof. R. H. Wood provided copies of manuscripts containing experimental results from his laboratory prior to publication. Dr. J. Hovey suggested examination of the Na₂SO₄(aq) system as an interesting additional test of the proposed ionic-strength dependence of the third virial coefficient.

8. References

¹K. S. Pitzer, J. C. Peiper, R. H. Busey, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 13, 1 (1984).

- ²E. C. W. Clarke, D. N. Glew, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 14, 489 (1985). ³P. G. Hill, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 19 1233 (1990).
- ⁴D. G. Archer, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, 21, 1 (1992).
- ⁵J. O'M. Bockris, A. Pilla, J. L. Barton, J. Phys. Chem. 64, 507 (1960).
- ⁶L. H. Adams, E. D. Williamson, J. Johnston, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 41, 12 (1919).
- ⁷L. H. Adams, R. E. Gibson, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 52, 4252 (1930).
- ⁸D. G. Archer, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 20, 509 (1991).
- ⁹K. S. Pitzer, J. Phys. Chem. 77, 268 (1973).
- ¹⁰K. S. Pitzer in Activity Coefficients in Electrolyte Solutions, R. N. Pytkowicz, ed. (C.R.C. Press, Boca Raton, FL 1979).
- ¹¹P. Lancaster, K. Salkauskas, Curve and Surface Fitting (Academic Press, New York 1986).
- ¹²J. A. Rard, D. G. Miller, J. Chem. Eng. Data 26, 33 (1981).
- ¹³H. F. Holmes, R. E. Mesmer, J. Solution Chem. 15, 495 (1986).
- ¹⁴D. G. Archer, P. Wang, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 19, 371 (1990).
- ¹⁵D. J. Bradley, K. S. Pitzer, J. Phys. Chem. 83, 1599 (1979) and 87, 3798 (1983).
- ¹⁶P. S. Z. Rogers, K. S. Pitzer, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 11, 15 (1982).
- ¹⁷J. D. Cox, D. D. Wagman, V. A. Medvedev, CODATA Key Values for Thermodynamics, (Hemisphere, Washington 1989).
- ¹⁸N. R. Draper, H. Smith, Applied Regression Analysis, (J. Wiley, New York 1981).
- ¹⁹I. W. Duedall, P. K. Weyl, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 12, 66 (1967).
- ²⁰F. Vaslow, J. Phys. Chem., 73, 3745 (1969).
- ²¹R. E. Hall, J. Wash. Acad. Sci. 14, 167 (1924).
- ²²A. Kruis, Z. Phys. Chem. 34, 1 (1931).
- ²³H. E. Wirth, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., **62**, 1128 (1940).
- ²⁴I. V. Olofsson, J. Chem. Thermodynam. 11, 1005 (1979).
- ²⁵F. Vaslow, J. Phys. Chem., 70, 2286 (1966).
- ²⁶F. J. Millero, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 38, 1441 (1967).
- ²⁷Yu, A. Epikhin, M. S. Stakhanova, Russ. J. Phys. Chem. 41, 1157 (1967).
- ²⁸L. A. Dunn, Trans Faraday Soc. 64, 2951 (1968).
- ²⁹F. J. Millero, E. V. Hoff, L. Kahn, J. Solution Chem. 1, 309 (1972).
- ³⁰F. J. Millero, G. K. Ward, P. V. Chetirkin, J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 61, 1492 (1977).
- ³¹F. T. Gucker, D. Stubley, D. J. Hill, J. Chem. Thermodynam. 7, 865 (1975).
- ³²P. P. Singh, E. M. Woolley, K. G. McCurdy, L. G. Hepler, Can. J. Chem. 54, 3315 (1976) and Depository of Unpublished Data, National Research Council of Canada.
- ³³ J. F. Alary, M. A. Simard, J. Dumont, C. Jolicoeur, J. Solution Chem. 11, 755 (1982).
- ³⁴J. A. Gates, R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Eng. Data 30, 44 (1985).
- ³⁵A. K. Helmy, F. F. Assaad, M. N. Hassan, H. Sadek, J. Phys. Chem. 72, 2358 (1968).
- ³⁶M. K. Srinivasan, B. Prasad, Trans. Faraday Soc. 35, 1462 (1930).

- ³⁷W. R. Bousfield, C. E. Bousfield, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London, Ser. A 218, 119 (1919).
- ³⁸G. P. Baxter, C. C. Wallace, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 38, 70 (1916).
- ³⁹G. Jones, S. M. Christian, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 59, 484 (1937).
- ⁴⁰L. A. Dunn, Trans. Faraday Soc. 64, 1898 (1968).
- ⁴¹F. J. Millero, J. Phys. Chem. 74, 356 (1970).
- ⁴²F. J. Millero, G. K. Ward, F. K. Lepple, E. V. Hoff, J. Phys. Chem. 78, 1636 (1974).
- ⁴³C-T A. Chen, J. H. Chen, F. J. Millero, J. Chem. Eng. Data, 25, 307 (1980).
- ⁴⁴G. Perron, J.-L. Fortier, J. E. Desnoyers J. Chem. Thermodynamics, 7, 1177 (1975).
- ⁴⁵J.-L. Fortier, M.-A. Simard, P. Picker, C. Jolicoeur, Rev. Sci. Intrum. **50** 1474 (1979).
- ⁴⁶G. Dessauges, N. Miljevic, W. A. Van Hook, J. Phys. Chem. 84, 2587 (1980).
- ⁴⁷G. C. Allred, E. M. Woolley, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 13, 147 (1981).
- 48F. J. Millero, W. Drost-Hansen, J. Chem. Eng. Data 13, 330 (1968).
- ⁴⁹R. T. Emmett, Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Miami (1973).
- ⁵⁰R. Hilbert, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Karlsruhe (1979).
- ⁵¹R. E. Gibson, O. H. Loeffler, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 63, 443 (1941).
- ⁵²R. E. Gibson, O. H. Loeffler, Annal. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 51, 727 (1949).
- ⁵³V. Majer, J. A. Gates, A. Inglese, R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Thermodynamics **20**, 949 (1988).
- ⁵⁴A. J. Ellis, J. Chem. Soc. A 1579 (1966).
- ⁵⁵P. S. Z. Rogers, D. J. Bradley, K. S. Pitzer, J. Chem. Eng. Data 27, 47 (1982).
- ⁵⁶D. F. Grant-Taylor, J. Solution Chem. 10, 621 (1981).
- ⁵⁷M. Gehrig, H. Lentz, E. U. Franck Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem. 87, 597 (1983).
- ⁵⁸A. J. Ellis, R. M. Golding. Amer. J. Sci. 261, 47 (1963).
- ⁵⁹V. Majer, L. Hui, R. Crovetto, R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 23, 213 (1991).
- ⁶⁰D. G. Archer, V. Majer, A. Inglese, R. H. Wood, J. Colloid Interf. Sci. 124, 591 (1988).
- ⁶¹H. E. Wirth, F. K. Bangert, J. Phys. Chem. 76, 3488 (1972).
- ⁶²I. Kh. Khaibullin, N. M. Borisov, Teplofiz. Vysokikh Temperatur 4, 518 (1966).
- ⁶³B. M. Fabuss, A. Korosi, A. K. M. Hug, J. Shamsul, J. Chem. Eng. Data 11, 325 (1966).
- ⁶⁴A. Korosi, B. M. Fabuss, J. Chem. Eng. Data 13, 548 (1968).
- ⁶⁵V. I. Zarembo, M. K. Federov, Zhurnal Prikladnai Khimii 48, 1949 (1975).
- ⁶⁶A. M. Rowe, J. C. S. Chou, J. Chem. Eng. Data 15, 61 (1970).
- ⁶⁷H. E. Wirth, A. LoSurdo, J. Chem. Eng. Data 13, 226 (1968).
- ⁶⁸I. G. Mikhailov, V. A. Shutilov, Akust. Zhur. 10, 450 (1964).
- ⁶⁹M. Sakurai, T. Nakajima, T. Komatsu, T. Nakagawa, Chem. Letters 971 (1975).
- ⁷⁰E. Küpper, Caliche 8, 467 (1927).
- ⁷¹A. Chretien, Ann. Chim. Paris 12, 9 (1929).
- ⁷²E. Cornec, H. Krombach, Ann. Chim. Paris 18, 5 (1932).
- ⁷³H. Benzler, K ltetechnik 7, 66 (1955).
- ⁷⁴K. E. Holmberg, Ab. Atomenergi, Stockholm Rapp. AE-340, (1968).
- ⁷⁵R. W. Potter, M. A. Clynne, D. L. Browne, Econ. Geol. 73, 284 (1978).
- ⁷⁶Earl of Berkeley, Phil. Proc. Royal Soc. London, 203, 189 (1904).
- ⁷⁷A. F. Scott, W. R. Frazier, J. Phys. Chem. 31, 459 (1927).
- ⁷⁸H. G. Leopold, J. Johnston, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 49, 1974 (1927).
- ⁷⁹F. Flottmann, Z. Anal. Chem. 73, 1 (1928).
- ⁸⁰E. Cornec, A. Neumeister, Caliche 10, 492, (1929).

