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## ABSTRACT

A laboratory prepared compound lead oxide $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ was used for XRD and electron microscopic investigation. Using B.E.T. Method, the measurement of the particle size turned out to be $2.40 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{g}$. A series of calculations was made to refine the cell constants. Then a frequently-used computer program (LSUCRIPC) was run to compute the cell constants more precisely. The received values were $\mathrm{a}=4.95048, \mathrm{~b}=5.93631, \mathrm{c}=5.47491$. © 2008 Trade Science Inc. - INDIA
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## INTRODUCTION

$\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ has an orthorhombic system with space group $\mathrm{Pbcn}-\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{Z}=4$. In the $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ lattice with its distorted hexagonal closest $\mathrm{O}^{2}$ packing is occupied half of the octahedron situations by $\mathrm{Pb}^{4+}(\mathrm{Pb} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{O}: 2.16 \AA)$. Each $\mathrm{O}^{2}$ ion is to three $\mathrm{Pb}^{4+}$ ions neighboring ${ }^{[1]} \cdot \alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ can be understood on the one hand as Halbbrookite $\left(\mathrm{TiO}_{2}\right)$ type, and on the other as a ground structure of the types of the Wolframits $\left(\mathrm{FeWO}_{4}\right)$ and Columbits $\left(\mathrm{FeNb}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\right)$. The latter one can be understood as order structure of the $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ type. Debye-Scherrer-diagram with schematic representation of the intensities is shown in the following TABLE ${ }^{[1-5]}$.

| $\mathbf{a}$ | $\mathbf{b}$ | $\mathbf{c}$ | Lit. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.938 | 5.939 | 5.486 | 1 |
| 4.938 | 5.939 | 5.486 | 2 |
| 4.954 | 5.954 | 5.477 | 3 |
| 4.938 | 5.939 | 5.486 | 4 |
| 4.977 | 5.94 | 5.444 | 5 |

The work aimed to determine cell constants and crystallite sizes.

## EXPERIMENTAL

## Materials and equipment

The preparation of $-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ as described in the next section; The utilization of $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$, made by Merck Co.Darmstadt, Germany; The use of XRD: X-Ray diffractometer D 5000, Siemens, Kristalloflex; SEM: Scanning Electron Microscope, REM-JEOL (GSM840); TEM: Transition Electron Microscope, Hitachi (H600).

## Preparation of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$

$\mathrm{A}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}$ solution ( 25 g solved in $25 \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) was added to 100 ml saturated $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{COONH}_{4}$ solution (solved in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ). To this mixture was added gradually $32.5 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~Pb}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{COO}\right)_{2}\left(\mathrm{PbAc}_{2}\right)$ (solved in 30 ml $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ). At the same time $70 \mathrm{ml} 25 \% \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ solution was added to the mixture. This solution turned yellow and then dark-brown and finally reddish. After approximately 6 hours stirring, $5 \mathrm{~g}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}$ was added to it. This mixture was further-stirred about 38 hours at


Figure 1: XRD diagram of $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$


Figure 2: SEM electron microscopic photograph of $\alpha$ $\mathbf{P b O}_{2}$, enlargement is 5000X


Figure 2: SEM electron microscopic photograph of $\alpha$ $\mathbf{P b O}_{2}$, enlargement is 5000 X
$25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. In order to remove excess of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ and to bring unwanted lead compound in solution, it was warmed up to $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, This mixture was cooled down and the supernatant (jut out) solution with white crystals of $\mathrm{PbAc}_{2}$ was removed temporarily. The black precipitation consisted of fine-grained, water insoluble of $\alpha$ $\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$. In order to clean the product, it was transferred into some centrifuge container and was washed for several times with diluted $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{COONH}_{4}$ solution. Afterwards it was dried in a desiccators over silica gel at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

## X-ray diffraction

The $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ sample was prepared in Bedacryl and it was exposed to $\mathrm{CuK} \alpha 1$ radiation for two hours (see figure 1).

Initial materials as well as products were finely ground and prepared on a sample holder using a Scotch tape and Bedacryl I.C.I. They were X-rayed with $\mathrm{CuK} \alpha 1$ radiation using a Guinier Camera with focusing quartz Monochromator. The exposure time varied from 8 to 16 hours (mostly 10 h .). For precise d spacing, an internal standard was used: $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ proved unsatisfactory because of insufficient reflections in the higher $d$ range.

