

1999-01-01

Use of Excel to Obtain Voltammetric Information on Microelectrodes

Enda Howard

Technological University Dublin

John Cassidy

Technological University Dublin, john.cassidy@tudublin.ie

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/scschcpsart>

 Part of the [Chemistry Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Howard, E., Cassidy, J.F.: Use of Excel to Obtain Voltammetric Information on Microelectrodes. *Journal of Chemical Education*, Vol.77, 2000, pp. 409-411. doi.org/10.21427/gk3a-m354

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](#)

Analysis with Microelectrodes Using Microsoft Excel Solver

Enda Howard and John Cassidy

School of Chemistry, Dublin Institute of Technology, Kevin Street, Dublin 8, Ireland

Abstract

The use of curve fitting for the analysis and interpretation of voltammetric data obtained while working with microelectrodes is discussed as a useful exercise for introducing students to the principle of problem solving using least-squares curve-fitting techniques. The advantages associated with this approach to data processing over the approach where the limiting current (i_L) alone is used are discussed and its limitations are highlighted.

This technique was applied to the determination of unknown concentrations of ferrocyanide and the most satisfactory recovery of concentrations was found when both the values of the formal potential (E^0) and concentration (C) were varied to match the experimental results with an equation characterizing the current potential curve for a reversible couple. In this case recoveries of $100\% \pm 5\%$ were obtained for the concentration range 5×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-2} M. It was also found that Solver was unable to fit the equation when the sum of squared residuals was $< 2 \times 10^{-9}$. This technique can be generalized for use with a number of other electrochemical experiments such as polarography, rotating disk electrochemistry, and normal pulse polarography.

Keywords

Analytical Chemistry; Computer Assisted Instruction; Electrochemistry

Analysis with Microelectrodes Using Microsoft Excel Solver

Enda Howard and John Cassidy*

School of Chemistry, Dublin Institute of Technology, Kevin Street, Dublin 8, Ireland; *JCassidy@dit.ie

Introduction

Considerable interest has been shown in the use of fitting experimental data to nonlinear functions as a means of introducing undergraduate students to the principle of problem solving using least-squares curve-fitting techniques (1-5). The purpose of this article is to demonstrate the use of a least-squares curve-fitting technique for voltammetric analysis. The problem of determining the concentrations of analytes in a solution using linear-sweep voltammetry at a microelectrode is chosen because the degree of experimental difficulty is less than, for example, in polarography, rotating disk electrochemistry, or normal pulse polarography. Furthermore, the limiting current magnitude in each of these techniques has typically been used for chemical analysis. This paper outlines a method which employs the full voltammetric curve to yield analytical information.

Theory

The current response obtained by the application of a linear ramp waveform to a microelectrode in a solution of ferrocyanide at a sweep rate of 10 mV/s is shown in Figure 1(•). The height of the plateau corresponds to the limiting current (i_L), which is proportional to the concentration of the analyte in solution. However, a problem arises in the determination of i_L because only rarely is the limiting current plateau parallel to the baseline. Extrapolating the tails of the trace and measuring the perpendicular distance between them is another option, but again, a problem arises if the tails are not parallel. These conditions introduce an element of subjectiveness into the determination of i_L . This problem also arises in other voltammetric methods, for example, polarography, rotating disk electrochemistry, and normal pulse polarography (6-8). Microelectrodes were employed in this work as a model for other voltammetric techniques because they are safer to use than mercury and can be easily fabricated (9).

By collecting and digitally storing the current response it is possible to obtain a value for concentration (C) using the complete voltammetric curve, rather than the limiting current alone. Microsoft Excel Solver provides a means of achieving this simply and effectively.

Before Microsoft Excel Solver can be used to determine unknown concentrations, a spreadsheet must first be prepared, which consists of a list of theoretical data and a corresponding list of experimental data. The list of experimental data is created by importing the data acquired during the experiment into the Excel spreadsheet, and the list of theoretical data is created by means of a model of the system. In this case the equation representing the microelectrode response for a reversible couple is used to generate the list of theoretical data (10):

$$i = \frac{4nFrDC}{1 + \exp\left(\frac{nF(E - E^{\circ'})}{RT}\right)}$$

where, n = number of electrons involved in the reaction, F = Faraday's constant, r = radius of the electrode, D = diffusion

coefficient of the analyte, C = concentration of the analyte in solution, E = applied potential and $E^{\circ'}$ = formal potential.

This equation describes the complete current-potential curve obtained under voltammetric conditions for a reversible system; the numerator determines the limiting current and the denominator determines the change in current as a function of potential. Modifying this technique to suit other voltammetric techniques requires only that the appropriate expression for the limiting current be substituted as the numerator in this equation.

RESULTS

The typical spreadsheet layout before fitting and a set of typical experimental parameters is given in Figure 2.

