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A very extensive literature survey of all available phase diagram and thermodynamic data has been carried out for all 40 possible common-anion binary systems (AX-BX) and all 30 possible common-cation binary systems (AX-AY) involving the alkali halides (A, B = Li, Na, K, Rb, Cs; X, Y = F, Cl, Br, I). A critical analysis and evaluation of these data have been performed with a view to obtaining a "best" evaluated phase diagram and a set of "best" evaluated thermodynamic parameters for each system. To this end, a computer-assisted coupled analysis of the phase diagram data and the thermodynamic data for each system has been employed. Mathematical expressions for the thermodynamic properties of all known phases have been obtained which are consistent with the measured thermodynamic properties and phase diagrams as well as with established thermodynamic principles and theories of solution behavior. The parameters of these expressions are reported here and have been used to generate the computer-calculated diagrams in the compilation.
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1. Introduction

Molten salt phase diagrams are of central importance in metallurgy and materials science. They contribute to our knowledge of the behavior of materials in many applications and provide information relating to ionic interactions in solution.

There exists a wealth of data on phase diagrams of the alkali halides, particularly in compendia. In these sources, as in the general literature, there is a relative lack of critical evaluation of these data. There have been some attempts at systematic evaluation, but these have not exploited the contribution of a thermodynamic simultaneous analysis of the data.

For the common-ion binary alkali halide systems, there exists also a large amount of data on mixing and excess properties, in both the liquid and solid states. The following section of the present report describes the computer-coupled thermodynamic/phase diagram analysis used in the critical evaluation of phase diagram data. This procedure enables the evaluator to test the thermodynamic consistency within and among all reported phase diagrams and excess property measurements. This procedure, we believe, results in a much more rigorous and objective assessment of all data than has hitherto been possible. Furthermore, it enables a thermodynamically correct "smoothing" of the experimental data to be performed, and a "best" phase diagram to be calculated.

For each of the 70 systems, the details of the evaluation procedure and the phase diagram for that system are grouped together. Not all reported experimental points are shown on the phase diagram in each case. However, all references found for each system have been included and discussed. The evaluated "best" equations for the thermodynamic properties of all phases are given. The phase diagrams shown were calculated from these equations and are considered to be the "best" evaluated diagrams which can be deduced from the data currently available. The "probable maximum inaccuracy" of the evaluated phase diagram has been estimated for each system. Phase boundaries indicated by dashed lines are considered to be less accurately known.

Tabulated summaries of the thermodynamic properties of all phases represented in the evaluated phase diagrams, together with a topological classification of the diagrams, i.e., according to type (simple eutectic, etc.) are found in the Appendix. There is also a summary of the temperatures and Gibbs energies of fusion and transformation of the pure halides. While most of the pure component data were taken from a recent standard source, a re-evaluation using more up-to-date data was found necessary in a few cases as indicated.

It should be noted that for all 70 binary systems reported here, one consistent set of melting points for the pure salts has been adopted. In many reported experimental binary phase diagrams, the melting points of the pure salts differ significantly from these values. Account was taken of this problem in the evaluations.

2. Computer-Coupled Thermodynamic/Phase Diagram Analysis

2.1. Introduction

As well as providing a set of self-consistent thermodynamic equations which simultaneously reproduce the thermodynamic properties and the phase diagram of the system, the technique of coupled thermodynamic/phase diagram analysis yields a thermodynamically correct "smoothing" of the experimental data. Furthermore, discrepancies among various sets of data can often be resolved in this way, and error limits can more easily be assigned. Unknown or uncer-
tain phase boundaries can often be estimated with good precision and, conversely, some reported phase boundaries can be rejected as being inconsistent with the thermodynamic properties of the system. Finally, such a thermodynamic analysis is the first step in estimating ternary and higher order phase diagrams from binary data. A short bibliography on computer-coupled thermodynamic/phase diagram analysis and calculation 10–17 should suffice to orient the reader. The principles of simultaneous least-squares optimization of thermodynamic and phase diagram data are described in Ref. 10. The interactive computer programs which were used in the optimizations and phase diagram calculations are described in Ref. 11. (These programs are available “on-line” or on diskette, and further information may be obtained from the authors.)

2.2. Thermodynamic Relationships

For equilibrium between a solid and a liquid phase in a binary system with components A and B, we may write

\[ R T \ln d_A^s - R T \ln d_A^l = - \Delta_{ fus} U_A, \]  

(1)

where \( d_A^s \) and \( d_A^l \) are the activities of A on the liquidus and solidus at temperature \( T \). Here, \( \Delta_{ fus} G_A^s \) is the Gibbs energy of fusion of A at \( T \) and \( R \) is the gas constant. Setting the ideal activities equal to the mole fractions \( x^l \) and \( x^s \) we may write

\[ R T \ln x_A^s / x_A^l + G_A^{(E)} - G_A^{(s)} = - \Delta_{ fus} G_A^s, \]

(2)

where \( G_A^{(E)} \) and \( G_A^{(s)} \) are the partial excess Gibbs energies of A in the liquid and solid. These are zero in an ideal solution. Note that

\[ G_A^{(E)} = R T \ln \gamma_A^l, \]

(3)

\[ G_A^{(s)} = R T \ln \gamma_A^s, \]

(4)

where \( \gamma^l \) and \( \gamma^s \) are the activity coefficients in the liquid and solid.

An equation identical to Eq. (2) can be written for the other component, B. If the Gibbs energies of fusion are known, and if the excess Gibbs energies are also known as functions of temperature and composition, then these two equations can be solved simultaneously by numerical methods to calculate the liquidus and solidus lines. Conversely, if the liquidus and solidus are known along with the excess Gibbs energies for one phase, then the excess Gibbs energies for the other phase can be calculated.

The integral excess Gibbs energy \( G^E \) is related to the partial excess Gibbs energies by the following equation:

\[ G^E = x_A G_A^E + x_B G_B^E, \]

(5)

Conversely, the partial properties can be obtained from the integral property from the following equation:

\[ G_i^E = G^E + (1 - x_i) \frac{dG^E}{dx_i}, \]

(6)

where \( i = A \) or \( B \).

The excess Gibbs energy can be written as

\[ G^E = H^E - TS^E, \]

(7)

where \( H^E \) and \( S^E \) are the excess enthalpy and entropy, respectively. In most cases it can be assumed that \( H^E \) and \( S^E \) are independent of temperature. In only four of the 70 systems in the present compilation were the data of sufficient precision and available over a wide enough temperature range to merit inclusion of a temperature-dependent term in the expressions for \( H^E \) and \( S^E \). The details are discussed under the evaluations for these particular systems. For the remainder of the present section, it will be assumed that \( H^E \) and \( S^E \) are independent of temperature.

2.3. Polynomial Expressions of Excess Properties

For phases (solid and liquid) with extended ranges of solubility, \( H^E \) and \( S^E \) may be expanded as polynomials in the mole fractions as follows:

\[ H^E = x_A x_B (h_0 + h_1 x_B + h_2 x_B^2 + \cdots), \]

(8)

\[ S^E = x_A x_B (s_0 + s_1 x_B + s_2 x_B^2 + \cdots), \]

(9)

where the \( h_i \) and \( s_i \) are empirical coefficients. Corresponding expressions for the partial properties can be obtained by differentiating Eqs. (8) and (9) via Eq. (6) to give

\[ H_A^E = \sum_{i=0} h_i (x_B - x_A)_A x_B^{i+1}, \]

(10)

\[ S_A^E = \sum_{i=0} s_i (x_B - x_A)_A x_B^{i+1}, \]

(11)

\[ H_B^E = x_A^l \sum_{i=0} h_i (i + 1) x_B^i, \]

(12)

\[ S_B^E = x_A^l \sum_{i=0} s_i (i + 1) x_B^i, \]

(13)

whence:

\[ G_A^E = R T \ln \gamma_A^l = H_A^E - TS_A^E, \]

(14)

\[ G_B^E = R T \ln \gamma_B^l = H_B^E - TS_B^E, \]

(15)

The empirical coefficients \( h_i \) and \( s_i \) are found by the simultaneous optimization of the thermodynamic and phase diagram data. If only the first terms \( (h_0, s_0) \) in the empirical series Eqs. (8) and (9) are nonzero, then the solution is termed “regular.” If two terms are required to fit the data then the system is called “subregular.” Experience has shown that most alkali halide solutions approximate quite closely to regular or subregular behavior. No more than four terms were required in Eqs. (8) and (9) for any of the 70 systems, and usually one or two terms sufficed. If only limited experimental data are available, then the assumption of regular or subregular behavior will yield an acceptable approximation.

Experience with alkali halide solutions has also shown that the enthalpic term \( H^E \) in Eq. (7) is generally larger in magnitude than the entropic term \( TS^E \). Hence, if available data are limited, it is a reasonable assumption to set \( S^E = 0 \) and to assume that \( G^E \) is temperature independent.