## Electron microscopy

The first series of the morphologic investigation of $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ was accomplished with a SEM electron microscope (REM-JEOL-JSM-840). The preparation of the sample was also accomplished by coating of the surface with gold ( $3-4 \mathrm{~min}$ ). The reasonable enlargement was 5000 times. The second series of electron microscopic investigation with TEM equipment was accomplished (EM-Hitachi, H-600). The sample was prepared in the following way. The white powdery sample was first coated with carbon. This carbon film was then treated with HF acid on the surface and was investigated by means of TEM equipment. The reasonable enlargement was 5000 times (see figures 2 and 3) ${ }^{[6-15]}$.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The XRD results show a good agreement with standard diagram of $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ (Figure 1)(ASTM 21-474). The analysis of the product showed that the sample was stable.Making use of this method, we managed to produce pure $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ for the first time.

SEM photograph of the produced $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ is shown in Figure 2. Crystals are round with a diameter of 1 $\mu \mathrm{m}$, they have a good arrangement to each other forming large round crystals.

TEM photograph of the produced $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ is shown in Figure 3. The crystals are somehow larger, yet they are round. The reasonable enlargement in TEM photograph was 5000 times.

Specific surface, particles size and crystal size of $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ : BET method was used to measure particle
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size of $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$. The received result was $2.40 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{g}$.

## Calculation of cell factor

A mixture of two powder $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ and $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ was prepared in the ratio of $3: 1$ which made its grinding easy. Now an X-ray diffraction was made. The goal was to obtain a precision of the line situation. It is often quoted in references that $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ supplies sharp lines. TABLE 1: line of the $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ (ASTM-33-1161), Hex. $\mathrm{a}_{0}=$ 4.9133, $\mathrm{c}_{0}=5.4053, \mathrm{z}=3, \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{x}}=2.649 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}, \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{m}}=2.656$.

| No. | $\mathbf{4} \boldsymbol{\theta}$ <br> $\mathbf{C u K} \boldsymbol{1} \mathbf{L i t}$. | $\mathbf{4 \theta}$ <br> FeK $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{L i t}$. | $\mathbf{D}$ <br> $(\AA)$ | $\mathbf{I}$ | h.k.l. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 41.69 | 52.58 | 4.257 | 2.2 | 100 |
| 2 | 33.30 | 67.35 | 3.342 | 1.0 | 101 |
| 3 | 73.08 | 92.81 | 2.457 | 0.8 | 110 |
| 4 | 78.91 | 100.40 | 2.282 | 0.8 | 102 |
| 5 | 80.56 | 102.56 | 2.237 | 0.4 | 111 |
| 6 | 84.93 | 108.29 | 2.127 | 0.6 | 200 |
| 7 | 91.62 | 117.12 | 1.9792 | 0.4 | 201 |
| 8 | 100.28 | 128.70 | 1.8179 | 1.4 | 112 |
| 9 | 101.22 | 129.96 | 1.8021 | 0.1 | 003 |
| 10 | 109.73 | 141.52 | 1.6719 | 0.4 | 202 |
| 11 | 110.65 | 142.78 | 1.6591 | 0.2 | 103 |
| 12 | 114.47 | 148.03 | 1.6082 | 0.1 | 210 |
| 13 | 119.89 | 155.97 | 1.5418 | 0.9 | 211 |
| 14 | 127.99 | 167.02 | 1.4536 | 0.1 | 113 |
| 15 | 131.52 | 172.07 | 1.4189 | 0.1 | 300 |
| 16 | 135.50 | 177.85 | 1.3820 | 0.6 | 212 |
| 17 | 136.26 | 178.97 | 1.3752 | 0.7 | 203 |
| 18 | 136.64 | 179.53 | 1.3718 | 0.8 | 301 |
| 19 | 146.92 | 194.91 | 1.2880 | 0.2 | 104 |
| 20 | 151.34 | 201.72 | 1.2558 | 0.2 | 302 |
| 21 | 155.32 | 207.98 | 1.2285 | 0.1 | 220 |
| 22 | 159.75 | 215.12 | 1.1999 | 0.2 | 213 |
| 23 | 160.09 | 215.67 | 1.1978 | 0.1 | 221 |
| 24 | 162.29 | 219.29 | 1.1843 | 0.3 | 114 |
| 25 | 163.94 | 220.37 | 1.1804 | 0.3 | 310 |

In order to compute the correction factor by measuring the X -ray film, some $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ was added to the $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ powder. TABLE 1 shows the XRD lines of the compound $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$.

