

An Extension of the Van der Waals Equation of State

Jianxiang Tian

Department of Physics, Dalian University of Technology
Dalian 116024, P.R.China

Department of Physics, Qufu
Normal University, Qufu 273165, P.R.China

Yuanxing Gui

Department of Physics, Dalian University of Technology
Dalian 116024, P.R.China

March 22, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we extend the Van der Waals equation of state to a universal form and find that the Van der Waals equation of state is a special condition of this form. Then a good form of equation of state for a balanced liquid-gas coexistence canonical argon-like system is given. The localization of this universal form is mentioned out in the end.

PACS: 05.70.Ce; 05.70.-a.

Keywords: equation of state; liquid-gas coexistence.

1 INTRODUCTION

Much attention has been paid in recent years to the hard core Yukawa (HCY) potential as a model for the pair interactions of fluids [1]. The liquid state theories such as the Mean Spherical Approximation (MSA) and the Self Consistent Ornstein-Zernike Approximation (SCOZA) are proposed. Recent studies of the HCY fluid can be found in [2,3] and references therein. But the Van der Waals equation of state

$$P = \frac{k_B T}{v - b} - \frac{a}{v^2} \quad (1)$$

was less mentioned recently. Here a and b are parameters, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and $v = V/N$. In PART 2 of this paper, we extend the VDW equation

Email address: lanm anhuayu@ yahoo.com .cn

of state to a universal form and find that the VDW equation of state is a special case of this form. In PART 3, we state the localization of this universal form by applying it to the liquid-gas phase transition to one order.

2 Theory

We define particle number density by

$$n = \frac{N}{V} = \frac{1}{v}; \quad (2)$$

Then Eq.(1) can be expressed as

$$P = \frac{N k_B T}{V - N b} - a n^2; \quad (3)$$

Now we extend the VDW equation of state to such a form as

$$P = \frac{N k_B T}{V - N b} - B n^{+1}; \quad (4)$$

B and a are parameters, too. When $a = 1$, $B = a$, Eq.(4) reads the VDW equation of state. Now we sign

$$T = T_c; \quad (5)$$

$$n = n_c; \quad (6)$$

$$P = P_c; \quad (7)$$

with T_c the critical temperature, P_c the critical pressure, n_c the critical particle number density.

At critical point, the function $P = P(V; T; N)$ has such qualities as

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial V} \Big|_c = 0; \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial V^2} \Big|_c = 0; \quad (9)$$

Thus we get the critical data from Eq.(4) by solving Eq.(8) and Eq.(9). They are

$$n_c = \frac{1}{(a + 2)b}; \quad (10)$$

$$k_B T_c = (\gamma + 1) \left(\frac{2}{\gamma + 2} \right)^2 B n_c; \quad (11)$$

$$P_c = \frac{2}{\gamma + 2} B n_c^{\gamma+1}; \quad (12)$$

$$C = \frac{n_c k_B T_c}{P_c} = \frac{4(\gamma + 1)}{(\gamma + 2)}; \quad (13)$$

Letter C represents the critical coefficient. Substituting Eq.(10-12) to Eq.(4), we get the reduced equation of state:

$$P = \frac{4n T (\gamma + 1)}{((\gamma + 2) n^{\gamma})} - \frac{(\gamma + 2) n^{\gamma+1}}{(\gamma + 2) n^{\gamma}}; \quad (14)$$

When $\gamma = 1$, Eq.(4) reads

$$P = \frac{N k_B T}{V - N b} - B n^2; \quad (15)$$

which is just the form of the VDW equation of state. Data in Eq.(10-13) read

$$n_c = \frac{1}{3b}; \quad (16)$$

$$k_B T_c = \frac{8B}{27b}; \quad (17)$$

$$P_c = \frac{B}{27b^2}; \quad (18)$$

$$C = \frac{n_c k_B T_c}{P_c} = 8/3; \quad (19)$$

We are very familiar with these results, which are the data from the VDW equation of state. Eq.(14) reads

$$P = \frac{8n T}{(3 - n)} - 3n^2; \quad (20)$$

which is the reduced form of the VDW equation of state. From Eq.(3), Eq.(4) Eq. (14) and Eq.(20), we see that the original form of the VDW equation of state is