As a general rule, the larger the cations and/or anions and the smaller the difference between the radii of the two cations in a common-anion binary system (or between the two anions in a common-cation binary system), the more closely the above approximations (one- or two-term polynomial expansions; \( S^E = 0 \)) are obeyed.
2.4. Solid Solutions with Limited Solubility: Henrian Behavior

In certain systems, limited solid solubility of only a few mole percent of one component in the other is observed. Such solid solutions may be considered to be Henrian solutions. That is, letting component A be the solvent, the activity of A is ideal (Raoultian):

$$a_A^* = x_A^*$$ and $$G_A^{E(s)} = 0.$$  \hfill \text{(16)}

For the solute, B, the activity coefficient $$\gamma_B^* = a_B^*/x_B^*$$ is independent of composition. Hence, $$G_B^{E(s)} = RT \ln \gamma_B^*$$ is also independent of composition, and can, to a reasonable approximation, be taken to be independent of temperature:

$$G_B^{E(s)} = RT \ln \gamma_B^* = \text{constant.} \hfill \text{(17)}$$

In such cases of limited solid solubility of solute B in solvent A, we note that Eq. (2) alone is sufficient to permit $$G_A^{E(1)}$$ to be calculated along the liquidus, if the solids and liquidus lines are known, since $$G_A^{E(s)} = 0.$$  

2.5. Limiting Slopes of Liquidus Lines: Estimation of Solid Solubility

In some systems, the extent of solid solubility is not known. In such cases, the measured limiting slope of the liquidus line $$(dx^*/dT)$$ at $$x_A = 1$$ (pure A) can permit the extent of solid solubility to be estimated. In the limit at $$x_A = 1$$, both the liquid and solid phases become Henrian such that $$G_A^{E(s)}$$ and $$G_A^{E(1)}$$ both approach zero. Similarly, for $$x_A \approx 1$$, the Gibbs energy of fusion of A is well approximated by the expression $$\Delta_{fus} H_A^* (1 - T/T_{fus(A)})$$, where $$\Delta_{fus} H_A^*$$ is the enthalpy of fusion of A at its melting point, $$T_{fus(A)}$$. Differentiation of Eq. (2) in the limit at $$x_A = 1$$ then gives

$$\frac{dx_A^*}{dT} = \frac{\Delta_{fus} H_A^*}{R(T_{fus(A)})^2}$$ when $$x_A = 1.$$  \hfill \text{(18)}

From the known enthalpy of fusion and the measured limiting liquidus slope, $$(dx^*/dT)$$, the limiting solidus slope $$(dx^*/dT)$$ can be calculated. If this is close to zero, then the solid solubility is of limited extent.

2.6. Optimization Procedure

The actual steps followed in an optimization will vary from system to system. Details are given under the evaluation for each system. However, some general observations can be enunciated.

In 53 of the 70 systems, $$H^{E(1)}$$ in the liquid phase has been measured calorimetrically by Prof. O. Kleppa and coworkers. These data, which are very reliable, have been fitted to 1-, 2-, or 3-membered series as in Eq. (8).

In the cases of systems with limited solid solubility, Eq. (2) was then used under the assumption of Henrian solid behavior, to calculate excess Gibbs energies along the A- and B-liquidus lines. That is, $$G_A^{E(s)}$$ was set equal to zero for the solvent, according to Eq. (16). Combining these excess Gibbs energies with the already fitted calorimetric liquid enthalpies permitted the excess liquid entropy $$S^{E(1)}$$ to be calculated and then smoothed by representation as a 1- or 2-member (very exceptionally a 3 or 4 member) polynomial as in Eq. (9). The Henrian constant of Eq. (17) could then be calculated from the measured solubility limits for each of the two solid solutions. In those few systems for which calorimetric liquid enthalpies were not available, $$S^{E(1)}$$ was set equal to zero, and the values of $$H^{E(1)}$$ obtained from the phase diagram were then smoothed by polynomial representation as in Eq. (8).

In the cases of systems with complete solid miscibility, $$H^{E(s)}$$ has been measured calorimetrically in only a few cases. In general, in these systems it must be assumed that $$S^T = 0$$ in either the liquid or solid phase or in both. If $$G^{E(s)}$$ for the completely miscible solid phase is positive, then there will be a zone of demixing (i.e., a miscibility gap) in the solid whose boundaries and consolute point can be calculated from the equation for $$G^{E(s)}$$. Conversely, if the miscibility gap has been measured experimentally, then these data can be used to help determine the coefficients in the expression for $$G^{E(s)}$$ (Ref. 10).

Some of the systems studied contain intermediate compounds. In no cases have the Gibbs energies of fusion of these compounds been measured. However, once $$H^{E(1)}$$ and $$S^{E(1)}$$ have been determined, the Gibbs energies of fusion of the compounds can be calculated from their measured liquidus lines via Eq. (2) if they are assumed to be stoichiometric compounds. Their Gibbs energies of formation from the pure component salts can then also be calculated.

In a few systems, activities of components have been measured by auxiliary methods. The number of such systems is small. The following is a summary showing the number of systems for which different data types were available.

| Systems with phase diagram and/or thermodynamic data: | 70 |
| Systems with emf (electromotive force) data: | 7 |
| Systems with vapor pressure data: | 2 |
| Systems with mass spectrometric data: | 2 |

For all those systems having auxiliary data, the pertinent sources are mentioned and discussed under the section for the appropriate system, and all references have been retained. These data could also be used in principle in the data optimization, but were in fact not used for this purpose. This is because these data, compared to available calorimetric or phase diagram data, were too sparse or inaccurate.

An example will illustrate this conclusion. The system KCl(A) + NaCl(B) has been widely studied; good phase diagram and thermodynamic data exist for both liquid and solid phases (26 references). From the phase diagram/thermodynamic property optimization for this system, as reported in this work, it was found that the quantities

$$H^{E(1)} = x_A x_B (-2050 - 272 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \hfill \text{(19)}$$

$$S^{E(1)} = 0, \hfill \text{(20)}$$

(assumed independent of temperature) were sufficient to describe the liquid phase. Equation (19) represents the excess enthalpy as determined calorimetrically by Kleppa. Measurements of activities by other methods have also been reported. In Table I, results for the excess chemical potential of NaCl in the liquid are shown, as found by three methods:
TABLE 1. System KCl(A) + NaCl(B). Excess chemical potential of NaCl, $G^E_B$, in the liquid as determined by emf and phase diagram/thermodynamic analysis technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_B$</th>
<th>This work$^a$</th>
<th>emf$^b$</th>
<th>emf$^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Quantity assumed to be independent of temperature.

$^b$Reference 19, data at 880 °C.

$^c$Reference 20, data at 885 °C.

(i) Eqs. (19) and (20), (ii) emf Ref. 19, and (iii) emf Ref. 20. Both emf studies report rather large positive deviations from ideality. If Eq. (19) is taken to represent the excess enthalpy, then the partial excess entropy of NaCl, as determined by emf, may be as large as $-3$ J mol$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ at the equimolar composition. As Forland and Thulin$^{20}$ point out, this is an impossibly large deviation for this system, and instead they attribute the deviation to the presence of a liquid junction potential in the original emf measurements. That this is probably the case is supported also by independent NaCl activity measurements made by mass spectrometry$^{21}$ on the liquid. The results of these measurements, done in the interval 700-810 °C and extrapolated to 880 °C, indicate that $G^E_B$ is slightly negative, and that the partial excess entropy $S^E_B$ is very small ($\approx 0.4$ J mol$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ at the equimolar composition).

In conclusion, we favored phase diagram and thermodynamic data in our optimization and excluded other types of data, because the latter were sparse and uncertain. Electrolyte force measurements in systems containing alkali metals are particularly difficult, due to spurious effects. The interpretation of vapor pressure data is not entirely unambiguous and precise measurement is difficult. The mass spectrometric data may be accurate, depending upon the species whose ion currents are used to derive activities.

Only in the case where no phase diagram or thermodynamic data were at hand, but auxiliary data were available, would we consider the use of auxiliary data in the optimization. This was never the case among the 70 systems reported here. In such a hypothetical case, auxiliary data would be considered together with qualitative and quantitative estimates drawn from phase diagram and thermodynamic properties of analogous systems already studied.

3. The Evaluations

3.1. Common-Anion Systems

a. Fluorides

LIF(A) + NaF(B)

Earlier work on this system$^{22,23}$ with the visual-polythermal method indicated a eutectic at $x_B = 0.39$ at 652 °C. The most recent results,$^{24,25}$ obtained by thermal and differential thermal analysis, gives 649 °C and 0.39, with a limited solubility of LiF in NaF of about 8.5 mol% at the eutectic temperature. From this solubility, a Henrian activity coefficient of LiF in NaF, relative to the solid standard state at the eutectic temperature was calculated as

$$RT \ln \gamma_A = 18895 \ \text{J mol}^{-1},$$

which was assumed to be independent of temperature. The liquidus limiting slope at the LiF side does not suggest a solid solution; Holm$^{24}$ estimates less than 1% solubility of NaF in LiF.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by two laboratories$^{26-28}$, the more recent results of Klepp$^{28}$ (measured at 1087 °C and assumed independent of $T$) have been used in the present calculation.

$$H^E(1) = x_A x_B (-7565 + 368x_B) \ \text{J mol}^{-1}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

Small excess entropy terms were calculated

$$S^E(1) = x_A x_B (-1.607 - 1.124x_B) \ \text{J mol}^{-1} \ K^{-1},$$

which enabled the liquidus to be reproduced within 5 °C of Holm's$^{24}$ results, as well as this author's eutectic temperature and composition.