Now the two density diagram were compared with each other and the sharp lines were picket out, the results did not belong to $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$. The sharp lines belong to $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$, the lines of $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ were measured and the following TABLE was set up. In this TABLE, $\Delta$ shows the difference between reference and experimental values.

Now having $\Delta$ and $4 \theta$ values, the $\Delta$ values were laid on against $4 \theta_{\text {meas. }}$ values and the received points were used to calculate the curve. Now on the received curve was read off for each $4 \theta_{\text {meas. }}$. values a new $\Delta$ value i.e. $\Delta_{\text {rec. }}$. Thus TABLE 3 was set up.

Then there was $4 \theta_{\text {corr. }}$ according to the following formula:
$4 \theta_{\text {corr. }}=4 \theta_{\text {corr. }}+\Delta_{\text {rec. }}$
TABLE 2: The comparison of the lines of $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$, the experimentally and those from the references

| No. | $\boldsymbol{\alpha}-\mathbf{S i O}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{h k l}$ | $\mathbf{4} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text {meas. }}$ | $\mathbf{4 \theta}_{\text {ref. }}$ | $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ |
| 1 | 100 | 41.33 | 41.69 | 0.36 |
| 2 | 101 | 53.33 | 53.30 | 0.97 |
| 3 | 102 | 78.66 | 78.91 | 0.25 |
| 4 | 111 | 80.33 | 80.56 | 0.23 |
| 5 | 200 | 84.66 | 84.93 | 0.27 |
| 6 | 201 | 91.33 | 91.62 | 0.29 |
| 7 | 112 | 100.33 | 100.28 | -0.05 |
| 8 | 211 | 120 | 119.89 | -0.01 |
| 9 | 212 | 135.33 | 135.50 | 0.17 |
| 10 | 203 | 136.2 | 136.26 | 0.06 |

TABLE 3: The measured and calculated data of $\operatorname{Sin}^{2} \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot 10^{4}$ for $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$

| No. | $\alpha-\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ |  |  |  | $\alpha-\mathrm{PbO}_{2}$ |  | $4 \theta_{\text {corr }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Sin}^{2} \theta .10^{4} \\ (\text { meas.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Sin}^{2} \theta .10^{4} \\ \text { (cal.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{P b O}_{\mathbf{2}} \\ \mathrm{hkl} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | hkl | $4 \theta_{\text {meas }}$. | $4 \theta_{\text {ref. }}$ | $\Delta$ | $4 \theta_{\text {meas }}$. | $\Delta_{\text {rec }}$. |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 100 | 41.33 | 41.69 | 0.36 | 46.46 | 0.677 | 47.137 | 405.35 | 389.1 | 110 |
| 2 | 101 | 53.33 | 53.30 | 0.97 | 56.66 | 0.92 | 57.58 | 598.85 | 604.66 | 111 |
| 3 | 102 | 78.66 | 78.91 | 0.25 | - | - | - | - | 671.18 | 020 |
| 4 | 111 | 80.33 | 80.56 | 0.23 | 65 | 0.56 | 65.65 | 783.04 | 794.33 | 002 |
| 5 | 200 | 84.66 | 84.93 | 0.27 | 68.2 | 0.47 | 68.67 | 859.70 | 869.5 | 021 |
| 6 | 201 | 91.33 | 91.62 | 0.29 | 72.4 | 0.37 | 72.77 | 965.2 | 953.37 | 200 |
| 7 | 112 | 100.33 | 100.28 | -0.05 | 81 | 0.24 | 81.24 | 1197.97 | 1200.8 | 112 |
| 8 | 211 | 120 | 119.89 | -0.11 | - | - | - | - | 1465.7 | 022 |
| 9 | 212 | 135.33 | 135.50 | 0.17 | - | - | - | - | 1623.6 | 220 |
| 10 | 203 | 136.2 | 136.26 | 0.06 | 99.3 | 0 | 99.3 | 1762.72 | 1748.1 | 202,130 |
| 11 | - | - | - | - | 101.2 | -0.02 | 101.18 | 1826.3 | 1822.9 | 221 |
| 12 | - | - | - | - | 111.6 | -0.073 | 111.53 | 2189.58 | 2193.9 | 113 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - | 118 | -0.101 | 117.89 | 2424.8 | 2418.8 | 222 |
| 14 | - | - | - | - | 121 | -0.101 | 120.89 | 2537.88 | 2445.8 | 023 |

