

Thermodynamics (Classical) for Biological Systems

Prof. G. K. Suraishkumar

Department of Biotechnology

Indian Institute of Technology Madras

Module No. # 06

Reaction Equilibria

Lecture No. # 36

Effect of Temperature and Pressure on the Equilibrium Constants

(Refer Slide Time: 00:19)

Effect of temperature on the equilibrium constant

Recognizing that μ_i^0 is a function of T , Eq. 6.18


$$-RT \ln K_p = \sum_i \nu_i \mu_i^0 \quad \text{Eq. 6.18}$$

can be written as

$$\ln K_p = -\frac{1}{R} \sum_i \nu_i \left(\frac{\mu_i^0}{T} \right) \quad \text{Eq. 6.29}$$

Upon differentiation of Eq. 6.29 wrt T we get

$$\frac{d \ln K_p}{dT} = -\frac{1}{R} \sum_i \nu_i \frac{d \left(\frac{\mu_i^0}{T} \right)}{dT} \quad \text{Eq. 6.30}$$



Welcome!

Let us begin today by considering the effect of temperature on the equilibrium constant. We have seen equilibrium constants for reactions and their relationship to the standard chemical potential in the previous class. This class, we will start looking at the effect of temperature on the equilibrium constant. Let us first recognize that μ_i naught, the standard chemical potential – this is a part of μ_i equals μ_i naught plus $RT \ln f_i$ or equivalent – μ_i naught is ... a function of only temperature. Therefore, this equation 6.18 minus $RT \ln K_p$ equals sum over i , ν_i , the stoichiometric co-efficient, times μ_i naught – this is what we had derived in the last class. And, this is also the relationship between the equilibrium constant and the standard chemical potential.

This equation, let us rewrite by recognizing the functionality of T as \ln of K_p ... let us take T to the other side, RT to the other side. Minus 1 by R , there is also minus here, sum over $\nu_i \mu_i$ naught by T Since μ_i naught is a function of T , let us group this T along with μ_i naught to enable further manipulations with much ease. Let us call this equation 6.29. This is why we did it – we are going to differentiate this expression; ... when we differentiate, it is good to know the functionalities clearly, and that is why we had grouped it with μ_i naught. μ_i naught by T is inside the sum here. The product is $\nu_i \mu_i$ naught by T .

If, we differentiate equation 6.29 with respect to T ... in fact, that is what we are looking for; we are looking for the effect of temperature on the equilibrium constant. The equilibrium constant that we have considered first is K_p . So, we get $d \ln K_p / dT$ is nothing but $-1/R$ sum over ν_i ; ν_i is just a stoichiometric co-efficient, not a function of temperature. Therefore, the function of temperature is μ_i naught by T alone. Therefore, this becomes d/dT of μ_i naught by T . Let us call this equation 6.30.

(Refer Slide Time: 03:04)

We know from Eq. 4.1 that

$$\mu_i = \mu_i^0 + RT \ln P y_i$$

Dividing the above equation throughout by T , we get

$$\frac{\mu_i}{T} = \frac{\mu_i^0}{T} + R \ln P + R \ln y_i \quad \text{Eq. 6.31}$$

At constant pressure, and constant composition, we get

$$\left(\frac{\partial (\mu_i/T)}{\partial T} \right)_{P, n_i} = \left(\frac{d (\mu_i^0/T)}{dT} \right) \quad \text{Eq. 6.32}$$

We know from equation 4.1 ... 4.1 is just the definition of the chemical potential ... μ_i equals μ_i naught plus $RT \ln P y_i$. We are still with the perfect mixtures. So, μ_i equals μ_i naught plus $RT \ln P y_i$. Let us divide this equation throughout by T . Then we get μ_i by T equals μ_i naught by T plus of course, $R \ln P$ – I have just split this term. This is \ln of a in to b that is \ln of a plus \ln of b ; and there is an RT that is multiplying. So, you have $RT \ln P$ plus $RT \ln y_i$. $RT \ln P$ by T gives you $R \ln P$ plus, similarly, $R \ln y_i$. This is equation 6.31.

Now, if we assume conditions of constant pressure and constant composition – quite easy to see that pressure remains a constant, and the composition as represented by the mole fraction that remains a constant. And therefore, the derivative with respect to T of μ_i by T, $\left(\frac{\partial(\mu_i/T)}{\partial T}\right)_{P, n_i}$ but here indicated by y_i , the constancy just means the same but let me explicitly write n_i here.

So, $\left(\frac{\partial(\mu_i/T)}{\partial T}\right)_{P, n_i}$... on the right hand side becomes $d(\mu_i/T)$ by dT μ_i naught by T gives that is a function of only the temperature. I have taken the total derivative here and these two are constants. Therefore, they are not functions of temperature. And therefore, their derivatives go to zero. They are constant values as far as temperature variation goes and therefore, they can be taken as a zero. Let us call this equation 6.32.