Provable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram: (Fig. 1): ± 5 °C.

KF(A) + LiF(B)

Several investigations$^{22,29-34}$ report a eutectic in the range 487-493 °C at $x_B = 0.50$. The Russian investigators$^{22,29-34}$ used the visual-polythermal method, while Aukrust et al.$^{33}$ used thermal analysis and high-temperature filtration supplemented by visual observation in some cases. The limiting liquidus slopes of the phase diagram of the

![Fig. 1. The system LiF(A) + NaF(B).](image-url)
American authors suggest a solid solubility of no more than 2% at either end, and calculations were performed under the assumption of no solid solubility.

The excess enthalpy of this system has been reported by two laboratories and the more recent and reliable data of Hong and Kleppa were used in the present work:

\[ H^E(1) = x_A x_B \left( -19251 - 1205x_A + 4732x_A^2 \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \] (24)

The use of small excess entropy terms

\[ S^E(1) = x_A x_B \left( -1.375 - 3.146x_B \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}, \] (25)

enabled a good fit (within 5°C) to the liquidus of Aukrust et al.

The calculated eutectic is at \( x_B = 0.51 \) at 492°C. Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 2): ± 5°C.

**LiF(A)+RbF(B)**

Two investigations of this system by Russian authors report a eutectic at 448–450°C and \( x_B = 0.50 \); the visual-polythermal method was used. Later American work provided liquidus and solidus data points in the range \( 0.2 < x_B < 0.7 \), obtained from cooling curve experiments. The American authors report a eutectic at 470°C, \( x_B = 0.56 \) as well as the presence of an incongruently melting compound LiF·RbF (peritectic at \( x_B = 0.53, 457°C \)). The crystal structure parameters of the intermediate compound were determined separately. A recent report of a quaternary system limited by the LiF + RbF binary system cites Thoma’s results, and there are apparently no more recent data than these. Since the American work is more complete than the other, liquidus points were read off the published diagram and were used for the present calculation, together with the reported invariant points.

The excess enthalpy has been measured by direct calorimetry at 898°C by Holm and Kleppa, whose results are used here:

\[ H^E(1) = x_A x_B \left( -17155 - 6275x_A \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \] (26)

None of the investigators reports or mentions solid solubility, although some solubility of LiF in RbF might be expected. None was assumed in the present work. With the assumption of \( H^E(1) \) given by Eq. (26) three \( S^E(1) \) coefficients were calculated:

\[ S^E(1) = x_A x_B \left( -22.166 + 49.002x_B - 33.98x_B^2 \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. \] (27)

The calculated phase diagram based on Eqs. (26) and (27) reproduced the experimental liquidus curves within 10°C, and the eutectic and peritectic points exactly. Although this is a good representation, its accuracy is possible only through the adoption of the very asymmetrical \( S^E(1) \) expression, Eq. (27). If the diagram is calculated with \( S^E(1) = 0 \) and with Eq. (26) for \( H^E(1) \), then the RbF liquidus is reproduced almost exactly (within 2°C), but the LiF liquidus is up to 100°C lower than the reported. These results suggest that the experimental diagram may be in error, probably on the LiF side.

The calculated Gibbs energy of fusion of the compound 0.5(LiF·RbF) is

\[ \Delta_{\text{sub}} G^\ddagger = 13700 - 18216T \text{ J/mol}. \] (28)

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 3): RbF liquidus, ± 20°C; LiF liquidus, ± 40°C.

**CsF(A)+LiF(B)**

Tabulated data for this system are not available from the literature, although phase diagrams have been published, based on the work of Russian and American investigators. Bukhalova and Semenova used a thermographic method, recording the differential heating and cooling curves. They report the compound LiF·CsF melting congruently at 494°C, with eutectics at \( x_B = 0.40, 479°C \) and \( x_B = 0.525, 490°C \). Later work by Russian authors on ternary and higher systems limited by the LiF + CsF binary system confirm the presence of a congruently melting compound, and two eutectics (487–490°C, 474–479°C). In contrast, Barton et al. from cooling curve and thermal gradient quenching experiments find an incongruently melting compound (peritectic at \( x_B = 0.45, 495°C \) and eutectic at...
\[ x_B = 0.37, 475 \, ^\circ C \text{ Deadmore and Machin,}^{49} \text{ also from cooling curve analysis, confirm the findings of Barton et al., reporting only the peritectic (} x_B = 0.46, 488 \, ^\circ C \text{) and eutectic (} x_B = 0.36, 470 \, ^\circ C \text{). Calculations in the present work were performed separately on the Russian}^{42} \text{ and American}^{44} \text{ work; the data used included the invariant points reported in each case, and liquidus points at 0.1 mole fraction intervals read off published diagrams.}^{39,43} \]

None of the investigations\textsuperscript{39,42-49} mentions solid solubility, although some solubility of LiF and CsF might be expected. Calculations were performed in the present work under the assumption of zero solid solubility. The excess enthalpy was measured at 751 \, ^\circ C \text{ in solid-liquid mixing experiments by Holm and Kleppa,}^{26} \text{ whose results are used here:}

\[ H^E(t) = \chi_{x_B} x_B (11.050 \times 7450 x_B - 5525x_B x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(29)

Under the assumption that \( G^E(t) \) is given by Eq. (29), a phase diagram was calculated. At the eutectic temperatures of 479 and 490 \, ^\circ C \text{ reported in Ref. 42, the calculated liquidus compositions were } x_B = 0.39 \text{ and } x_B = 0.535, \text{ in very good agreement with the reported}^{42} \text{ eutectic compositions. In addition, the calculated CsF liquidus was everywhere within 5 \, ^\circ C \text{ of the Russian}^{42} \text{ results. However, the LiF liquidus was up to 40 \, ^\circ C \text{ below that reported in Ref. 42. The corresponding deviations from the American}^{44} \text{ results were larger. Hence, fitting either measured phase diagram would require a very asymmetrical and unusual } S^E(t). \text{ The fact that the CsF liquidus and both eutectic points were well fitted by the very simple assumption that } S^E(t) = 0 \text{ suggests that this assumption may be valid and that the reported LiF liquidus curves may be in error. The calculated phase diagram shown here is based upon a } G^E(t) \text{ given by Eq. (29), and a congruently melting compound as indicated by Bukalova and Smekhova.}^{47} \text{ The calculated Gibbs energy of fusion of the compound 0.5 (CsF-LiF) is}

\[ \Delta_{\text{ fus}} G^* = 17950 - 23.400 T \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(30)

The entropy of fusion is reasonable, thus giving further support to the calculated diagram.

In summary, however, these findings do not permit an unequivocal choice among the two reported diagrams\textsuperscript{39,44} and the calculated diagram.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated phase diagram (Fig. 4): CsF liquidus, \pm 15 \, ^\circ C; LiF liquidus, \pm 35 \, ^\circ C.

\textbf{KF(A) + NaF(B)}

Data defining the liquidus in earlier investigations\textsuperscript{50-54} are generally within 10 \, ^\circ C of the most recent work of Holm.\textsuperscript{24} The Russian investigators used the visual-polythermal method\textsuperscript{11-53} or a combination of visual-polythermal and cooling curve methods.\textsuperscript{50,54} Holm\textsuperscript{24} used thermal and differential thermal analysis. All agree on the eutectic composition, \( x_B = 0.40, \) but the reported eutectic temperature lies in the range 699\textsuperscript{50} to 721 \, ^\circ C.\textsuperscript{24} Holm's work appears to be the most carefully done, and hence was chosen for this study. He found negligible solid solubility at the NaF side of the diagram, but 5 mol % at the KF side, at the eutectic temperature. From this solubility, a Markov activity coefficient of NaF in KF, relative to the solid standard state at the eutectic temperature was calculated as

\[ RT \ln y_B = 24770 \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \]  

(31)

which was assumed to be independent of temperature.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured in two laboratories,\textsuperscript{27,28} and the more recent and reliable data of Hong and Kleppa\textsuperscript{28} (measured at 1087 \, ^\circ C and assumed independent of \( T \)) have been used here:

\[ H^E(t) = -355x_B x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(32)

One excess entropy coefficient was calculated:

\[ S^E(t) = -2.541x_B x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} K^{-1}. \]  

(33)

This allowed the measured diagram\textsuperscript{24} to be reproduced closely. The calculated eutectic is 719 \, ^\circ C at \( x_B = 0.40. \) The calculated NaF liquidus is within 2 \, ^\circ C of the measured\textsuperscript{24} while on the KF side it is 4 to 5 \, ^\circ C below the measured.\textsuperscript{24} The earlier measurements\textsuperscript{50-54} of this liquidus are also slightly below Holm's values, however, and hence agree closely with the calculated liquidus.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 5): \pm 5 \, ^\circ C.