TABLE 4: Calculated $\operatorname{Sin}^{2} \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot 10^{4}$-values, $4 \theta$-values are used from TABLE 3

| No. | $\mathbf{4 \theta}_{\text {corr. }}$ | $\mathbf{I}$ | $\boldsymbol{S i n}^{\mathbf{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta} . \mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{0}^{\mathbf{4}}$ (corr.) | hkl |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 47.14 | 1 | 417.08 | 110 |
| 2 | 57.56 | 10 | 618.06 | 111 |
| 3 | - | 2 | - | 020 |
| 4 | 65.65 | 7 | 798.35 | 002 |
| 5 | 68.67 | 7 | 871.23 | 021 |
| 6 | 72.77 | 2 | 974.75 | 200 |
| 7 | 81.24 | 1 | 1204.78 | 112 |
| 8 | - | 1 | - | 022 |
| 9 | - | 3 | - | 220 |
| 10 | 99.30 | 4 | 1762.7 | 130,202 |
| 11 | 101.18 | 3 | 1825.6 | 221 |
| 12 | 111.53 | 2 | 2186.9 | 113 |
| 13 | 117.9 | 2 | 2420.7 | 222 |
| 14 | 120.9 | 3 | 2533.7 | 023 |

Now using the following formula, a TABLE was set up, with the measured $\operatorname{Sin}^{2} \theta \cdot 10^{4}$ values as can be seen in TABLE 3:
$\operatorname{Sin} \theta=\frac{\mathrm{n} \cdot \lambda}{2 \mathrm{~d}}$
$\lambda=1.5405(\mathrm{CuK} \alpha 1), \mathrm{n}=1, \mathrm{~d}$ (from TABLE).
Now we are able to compute on the basis of $\operatorname{Sin}^{2}$ $\theta_{\text {corr: }} 10^{4}$ the cell constants.
$\operatorname{Sin}^{2} \boldsymbol{\theta} .1 \mathbf{1 0}^{4}=$ A.h ${ }^{2}+$ B. $\mathbf{k}^{2}+$ C. $\mathbf{l}^{2}$
At first those lines which possess only a run number of hkl, different of zero were picket out.

Thus the first series of A, B, C values were obtained. These values were registered into the so-called atomic position x -ray diagram. At the beginning one selected: $\mathrm{h}=0 ; \mathrm{k}=1,2,3,4 ; \mathrm{l}=1,2,3,4$ and then calculated the lines (the values larger than 26000 were rejected as insignificant). Next it was selected: $\mathrm{h}=1$; $\mathrm{k}=1,2,3 ; \mathrm{l}=1,2,3$ and then calculated the lines.
Like above: $\mathrm{h}=\mathbf{2 ;} \mathrm{k}=\mathbf{1 , 2 , 3 ;} \mathrm{l}=\mathbf{1 , 2 , 3}$ etc.
Now the received lines values were compared with measured values. If they correlated well, then the A, B, C values would be selected, otherwise one had to vary A, B, C values (cell constants) till they become optimal. This is known as the refinement of the cell constant. Now these data were computed with a computer program called LSUCRIPC. The input $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ values were used 3 times for computations (though not yet optimal). The structure, name, angles (value of $\theta$ ) and experimentally received lines ( $4 \theta_{\text {corr }}$ ) were also entered into the program. At first the calculated values of A, B, C were compared with LSUCRIPC and Reference
values.
The optimization was accomplished over 40 times. The following values were received $a=4.95048$, $\mathrm{b}=5.93631, \mathrm{c}=5.47491$. This values show good agreement with those from references.
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