J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1992

- ⁸¹W. C. Schroeder, A. Gabriel, E. P. Partridge, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 57, 1539 (1935).
- ⁸²R. D. Eddy, A. W. C. Menzies, J. Phys. Chem. 44, 207 (1940).
- ⁸³C.-T. Liu, W. T. Lindsay, J. Solution Chem. 1, 45 (1972).
- ⁸⁴R. W. Potter, R. S. Babcock, D. L. Brown, J. Res. U.S.G.S. 5, 389, (1977).
- ⁸⁵G. A. Krestov, V.D. Ovchinnikova, T-K. Vorontsova, Zh. Neorg. Khim. 22, 2311 (1977).
- ⁸⁶R. W. Potter and M. A. Clynne, J. Res. U.S. Geol. Survey 6, 701 (1978).

- ⁸⁷J. Sommer, Z. Angew. Physik. 10, 517 (1958).
- ⁸⁸V. P. Ilinsky, V.F.Korolev, E. I. Akumov, J. Appl. Chem. USSR 25, 569, (1952).
- ⁸⁹W. H. Rodebush, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 40, 1204 (1918).
- ⁹⁰G. Scatchard, S. S. Prentiss, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 55, 4355, (1933).
- ⁹¹F. Momicchioli, O. Devoto, G. Grandi, G. Cocco, Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem., 74, 59 (1970).
- 92H. F. Gibbard, A. F. Gossman, J. Solution Chem., 3, 385 (1974).
- ⁹³Q. D. Craft, W. A. VanHook, J. Solution Chem., 4, 923 (1975).
- ⁹⁴N. Miljevic, G. Dessauges, W. A. VanHook, J. Solution Chem., 10, 29 (1981).
- ⁹⁵R. P. Smith, , J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 61, 500 (1939).
- ⁹⁶R. P. Smith, D. S. Hirtle, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 61, 1123 (1939).
- ⁹⁷H. F. Gibbard, G. Scatchard, R. A. Rousseau, J. L. Creek, J. Chem. Eng. Data, **19**, 281 (1974).
- 98P. Olynyk, A. R. Gordon, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 65, 224 (1943).
- 99R. H. Stokes, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 69, 1291 (1947)
- ¹⁰⁰R. E. Gibson, L. H. Adams, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 55, 2679 (1933).
- ¹⁰¹S. Shankman, A. R. Gordon J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 61, 2370 (1939).
- ¹⁰²C. N. Pepela, P. J. Dunlop, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 4, 255 (1972).
- ¹⁰³E. R. Gardner, P. J. Jones, H. J. de Nordwall, Trans. Faraday Soc. 59, 1994 (1963).
- ¹⁰⁴E. R. Gardner, Trans. Faraday Soc. 65, 91, (1969).
- ¹⁰⁵C.-T. Liu, W. T. Lindsay, J. Phys. Chem. 74, 341 (1970).
- ¹⁰⁶V.P. Mashovets, V.I. Zarembo, M.K. Fedorov, J. Appl. Chem. USSR 46, 684 (1973).
- 107R. Caramazza Gazz. Chim. Ital. 90, 1839 (1960).
- ¹⁰⁸A. H. Truesdell, Science 161, 884 (1968).
- ¹⁰⁹T. Mussini, A. Pagella, Chim. Ind.(Milan), 52, 1187 (1970).
- ¹¹⁰H. S. Harned, L. F. Nims, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 54, 423, (1932).
- ¹¹¹D. W. Anderson, G. N. Malcolm, H. N. Parton, J. Phys. Chem. 64, 494 (1960).
- ¹¹²F. Vaslow, J. Phys. Chem. 75, 3317 (1971).
- ¹¹³F. J. Millero, L. D. Hansen, E. V. Hoff, J. Marine Res. 31, 21 (1973).
- ¹¹⁴R. H. Busey, H. F. Holmes, R. E. Mesmer, J. Chem. Thermodynamics, 16, 343 (1984).
- ¹¹⁵E. A. Gulbransen, A. L. Robinson, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 56, 2637 (1934).
- ¹¹J.-L. Fortier, P.-A. Leduc, J. E. Desnoyers, J. Solution Chem., 3, 323, (1974).
- ¹¹⁷W. H. Leung, F. J. Millero, J. Solution Chem. 4, 145 (1975).
- ¹¹⁸E. E. Messikomer, R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 7, 119,
- (1975).
- ¹¹⁹A. L. Robinson, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 54, 1311, (1932).
- ¹²⁰T. F. Young, O. G. Vogel, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 54, 3036, (1932).
- ¹²¹T. F. Young, J. S. Machin, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 58, 2254, (1936).
- ¹²²R. Bury, A. Mayaffre, M. Chemla, J. Chim. Phys. 73, 935 (1976).
- ¹²³J. E. Mayrath, R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 14, 15 (1982).
- ¹²⁴D. G. Archer, J. Solution Chem. 15, 727 (1986).
- ¹²⁵D. D. Ensor, H. L. Anderson, J. Chem. Eng. Data 18, 205 (1973).
- ¹²⁶R. H. Wood, R. A. Rooney, J. N. Braddaock, J. Phys. Chem. 73, 1673 (1969).
- ¹²⁷F. A. Askew, E. Bullock, H. T. Smith, R. K. Tinkler, O. Gatty, J. H. Wolfenden, J. Chem. Soc. 1368 (1934).
- ¹²⁸G. C. Benson, G. W. Benson, Rev. Sci. Intrum. 26, 477 (1955).
- ¹²⁹Q. D. Craft, W. A. Van Hook, J. Solution Chem. 4, 901 (1975).
- ¹³⁰J. Wst, E. Lange, Z. Phys. Chem. (Leipzig) 116, 161 (1925).
- ¹³¹K. P. Mishchenko, I. F. Yakovlev, J. Gen. Chem. USSR, 29, 1735 (1959).
- ¹³²W. L. Gardner, R. E. Mitchell, J. W. Cobble, J. Phys. Chem. 73, 2025 (1969).

¹³⁵A. Dadgar, M. R. Taherian, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 9, 711 (1977).

¹³⁶S. Taniewska-Osinska, R. Logwinienko Acta Univ. Lodz Ser. 2 69

¹³⁷A. Sanahuja, E. Cesari, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 16, 823 (1985).