$$P = \frac{N k_B T}{V - N b} - 1 - a n^{\gamma+1}; \quad (21)$$

When $\beta = 0.7432$, Eq.(4) reads

$$P = \frac{N k_B T}{V - N b} - 0.7432 B n^{1.7432}; \quad (22)$$

Eq.(10-13) reads

$$n_c = 0.2709 b^{-1}; \quad (23)$$

$$k_B T_c = 0.2609 B b^{0.7432}; \quad (24)$$

$$P_c = 0.0207 B b^{1.7432}; \quad (25)$$

$$C = \frac{n_c k_B T_c}{P_c} = 3.4201; \quad (26)$$

Eq.(14) reads

$$P = \frac{9.3821 n T}{(2.7432 - 0.7432 n)} - 3.6911 n^{1.7432}; \quad (27)$$

Eq.(26) offers the critical coefficient of argon approximately.

In 1975, W.G.Hoover, etc, generalized the Van der Waals mean-field attraction by choosing the attractive potential energy proportional to the S th power of the density [4]. Its per-particle partition function has the form [4]:

$$z = \frac{V_e}{N^3} \exp \left[\frac{0}{N k_B T} - \frac{3''}{N k_B T} + \frac{B}{k_B T} n^S \right]; \quad (28)$$

Parameters are interpreted there. S is the exponent of n : We all know that the equation of state can be obtained by

$$P = kT \frac{\partial}{\partial V} \ln z_{T,N}; \quad (29)$$

Then we can integrate Eq.(4) to get its corresponding per-particle partition function. The result is

$$z_0 = f(T; N; m) (V - N b)^N \exp \left[\frac{B}{k_B T} n \right]; \quad (30)$$

with f a function independent with V : Here m is the mass of one particle. The equation of state obtained from Eq.(28) is complex. It is difficult to get its reduced form. Relatively, Eq.(4) is easier to be operated.

If we replace the Van der Waals repulsion term in Eq.(4) with the Camahan-Starling hard-sphere repulsion term [5,6], the equation of state is written as

$$P = \frac{N k_B T}{V} \left[1 + \frac{4y - 2y^2}{(1 - y)^3} \right] - B n^{+1}; \quad (31)$$

with $y = g(4V_m)$: Here g is the covolume of Camahan-Starling hard-spheres [5], and V_m is molar volume. The critical data of Eq.(31) and the reduced form of Eq.(31) are difficult to be solved. We do not discuss it in this paper.

3 Discussion

Here we only study the balanced liquid-gas phase coexistence canonical system with Eq.(4) and Eq.(14).

In 1945, E A Guggenheim collected the data of this system from experiments and gave out the correlation of ρ_1 , ρ_2 and T by the empirical equations [7] below

$$\rho_1 = 1 + 0.75(1 - T)^{-1} - 1.75(1 - T)^{-3}; \quad (32)$$

$$\rho_2 = 1 + 0.75(1 - T)^{-1} + 1.75(1 - T)^{-3}; \quad (33)$$

For

$$\rho_1 = m n_1 = m n_c = n_1 = n_c = \rho_1; \quad (34)$$

$$\rho_2 = m n_2 = m n_c = n_2 = n_c = \rho_2; \quad (35)$$

we have

$$\rho_1 = 1 + 0.75(1 - T)^{-1} - 1.75(1 - T)^{-3}; \quad (36)$$

$$\rho_2 = 1 + 0.75(1 - T)^{-1} + 1.75(1 - T)^{-3}; \quad (37)$$

In Eq.(32-35), ρ_1 is the reduced density of the gases and ρ_2 is the reduced density of the liquids. As far as an argon system is concerned, the inaccuracy of these two equations is generally only one or two parts per thousand of ρ_2 or of ρ_1 when $T > 0.60T_c$ [7]. So, it is acceptable to consider the data of $(T; \rho_1(T); \rho_2(T))$ from Eq.(36) and Eq.(37) as the experimental ones in this temperature region when the balanced liquid-gas coexistence argon-like system is considered. In Eq.(34-35), m is the mass of one particle. E A Guggenheim gave a numerical analytic result of the relation between the reduced temperature and the reduced pressure from experiments by equation [8]