(Refer Slide Time: 05:16)

Using Eq. 5.15, i.e.

$$\left(\frac{\partial(\mu_i/T)}{\partial T}\right)_{P, n_i} = -\frac{\bar{H}_i^T}{T^2} \quad \text{Eq. 5.15}$$

Eq. 6.32 can be written as

$$-\frac{\bar{H}_i^T}{T^2} = \left(\frac{d(\mu_i^0/T)}{dT}\right) \quad \text{Eq. 6.33}$$

RHS is a total derivative, since μ_i^0 is a function of temperature alone

Eq. 6.33 implies that the partial molar enthalpy, \bar{H}_i^T is a function of temperature alone, and will be the same value for all values of y_i , even if it is equal to 1 (for a pure component)

Using equation 5.15 – you remember? This is the third equation that we derived when we took a detour in the module 5. Now, it is coming in handy. $\left(\frac{\partial(\mu_i/T)}{\partial T}\right)_{P, n_i}$ We have already shown that as equal to minus of \bar{H}_i^T/T^2 , the partial molar enthalpy divided by T squared. So, on one hand, from equation 5.15 we have $\left(\frac{\partial(\mu_i/T)}{\partial T}\right)_{P, n_i}$ equals minus \bar{H}_i^T/T^2 ; and as a part of this equation, we have $\left(\frac{\partial(\mu_i/T)}{\partial T}\right)_{P, n_i}$ equals $d(\mu_i/T)$ by dT . Therefore, we can since the left hand sides are equal we can equate the right hand sides. Therefore, 6.32 can be written as $-\bar{H}_i^T/T^2 = d(\mu_i/T)$ by dT . Let us call this equation 6.33. The right hand side is a total derivative

since μ_i is a function of temperature alone. The partial derivative that we had taken earlier becomes a total derivative here.

Now, equation 6.33 says something important. It implies that the partial molar entropy, H_i/T , is a function of temperature alone. And, more importantly, it will have the same value for all values of the composition, because it is independent of the composition. Rather it is a function of temperature alone; it is going to be independent of pressure or composition. Therefore, this will have the same value for all values of the mole fraction, even if the mole fraction equals 1. In other words, even if it is a pure component this equation must be valid ... that is a powerful statement here.

(Refer Slide Time: 07:32)

For the pure component i the partial molar value can be replaced by the molar value

Thus, Eq. 6.33 can be written as

$$-\frac{H_i}{T^2} = \left(\frac{d(\mu_i^0/T)}{dT} \right) \quad \text{Eq. 6.34}$$

Therefore, Eq. 6.30 can be written as

$$\frac{d \ln K_p}{dT} = \frac{1}{RT^2} \sum v_i H_i \quad \text{Eq. 6.35}$$

The slide also features the NPTEL logo in the bottom left corner.

Therefore, for the pure component i the partial molar value can be replaced by the molar value. This equation is anyway going to be valid ... here, this equation 6.33 is anyway going to be valid, because of the function of temperature alone. And therefore, equation 6.33 can be written as minus H_i by T squared – instead of the partial molar value, I have taken the molar enthalpy here – minus H_i by T squared equals d/dT of μ_i by T . So, remember our aim was to get the variation of equilibrium constant with temperature. We are in the process ... should never lose track of whatever we are trying to do, when we are in the middle of algebra. That way it helps us keep our sanity.

Equation 6.34 is this, and therefore, equation 6.30 can be written as ... equation 6.30 was nothing but the relationship ... you know we had differentiated \ln of K_p equals minus 1

by $R \dots$ so on and so forth ... this will come to you right away. If not, you can go back and look at equation 6.30. $d \ln K_p$ by T equals 1 by $R T$ squared sum over $\nu_i H_i$.

Let, me just tell you how this comes about by going back a little bit. Equation 6.30 was this. $d \ln K_p$ $d T$ equals minus 1 by R sum over $\nu_i d T$ of μ_i naught by T . Now, we have a relationship for $d T$ of μ_i naught by T in terms of the molar enthalpy itself. That was minus H_i by T . Therefore, if you take T out here you will get plus you know there is a minus one by T here. Therefore, if you take T out here, you get plus one by RT here, and this would be $\nu_i H_i$ summed over all i . And, that is what we have said here ... coming up in a minute ... $d \ln K_p$ $d T$ equals one by $R T$ squared sum over all i $\nu_i H_i$. So, this is a useful expression this gives the variation of the equilibrium constant K_p with respect to temperature in terms of the enthalpies of the components involved in the reaction.

This is something that you are used to doing right from higher secondary school. You know ... sum over $\nu_i H_i$ is how you found your ΔH for the various reactions, if you recall that process. ... You took the enthalpies of the products summed them up; enthalpies of the reactants, summed them up; subtracted enthalpy of the reactants from the enthalpy of the products. That formally written in a compact notation is this ... sum over $\nu_i H_i$. Let us call this equation 6.35.