¹³⁸A. Sanahuja, E. Cesari, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 16, 1195 (1984).

¹³⁹S. G. Lipsett, F. M. G. Johnson, O. Maass J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 49,

¹³³C. M. Criss, J. W. Cobble J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 83, 3223 (1961).

¹³⁴L. Benjamin, Can. J. Chem. 41, 2210 (1963).

(1976).

925 (1927).

- ¹⁴⁰S. G. Lipsett, F. M. G. Johnson, O. Maass J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 49, 1940 (1927).
- ¹⁴¹D. H. Davies, G. C. Benson, Can. J. Chem. 43, 3100 (1965).
- ¹⁴²P. S. Z. Rogers, C. J. Duffy, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 21, 595 (1989).
- ¹⁴³J. E. Tanner, F. W. Lamb, J. Solution Chem. 7, 303 (1978).
- ¹⁴⁴M.-A. Simard, J.-L. Fortier, Can. J. Chem. 59, 3208 (1981).
- ¹⁴⁵M. Randall, F. D. Rossini, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 51, 323, (1929).
- ¹⁴⁶J. A. Gates, D. M. Tillett, D. E. White, R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 19, 131 (1987).
- ¹⁴⁷D. E. White, R. H. Wood, J. Solution Chem. 11, 223 (1982).
- ¹⁴⁸D. R. White, C. J. Downes, J. Solution Chem. 17, 733 (1988).
- ¹⁴⁹S. Likke, L. A. Bromley, J. Chem. Eng. Data 18, 189 (1973).
- ¹⁵⁰R. W. Carter, R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Thermodynamics 23, 1037, (1991).
- ¹⁵¹J.-L. Fortier, P.-A. Leduc, J. E. Desnoyers, J. Solution Chem. 3, 323 (1974).
- ¹⁵²L. V. Puchkov, P. S. Styazhkin, M. K. Fedorov, Zh. Prikl. Khim. 49, 1232 (1976).
- ¹⁵³G. Scatchard, B. Vonnegut, D. W. Beaumont, J. Chem. Phys. 33, 1292 (1960).
- ¹⁵⁴J. A. Rard, R. F. Platford in Activity Coefficients in Electrolyte Solutions 2nd ed., K. S. Pitzer, ed. (C.R.C. Press, Boca Raton, FL 1991) in press.
- ¹⁵⁵W. J. Hamer, Y.-C. Wu, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 1, 1047 (1972).
- ¹⁵⁶J. E. Desnoyers, C. DeVisser, G. Perron, P. Picker, J. Solution Chem. 5, 605 (1976).
- ¹⁵⁷E. I. Akhumov, B. B. Vasil'ev, Zh. Obsch. Khim. 2, 282 (1932).
- ¹⁵⁸E. K. Akopov, J. Appl. Chem. USSR 36, 1859 (1963).
- ¹⁵⁹N. N. Khitrova, J. Appl. Chem. USSR 27, 1217 (1954).

- ¹⁶⁰E. Janecke, Z. Elektrochem. 53, 250 (1949).
- ¹⁶¹See, for example, the phase diagram shown on page 2 of Gmelin Handbuch der Anorganischen Chemie Num 21 (Verlag Chemie, Weinheim, 1973).
- ¹⁶²N. B. Keevil, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 64, 841 (1942).
- ¹⁶³V. L. Thurmond, G. W. Brass, J. Chem. Eng. Data, 33, 411 (1988).
- ¹⁶⁴S. E. Knipmeyer, D. G. Archer, R. D. Chirico, B. E. Gammon, I. A. Hossenlopp, A. Nguyen, N. K. Smith, W. V. Steele, M. M. Strube, Fluid Phase Equilib. **52**, 185, (1989).
- ¹⁶⁵D. D. Wagman, W. H. Evans, V. B. Parker, R. H. Schumm, I. Halow, S. M. Bailey, K. L. Churney, R. L. Nuttall, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 11, Suppl. 2 (1982).
- ¹⁶⁶J. L. Oscarson, S. E. Gillespie, J. J. Christensen, R. M. Izatt, and P. R. Brown, J. Solution Chem. 17, 841, 865 (1988).
- ¹⁶⁷H. F. Holmes, R. H. Busey, J. M. Simonson, R. E. Mesmer, D. G. Archer, and R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Thermodyn. **19**, 863 (1987).
- ¹⁶⁸J. E. Mayrath, R. H. Wood, J. Chem. Eng. Data 28, 56 (1983).
- ¹⁶⁹L. M. Connaughton, J. P. Hershey, F. J. Millero, J. Solution Chem. 15, 989 (1986).
- ¹⁷⁰J. R. Quint, R. H. Wood, J. Phys. Chem. 89, 380 (1985).
- ¹⁷¹R. T. Pabalan, K. S. Pitzer, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **51**, 2429 (1987).
- ¹⁷²K. S. Pitzer, personal communication with indication that this subject will be examined in a paper to appear in Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta, coauthored by I.-Ming Chou.
- ¹⁷³R. M. Izzatt, J. L. Oscarson, X. Chen, S. E. Gillespie, Electric Power Research Institute Topical Report NP-5078 (1992).
- ¹⁷⁴J. M. Simonson, R. E. Mesmer, P. S. Z. Rogers, J. Chem. Thermodynam. 21, 561 (1989).

Appendix 1. Unusual Results for Calcualtion of the Specific Compressibility for Temperatures Greater Than 530 K and for Pressures Less Than 30 MPa

The specific compressibility, when calculated from the equations given in the main body of the text, for high temperature and low pressure exhibits a maximum with respect to pressure at fixed concentration and fixed temperature, for concentrations smaller than the reference molality. An example for which this maximum is clearly visible is shown in Fig. A1-1 (unbroken curve). The maximum shown in Fig. A1-1 results from a calculated change in the difference of the compressibility of the solution from that of the solvent $\{\beta - \beta^{\circ}\}$ that is much larger at lower pressure, for example 8 MPa, than at a larger pressure, for example 30 MPa. A large pressure dependence of the change in compressibility of the solvent resulting from the addition of ions to a solvent of high compressibility is considered reasonable, (see Ref. 170 as an example of the rationalization of such effects) however, it is possible that this effect is over-estimated in the above-described representation. Examination of several alternate representations as well as the experimental results in the region of representation suggested that the maximum in the compressibility shown in Fig. A1-1 resulted from the combination of the choice of fitting functions with the choice of a particular dielectric-constant representation (used for calculation of Debye-Hückel limiting-law values.) This can be demonstrated by repeating the least-squares representation of the experimental results with the functions described in the body of the text with the sole exception of a substitution of the dielectricconstant equation of Bradley and Pitzer¹⁵ for that of Archer and Wang.¹⁴ The so-obtained representation yields the monotonically changing compressibility shown in Fig. A1-1. The second representation of experimental results is summarized in Tables A1-1 and A1-2 which are analogous to Tables 3 and 4. Substitution of the Bradley and Pitzer equation results in representation of the most significant experimental results, for temperatures less than 400 K, almost as well as they were represented when the Archer and Wang equation was used. Significant differences exist between the two representations for temperatures above 400 K. Representation of the 604 K density difference results of Majer et al.59 was significantly better with use of the Bradley and Pitzer equation (σ_{fit} was halved) with much of this improvement having been obtained at the expense of the 597 K density difference results from Majer *et al.*⁵³ On the other hand, a significant bias from the 573 K enthalpy of dilution results from Busey *et al.*¹¹⁴ (δ_{fit} increased from -30 J·mol⁻¹ to 460 J·mol⁻¹), significant increases in the r.m.s. differences of the 598 K heat capacity results from Gates *et al.*¹⁴² and from Rogers and Duffy¹⁴⁶ and an approximate 50% increase in the r.m.s differences of the enthalpies of dilution, for temperatures greater than 400K, from Mayrath and Wood¹²³ were observed with the representation obtained with use of the Bradley and Pitzer equation.