\textbf{KF(A) + NaF(B)}

Data defining the liquidus in earlier investigations\textsuperscript{50-54} are generally within 10 \, ^\circ C of the most recent work of Holm.\textsuperscript{24} The Russian investigators used the visual-polythermal method\textsuperscript{11-53} or a combination of visual-polythermal and cooling curve methods.\textsuperscript{50,54} Holm\textsuperscript{24} used thermal and differential thermal analysis. All agree on the eutectic composition, \( x_B = 0.40, \) but the reported eutectic temperature lies in the range 699\textsuperscript{50} to 721 \, ^\circ C.\textsuperscript{24} Holm's work appears to be the most carefully done, and hence was chosen for this study. He found negligible solid solubility at the NaF side of the diagram.
NaF(A) + RbF(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been reported in three independent investigations. In the earlier work, the visual-polythermal method was used, and the reported eutectic was 644 or 675 °C, \( x_B = 0.67 \) or 0.73. In the most recent work by Holm, determinations were made by thermal analysis, differential thermal analysis (DTA), and quenching; special care was taken with RbF, as it is very hygroscopic. The possibility of solid solution was examined closely, and it was concluded that solid solution in both components was less than 1%. The earlier work cites no solid solution, and this is consistent with the limiting slopes of the reported liquidus. Holm's work appears to be the most carefully done, and his data were used for the present calculations (eutectic 667 °C, \( x_B = 0.672 \)).

The excess enthalpy of this system has been measured in two laboratories. The results of Holm and Kleppa at 1008 °C were used in the present work, as they were obtained by direct calorimetry rather than by drop calorimetry. The excess enthalpy is small and can be represented by the following equation:

\[
H^E(1) = 375x_Ax_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\]

With the use of this excess enthalpy (assumed independent of \( T \)) and the experimental phase diagram points, three excess entropy coefficients were calculated:

\[
S^E(1) = x_Ax_B \left( -2.658 + 4.140x_B 
- 4.702x_B^2 \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1},
\]

which enable the reported liquidus to be reproduced within 3 °C, except for two points (within 10 °C) which appear distinctly higher than the calculated curve. Holm's eutectic is reproduced exactly.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 6): ± 5 °C.

CaF(A) + NaF(B)

Liquidus data are available in two studies both by thermal analysis (cooling curves). In the Russian report, the liquidus shown an unlikely inflection near pure NaF, which is absent in the other work. The phase diagram of deadmore and Machin therefore was used as the basis of the present calculations. In these reports and others, the eutectic falls in the range 610–618 °C, \( x_B = 0.20–0.24 \). No solid solubility was observed by Samuseva and Plyushchev in the range 1–98 mol % NaF. This was confirmed by x-ray analysis of quenched samples at \( x_B = 0.25, 0.5, \) and 0.75, and corroborated by limiting liquidus slopes of the chosen phase diagram.

The excess enthalpy of this system has been measured at several temperatures between 820 and 1100 °C by drop calorimetry. In a preliminary calculation, the excess enthalpy at 820 °C was used with the chosen eutectic point (610 °C, \( x_B = 0.235 \)). This calculation indicated that the excess Gibbs energy of the system at the eutectic is small \([G^E(1) \approx 300 \text{ J mol}^{-1}\)] with a very negative excess entropy \([S^E(1) \sim -5 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}\)]. The latter finding is improbable in reality, in comparison with other similar systems. The calculated phase diagram showed deviations from the measured of up to 50 °C. For these reasons, and considering the fact that \( H^E(1) \) was measured by an indirect technique, it was deemed better to derive thermodynamic quantities from the phase diagram. Thus in a second calculation it was assumed that \([G^E(1) = H^E(1)\text{, independent of temperature, and the following result was obtained:}\]

\[
H^E(1) = x_Ax_B (955 + 2718x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\]

With the use of this excess enthalpy, the eutectic was reproduced exactly, and liquidus points on the NaF side reproduced within 5 °C (within 15 °C for two scattered points). The calculated CaF liquidus followed the measured one, at a displacement corresponding to the uncertainty in the melting point of CaF (that is, the melting point of CaF reported in Ref. 49 is 23 °C lower than the chosen value in Table A1).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 7): ± 10 °C.

KF(A) + RbF(B)

Data defining the liquidus, obtained by the visual-polythermal method, have been reported in tabular form, and as a smooth curve in a phase diagram obtained from analysis of cooling curves. Both studies report continuous

![Fig. 6. The system NaF(A) + RbF(B).](image1)

![Fig. 7. The system CaF(A) + NaF(B).](image2)
solid solution. A temperature minimum at 770 °C, 
\(x_B = 0.72\) is indicated by the American authors,\(^{59}\) but none 
by the Russian authors.\(^{58}\) Although the melting point of 
RbF reported in the Russian work\(^{58}\) is 13 °C below the 
chosen value in Table A1, this work was taken as a guide to the 
general shape of the liquidus. There are no data defining the 
solidus.

The excess enthalpy has been measured at 898 °C by 
direct calorimetry by Holm and Kleppa,\(^{26}\) whose result is 
used here:

\[ H^E (1) = 360x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(37)

This was taken as the excess free energy of the liquid, independent 
of temperature for the present calculations. The phase diagram was calculated with this assumption, and 
with the assumption that the solid exhibits regular solution 
behavior. The phase diagram based upon the value

\[ G^E (s) = 2500x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \]  

(38)

is shown, and is prepared as the most reasonable reconstruction 
for the system. The calculated liquidus closely approximates 
the experimental,\(^{58}\) when allowance is made for the 
difference in reported melting point of RbF. There is a very 
shallow temperature minimum at \(x_B \approx 0.84\). The calculated 
consolde temperature for solid demixing is \(-125 °C\).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram 
(Fig. 8): \(\pm 15 °C\).

**CsF(A) + KF(B)**

Data for the liquidus are to be found in one study,\(^{60}\) 
which reports the eutectic at 625 °C and \(x_B = 0.43\). Another 
report confirms these values,\(^{61}\) while a third\(^{62}\) gives the 
eutectic temperature as 627 °C. All determinations were 
performed by thermal analysis. Samuseva and Plyuschev\(^{63}\) report “up to” 15 mol % solid solubility of KF in CsF and 
none detectable (<3%) on the KF side. The latter finding is 
corroborated by the limiting liquidus slope at the KF side. 
The authors, however, show the solidus curve at the CsF side 
to be convex toward this axis. The difference between the 
limiting liquidus and solidus slopes at the CsF side indicates 
that this is not correct.

There is a large uncertainty in the observed melting point of CsF. Therefore, a thermodynamic optimization was 
performed with liquidus data for compositions between the 
eutectic and pure KF only. From these data a single excess 
enthalpy coefficient was calculated:

\[ H^E (1) = 2028x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \]  

(39)

based on the assumption that \(G^E (1) = H^E (1)\) and that 
\(H^E (1)\) is independent of temperature. From the calculated 
activities of KF and CsF in the liquid at the eutectic, a solid 
solubility of KF in CsF of 25 mol % was deduced, although 
this value must, of course, be taken as only very approximate. 
Furthermore, a Henry's activity coefficient for KF in 
solid solution at the eutectic temperature, given by

\[ RT \ln \gamma_B = 10 \, 448 \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \]  

(40)

was calculated which is here assumed to be independent of 
temperature.

With the use of these values for \(H^E (1)\) and \(RT \ln \gamma_B\), a 
phase diagram was calculated, which reproduced the ob- 
served\(^{60}\) eutectic point exactly. The KF liquidus was reprodu- 
ced to within 10 °C, except for one point near pure KF, 
which may be accounted for by the discrepancy in the melting 
point of KF. The CsF-side liquidus differs significantly 
from the measured.\(^{60}\) It is to be noted, however, that both 
the calculated solubility of KF in CsF (25%) at the eutectic 
temperature and the curvature of the solid solubility curve 
are thermodynamically consistent with the observed\(^{60}\) KF 
side of the diagram. In this respect the calculated diagram is 
more probably correct than the experimental in this region.

Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated liquidus 
(Fig. 9): \(\pm 10 °C\).

**CsF(A) + RbF(B)**

There is apparently only one report of the measured phase 
diagram of this system.\(^{60}\) The reported diagram however 
shows a temperature minimum in the solidus without a 
corresponding minimum for the liquidus; it thus violates the 
phase rule. The data were obtained by thermal analysis, and 
so the reported liquidus is probably more accurate than the 
solidus. The shape of the liquidus was, therefore, taken as a 
guide for the present calculations, in which it was assumed that 
\(G^E (1) = 0\), as a reasonable approximation. The solid 
phase was assumed to be a regular solution. The calculated 
liquidus, based on an excess Gibb's energy of solid solution of
corresponded closely to the observed, with due allowance for differences between the melting points of the pure substances as reported by and as listed in Table A1. The two-phase region, as calculated, is much narrower than the reported, and there is no temperature minimum. The calculated phase diagram, moreover, is thermodynamically consistent, and probably corresponds more faithfully to true behavior than the published one. The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is $-155\,^\circ C$.

Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated diagram (Fig. 10): $\pm 15\,^\circ C$.