$$P_e = \exp(5.29 - 5.31/T); \quad (38)$$

which best fits the experimental data for argon when $T > 0.56T_c$ except a tiny region near the critical point [8]. Thus it is acceptable to consider the data of $(P_e; T)$ from Eq.(38) as the experimental ones, too. Substituting the data $(T; \rho_1(T))$ from Eq.(36) to Eq.(14), we get the data of the reduced pressure of the gases when ρ_1 is fixed. Then we compare these data with the ones gotten from Eq.(34) to see the accuracy of Eq.(14) when ρ_1 is chosen to be this value. Table (1) illustrates the data with $\rho_1 = 0.7432$, $\rho_1 = 0.8$, $\rho_1 = 1$, and $\rho_1 = 1.5$. P_1 is the reduced pressure of the gases gotten by substituting the data $(T; \rho_1(T))$ in Eq.(36) to Eq.(14). And P_2 is the reduced pressure of the liquids gotten by substituting the data $(T; \rho_2(T))$ in Eq.(37) to Eq.(14). From Table 1, we can see

$\mathcal{P}_1 - P_{ej=0.7432} < \mathcal{P}_1 - P_{ej=0.8} < \mathcal{P}_1 - P_{ej=1} < \mathcal{P}_1 - P_{ej=1.5}$ when $T > 0.8$.

$\mathcal{P}_2 - P_{ej=0.7432} < \mathcal{P}_2 - P_{ej=0.8} < \mathcal{P}_2 - P_{ej=1} < \mathcal{P}_2 - P_{ej=1.5}$ when $T > 0.8$.

$\mathcal{P}_1 - P_{ejT} < \mathcal{P}_2 - P_{ejT}$ when T are fixed in the region $0.7 < T < 0.99$.

So we can conclude that $\epsilon = 0.7432$ is the best one of these four values in the temperature region $0 < T < 0.8$ and Eq.(14) fits the gas phase better than the liquid phase.

Here we will ask whether a proper $\epsilon = \epsilon_0$, which can bring right academic forecast to the experimental data P , n_1 , n_2 and T , exists. Now we suppose that such a proper ϵ_0 exists. Then Eq.(14) is fixed to be the form of

$$P = \frac{4n(T; \epsilon_0 + 1)}{((\epsilon_0 + 2) - n(\epsilon_0))} \cdot \frac{(\epsilon_0 + 2)n^{(\epsilon_0 + 1)}}{\epsilon_0} : \quad (39)$$

Thus we have

$$y = y(T; \epsilon_0) = P(n_1; T; \epsilon_0) - P(n_2; T; \epsilon_0) = 0; \quad (40)$$

where n_1 , n_2 and T are the experimental ones in Eq.(36) and Eq.(37). According to our supposition, at two different reduced temperature T_1 and T_2 , Eq.(40) will be true. Fig.(1) is the curve of $y = y(T_1 = 0.8, \epsilon)$. Fig.(2) is the curve of $y = y(T_2 = 0.85, \epsilon)$. From the figures, we know that $y = y(T_1 = 0.8, \epsilon) = 0$ when $\epsilon = \epsilon_0(T_1 = 0.8) = 1.7050$, $y = y(T_2 = 0.85, \epsilon) = 0$ when $\epsilon = \epsilon_0(T_2 = 0.85) = 1.9190$. For $\epsilon_0(T_1 = 0.8) \neq \epsilon_0(T_2 = 0.85)$, the proper $\epsilon = \epsilon_0$ we try to find does not exist.

In 1990, JM Kincaid, etc, represented the pure fluid coexistence curves by series expansion successfully [9]. Detailed description about pure fluid coexistence curves such as argon's can be seen there. Our result here is not as good as theirs, but is more simple in calculation.

4 Acknowledgement

This project is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 10275008. We thank Mrs Cuihua Zhang, who is working in the office of Civil Administration Sishui, Jining, Shandong Province, P.R. China, for her help with this paper. We thank Prof. Yunjie Xia for his help with the English expression of this paper.

References

- [1] Y. Rosenfeld, J. Chem. Phys. 98, 8126 (1993).

Figure 1: The curve of $y = y(T_1 = 0.8, \quad)$ versus \quad . The dotted line is beeline $y = 0$ which is a reference here.