Estimated parameter values obtained from the representation obtained with use of the Bradley and Pitzer equation are given in Table A1–3.



FIG. A1-1. Compressibility of 1.0 mol·kg⁻¹ NaCl(aq) against pressure for 573.15 K. The solid line is calculated from the representation that used the Archer and Wang dielectric-constant equation. The solid line is obtained from a reperesentation that used the dielectric-constant equation from Bradley and Pitzer. The vertical line marks the saturation pressure of water for 573.15 K.

THERMODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF THE NaCI + H₂O SYSTEM

Table A	\1-1 .	Literature sour	ces for the	e volumetric	properties	of NaCl(aq)
---------	---------------	-----------------	-------------	--------------	------------	-------------

Reference	Temperature range (K)	Pressure range ^a (MPa)	Molality range (mol·kg ⁻¹)	n	type	σ _{est} ^b .	σ _{fit}	δ _{fit}
19	273.95	0.1	0.015-0.126	11	ρs ^c	5×10 ⁻⁶	4×10 ⁻⁶	1.1×10 ^{-6^d}
20	278.15	0.1	0.053.5	19	V.	0.028	0.036	-0.021°
21	298.15	0.1	0.17-5.86	13	ρ _s /ρ _w	40×10 ⁻⁶	18×10 ⁻⁶	$2 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
22	298.15	0.1	0.0026-0.75	15	p./p.	3×10 ⁻⁶	5×10-6	$-3 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
23	298.15	0.1	0.04-6.14	11	₽ √ ₽₩	30×10-6	23×10-6	$15 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
24(set 1)	298.15	0.1	0.06-2.1	21	ρsρw	U	33×10-6	$-28 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
24(set 2)	298.15	0.1	0.06-2.8	18	ρsρw	U	54×10^{-6}	$40 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
25	298.15	0.1	0.05-3.5	19	V_{\bullet}	0.017	0.016	-0.002°
26	298.15	0.1	0.02-0.31	5	P=-P+	5×10^{-6}	4×10 ⁻⁶	$0 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
27	298.15	0.1	1.0-6.0	7	ρ _s /ρ _w	U	419 × 10 ⁻⁶	$-233 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
28	298.15	0.1	0.210.82	2	ρ _s /ρ _w	10×10 ⁻⁶	8×10^{-6}	$-1.0 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
28	298.15	0.1	0.004-0.82	1	$\Delta_{\rm dil}V_{\rm \Phi}$	0.02	0.000	0.000°
29	323.15	0.1	0.005-0.98	10	ρ _s –ρ _w	20×10^{-6}	25×10-6	$13 \times 10^{-6^{6}}$
30	298.15	0.1	0.01-1.0	12	ρsρw	3×10 ⁻⁶ ; 0.064%	17×10-6	$-13 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
31	298.15	0.1	0.17-5.0	9	ρ₅/ρ _w	U	189×10^{-6}	$132 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
32	298.15	0.1	0.1-0.5	10	ρsρw	U	79×10-6	$44 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
33	298.15	0.1	0.28-5.10	10	ρsρw	U	112×10 ⁻⁶	$-78 \times 10^{-6^{d}}$
34	298.15	0.1-40	0.06-5.0	40	ρsρw	20×10 ⁻⁶ ; 0.1%	93×10 ⁻⁶	$-15 \times 10^{-6^{a}}$
33	298.15	0.1	0.28-5.10	10	$\alpha_s - \alpha_w$	$\sigma E_{\phi} = 2 \times 10^{-6} m_{\rm L} = 2.0$	4.6×10 ⁻⁶	2.6×10^{-6}
35	303.15	0.1	0.1–1.0	8	V_{ϕ}	0.3	0.31	-0.29°
36	308.15	0.1	0.002-1.08	13	ρ₅/ρ _w	30×10 ⁻⁶ ; 1.3%	82×10^{-6}	$-52 \times 10^{-6^{a}}$
37	280.15-306.19	0.1	0.255.7	21	ρ₅/ρ _₩	100×10^{-6}	95×10 ⁻⁶	61 × 10 ⁻⁶⁴
38	273.15-323.19	0.1	0.25-5.9	15	ρ₅/ρ _₩	100×10^{-6}	95×10^{-6}	-64×10^{-64}
39	273.15-298.15	0.1	0.002-1.02	18	ρ₅/ρ _₩	15×10^{-6}	18×10^{-6}	$4 \times 10^{-6^{4}}$
40	273.2-338.15	0.1	0.23-0.9	27	$\Delta_{\rm dil}V_{\Phi}$	0.12	0.18	-0.11°
40	273.2-338.15	0.1	0.21-1.0	17	ρ₅/ρ _w	30×10 ⁻⁶	45×10-6	29×10-0
41	273.15-328.15	0.1	0.010.96	83	ρ₅∽ρ _₩	5×10 ⁻⁶ ; 0.14%	22×10^{-6}	$-2 \times 10^{-6^{\circ}}$
42	273.15-318.15	0.1	0.25-5.0	34	β₅−β _w	0.6×10^{-6}	0.59×10^{-6}	0.01 × 10 ⁻⁶⁴
43	273.15-308.15	0.1	0.01-1.5	47	$\rho_s - \rho_w$	4×10 ⁻ °; 0.085%	11 × 10 ⁻⁶	$-3 \times 10^{-6^{\circ}}$
44	274.65-318.15	0.1	0.03-3.0	58	ρsρw	7.5×10 ⁻ °; 0.15%	46×10^{-6}	5×10-0°
45	283.15-313.15	0.1	0.19-1.89	20	$\alpha_s - \alpha_w$	$\sigma E_{\phi} = 2 \times 10^{-6} m_{\rm L} = 2.0$	1.8×10 ⁻⁶	-0.12×10^{-6}
46	288.15-318.15	0.1	0.17-5.9	58	ρsρw	0.045%	23×10-	$-0.4 \times 10^{-6^{\circ}}$
47	288.15-313.15	0.1	0.06-2.9	55	ρs≔ρ _w	U	27×10-°	4×10-**
48	293.15-313.15	0.1	0.114	21	V.	U	0.13	0.08 ^e
49	273.15-323.15	10-100	0.03-2.0	178	$\Delta \rho(P_2 - P_1)$	$\sigma V_{\phi} = 0.1; m_{\rm L} = 1.0$	0.44	0.2 ^e
50	293.15-571.65	10-100	0.017-5.7	216	ps .	860×10~°	851 × 10	$466 \times 10^{-6^{-1}}$
51, 52	298.15-358.15	0.1-100	0.89-5.68	104	ρ₅/ρ _w	40×10~°	39×10-	$-1.1 \times 10^{-6^{-1}}$
53	323.16-548.05	***- 40	0.056-5.0	250	ρs-ρw	50×10 ⁻ °; 0.5%	267×10-°	$-105 \times 10^{-6^{\circ}}$
53	321.6-549.7		0.01-3.09	163	ρs−ρ _w	36×10 ⁻ ; 0.36%	291×10-°	7×10 ⁻⁶⁻
54	348.15-473.15	2.03	0.1-1.0	24	ρs		164 × 10 ⁻⁶	$-119 \times 10^{-6^{-1}}$
55	348.15-473.15	2.03	0.053-4.39	48	ρ₅/ρ _₩		183×10-°	$-6 \times 10^{-6^{-1}}$
50	430-600	20.	0.1-4.0	39	ρs	0	0.016	0.0057
5/	4/3.13-3/3.13	1.5-100	1.1-4.5	30	ρs	3×10-3	4.2×10^{-3}	$2.6 \times 10^{-3^{-1}}$
58 57	448.13~5/3.15	<i>p</i> ,	0.5-3.0	24	βs	10×10-5	5.2×10-3	-4.2 × 10 ^{-3⁴}
33 50	JY/.43	21-39	0.01-5.05	30	ρsρw	130×10 ⁻ °; 1.3%	1.28×10 ⁻³	$-0.66 \times 10^{-3^2}$
JY 160	004.4 200.15 260.15	2/38	0.01-3.1	87	₽s₽w	480×10 ⁻ "; 1.2%	0.60×10^{-3}	$-0.19 \times 10^{-3^{-10}}$
102	208.12-208.12	0.101	0.20-0.2	141	ρsρw	50×10 ⁻ "; 0.1%	75 × 10-"	19×10-0-