**b. Chlorides**

LiCl(A) + NaCl(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in several studies, determined by thermal analysis and visual-polythermal methods. Lamplough examined only dilute solutions of LiCl in NaCl. Some authors report a minimum and complete solid miscibility at the liquidus temperature, while others report a eutectic and intermediate compounds. Table 2 summarizes the reported minima and invariant points.

In addition, a few authors report, on the basis of small breaks in the liquidus curve, a LiCl homomorphic transition at $565\,^\circ C$, $x_B = 0.185$. There are no confirmatory reports by x-ray or other methods, and the existence of such a transformation has been doubted. This transformation is shown on the phase diagram in a authoritative compilation, although no phase transformation of LiCl is known.

Evidence for the existence of intermediate compounds is based on breaks in the liquidus curves in binary and ternary systems. Other methods were also used. X-ray analysis of cooled solid samples failed to detect compounds. Chesnokov et al. used DTA, x-ray, and crystallo-optical analyses, but reported only the $575\,^\circ C$ peritectic from thermal analysis. Smits et al. examined the NaCl + 2LiCl composition by x-ray and found no compounds. Akopov and Bergman, in addition to cooling curves, also performed heating experiments at selected compositions, and report breaks at 575 and $610\,^\circ C$, corresponding to two compounds. Thus, although the existence of compounds has been claimed to be established, there is a lack of independent confirming evidence. Finally, all reported liquidus at their lowest temperatures are flat (i.e., zero slope) rather than sharp (finite slope), indicating that the system has a minimum and not a eutectic. This is true even of those authors who claim a eutectic rather than a minimum.

Data defining the solidus were obtained by thermal analysis only and indicate continuous solid solution. The presence (but not the extent) of solid solution was confirmed by x-ray diffraction. The presence of appreciable solid solution is denied by some, but this statement does not take into account any more recent disconfirming evidence. Moreover, the limiting slopes of the liquidus indicate extensive solid solubility.

The consolute point for solid–solid miscibility has been reported as $314\,^\circ C$, $x_B = 0.35$ from cooling curves, and $x_B = 0.42$ from optical investigation of thin sections. $400\,^\circ C$ from heating curves and $500\,^\circ C$ from thermographic analysis.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid was obtained by Hersh and Kleppa by calorimetric solid–liquid mixing experiments at $740\,^\circ C$. Their results are used here:

$$H^E(1) = -4686\,x_A x_B \, J \, mol^{-1}. \quad (42)$$

In a preliminary calculation, Eq. (42) was used and the system was treated as having a eutectic and no solid solubility. The observed liquidus could not be satisfactorily reproduced. Subsequently, the system was treated as one with continuous solid solution at the liquidus temperature. A phase diagram was calculated with $G^E(1)$ assumed to be given by Eq. (42), and $G^E(s)$ given by Eq. (43).

![Graphical representation](Image)
both independent of temperature. The calculated liquidus is
within 6 °C of the experimental,64,67,68 except at \( T > 670 \) °C,
where the experimental liquidus themselves63,64,65-68 diverge
to some extent. In summary, the thermodynamic analysis
indicated that the assumption of eutectic and intermediate
compounds is inconsistent with the flatness of the liquidus at
its lowest temperature, and supports the existence of a mini-
mum.

The calculated minimum is 554 °C, \( x_B = 0.28 \). The cal-
culated consolute temperature for solid–solid demixing is
241 °C at \( x_B = 0.33 \). Since there is significant residual uncer-
tainty concerning the existence of compounds, and the ex-
tent of solid solubility, the solidus and solid miscibility gap,
as calculated, are less accurate than the calculated liquidus.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus
(Fig. 11): ± 10 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus
(Fig. 11): ± 25 °C.

\textbf{KCl(A) + LiCl(B)}

Data defining the liquidus obtained from thermal anal-
ysis in several investigations63,64,65-68,69 are in good agree-
ment. The spread in the measured liquidus temperatures is
essentially the same as the spread in the melting points of the
pure components as reported by the different investigators
(KCl, ± 13 °C, LiCl, ± 6 °C). The eutectic as reported, lies
in the range 348 to 361 °C at \( x_B = 0.58 \) to 0.595. Investiga-
tion of the limit of solid solubility by thermal analysis in the
earlier work65 indicated less than 5 mol % at either end; the
limiting liquidus slopes confirm this finding. The most recent
tabulated liquidus points are those of Murgulescu and Stern-
berg69, these agree well (within 10 °C) with points read off
the phase diagram of Aukrust et al.73

The activity of LiCl has been deduced from emf mea-
surements on the liquid at 64089 and 722 °C.90

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been reported by
two groups.84,91 Hersh and Klepp84 performed solid–liquid
mixing experiments at 740 °C, and since their work is more
detailed and covers a wider concentration range than that of
Markov et al.,85 their results are used here:

\[ H^E (1) = x_A x_B ( - 17570 - 377 x_B ) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

\[ (44) \]

Thermodynamic analysis using this excess enthalpy indicat-
ed that a eutectic temperature of 355 °C is most consist-
tent with a simple entropy function, and hence is to be prefered
over the low and high extremes reported. Two excess en-
tropy terms were calculated:

\[ S^E (1) = x_A x_B ( - 7.627 + 4.958 x_B ) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}, \]

\[ (45) \]
to give a calculated eutectic composition of \( x_B = 0.595 \). The
calculated liquidus is everywhere within 10 °C of those of the
most recent investigations.63,65,85

Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated diagram
(Fig. 12): ± 10 °C.

\textbf{LiCl(A) + RbCl(B)}

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in five
independent investigations.63,65,85,86,92 The methods used
were cooling curves,63,85,86 heating curves,86 and visual-poly-
termal.92 A summary of reported eutectics and perite-
tics is given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T/°C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>0.4225</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T/°C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of a peritectic is indicated by a pro-
nounced discontinuity in the liquidus curve of three stud-
ies.85,86,92 In the other studies, the liquidus data points were
not numerous enough in the region \( 0.4 < x_B < 0.5 \) to show
this. Richards and Meldrum85 assign the composition
LiCl-RbCl to the intermediate compound on the basis of
analogy with similar systems, but did no solid phase analysis.
Keitel86 studied thin solid sections optically, and deduced
1:1 stoichiometry. If Yasov et al.85 give no basis for this com-
position. Only very recently,93 has this 1:1 compound been
isolated and characterized by x-ray measurements.

Zhemohiunyi and Rambach85 observed a “eutectic”

\[ \text{Fig. 11. The system LiCl(A) + NaCl(B).} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 12. The system KCl(A) + LiCl(B).} \]

arrest over the range 0.22 < x_B < 0.96. The limiting liquidus slopes of four liquids\(^ {148,86,88,92}\) all indicate that the solid solubility at either end is probably smaller than these figures indicate, and so zero solid solubility was assumed in the present calculations.

The activity of LiCl in the liquid has been deduced from emf measurements at 652 °C.\(^ {90}\)

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by Hersh and Kleppa\(^ {84}\) at 740 °C by direct calorimetry; their result is used here:

\[ H^E (1) = x_A x_B (\frac{-17,866 - 4812 x_A}{3975 x_A x_B}) J \text{ mol}^{-1}. \] (46)

With the use of this excess enthalpy and the liquidus points of three studies,\(^ {85,86,88}\) two excess entropy coefficients were calculated.

\[ S^E (1) = x_A x_B (\frac{-7.352 - 6.725 x_B}{4.71}) J \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. \] (47)

The liquidus calculated with Eqs. (46) and (47) reproduced the experimental liquidus points\(^ {85,86,88}\) within 8 °C with few exceptions. The calculated eutectic is 313 °C, \( x_B = 0.422 \). The peritectic is similarly calculated to be 324 °C, \( x_B = 0.471 \), and the Gibbs energy of fusion of the compound 0.5 (LiCl-RbCl) is

\[ \Delta_{fg} G = 8128.9 - 13.575 T \text{ J/mol}. \] (48)

Probable maximum error in calculated liquidus (Fig. 13): ± 10 °C.

**CsCl(A) + LiCl(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in three studies.\(^ {85,95,96}\) The methods used were cooling curves with\(^ {85}\) and without\(^ {95}\) visual observation, and visual-polythermal.\(^ {96}\)

All three liquidus are reasonably concordant (within 10 °C) except in the range 0.25 < x_B < 0.5. In the most recent work\(^ {96}\) the liquidus is better defined over the entire composition range, and so Dergunov's\(^ {96}\) results were taken as reference for the present calculations. Apart from these three detailed reports of the liquidus, there have been a large number of later re-examinations of this system as a limiting edge of ternary phase diagrams. The reported invariant points are summarized in Table 3.