- [2] C.Caccamo, G.Giunta and G.Malescio, Mol.Phys. 84, 125 (1995).
- [3] D.Pini, G.Stell and N.B.Wilding, Mol.Phys. 95, 483 (1998).
- [4] W.G.Hoover, G.Stell, E.Goldmark and G.D.Degani, J.Chem.Phys. 63, 5434 (1975).
- [5] N.F.Camahan, K.E.Starling, J.Chem.Phys. 51, 635, (1969).
- [6] N.F.Camahan, K.E.Starling, AIChE Journal, 18, 1184, (1972).
- [7] E.A.Guggenheim, J.Chem.Phys, Vol13, Num.7 (1945).
- [8] E.A.Guggenheim, Thermodynamics, North-Holland Physics Publishing, 138-139 (1967).
- [9] J.M.Kincaid, B.Tooker and G.Stell, Fluid Phase Equilibria, Vol60, Issu.3, 239, (1990).

Figure 2: The curve of $y = y(T_1 = 0.35, \cdot)$ versus \cdot . The dotted line is beeline $y = 0$ which is a reference here.

				= 0.7432	= 0.8	= 1	= 1.5
T = 0.7	P_1			0.1075	0.1042	0.0931	0.0715
	P_2			0.5781	0.2249	5.0082	138.7650
	P_e			0.1007	0.1007	0.1007	0.1007
	\mathcal{P}_1	$P_e j$		0.0069	0.0035	0.0076	0.0292
	\mathcal{P}_2	$P_e j$		0.6788	0.1243	4.9075	138.8657
				= 0.7432	= 0.8	= 1	= 1.5
T = 0.8	P_1			0.2581	0.2529	0.2339	0.1907
	P_2			0.1786	0.5896	2.6568	32.0708
	P_e			0.2599	0.2599	0.2599	0.2599
	\mathcal{P}_1	$P_e j$		0.0018	0.0069	0.0260	0.0692
	\mathcal{P}_2	$P_e j$		0.0813	0.3297	2.3969	31.8109
				= 0.7432	= 0.8	= 1	= 1.5
T = 0.85	P_1			0.3681	0.3625	0.3408	0.2876
	P_2			0.4756	0.7420	1.9883	12.6041
	P_e			0.3840	0.3840	0.3840	0.3840
	\mathcal{P}_1	$P_e j$		0.0159	0.0215	0.0432	0.0964
	\mathcal{P}_2	$P_e j$		0.0916	0.3580	1.6043	12.2201
				= 0.7432	= 0.8	= 1	= 1.5
T = 0.9	P_1			0.5116	0.5061	0.4840	0.4250
	P_2			0.7191	0.8695	1.5264	5.5068
	P_e			0.5434	0.5434	0.5434	0.5434
	\mathcal{P}_1	$P_e j$		0.0318	0.0373	0.0594	0.1184
	\mathcal{P}_2	$P_e j$		0.1758	0.3261	0.9831	4.9634
				= 0.7432	= 0.8	= 1	= 1.5
T = 0.95	P_1			0.7043	0.7001	0.6821	0.6290
	P_2			0.9035	0.9645	1.2122	2.3443
	P_e			0.7412	0.7412	0.7412	0.7412
	\mathcal{P}_1	$P_e j$		0.0369	0.0411	0.0591	0.1122
	\mathcal{P}_2	$P_e j$		0.1623	0.2232	0.4710	1.6031
				= 0.7432	= 0.8	= 1	= 1.5
T = 0.97	P_1			0.8028	0.7997	0.7859	0.7428
	P_2			0.9570	0.9896	1.1178	1.6391
	P_e			0.8317	0.8317	0.8317	0.8317
	\mathcal{P}_1	$P_e j$		0.0289	0.0321	0.0458	0.0889
	\mathcal{P}_2	$P_e j$		0.1253	0.1578	0.2860	0.8073
				= 0.7432	= 0.8	= 1	= 1.5
T = 0.99	P_1			0.9228	0.9214	0.9148	0.8926
	P_2			0.9936	1.0027	1.0370	1.1576
	P_e			0.9290	0.9290	0.9290	0.9290
	\mathcal{P}_1	$P_e j$		0.0062	0.0076	0.0142	0.0364
	\mathcal{P}_2	$P_e j$		0.0646	0.0737	0.1080	0.2286

Table 1 : Data





