

ELECTROLYTIC SEPARATION OF HYDROGEN ISOTOPES IN ALKALINE SOLUTION

V. M. Tsionskii and L. I. Krishtalik

UDC 541.138

We have found that the separation coefficient S for hydrogen isotopes (protium and tritium) during electrolysis at a mercury cathode in aqueous solutions of $0.02\text{ N } (\text{CH}_3)_4\text{NOH}$ and $0.02\text{ N } (\text{CH}_3)_4\text{NOH} + 0.18\text{ N } (\text{CH}_3)_4\text{NI}$ is independent of the electrode potential and solution composition having a value $S = 4.08 \pm 0.13$ in the range of hydrogen-evolution overvoltages (η) from 1.22 to 1.66 at a temperature of 30°C . The values of η agree with those of Korshunov [1].

The independence of S from η contradicts the model of the elementary discharge act proposed by Horiuti and Polyani [2], for which the activation process is the extension of an O-H bond. In this model, the $S(\eta)$ dependence is explained by a change in the probability for proton tunneling with a change in the height of a potential barrier [3]. In this sense there is no fundamental difference between acidic and alkaline solutions. However, in our measurements S is constant, although the activation energy (calculated from polarization measurements in the range 24.5 to 69°C) varied over a wide range (3.6 - 7.3 kcal/mole). In acidic solutions in this activation-energy range, the value of S changes considerably [3]. From the point of view of the model relating the activation to a reorganization of the solvent [4], a change in the activation energy would have no relation to a decrease in S with increasing η .

The $S(\eta)$ dependence is explained by the approach of an H_3O^+ ion toward the electrode, which increases the probability for a quantum jump of the proton [5]. For H_2O molecules, there is no reason to expect a significant change in their distance from the electrode; hence, one would expect a much weaker dependence of S on η in alkaline solutions than in acidic solutions, as is confirmed experimentally.

LITERATURE CITED

1. V. N. Korshunov, Dissertation, Moscow State University (1963).
2. J. Horiuti and M. Polyani, *Acta Physicochim. URSS*, **2**, 505 (1935).
3. J. O'M. Bockris and D. B. Matthews, *Electrochim. Acta*, **11**, 243 (1966).
4. R. R. Dogonadze, A. M. Kuznetsov, and V. G. Levich, *Élektrokhimiya*, **3**, 739 (1967).
5. L. I. Krishtalik and V. M. Tsionskii, *Élektrokhimiya*, **5**, 1019 (1969).

Institute of Electrochemistry, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Moscow. Translated from *Élektrokhimiya*, Vol. 5, No. 12, pp. 1501-1502, December, 1969. Original article submitted May 28, 1968.

©1970 Consultants Bureau, a division of Plenum Publishing Corporation, 227 West 17th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011. All rights reserved. This article cannot be reproduced for any purpose whatsoever without permission of the publisher. A copy of this article is available from the publisher for \$15.00.