### Table 3. Reported invariant points of the system CsCl(A) + LiCl(B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CsCl polymorphic transition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390(?)</td>
<td>0.423(?)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440(?)</td>
<td>0.375(?)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peritectic near 380 °C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peritectic (s) below 380 °C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323(?)</td>
<td>0.515(?)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, a LiCl homomorphic transition at 565 °C, \( x_B = 0.875 \) has been claimed\(^ {94,101}\) based on small breaks in the liquidus curve. The existence of this transition has been doubted\(^ {1}\), and there is no confirming evidence.\(^ {81}\)

The composition of the intermediate compounds has been determined by Korrenz\(^ {95}\) from heating curves, microscopic study of solidified melts, and observed temperature arrests during cooling. The peritectic near 380 °C he identified as involving LiCl-2CsCl. Between 380 °C and the eutectic temperature he postulates two peritectics representing another crystalline form of LiCl-2CsCl and CsCl-LiCl. That there is at least one peritectic in this region is corroborated by the unmitigable liquidus discontinuity of Kitchard's and Meldrum\(^ {85}\) checked by repeated determinations with specially purified CsCl (mp 645 °C). In the present work, the eutectic, CsCl transformation and LiCl-2CsCl peritectic were included as well-established invariant points. Another peritectic for CsCl-LiCl was provisionally included, representing one of other possible invariants of this system. This peritectic is not part of the calculated diagram. It was assigned a temperature of 354 °C which is an average of the reported peritectic temperatures below 380 °C. The compound LiCl-CsCl has been isolated and characterized by x-ray diffraction.\(^ {103}\) Its melting point is not known accurately, and its Gibbs energy of fusion cannot be calculated with sufficient precision from the phase diagram. For these reasons, this compound is not part of the calculated phase diagram; its stoichiometry is indicated in Fig. 14, and a peritectic temperature of 354 °C, an average of the reported temperatures below 380 °C, has been assigned to it.

Korrenz\(^ {95}\) observed eutectic and peritectic arrests in the range 0.1 < x_B < 0.8 and found no indication of solid solubility. The limiting slopes of the liquidus curves at either...
end suggest negligible solid solubility. None was assumed in the present calculations, although there has been no recent study.

The activity of LiCl in the liquid has been deduced from emf measurements on the liquid at 622 °C. Burylev has performed vapor pressure measurements on the melt in the range 929–1148 °C.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 670 °C by Hersh and Kleppa by direct calorimetry. Their result is used here:

$$H^E (1) = x_A x_B ( - 19456 - 7448 x_B ) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (49)

On the basis of this excess enthalpy and the liquidus points of Dergunov, two excess entropy coefficients were calculated:

$$S^E (1) = x_A x_B ( - 20.541 + 3.285 x_B ) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (50)

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of the thermodynamic quantities of Eqs. (49) and (50). The calculated liquidus was everywhere within 10 °C of the experimental. The calculated invariant points are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>$x_B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L+EC</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+1:1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+2:1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Gibbs energy of fusion of the 2:1 intermediate compound 0.67 (CsCl) 0.33 (LiCl) was calculated to be

$$\Delta_{fus} G^f = 16340 - 24.519 T \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (51)

Probable maximum error in calculated diagram (Fig. 14): ± 10 °C.

**RCA(A)+NBC(B)**

The liquidus curve has been investigated many times by methods of cooling curves and temperature of first appearance of crystals. The reported minimum varies between 640 and 670 °C. Most of the values lie near the most recently reported value of 658 °C at $x_B \approx 0.50$. An exception is the work of Coleman and Lacy, showing 645 °C. However this work, performed with a hot-stage microscope, is based on a technique which may be inherently less accurate than thermal analysis.

Points on the solidus curve have been measured by means of thermal analysis, optical methods, crystal growth analysis, and conductivity. The solidus curves reported by these authors are in poor agreement.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 810 °C by direct calorimetry by Hersh and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

$$H^E (1) = x_A x_B ( - 2050 - 272 x_B ) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (52)

The limits of solid miscibility have been investigated in numerous studies. Most of the earlier work (before 1950) was done by thermal or optical analysis, and the results were not concordant. They indicated a consolute point near 400 °C. An exception is Nacken, who measured refractive indices of solidified melts, and who obtained 405 °C, $x_B = 0.65$. Later investigators used x-ray diffraction at room or higher temperatures. Their results are generally concordant within 25 °C over the entire concentration range. The consolute point lies in the range 490 to 502 °C, $x_B = 0.5$ to 0.7. Studies of the kinetics of decomposition of the mixed crystals showed that the approach to equilibrium is slow and may occur in several steps; thus the earlier work may have been in error because measurements were not taken at equilibrium.

The activity of NaCl in the liquid has been deduced from emf measurements by a number of authors covering a temperature range from the liquidus minimum to 885 °C. Activities have also been obtained by mass spectrometry from the liquidus minimum to 810 °C. The vapor pressure of the melt has been measured.

The enthalpy of formation of metastable solid solutions, annealed at high temperature and quenched to room temperature, has been measured calorimetrically. The results of these two studies agree within 200 J mol$^{-1}$.

A phase diagram was calculated, based upon Eq. (52) with $S^E (1) = 0$ for the liquid, and Eq. (53) for the solid phase:

$$G^E (s) = x_A x_B (14333 + 3278 x_B$$
$$+ 32.796 T - 5.593 T \ln T) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (53)

From Eq. (53) may be deduced other thermodynamic quantities for the solid state:

$$H^E (s) = x_A x_B (14333 + 3278 x_B$$
$$+ 5.593 T) \text{ J mol}^{-1},$$ \hspace{1cm} (54)

$$S^E (s) = x_A x_B (-27.203$$
$$+ 5.593 \ln T) \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1},$$ \hspace{1cm} (55)

$$C_p^E (s) = 5.593 x_A x_B J K^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (56)

Equation (53) was derived from the liquidus points of Pelton et al., the most recent miscibility gap data, and the enthalpy of formation of mixed crystals at room temperature. The calculated liquidus is everywhere with 5 °C of the experimental. The calculated solidus follows closely, but not exactly, the most recent experimental solidus. The calculated minimum is 657 °C, $x_B = 0.506$. The calculated
consolute point is 500 °C, \( x_B \approx 0.58 \), and the envelope is within 30 °C of the experimental.\(^ {124} \) Equation (54) reproduces the experimental heats of formation at 25 °C:\(^ {122} \) within 235 J mol\(^{-1} \).

**Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus** [Fig. 15(a)]: ± 5 °C.

**Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus** [Fig. 15(a)]: ± 15 °C.

**Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated consolute temperature** (Fig. 15b): ± 20 °C.

**NaCl(A) + RbCl(B)**

Data defining liquidus and solidus have been tabulated in four studies,\(^ {63, 88, 136, 137} \) obtained from cooling curves\(^ {63, 88, 136} \) supplemented by visual observation in two\(^ {63, 88} \) and from DTA.\(^ {137} \) The reported eutectic data may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/°C</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plotted liquidus points of Murgulescu and Sternberg\(^ {88} \) do not allow an unambiguous extrapolated eutectic composition. The later studies\(^ {88, 136, 137} \) show good agreement in reported melting points of the pure salts (within 2 °C), but Zhemehuzhnui and Rambach\(^ {63} \) report a NaCl melting point 20 °C higher than the other authors. All but one of the liquidus points of Murgulescu and Sternberg\(^ {88} \) fall on or near the curve reported by Pelton and Flenzas.\(^ {130} \) The phase diagram of the latest study\(^ {136} \) was therefore chosen as the most accurate to data.

The limits of solid solubility, from temperature arrests, were reported by Zhemehuzhnui and Rambach\(^ {63} \) as \( x_B = 0.02 \) and 0.95 at the eutectic temperature. These limits were also determined by the method of interdiffusion by Short and Roy,\(^ {138} \) who found \( x_B = 0.008 \) and 0.94 at 515 °C. Tsubuki et al.\(^ {139} \) used x-ray diffraction and say only that there is "negligible" solid solubility. The results from interdiffusion,\(^ {138} \) were taken as a guide for the present calculations.

The activity of NaCl in the liquid has been deduced from emf measurements\(^ {84} \) at 865 °C.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 810 °C by Hersh and Kleppa,\(^ {84} \) whose result is used here:

\[
H^E (I) = x_A x_B ( - 3222 - 335 x_A ) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \tag{57}
\]

Two solid solution Henry's coefficients, relative to the solid standard state, were calculated to reproduce the experimental solubilities\(^ {138} \) at 515 °C. For RbCl in NaCl, this was

\[
RT \ln \gamma_B = 31 027 \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \tag{58}
\]

and for NaCl in RbCl

\[
RT \ln \gamma_A = 18 325 \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \tag{59}
\]

The values of \( RT \ln \gamma \) were assumed to be independent of temperature.

The calculated liquidus, based on the excess enthalpy of Eq. (57) and an excess entropy given by

\[
S^E (I) = x_A x_B ( - 0.677 - 5.245 x_A ) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}, \tag{60}
\]

reproduced the experimental\(^ {136} \) eutectic exactly, and was everywhere within 2 °C of the reported\(^ {130} \) liquidus points. The calculated limits of solid solubility are \( x_B = 0.01 \) and 0.93 at the eutectic temperature (550 °C), while the values at 515 °C reproduce the experimental ones.\(^ {138} \)

**Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram** (Fig. 16): ± 5 °C.

**CsCl(A) + NaCl(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in three studies,\(^ {80, 80a, 80b} \) all of which used the cooling curve method.