The figures in cells A1 to E1 and A2 to B2 are experimental parameters and constants, which must be entered by the student, and row 3 consists of a series of labels. A typical set of experimental parameters and constants corresponding to the conditions detailed in the experimental section are included in the figure legend. Columns A and C are filled by imported experimental data for potential and current, respectively. The model values (column B) are generated by entering the following equation in cell B4:

$$= ((4 * \$A\$1 * \$B\$1 * \$C\$1 * \$D\$1 * \$E\$1) / (1 + \text{EXP}(\$B\$2 * (A4 - \$A\$2))))$$

The Edit → Fill → Down command is then used to create the column of data. Column D contains a list of the square of the residuals between each pair of model and experimental current data points and the number in cell E4 is the sum of squared residuals (SSR). This is the value which Solver will attempt to minimize during the curve-fitting process. Either a single variable, C , or two variables, C and $E^{\circ'}$, can be optimized during this operation. At this stage the simulation is a straightforward procedure and could be included in the practical as an introductory exercise in program writing for the student. Once these columns of data have been generated, Solver is activated (1, 11).

With microelectrodes the currents involved tend to be quite small, typically nanoamps. Original attempts to fit the experimental and theoretical data sets for these experiments gave unsatisfactory results, Solver failing to fit the data sets perhaps because it was unable to process the small numbers involved. To overcome this problem both the theoretical and experimental data sets were multiplied by a factor of 10^9 . This enhanced the performance of the curve fitting to an acceptable level. On further investigation it was found that Solver was unable to function when the value of the SSR fell below 2×10^9 .

Figure 1(•) shows the current profiles corresponding to the experimental data in Figure 2, Figure 1(Δ) is the current profile produced by the model before fitting with an initial guess by eye of the value of C of 4×10^{-6} moles cm^{-3} , and Figure 1(□) is the current profile returned by the model on completion of the fitting process. For the reason outlined above, both the theoretical and experimental data sets were multiplied by a factor of 10^9 before activation of Solver. In

this example both C and $E^{\circ'}$ are variable parameters. From the answer report it was seen that the SSR was reduced from 425.18 to 3.37 and that a value for C of 4.94×10^{-6} M was returned. This is a recovery of 98.8% on a standard concentration of 5.00×10^{-6} M $[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]^{4-}$. The constraints that were applied to the operation of the fitting process were chosen to prevent Solver from returning a negative value for concentration or formal potential.

To test the validity of this technique, a series of solutions of known concentration was prepared and analyzed using this method. Table 1 contains the nominal concentrations of the standard solutions (C) and the concentrations returned by Solver (C'). The percentage recovery is also quoted and serves as a measure of the correlation between the data sets.

It can be seen that the concentration values returned by Solver correlate well with the nominal concentrations over the range 1×10^{-2} M to 5×10^{-4} M. However, at lower concentrations the correlation becomes less satisfactory. Noise, although present in all the traces, becomes a problem at lower currents because it alters the overall shape of the trace, as can be seen in Figure 3. Below concentrations of 5×10^{-4} M the experimental trace deviates from the sigmoidal shape and the model is unable to compensate for this. Obviously this greatly affects the ability of Solver to fit the experimental and theoretical data sets and therefore affects the accuracy of the results. The presence of this noise is a limitation of the potentiostat employed in this work and there appears to be no reason why lower concentrations could not be analyzed with the aid of a more noise-free system.

It was also found that fitting the experimental and theoretical data sets by allowing Solver to simultaneously vary the values of C and $E^{\circ'}$ (the formal potential) resulted in concentration values closer to the nominal values than those obtained by varying only C , as can be seen in Table 1. In this way the information contained in the full sigmoidal shape is employed to yield an answer, rather than just the limiting current. The value of fitting the model with two variables can be clearly seen. Students should be encouraged to fit the curve with C and then with C and $E^{\circ'}$.

It is possible therefore to use curve-fitting techniques as a means of determining unknown concentrations for a reversible system to a high degree of accuracy, the limits of quantitation being governed by the presence of noise in the system. Any one or a combination of the other variables in the model can be determined in a similar fashion. This application of curve-fitting techniques using Microsoft Excel Solver provides a useful method of introducing students to this concept through practical experience. This method can also be adapted for use as an analytical tool with other voltammetric techniques such as polarography, rotating disk electrochemistry, and normal pulse polarography, substitution of the appropriate expression for the limiting current being the only modification required.

Experimental Details

Solutions of $\text{K}_4[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]$ were prepared in 0.1 M KCl. All solutions were degassed before collecting data, and a positive nitrogen pressure was maintained over the cell during voltammetric analysis. A three-electrode one-compartment cell with SCE as reference and a carbon rod auxiliary was employed and an EG&G M394 system was used to acquire data. The

microelectrodes (9) used were fabricated in the laboratory from 50- μm platinum wire (Goodfellow). This microwire was connected to a more rigid copper wire using silver epoxy and was heat-sealed in the narrow end of a pasteur pipet. After securing the copper wire at the open end of the pipet with an epoxy resin (Araldite), the sealed tip of the pipet was sanded and polished with 1- μm alumina until a disk of the platinum wire was exposed to solution.

Acknowledgment

Enda Howard would like to thank the Dublin Institute of Technology for an SRD Scholarship.