*** indicates that the lowest pressure for the data set changed with the experimental temperature

The letter U indicates that these points were given an insignificant weight in the least-squares procedure. When two values are given the σ_{exp} was taken to be the larger of the two values given. In the cases where a value is given for mL; the expected square root of the variance is taken to be the first value for $m > m_L$ and taken to be the first value divided by m_L for $m < m_L$.

Values of density were calculated from the data given only as a figure. d Units are g cm⁻³.

"Units are cm³·mol⁻¹.

^fUnits are K⁻¹.

⁸Units are MPa⁻¹.

^bValues of σ_{exp} depended on temperature. Values were 2 × 10⁻⁴, 2.8 × 10⁻⁴, 3.5 × 10⁻⁴, 4.2 × 10⁻⁴, and 5 × 10⁻⁴ g cm⁻³, for temperatures of 348.15 and 373.15, 398.15, 423.15, 448.15, and 473.15 K, respectively.

DONALD G. ARCHER

						······································		
D - 6.	Temperature	Pressure	Molality		ma h	c		
Reference	range (K)	range [*] (MPa)	range (mol·kg ⁻¹)	n	Туре	σest	$\sigma_{\rm fit}$	Δ_{fit}
	(K)	(1411 a)						
70	273.15	0.1	ms	1	ms (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.022	0.010	0.010 ^d
71	251.55-269.15	0.1	ms	4	m _s (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.024	0.024	0.005 [°]
72	252.05-273.25	0.1	ms	2	m _s (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.022	0.003	0.001 ^ª
73	252.05-273.15	0.1	m _s	7	m _s (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.015	0.017	-0.004^{d}
74	252.15-271.15	0.1	ms	5	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.040	0.036	0.033
75	252.34	0.1	ms	1	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl·2H ₂ O)	0.3	0.04	-0.04
76	273.15-380.15	0.1, p _s	ms	8	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.040	0.036	- 0.033 [°]
77	298.15	0.1	ms	2	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.010	0.013	0.013 [°]
70	278.15-356.15	0.1	m _s	16	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.010	0.008	0.000
78	293.6-323.15	0.1	$m_{\rm s}$	6	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.010	0.003	- 0.003
79	288.15-298.15	0.1	ms	3	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.020	0.011	- 0.010
71	273.15-381.95	$0.1, p_{s}$	ms	13	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.030	0.026	- 0.019
80	273.15-373.15	0.1	ms	5	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.063	0.061	- 0.053
72	273.25-373.15	0.1	$m_{\rm s}$	6	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.010	0.009	0.006"
72	393.15-462.55	$p_{ m s}$	m_{s}	4	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.040	0.046	- 0.005
81	423.15-573.15	p_{s}	$m_{\rm s}$	6	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.100	0.088	0.028
82	375.5-441.45	p_s	ms	z	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.050	0.048	- 0.036 ⁻
/4	2/3.15-333.15	0.1	ms	4	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.025	0.015	- 0.002
83	348.15-573.15	p_w	$m_{\rm s}$	11	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.030	0.023	0.014
84	422-003	p_{s}	$m_{\rm s}$	13	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.064	0.062	0.012
85	283.15-308.15	0.1	m _s	4	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCl)	0.010	0.008	0.007
87	290.0-3/3.14	0.1	ms	12	$m_{\rm s}$ (NaCI)	0.05	0.042	0.037
07	255-250			11 E	p_{dec}	0%	1%	- 2%
00 90	231.93-273.3 T	0.1	1053	12	p_{dec}	20	21	- 3.8"
73	T_{tus}	0.1	3 26_5 13	14	$\Delta_{\text{lus}} T$	0.005	0.011	- 0.010-
90	Te	0.1	0.0008_1.3	28	$\Delta_{fus} T$	$0.00075 m_{2} = 0.2$	0.004	0.0035
74	$T_{\rm fus}$	0.1	15_512	20 A	$\Delta_{fus} T$	$0.00075, m_{\rm L} = 0.2$	0.0038	0.0018
Q1	T _{fus}	0.1	0.02_3.07	21	$\Delta_{fus} T$	$0.000, m_{\rm L} = 5.0$	0.012	0.001
92	T _{fus}	0.1	0.14-3.6	32	$\Delta_{\rm rus} T$	$0.0007, m_1 = 1.0$	0.0037	0.0013[
93	Trus	0.1	0.07_4 7	32	$\Delta_{\rm fus} T$	$0.002, m_1 = 1.0$	0.0018	-0.0013
94	373	0.1	0.007-2.8	15	ΛT	0.0000, mg = 0.2	0.0023	-0.0022^{f}
95	333-343	0.1	0.05-1.0	24		0.005	0.00055	0.00021f
95	353-373	0.1	0.05-1.0	36	$\Delta_{max}T$	0.00037	0.00037	0.00003f
96	333.15	0.05	1.5-3.5	10	$\Delta_{\rm max}T$	0.005	0.0048	0.0038 ^f
96	343.15-373.15	0.07	1.5-3.5	43	$\Delta_{mn}T$	0.003	0.0023	- 0.00009 ^f
97	298.15-373.15	0.1	1.0-6.1	56	-тар- ф	0.0039	0.0044	~ 0.0032 ^f
98	293.15-303.15	0.1	2.4-6.1	36	φ.	0.0036	0.0035	-0.0024 ^f
99	298.15	p_{s}	4.0-5.9	9	$p_s - p_w$	0.0023	0.0022	0.0001 ^f
100	293.43	p_s	6.1	2	$p_s - p_w$	0.0020	0.0019	-0.0012f
100	298.15	0.1	4.3-6.0	6	$p_s - p_w$	· 0.007	0.0055	0.0043 ^r
101	293.43-298.15	<i>p</i> s	4.7-6.1	3	$p_{s} - p_{w}$	0.002	0.0025	0.00036 ^f
102	298.15	p_{s}	0.76-5.9	12	$p_{s}-p_{w}$	0.0046	0.0043	0.0027 ^f
83	348.15-423.15	p s	3.8-7.2	20	$p_{s-p_{w}}$	0.0075	0.0057	0.0046 ^r
83	448.15-498.15	p s	3.9-8.4	18	p_{s-p_w}	0.005	0.0031	0.0028 ^f
83	523.15-573.15	$p_{\rm s}$	4.1-10.4	18	ps-pw	0.003	0.0018	0.0006 ^f
103	422541	$p_{\rm s}$	1.0-3.0	22	$p_{s-}p_{w}$	0.01	0.0098	0.0031 ^f
104	440-512.4	p_{s}	0.5-1.0	7	$p_s - p_w$	U	0.024	0.012 ^r
105	398.15-573.15	p_{s}	0.25 - 1.0	38	$p_{s}-p_{w}$	U	0.013	-0.0073 ^f
106	423.15-573.15	p_{s}	1.2-5.55	20	$p_{s} - p_{w}$	U	0.030	- 0.010 ^r
107	273.15-323.15	0.1	0.001-4.0	60	$\ln(\gamma_2/\gamma_1)$	0.005	0.0043	0.00025
108	288.15-323.15	0.1	0.02-1.0	32	$\ln(\gamma_2/\gamma_1)$	U	0.0041	0.0010
109	298.15-343.15	0.1	0.03-5.0	48	$\ln(\gamma_{\pm})$	U	0.019	- 0.00056
110	273.45-313.15	0.1	0.05-4.0	76	$\ln(\gamma_2/\gamma_1)$	0.005	0.0048	- 0.0012
111	298.15	0.1	0.03-2.97	4	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\rm \phi}$	80	50	-20°
112	298.15	0.1	0.4-1.23	66	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	$0.09, m_{\rm L} = 0.8$	0.13	0.016
113	298.15	0.1	0.1-0.83	21	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	15	14	-7.8
114	348.35-372.85	6.6-41.	0.03-5.2	33	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{ m \phi}$	2%, 20.	24	-4.0°
114	423.25-473.05	6.6-41.6	0.03-5.2	47	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\rm \phi}$	2%, 20.	61	29°
114	523.45	6.6-41.7	0.03-5.2	31	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\rm \Phi}$	2%	153	- 19"
114	572.85	10.5-41.7	0.03-5.2	24	$\Delta_{\rm dil}L_{\rm \phi}$	2%	657	460°
115	283.15-298.15	0.1	0.0003-0.40	56	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	8.0	8.0	- 2.8
116	298.15	0.1	0.005-1.0	23	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	2.5	2.4	1.5"
117	303.15	0.1	0.2-1.0	7	$\Delta_{dil}L_{\phi}$	3.0	2.7	2.5°