The system was also examined briefly as a limiting edge of ternary and quaternary systems.\(^ {140-142} \) The reported eutectic data are summarized as follows:

In the earliest work, the reported melting point of NaCl is 19°C higher than the accepted value; also, Samuseva and Plyushchev show a NaCl liquidus with a point of inflection, which is absent in the other reports. For these reasons, the data of the more recent work were adopted for calculation purposes. Activities of NaCl in the liquid were deduced from emf measurements at 880°C. A eutectic halt was observed in the range NaCl = 0.01 to 0.99. This result, very low solid solubility, was confirmed by the limiting liquidus slopes of the phase diagram. By an indirect method, Fullam estimated that the solubility of NaCl in CsCl is less than 1 mol %.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by Hersh and Kleppa at 810°C by direct calorimetry, and their results are used here:

$$H^E (1) = x_\text{NaCl} x_\text{KCl} (4310 + 418 x_\text{KCl}) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$  

(61)

With this excess enthalpy, and the chosen phase diagram data, two excess entropy coefficients were calculated:

$$S^E (1) = x_\text{NaCl} x_\text{KCl} (-5.764 + 5.901 x_\text{KCl}) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}.$$  

(62)

A phase diagram, calculated with the liquid thermodynamic properties of Eqs. (61) and (62), reproduced all liquidus points within 6°C, and the eutectic was reproduced exactly.

The cesium chloride solid-state transformation temperature was observed from 100% CsCl to 1% CsCl without significant change, although the experimental transformation temperature of the pure salt (455°C) is much lower than the accepted value (470°C). Weyand has found that equilibrium thermal hysteresis occurs over a 20 to 50°C range in pure CsCl, an effect which was not noted in earlier work. Fullam measured the transformation temperature in the interval 0° < x_\text{KCl} < 0.96 by two independent techniques (DTA and thermal expansion). The transformation temperature is 466 ± 2°C in the interval 0.01 < x_\text{KCl} < 0.96. In the interval between 0% and 1% NaCl, the temperature is depressed from 474°C (Fullam's value for pure CsCl) to 466°C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 17): ±10°C.

For this system there exist tabulated data for the liquidus and solidus, and for the liquidus only. Both studies used the method of cooling curves for the liquidus and solidus. Phase diagrams have been given for both phase boundaries, and for the liquidus only. All investigations report a continuous solid solution at the liquidus temperature. Of the four reported liquidus, that of Zhuchuzhnyi and Rambach lies highest (with a high KCl melting point of 790°C) and that of Keitel lies lowest (with a liquidus minimum of 715°C). The others fall between these two. In those cases where both liquidus and solidus are reported, the phase boundaries are particularly far apart (up to 15°C). This behavior is improbable and may be in error. For these reasons, the liquidus reported by Dombrovskaya read off the published diagram was used as a guide to the present calculations. X-ray diffraction measurements on the melt cooled to room temperature all indicate a single phase.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by Hersh and Kleppa at 810°C by direct calorimetry, and their results are used here:

$$H^E (1) = 84 x_\text{NaCl} x_\text{KCl} \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$  

(63)

On the assumption that $G^E (1)$ is given by Eq. (63), independent of temperature, and that the solid solution follows regular solution behavior, a phase diagram was calculated using a $G^E (s)$ given by

$$G^E (s) = 1500 x_\text{NaCl} x_\text{KCl} \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$  

(64)

The calculated liquidus shows the same shape as the adopted reference liquidus, with allowance for the difference in melting point of RbCl. The solidus is everywhere within 5°C of the liquidus, and there is no minimum. In agreement with experiment, the calculated consolute point for solid–solid separation is below room temperature (-184°C).
Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 18): ± 10°C.

CsCl(A) + KCl(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in five studies, 83, 86, 151-153 in all of which thermal analysis was used. All report complete solid solubility at the liquidus temperature. Data for the minimum may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T 'C</th>
<th>xB</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most extensive study is the oldest, 89 but the reported KCl melting point is 20°C higher than the accepted value. Keitei's 86 melting point of CsCl is 15°C below the accepted value. The reported liquidus curves 83, 84, 151-153 differ by as much as 20°C from each other. For these reasons, and also since the later work 152, 153 includes only sparse data points, Dombrovsky's 151 liquidus was chosen as a guide for present calculations. The melting points of the pure components in the chosen work 151 agreed well with the accepted values. Points at 0.1-mole fraction intervals were read off the smooth curve of the published phase diagram. 153

Data for the solidus have been observed from the temperature of completed crystallization. 83, 86 The data of the two studies agreed within 15°C. The data of Ref. 63 are shown on the diagram because they are more numerous, and because they are probably more accurate in the region of the minimum.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 810°C by Hersh and Kleppa, 84 and their results are used here:

\[ H^E (1) = 795x_Ax_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (65)

A phase diagram was calculated, based upon a \( G^E (1) \) given by Eq. (65), independent of temperature, and a \( G^E (s) \) given by Eq. (66):

\[ G^E (s) = x_Ax_B(5957 + 6044x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (66)

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 19): ± 15°C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus (Fig. 19): ± 20°C.

CsCl(A) + RbCl(B)

Data for the liquidus and solidus of this system have been tabulated in three studies, 83, 160 obtained from cooling curves in all cases. All three report an unbroken series of solid solutions. The melting point of RbCl as reported by 83 is 6°C higher than the accepted value, while that reported by Ref. 162 is 5°C lower. For both liquidus and solidus, the data points of the three studies differ by as much as 10°C. A temperature minimum is indicated on the CsCl side) in two reports 83, 160 but none in the third. 86 The existence of a minimum is problematical, since Keitei 86 reports a CsCl melting point 13°C below the other investigators, and Wood et al. 162 show a minimum for which liquidus and solidus are separated by 9°C, which is an impossible construction. All three reports show a liquidus—solidus separation of up to 10°C, which in comparison with other systems of this type, is improbable. In view of these uncertainties, it was decided to take the liquidus of Wood et al. 162 as a guide for present calculations.

Fig. 18. The system KCl(A) + RbCl(B).

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 810 °C by direct calorimetry by Hersh and Kleppa, whose result is used here.

\[ H^E (1) = 335x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(67)

On the assumption that both liquid and solid solutions are regular, and that the excess Gibbs energy of both phases is independent of temperature, a phase diagram was calculated in which \( G^E (s) \) is given by Eq. (67) and \( G^E (l) \) by Eq. (68):

\[ G^E (s) = 2500x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(68)

The calculated phase diagram, as shown in Fig. 20, has a shallow minimum, but the existence of this minimum cannot be taken as established. It is sensitive to the solid solution thermodynamic parameter in Eq. (68), and as mentioned earlier, the experimental diagrams are ambiguous in this respect.

The cesium chloride transition temperature in this system has been studied by thermal analysis and by x-ray diffraction above room temperature. Arends et al., used ionic conductivity. All investigators indicate that the transformation temperature is depressed by RbCl, but the extent of lowering differs in these studies. At \( x_B = 0.14 \), the reported temperatures are 425, 375, 310, and 260 °C. Part of this difference may be due to the presence of a large thermal hysteresis effect of 20 to 30 °C, which is increased by the addition of RbCl. The enthalpy of formation of solid solution at room temperature has been measured calorimetrically. The solid state at room temperature has also been examined by x-ray diffraction, and the two-phase miscibility limits have been determined from the aqueous solubility isotherm and radioactive tracer analysis. Makarov and Vlasov estimated the excess Gibbs energy in the miscible regions of solid solutions at room temperature from the activity coefficients of the salts in saturated and unsaturated aqueous solutions, with the use of the McKay-Peery method.229

The CsCl transformation temperature curve was calculated on the basis of a \( G^E (s) \) given by Eq. (68) for the CsCl + RbCl region, and zero solid solubility of RbCl in CsCl. The curve shown in the figure, is suggestive only. Its slope depends on the factors already mentioned, and also on the assumed enthalpy of transition, here taken as 3766 J mol\(^{-1}\); the experimental values lie however in the range 2.4 to 7.5 kJ mol\(^{-1}\). In any case, Weyand reports appreciable solubility of RbCl in CsCl, as well as a solid-solid miscibility gap in the \( \beta \)-phase with a consolute temperature of about 470 °C. The consolute temperature for the \( \beta \)-phase calculated from Eq. (68) is \(-123 °C\). The result of Weyand is thus very doubtful.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 20): \( \pm 10 °C \).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus (Fig. 20): \( \pm 15 °C \).

c. Bromides

LBr(A) + NaBr(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two studies, first by cooling curves and the second by the visual-polythermal method. There is confusion in accounts of this system, as to whether it is one with continuous solid solutions, or whether it is one of the eutectic type with intermediate compounds. The limiting slopes of the experimental liquidus indicate extensive solid solubility at both extremes. The reported minimum and invariant points are summarized in Table 4.

Data defining the solidus have been tabulated in the oldest study, found from the temperature of complete crystallization. The same method was used in a later study (Ref. 173, data not tabulated). Kellner used microscopic examination of thin sections, and Bogaenko et al., used x-ray diffraction on cooled solid samples. Both groups concluded that there was continuous solid solution at high temperature. Kellner reported the solid solutions to be stable down to room temperature, but suggested this was due to supercooling. Bogaenko et al. found that the solid solutions had demixed at room temperature. Confirmatory x-ray evidence for continuous solid solutions was presented in a later report. Tamman and Ruppel observed turbidity and transfluence of solidified melts during slow cooling and heating. The change in optical properties took place over a considerable temperature range at a given composition, but approximate co-ordinates of the consolute point may be deduced from their data: \( x_B = 0.4, 155 \) to 265 °C. The bound-

![Fig. 20. The system CsCl(A) + RbCl(B).](image-url)
ary of the demixing region has been better defined by the x-ray diffraction measurements of Oonk et al. Their measurements cover the temperature range 80–229 °C; they quote a consolute temperature of 240 °C.