Literature Cited

1. Harris, D. C. *J. Chem. Educ.* 1998, 75, 119–121.
2. Ma, N.-L.; Tang, C. W. *J. Chem. Educ.* 1998, 75, 122–123.
3. Zielinski, T. J.; Allendoerfer, R. D. *J. Chem. Educ.* 1997, 74, 1001–1007.
4. Machaca-Hertera, J. O. *J. Chem. Educ.* 1997, 74, 448–449.
5. Van Herk, A. M. *J. Chem. Educ.* 1995, 72, 138–140.
6. Bond, A. M. *Modern Polarographic Methods in Analytical Chemistry*; Dekker: New York, 1980.
7. Heyrovsky, J.; Zuman, P. *Practical Polarography*; Academic: London, 1968.
8. Flato, J. B. *Anal. Chem.* 1972, 44, 75A.
9. *Ultramicroelectrodes*; Fleischmann, M.; Pons, S.; Rolison, D. R.; Schmidt, P. P., Eds.; Datatech: Morgantown, NC, 1987.
10. Bard, A. J.; Faulkner, L. R. *Electrochemical Methods—Fundamentals and Applications*; Wiley: New York, 1980; p 159.
11. Hanratty, V.; Diamond, D. *Spreadsheet Applications in Chemistry Using Microsoft Excel*; Wiley: New York, 1997.




Figure 1. Current profiles corresponding to (♦) experimental data, where microelectrode radius = 2.53×10^{-3} cm, sweep rate = 10 mV s^{-1} , concentration of $[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]^{4-} = 5 \text{ mM}$ in 0.1 M KCl ; (□) theoretical data set from Fig. 2 after the fitting process has been completed; and (Δ) theoretical data set from Fig. 2 before activating Solver. Prior to fitting, a value of $4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ M}$ was used in the model for the concentration of $[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]^{4-}$.




Figure 3. The fitting of experimental data (■) to the model (smooth curve) for (a) $5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ M K}_4[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]$ and (b) $1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ M K}_4[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]$. All other experimental conditions are as in Figure 1.

	A	B	C	D	E
1	n	F	r	D	C
2	E ^o	nF/RT			
3	Applied E	Model	Data	Residuals ²	SSR
4	-2.00E-01	1.67E-05	0.00E+00	2.78E-10	425.1851778
5	-1.60E-01	8.13E-05	0.00E+00	6.60E-09	
6	-1.20E-01	0.00039617	-3.30E-02	1.12E-03	
7	-8.00E-02	0.001931596	0.00E+00	3.73E-06	
8	-4.00E-02	0.009415637	1.33E-01	1.53E-02	
9	0.00E+00	0.045844507	3.67E-01	1.03E-01	
10	4.00E-02	0.221982956	-4.00E-01	3.17E-02	
11	8.00E-02	1.046903188	1.33E+00	8.01E-02	
12	1.20E-01	4.401216425	5.40E+00	9.98E-01	
13	1.60E-01	12.83551429	1.56E+01	7.64E+00	
14	2.00E-01	21.14652325	2.67E+01	3.08E+01	
15	2.40E-01	24.38466483	3.10E+01	4.38E+01	
16	2.80E-01	25.17528862	3.19E+01	4.52E+01	
17	3.20E-01	25.37865481	3.18E+01	4.12E+01	
18	3.60E-01	25.38581218	3.15E+01	3.74E+01	
19	4.00E-01	25.38728057	3.12E+01	3.38E+01	
20	4.40E-01	25.38758174	3.11E+01	3.26E+01	
21	4.80E-01	25.3876435	3.10E+01	3.15E+01	
22	5.20E-01	25.38765617	3.09E+01	3.04E+01	
23	5.60E-01	25.3876435	3.10E+01	3.15E+01	
24	6.00E-01	25.38765877	3.09E+01	3.04E+01	
25	6.40E-01	25.3876593	3.07E+01	2.82E+01	

Figure 2. Typical layout of the Excel spreadsheet before activating Solver. Typical values for experimental parameters and constants are $n = 1$, $F = 96,487 \text{ C mol}^{-1}$, $r = 2.53 \times 10^{-3} \text{ cm}$, $D = 6.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, $C = \text{unknown}$, $E^o = 0.15 \text{ V}$, $nF/RT = 39.608$. Columns B and C are multiplied by a factor of 10^9 to improve the quality of the fitting process.

Table 1. Comparison of Standard Concentration Values with Values Returned by Solver

Standard Concn/ mol dm ⁻³	Solver			
	Only C Varied		Both C and E ^o Varied	
	Concn/ mol dm ⁻³	Recovery (%) ^a	Concn/ mol dm ⁻³	Recovery (%) ^a
1×10^{-2}	9.86×10^{-3}	98.6	9.89×10^{-3}	98.9
5×10^{-3}	4.86×10^{-3}	97.2	4.92×10^{-3}	98.4
1×10^{-3}	1.06×10^{-3}	106.0	1.05×10^{-3}	105.0
5×10^{-4}	5.12×10^{-4}	102.4	4.91×10^{-4}	98.2
1×10^{-4}	2.22×10^{-4}	45.0	2.22×10^{-4}	45.0

^aCalculated as (value returned by Solver/standard concn) $\times 100$. This is a measure of the correlation between the calculated and real concentrations.