TABLE A1-2. Literature sources for the activity and thermal properties of NaCl(aq)

.

THERMODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF THE NaCI + H₂O SYSTEM

TABLE A1-2. Literature sources for the activity and thermal properties of NaCl(aq) - Continued

Reference	Temperature range (K)	Pressure range ^a (MPa)	Molality range (mol·kg ⁻¹)	n	Туреь	σ _{est} c	$\sigma_{\rm fit}$	$\Delta_{ m fit}$
	000 15			10				
118	298.15	0.1	0.04-5.0	19		6.U 10	6.1	- 3.4"
110	343.13	0.1	0.04-5.0	10	а _{dil} с _ф	10	9.7	- 3.7
118	348.13 209.15	0.1	0.04-5.0	10	<u>х</u> ашсь Стапсь	10	0.3	1.4
119	298.13	0.1	0.0000-0.1	24	ΔdilL _φ ∧ T	3	4./	-0.4
120	298.08	0.1	0.44-6.14	17	A	12	0.80	12.9
120	270	0.1	0.00.61	21	<u>а</u> діје-ф Л.,,/Г.,	$1 \\ 05 \\ m_{2} - 05$	0.07	0.36
121	273.4	0.1	0.05-0.1	18	Δ <u>α</u> μω _φ	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 0.5$	0.60	~0.35 ~0.35 ^{\$}
121	203.0	0.1	0.2-0.1	17	A I	$0.3, m_{\rm L} = 0.5$	0.35	0.33 0.003 [#]
121	298.2	0.1	0.00025-1.0	7		25	27	1.093
123	348 15	0.1	0.035-6.0	21		50 m = 03	5.8	-2.5 ⁸
123	373 15	0.11	0.009-6.0	28	Δαμοφ	10.0, <i>m</i> _ = 0.0	75	5.58
123	473 65	0.5	0.007-6.0	46	$\Lambda \dots I$.	h	78	248
173	450.05	0.0	0.007-0.0	25		ь	20	24
123	472 95	1.55	0.04-0.0	11	<u>данс</u> ЛГ.	30	20	21 ⁸
124	340 7	1.03	0.03_3.0	18		20	20	
124	208.2	1.03	0.03 2.0	10	A T	20 b	20	14 1 4 ⁸
124	448 3	1.03	0.01-3.0	22		b	76	
124	498 3	3 35	0.01-3.0	21		h	80	
125	313 15	0.1	0.005-6.0	47		20	15	-31
125	323 15	0.1	0.004-5.7	31		20	13	58
125	333.15	0.1	0.008-57	32		20	16	2 ⁸
125	343.15	0.1	0.007-5.7	32		20	20	7 ²
125	353.15	01	0.007-5.7	20	$\Delta_{an}L_{a}$	11	62	258
126	298.15	0.1	0.27-3.0	6		20	15	
127	293.15	0.1	0.02-0.04	ğ	$\Delta_{col}H_{m}$	250	168	46 ⁸
128	298.15	0.1	0.05-1.3	24	$\Delta_{rol}H_{m}$	40	23	21
129	278.15-348.15	0.1	0.46	5	$\Delta_{rol}H_{m}$	40	46	45 ⁸
130	298.15	0.1	0.5-5.6	14	$\Delta_{rol}H_{rol}$	40	30	78 ⁸
129	278.15-313.15	0.1	0 0003-4 1	41	$\Delta_{m}H_{m}(m_{m}m_{n})$	120	178	00 ^g
131	275.15	0.1	0.06-6.0	18	ΔΗ	230	235	- 33 142 ^g
132	387.4-472.65	n.	0.01-0.04	17	A.,H.	300	233	- 142
133	273.2-368.3	0.1	0.003-0.02	58	$\Delta_{-1}H_{-1}$	150	156	- 100 ⁸
134	298.15	0.1	0.02-0.72	23	$\Delta_{col}H_{m}$	40	23	- 109 14 ⁸
135	298.15	0.1	0.01-0.03	5	$\Delta_{rol}H_{rr}$	40	25	-21 ⁸
136	278.15-298.15	0.1	0.055.0	88	$\Delta_{sol}H_m$	170	171	81
137	303-313	0.1	0.006-0.12	48	$\Delta_{rol}H_{rr}$	190	181	141#
138	298.15	0.1	0.01-0.12	16	$\Delta_{sol}H_m$	100	102	21*
139	293.15-298.15	0.1	0.8-5.9	17	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_m$	40	18	0.7*
140	298.15	0.1	0.07-5.5	20	$\Delta_{\rm sol}H_m$	40	11	-2*
141	298	0.1	0.25-0.5	4	$\Delta_{ini}H_{m}$	40	6	-4 ⁸
142	323.14-573.15	7–36	1.0-6.0	127	$C_{n,s}/C_{n,w}$	0.00125	3.5	-0.4 ^b
142	598.01	20.1	1.0-6.0	24	C _{R s} /C _{R w}	0.005	31.2	19.0 ^h
146	349-573	***-17.9	0.085.0	402	$c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$	*	12.8	- 2.2 ⁱ
146	597.8	17.9	0.085-3.0	18	Cp, s/Cp, w	*	111	71 ⁱ
147	348.2-598.6	17.7	3.0	7	Cp, s/Cp, w	*	3.2	- 2.2 ⁱ
148	358.3, 573.95	17.7	1.0-3.0	6	$c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$	*	5.8	4.2 ⁱ
150	598.11	17.7	1.0-3.0	6	Cp. s/Cp. w	*	7.1	-5.1 ¹
149	353.15-473.15	***	0.35-2.13	35	C _{D.S}	0.012	5.4	0.2
143	278.15	0.1	0.076-6.0	20	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 1.5$	1.2	-0.6 ^k
143	298.15	0.1	0.04-6.0	30	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 1.5$	1.9	-0.4 ^k
143	318.15	0.1	0.04-6.0	26	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 1.5$	2.0	-0.5 ^k
143	338.15	0.1	0.086.0	22	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} = 1.5$	0.9	0.1k
143	358.15	0.1	0.08-6.0	17	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.5, m_{\rm L} - 1.5$	1.5	0.3 ^k
24	298.15	0.1	1.0-3.2	13	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.4, m_{\rm L} = 2.5$	0.5	0.04 ^k
144	298.15	0.1	0.011-5.32	22	$C_{p,\phi}$	$0.75, m_1 = 0.1$	1.1	-0.4 ^k
145	298.15	0.1	0.05-2.5	11	$C_{p,\phi}$	$1.0, m_1 = 0.6$	3.6	-1.9 ^k
27	298.15	0.1	1.0-6.0	8	$c_{p,s}/c_{p,w}$	U	1.1	0.7 ^k
115	298.15	0.1	0.01-3.0	22	C _{n.b}	Ū	2.7	2.3 ^k
44	274.65	0.1	0.07-1.8	12	Co.b	U	3.9	- 0.6 ^k
44	278.15	0.1	0.03-1.0	11	$C_{p,\phi}$	Ū	3.7	1.1 ^k
44	288.15	0.1	0.03-3.0	16	C _{p, \u03cb}	Ŭ	1.3	0.6 ^k
44	308.15	0.1	0.03-3.0	16	Cat	Ū	3.8	3.7*
					-μ,ψ	-	0.0	5.7

