

Study of the stability of highly oxidized metals (Ir, Ti, Ta, Sn) in ethanol-water and isopropanol-water dispersions previous to EPD

M. Rosalina Pérez-García^a, Mercedes T. Oropeza-Guzmán^{*b,c}, Jan Talbot^d

a Universidad Politécnica Metropolitana de Hidalgo, Blvd. a Tolcayuca 1009, Ex Hacienda de San Javier, Tolcayuca, Hidalgo, C.P. 43860, MX

b CIDETEQ-Tijuana, Carr. Tijuana-Tecate 26.5, El Florida, Tijuana, B.C., C.P. 22444, MX

c CG-ITT, Blvd. Industrial s/n, Col Otay, Tijuana, B.C., C.P. 22500, MX

d Dep. of NanoEngineering, UCSD, 9500 Gilman Dr., La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

* oropeza1@yahoo.com, moropeza@cideteq.mx

Preliminary to EPD, a study of suspension stability is a paramount step. Zeta potential (ζ) is commonly used to indicate if a colloidal suspension will become unstable and coagulate.^[1-2] In general, for mineral aqueous suspensions, the zeta potential value is positive at pH < 6, and is negative at pH > 6. To obtain a stable suspension the absolute zeta potential values typically are greater than 25 mV.^[1-2]

IrO₂, Ta₂O₅, TiO₂ and SnO₂ powders were used in this research, which would be considered the active catalysts for a dimensional stable anodes, DSAs.^[3-11] To ensure a large catalytic surface area, the active particles should be dispersed on an inert support. The support of a DSA should be a porous, inert body that holds its shape, dimensions and chemical integrity during the catalytic process, such as titanium.^[3-11]

Dispersions were prepared with powders and reagents as received (from Alfa Aesar). The powders were suspended in the molar ratios previously reported^[9], in 100 mL solutions of ethanol (EtOH) or isopropanol (IPA) with water (10:90 % by vol.). Typically 0.018 g, 0.640 g, 0.916 g and 0.916 g of IrO₂, Ta₂O₅, SnO₂ and TiO₂ powders, respectively, were dispersed in 100 mL of the solution with 0.4 g/L of hexadecyl-trimethylammonium bromide (CTAB). Dispersions were mixed with a magnetic stirrer and ultrasonic bath (Branson 2210) alternately for 45 min before EPD.

Table 1 shows initial measurements of pH, effective particle size (PS) and zeta potential (ζ), of metallic oxide single dispersions with and without CTAB. The zeta potential results indicated that the presence of CTAB in the metallic oxide single dispersions was increased as we expected, being a positively charged agent. These behavior were showed in all metallic oxides studies, such as IrO₂, Ta₂O₅, TiO₂, SnO₂ in both mediums EtOH:H₂O and IPA:H₂O, indicating that the application of CTAB in the metallic oxide single dispersions should be able to consider cathodic EPD as needed.

In Table 2, metallic oxides mixtures were prepared and characterized. Initially, zeta potentials of the mixture dispersions of IrO₂-Ta₂O₅ in EtOH:H₂O and IrO₂-Ta₂O₅ in IPA:H₂O at their natural pH of 4.31 and 5.31 were measured to be -5.24 mV and -12.15 mV respectively. This indicated that a positively charged agent or surfactant to charge the particles positively would be needed to consider cathodic EPD, as we studied in Table 1 with single dispersions, therefore CTAB should be added to the mixture dispersions to obtain the expected results.

EPD-DSAs were characterized by SEM-EDS and compared with those obtained with traditional

Pechini's method.

Table 1.

	0 g/L CTAB				0.4 g/L CTAB			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1')	(2')	(3')	(4')
EtOH:H ₂ O (10:90)	IrO ₂	Ta ₂ O ₅	TiO ₂	SnO ₂	IrO ₂	Ta ₂ O ₅	TiO ₂	SnO ₂
pH	6.1	5.6	6.5	5.9	5.7	5.5	6.5	5.9
PS (nm)	397	312	120	248	628	213	802	205
ζ (mV)	-9.5	-14.7	-30.7	-18	4.7	30.8	-10.7	32
IPA:H ₂ O (10:90)								
pH	5.4	5.6	6.4	5.6	6.1	5.6	6.5	6.0
PS (nm)	569	363	170	348	3,359	302	358	95
ζ (mV)	-5.6	-12.5	-19.2	-11.5	9.4	35	-18	31.7

Table 2.

	0.4 g/L CTAB			
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
EtOH:H ₂ O (10:90)	IrO ₂ Ta ₂ O ₅	IrO ₂ TiO ₂	IrO ₂ Ta ₂ O ₅	IrO ₂ SnO ₂
pH	4.3	5.9	6.2	7.9
PS (nm)	308	2	2	1,770
ζ (mV)	54.6	37.7	35.4	19.2
IPA:H ₂ O (10:90)				
pH	4.6	6.3	5.9	7.6
PS (nm)	33	1	3	1,710
ζ (mV)	25	27.5	34.7	1.9

References:

1. Shane, J. M.; Talbot, J. B.; Schreiber, R. D.; Ross, C. L.; Sluzky, E.; Hesse, K. R. *J. of Colloidal and Interface Science* **1994**, *165*, 325-333
2. Shane, J. M.; Talbot, J. B.; Kinney, B. G.; Sluzky, E.; Hesse, K. R. *J. of Colloidal and Interface Science* **1994**, *165*, 334-340
3. Trasatti, S. *Electrochim. Acta* **2000**, *45*, 2377-2385
4. Ardizzone, S.; Trassati, S. *Advances in Colloid and Interface Science* **1996**, *64*, 173-251
5. Mousty, C.; Fóti, G.; Comninellis, Ch.; Reid, V. *Electrochim. Acta* **1999**, *45*, 451-456
6. Vercesi, G.P.; Rolewicz, J.; Comninellis, Ch. *Thermochimica Acta* **1991**, *176*, 31-47
7. De Pauli, C. P.; Trasatti, S. *J. of Electroanalytical Chemistry* **1995**, *396*, 161-168
8. Ardizzone, S.; Bianchi, C. L.; Cappelletti, G.; Ionita, M.; Minguzzi, A.; Rondinini, S.; Vertova, A. *Journal of Electroanalytical Chemistry* **2006**, *589*, 160-166
9. Pérez G., M. R.; González M., I.; Oropeza G., M. T. *ECS Transactions* **2009**, *20*, 227-235
10. Pérez G., M. Ph D. Thesis, Centro de Graduados-ITT, **2012**
11. Comninellis, Ch. *Electrochimica Acta* **1994**, *39*, 1857-1862
12. Simond, O.; Schaller, V.; Comninellis, Ch. *Electrochimica Acta* **1997**, *42*, 2009-2012