(Refer Slide Time: 11:17)

One can recall from the earlier classes that, for a reaction written as

$$\sum \nu_i M_i = 0$$

$$\sum \nu_i H_i = \Delta H \quad \text{Eq. 6.39}$$

the RHS is the enthalpy change of the reaction

NPTEL

... Sum over $\nu_i M_i$ equal to 0 for a reaction written like this as just mentioned. Sum over $\nu_i H_i$... recall that ν_i is positive for products on the right hand side of the

chemical expression, bio-chemical expression. ν_i is negative for the reactants on the left hand side of the chemical expression. This $\nu_i H_i$ summed over all i is nothing but the enthalpy change ... of the reaction. This is equation 6.39.

(Refer Slide Time: 12:00)

Thus


$$\frac{d \ln K_p}{dT} = \frac{\Delta H}{R T^2} \quad \text{Eq. 6.40}$$

Eq. 6.40 is known as the Van't Hoff's equation

Starting with Eq. 6.27

$$-RT \ln K_f = \sum_i \nu_i \mu_i^0 \quad \text{Eq. 6.27}$$

a similar exercise as above yields:

$$\frac{d \ln K_f}{dT} = \frac{\Delta H}{R T^2} \quad \text{Eq. 6.41}$$


Therefore, $d \ln K_p / dT$ is nothing but equal to $\Delta H / RT^2$. So, this gives us an easy method of measuring the variation or estimating the variation of the equilibrium constant with temperature. Just integrate this expression; then we have the kind of relationship that we are looking for, or the estimate that we are looking for. This is equation 6.40. And, this equation, $d \ln K_p / dT$ equals $\Delta H / RT^2$... has a special name. It is called the Van't Hoff's equation. Now, that you have seen this, we have worked out a means by which we get the ... dependence on temperature of K_p in terms of the enthalpy of the reaction, and of course, the temperature of the system and so on, what I would like you to do is: starting with equation 6.27 – I will show you what equation 6.27 is – I would like you to derive the same expression or the same dependence for a slightly different equilibrium constant.

As we have seen earlier, there are various equilibrium constants. You know this also from the higher secondary school time onwards. We have K_p , we have K_c , we have K_y , we have K_f , and what we are interested in here is K_f . This is equation 6.27. Start with this please, $-RT \ln K_f$ equals sum over $\nu_i \mu_i^0$. Since this derivation which lasted about five or six slides here with a lot of thought, I am going to give pretty much a lot of time for you ... may be about twenty, twenty five minutes.


Take that and derive the dependence; the temperature dependence of K_f the same way that we derived the temperature dependence of K_p .

Go ahead please, take about twenty to twenty five minutes and derive this. I am asking you to derive this here, because there are some slight variations and when you are faced with the variations ... that is when you start thinking, and that is when you start understanding the various relationships a little better. The overall scheme is the same but the details are a little different. So, please go ahead and derive this; go ahead, please.

(No audio from 14:45 to 44:44)

The relationship that we are looking for ... you can check whether you got the same ... is $d \ln K_f / dT$ equals again, $\Delta H / R T^2$. Just check whether you got that. Now, ... let us call this equation 6.41.

(Refer Slide Time: 45:15)



Over a small range of temperature, ΔH can be assumed to be independent of temperature, and hence, Eq. 6.40 can be written as

$$\ln \frac{K_{P2}}{K_{P1}} = \frac{\Delta H}{R} \left(\frac{1}{T_1} - \frac{1}{T_2} \right) \quad \text{Eq. 6.42}$$

NPTEL

If the temperature range is small, small enough so that the enthalpy change of the reaction can be assumed to be independent of temperature. In other words the ΔH is considered a constant in the range of temperatures that we are talking about. It is not exactly a constant, but its variation is small enough that the variation can be neglected. Then, this equation 6.40 can be written as – you know when we integrate that, we are trying to find out a value of K_p 2 given a value of K_p 1. So, $\ln K_p$ 2 by K_p 1 equals $\Delta H / R$, $1 / T_1$ minus $1 / T_2$. This is equation 6.42 ... this comes from the integration of equation 6.40. Let us go back to equation 6.40 to see how that comes about. This is equation 6.40 for K_p .

You can do the same thing for 6.41, K_f . If we integrate this, so integral from T_1 to T_2 ... in this case it will be $d \ln K_p$ integrated from K_{p1} to K_{p2} . And here, it will be integral from T_1 to T_2 , $\frac{\Delta H}{R T^2} dT$. If we do that, then this T power minus two and therefore, it becomes minus T power minus one and so on ... the integral ... Therefore, you will get $\ln \frac{K_{p2}}{K_{p1}} = \frac{\Delta H}{R} \left(\frac{1}{T_1} - \frac{1}{T_2} \right)$. The negative sign comes about because of the negative that arises as a result of the integration. We will call this equation 6.42, and this is actually the useful expression for finding out the temperature dependence of the equilibrium constant. Or, in other words, if one equilibrium constant at a particular temperature is known, then we can find another equilibrium constant at another temperature, T_2 .

Let us see ... whether we are justified in starting up the next topic. No, I do not think we will have time for that. So, let us stop here for now. When we come back in the next class, we will take things forward.