DONALD G. ARCHER

Referen	Temperature ace range (K)	Pressure range [*] (MPa)	Molality range (mol·kg ⁻¹)	n	Туреь	σ _{est} °	σ _{fit}	$\Delta_{\rm fit}$
44	318.15	0.1	0.03-2.5	15	C _{P. 4}	U	2.7	2.5 [±]
32	298.15	0.1	0.08-0.5	10	C _{n.}	U	0.6	-0.4 ^k
24	298.15	0.1	0.06-2.1	21	Cn. t	U	2.3	2.2 ^k
24	298.15	0.1	0.07-2.8	19	$C_{p, \bullet}$	U	5.3	5.1 ^k
47	283.15-313.15	0.1	0.04-2.9	53	C _{n.t}	U	0.9	0.0 ^k
33	298.15	0.1	0.28-5.1	10	Cnt	U	1.8	1.4 ^k
152	423.15-573.15	D.	0.4-6.04	24	Cn . ICn w	Ū	70	37 ^k
163	248.15	0.1	2.0-6.0	6	С _{р, з}	$10, m_{\rm L} = 6.0$	16	- 5*

TABLE A1-2. Literature sources for the activity and thermal properties of NaCl(aq) - Continued

*** indicates that the lowest pressure for the data set changed with the experimental temperature

^bType m_s refers to solubility of the indicated substance; p_{dec} refers to the vapor pressure of water in equilibrium with the dihydrate; The symbol p_s-p_w. refers to the difference in vapor pressure between solution and solvent.

The letter U indicates that these points were given an insignificant weight in the least squares procedure. When two values are given the our was taken to be the larger of the two values given. In the cases where a value is given for mil; the expected square root of the variance is taken to be the first value for $m > m_L$ and taken to be the first value divided by m_L for $m < m_L$.

dUnits are kJ-mol⁻³.

Units are Pa.

^fValues given in terms of the osmotic coefficient.

⁸Units are J-mol⁻¹.

^bValues of σ_{exp} were unitless, other values given in terms of $C_{p, \phi}$, units are J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹. ⁱValues of σ_{exp} were unitless and were those given in the sited reference, other values given in terms of $C_{p, \phi}$, units are J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹. ⁱValues of σ_{exp} had units of J·K⁻¹·g⁻¹, other values given in terms of $C_{p,\phi}$, units are J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹. ^k Units are J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹.

THERMODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF THE NaCI + H₂O SYSTEM

Table A1-3. Least-squares estimated parameters for Eqs. (3-37) with use of the dielectric-constant equation of Bradley and Pitzer *

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value	Parameter .	Value
$\overline{b_{1,1}}$	0.242651052883794	b _{2,1}	- 1.94792794517029	b _{3, 1}	······································
b _{1,2}		b2, 2	5.53477399563770	b _{3,2}	-0.0476961507576975
b _{1.3}	-0.160578547305475	b _{2,3}		b _{3, 3}	0.0248453996970447
b1.4	1.22249898267412	b2,4	- 40.9575943938422	b _{3, 4}	-0.583285519436642
b1.5		b2,5		b3, 5	
b1.6		b2.6		b _{3,6}	0.0966416317519622
b1.7	- 65.8299103364965	b2,7	495.488959381070	b3,7	5.17677315192276
b1.8		b _{2,8}	-0.647069267974439	b _{3.8}	0.00530484869542637
b1.9	0.592206494036454	b2,9		b3,9	
b _{1, 10}	-21.6059704995988	b _{2, 10}		b _{3, 10}	1.49331442521389
b1, 11	79.9242989836885	b2, 11	263.514104240237	b _{3, 11}	- 3.57598920090558
b1, 12		b _{2, 12}		b _{3, 12}	0.0846547308275376
b1, 13		b _{2, 13}	- 110.865524218289	b _{3, 13}	
b1, 14		b _{2, 14}		b _{3, 14}	- 19.6647827776674
b1. 15	35.9009013869343	b2, 15		b _{3, 15}	- 3.16551434879799
b1, 16	- 49.4314672615553	b _{2, 16}	54.9466586142382	b _{3, 16}	3.62129862281871
b1, 17	1.04390658682638	b2, 17		b _{3, 17}	
b1. 18	-41.9541567430562	b _{2, 18}		b _{3, 18}	3.67884876799807
b1, 19		b2, 19		b3, 17	
b1, 20		b2, 20		b _{3, 20}	
b _{1, 21}	33.2379600367917	b _{2, 21}		b _{3, 21}	
b1, 22	2.03031549012081	b2, 22		b _{3, 22}	
h1, 23	-0.187396334924425	b2, 23		b3, 23	
b _{1, 24}	8.81256035834609	b _{2, 24}		b _{3, 24}	0.564064305163377
b4, 1	0.738770355969160	b _{6, 1}	1.65044633819023	$\Delta_{\rm sol} G^{\circ}_{\rm anhydrous, T_{\rm r}, P_{\rm f}}$	$-9.036665 \pm 0.0065 \text{ kJ-mol}^{-1}$
b4, 2	- 3.48181614204602	b6, 2	0.786584166653199	$\Delta_{\rm sol} G_{\rm dibydrate, T_f, P_f}$	$-8.944448 \pm 0.044 \text{ kJ·mol}^{-1}$
b4. 3	1.08380749393807	b6, 3	0.216559238906270	Sm, cr, dihydrate, Tr. Pr	$162.7623 \pm 1.2 \text{ J}\cdot\text{K}^{-1}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$
b4, 4		b _{6, 4}	- 1.02990273530200	So,NaCi(aq),Tr, Pr	$115.4905 \pm 0.030 \text{ J}\cdot\text{K}^{-1}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$
b4, 5					
b4,6	9.76294707814877	b _{5,1}	1.73824910134822		
b4,7		b _{5, 2}	0.949889120761842		
b4, 8		b5, 3	4.94057353407296		
b4,9		b _{5, 4}	5.33065983741207		
b _{4, 10}		b _{5,5}	- 11.8258826797546		
b4, 11		b5, 6	0.146278779523558		
b4, 12		b _{5, 7}	-8.31379076485402		
b4, 13		b _{5,8}	0.237944972833914		
b4, 14					
b4, 15					
b4, 16			•		
b4, 17					
<i>b</i> _{4, 18}					
b _{4, 19}					
b4, 20					
b4, 21					
b4, 22					
D4, 23					
<i>b</i> _{4, 24}	28.1027292775539				

* The \pm values are 95% confidence intervals within the global data representation.

Appendix 2. Comparison of Enthalpies of Dilution from Different Calorimeters

Fig. A2–1 shows differences of enthalpy of dilution results from different calorimeters for $Na_2SO_4(aq)$ and HCl(aq). All are shown against the observed heat flux in one of the calorimeters. Calculation of the differences shown in Fig. A2–1 is described below.



FIG. A2-1. Differences of enthalpies of dilution from different calorimeters.

The first comparison to be described is for HCl(aq) from 548.15 K to 593.15 K. Oscarson et al.¹⁶⁶ presented their results in a manner somewhat different than that normally encountered in the description of enthalpy of dilution results. Because of this difference the calculation of ΔL_{ϕ} from the flow rates and observed enthalpies is briefly described. The flow rate of water (in g $H_2O \cdot min^{-1}$) in each of the calorimetric flow streams is obtained from multiplication of the value in the column labeled "Flow of Stream" and the number associated with the lower case letter above the appropriate "Heat of Dilution" column. The flow rate of solute (mol·min⁻¹) is obtained by multiplying the flow rate of water $(g min^{-1})$ in the appropriate column by the molality of solute and dividing by 1000 g·kg⁻¹. The molar enthalpy of dilution, ΔL_{ϕ} , is obtained by dividing the reported enthalpy flux (J·min⁻¹) by the solute flow rate. The final molality for the dilution is obtained by dividing the solute flow rate by the sum of the two water flow rates and multiplying by 1000 $g kg^{-1}$.

The values of ΔL_{ϕ} for HCl(aq) calculated in this way are referred to as $\Delta L_{\phi, HCl(aq), O}$. Values for comparison were calculated from the equation for HCl(aq) given by Holmes *et al.*¹⁶⁷ (their Model III). These values are referred to as $\Delta L_{\phi, HCl(aq), H}$. All of the $\Delta L_{\phi, HCl(aq), O}$ were smaller in magnitude than the corresponding

J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1992

 $\Delta L_{\phi, \text{HCl(aq)}, \text{H}}$. The percentage difference of these two values was termed a "% heat loss" and evaluated for each observation as:

$$%$$
 heat loss = 100 $\frac{\Delta L_{\phi, \text{HCl(aq), H}} - \Delta L_{\phi, \text{HCl(aq), Q}}}{\Delta L_{\phi, \text{HCl(aq), H}}}$. (A2-1)

These calculated values of % heat loss, against the observed enthalpy flux, Q, are shown in Fig. A2-1.

The second comparison is for Na₂SO₄(aq) for 423.15 K. Values of ΔL_{ϕ} for Na₂SO₄(aq) for 423.15 K were calculated from the enthalpy of dilution results given by Mayrath and Wood¹⁶⁸ in the following manner. Pitzer's ion-interaction equation for the apparent molar enthalpy:

$$L_{\phi} = \nu |z_{M} z_{X}| A_{H} \ln(1 + bI^{1/2})/2b - 2\nu_{M} \nu_{X} R T^{2} (mB_{MX}^{L} + m^{2} \nu_{M} z_{M} C_{MX}^{L})$$
(A2-2)

where:

$$B_{MX}^{L} = \left(\frac{\partial \beta_{MX}^{(0)}}{\partial T}\right)_{p} + 2\left(\frac{\partial \beta_{MX}^{(1)}}{\partial T}\right)_{p}$$

$$[1 - (1 + \alpha I^{1/2})\exp(-\alpha I^{1/2})]/\alpha^{2}I \quad (A2-3)$$

$$C_{\rm MX}^{\rm L} = 0.5 |z_{\rm M} z_{\rm X}|^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\partial C_{\rm MX}^{\rm M}}{\partial T} \right)_p \tag{A2-4}$$

and where $A_{\rm H}$ is the Debye-Hückel coefficient for apparent molar enthalpy, $\alpha = 1.4$ (kg·mol⁻¹)^{1/2}, b = 1.2(kg·mol⁻¹)^{1/2}, was fitted to Mayrath and Wood's experimental enthalpies of dilution for 423.65 K and 373.15 K. These two fitted equations were used to both calculate ΔL_{ϕ} and to interpolate for the 0.5 K difference in temperature between Mayrath and Wood's results and the results of Oscarson *et al*. The values of ΔL_{ϕ} that corresponded to the conditions given by Oscarson et al. and that were calculated from Mayrath and Wood's results are referred to as $\Delta L_{\phi, Na_2SO_4(aq), M}$. The $\Delta L_{\phi, Na_2SO_4(aq), M}$ were larger in magnitude than the values of $\Delta L_{\phi, Na_2SO_4(aq), O}$ calculated from the flow rates and enthalpy flux given by Oscarson et al., except for the very lowest molalities. The values of % heat loss for the Na₂SO₄(aq) results, calculated as in Eq. (A2-1), are also shown in Fig. A2-1.

Recently, Izzatt *et al*.¹⁷³ reported enthalpy of dilution values for NaOH(aq). They presented a table that compared their enthalpies of dilution for a nominal 1.9 mol·kg⁻¹ solution, for 523.15 K, to values they obtained "by interpolation" from information given by Simonson *et al*.¹⁷⁴ The differences of the enthalpy of dilution, reported in the Izzatt *et al*. table, were generally only a few tenths of a per cent, with the r.m.s. difference being about 0.5 per cent. These differences indicate a remark

able agreement between the two calorimeters; an agreement that is almost an order of magnitude better than that found for different calorimeters for NaCl(aq), when comparing individual dilution measurements. Such an agreement, if generally correct, would indicate an accuracy of Busey's calorimeter¹¹⁴ that would be about an order of magnitude more accurate than reported and would indicate an incorrect weighting of the Busey *et al.*¹¹⁴ results in the present work. Because of the significance of the Busey *et al.* results to the present work, other enthalpy of dilution results for NaOH(aq) given by Izzatt *et al.* were examined.

One test of the accuracy of an enthalpy of dilution calorimeter is how well dilutions with different initial molalities, i.e. overlapping dilution chords, agree with each other. Examination of overlapping dilution chords can be considered a test of the internal accuracy of the calorimeter. Figure A2-2 shows values given by Izzatt et al.¹⁷³ for the enthalpy of dilution, as ΔL_{ϕ} , of the nominal 1.9 mol·kg⁻¹ solutions and also a 9.82 mol·kg⁻¹ solution for 523.15 K. The enthalpy of dilution for the 1.9 mol·kg⁻¹ solutions is about 10 per cent larger than the corresponding enthalpy of dilution obtained from the 9.82 mol·kg⁻¹ dilutions (or about 3 per cent of the enthalpy of dilution of the 9.82 mol·kg⁻¹ solution). Thus, the internal accuracy of the enthalpy of dilution for NaOH(aq), for 523.15 K. does not appear to be better than 3 to 10 per cent. Because the internal accuracy of the calorimetric results is approximately an order of magnitude less accurate than what might be inferred from Izzatt et al.'s comparison of the 1.9 mol·kg⁻¹ dilutions, the weighting of the Busey *et al.*¹¹⁴ results in the present work was considered appropriate and changes were not warranted by the Izzatt *et al.* work.



FIG. A2-2. Enthalpy of dilution of NaOH(aq), for 523.15 K and 4.5 MPa, from Izzatt *et al.*¹⁷³ The squares are dilutions from 1.93 mol·kg⁻¹; the circles are dilutions from 1.84 mol·kg⁻¹. The triangles are dilutions from 9.82 mol·kg⁻¹.