In summary, those investigators who attempted to determine the solidus found complete solid solubility. Some who determined the liquidus found breaks which suggested peritectics, but there is no other confirmatory evidence to date for intermediate compounds. The phase diagram presented in the latest work shows a liquidus with sharp minimum and two breaks, but coupled to a smooth solidus representing continuous solid solution. This is an impossible construction. It was decided, for the present study, that it would be reasonable to treat the system as one of continuous solid solution at high temperature.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 690 °C in solid–liquid calorimetric mixing experiments by Hersh and Kleppa, and their result is used here:

\[ H^E (l) = x_A x_B [ -2971 - 586x_A ] \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(69)

A phase diagram was calculated, based on an excess Gibbs energy of the liquid given by Eq. (69), and of the solid by Eq. (70):

\[ G^E (s) = x_A x_B [9617 - 1.374T] + x_B [2150 - 4.6627T] \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

Hence (1) was assumed to be independent of temperature. The calculated liquidus closely follows the experimental liquidus points of Ref. (68) on the NaBr side of the minimum and lies between the values of Ref. 68 and Ref. 170 on the LiBr side. The calculated minimum is 510 °C, \( x_B = 0.26 \). The calculated solidus–liquidus separation is greater than that shown in experiment and cannot be taken as veridical. The calculated consolute point for solid demixing is 246 °C; both this datum and the calculated solid–solid phase boundary agree well with experiment.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus [Fig. 21(a)]: ± 15 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus [Fig. 21(a)]: ± 40 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated consolute temperature (Fig. 21(b)): ± 20 °C.

**KBr(A)+LiBr(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been reported in four independent studies. Only in the oldest work has there tabulated data. The investigation of Aukrust et al. appears to be the most carefully done; data points, read off their published diagram were used in the present calculations. Kellner obtained heating and cooling curves, and Aukrust et al. performed cooling curve experiments. The following is a summary of the reported eutectic data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T / ^\circ C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kellner observed a eutectic arrest in the range 0.05 < \( x_B < 0.95 \), and Aukrust et al. used a radioactive tracer technique for detecting solid solubility. The later work revealed no solid solubility, within experimental error. The limiting slopes of the experimental liquidus confirm this finding.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 745 °C by Hersh and Kleppa, whose result is used here:
\[ H^E (1) = x_A x_B \left( -13\,222 - 1757x_B \right) - 1967x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(71)

With the use of this excess enthalpy, two excess entropy coefficients were calculated:

\[ S^E (1) = x_A x_B \left( 0.378 - 3.638x_B \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}, \]  

(72)

which enabled the experimental diagram to be reproduced within 5° over the entire composition range. The eutectic, 328 °C and \( x_B = 0.60 \), is reproduced exactly.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 22): \( \pm 5 \text{ °C} \).

\[ \text{LiBr(A) + RbBr(B)} \]

Data defining the liquidus have been reported in two studies, both obtained by thermal analysis. The earlier data were tabulated but the later were not, so they were read off the published diagram. The melting points of the pure components as reported in the earlier work are both much lower than accepted values (LiBr, by 23 °C; RbBr, by 14 °C). The two reported liquidus curves differ by as much as 48 °C, although the invariant points reported in these two studies are in good agreement. Other determinations of the invariant points are not in good agreement with respect to temperature, as seen in Table 5.

In neither work were second temperature arrests recorded outside the range \( 0.2 < x_B < 0.7 \), so that solid solubility limits are experimentally undefined. On the LiBr side, the limiting liquidus slopes of both studies suggest no or very little solid solubility, and none was assumed in the present calculations. On the RbBr side, the liquidus points of Flor et al. are all consistently above those of Gromakov and Gromakova. The pronounced curvature of the liquidus of Ref. 184 suggests the presence of solid solubility. Since, however, the reported invariant points of the two studies are in remarkably good agreement, the assumption of significant solid solubility cannot be justified on these considerations alone. Consequently, zero solid solubility was assumed at the RbBr side also.

There are no independent determinations of the stoichiometry of the compound, which is assumed in the literature to be 1:1. This stoichiometry was nominally assumed in the present calculations.

<p>| Table 5. Reported invariant points of the system LiBr(A) + RbBr(B) |
|-----------------|--------|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T/°C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eutectic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peritectic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at \( 700 °C \) by Hersh and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

\[ H^E (1) = x_A x_B \left( -16\,067 - 4018x_A \right) - 4686x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(73)

A phase diagram was calculated, based on the \( H^E (1) \) of Eq. (73), assumed independent of temperature. The calculated invariant points are the following: eutectic, 260 °C, \( x_B = 0.411 \); peritectic, 272 °C, \( x_B = 0.453 \). The calculated liquidus follows the experimental points closely on the LiBr side. On the RbBr side the calculated liquidus is closer to the points of Ref. 70, suggesting that on this side of the diagram, the results of Flor et al. may be in error.

The calculated Gibbs energy of fusion of the compound, of nominal 1:1 stoichiometry 0.5(LiBr-RbBr), is

\[ \Delta_{\text{fus}} G^\circ = 10\,176 - 18.550 T \text{ J/mol.} \]  

(74)

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 23): \( \pm 30 °C \).

\[ \text{CsBr(A) + LiBr(B)} \]

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two studies by thermal analysis and visual-polythermal methods, respectively. In both investigations there is a definite break in the liquidus indicating a peritectic ascribed to the 1:1 compound, although there is no independent confirmation of this stoichiometry. A summary of the reported invariant points is as follows:
Eutectic and peritectic halts were observed in the earlier work\textsuperscript{187} in the range 0.05 < \( x_B \) < 0.95, indicating little, if any, solid solubility. The limiting slopes of the liquidus\textsuperscript{97,187} at either end suggest no solid solubility, and hence none was assumed in the present calculations.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 700 °C by Hersh and Kleppa,\textsuperscript{84} whose result is used here:

\[
H^E (l) = x_A x_B \left( -18661 - 6485x_A - 3891x_A x_B \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\] 

(75)

Three excess entropy coefficients were calculated, based on all the liquidus points of \( H^E \) of yaoz et al.,\textsuperscript{97} on those of Plyushechev and Samuseva\textsuperscript{187} in the range 0 < \( x_B \) < 0.3 and Eq. (75):

\[
S^E (l) = x_A x_B \left( -15.171 + 7.010x_B + 15.051x_B^2 \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}.
\] 

(76)

A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eqs. (75) and (76). The calculated liquidus lies within 8 °C of the experimental,\textsuperscript{97} except near the LiBr extreme, where the difference between the reported data points of Refs. 97 and 187 diverge somewhat. The calculated invariant points are the following: eutectic 274 °C, \( x_B = 0.613 \); peritectic 311 °C, \( x_B = 0.510 \). The calculated Gibbs energy of fusion of the intermediate compound, of nominal 1:1 stoichiometry 0.5 (LiBr·CsBr), is

\[
\Delta_{fus} G^* = 11559 - 19.802 T \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\] 

(77)

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 24): ± 15 °C.

\textbf{KBr(A) + NaBr(B)}

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in three studies,\textsuperscript{50,189} obtained from cooling curves\textsuperscript{50,189} and the visual-polythermal method.\textsuperscript{51} The reported melting points of pure components in the earliest work\textsuperscript{50} are much higher than accepted values; those in the later work\textsuperscript{51,189} are closer to the accepted. The liquidus of Ref. 51 lies consistently lower than those of Refs. 50 and 189. A summary of the reported values for the minimum is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T / °C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>191,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points defining the solidus were obtained in one study only\textsuperscript{189} from cooling curves. All three investigations\textsuperscript{50,51,189} indicated continuous solid solutions at the liquidus temperature.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry in two laboratories\textsuperscript{93,84} at 860 and 770 °C, respectively. The results agree within 65 J mol\(^{-1}\), but since the data of Hersh and Kleppa are both more numerous and cover a wider composition range, they are used here:

\[
H^E (l) - x_A x_B \left( -2134 - 251x_B \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\] 

(78)

The activity of NaBr in the liquid at 800 °C has been deduced from emf measurements.\textsuperscript{105} The solid–solid miscibility gap has been investigated in two studies.\textsuperscript{175,194} In the earlier work\textsuperscript{175} the optical transmission was followed during heating and cooling; the other used x-ray diffraction. In the optical experiments, changes in transmission occurred over a wide temperature range (150–200 °C) at a given composition, and so the curve cannot be located precisely from these data. It is significant, however, that the highest temperature reported in this work was 395 °C at \( x_B = 0.5 \). The x-ray method\textsuperscript{194} yielded a consolute point of 395 °C, \( x_B = 0.65 \).

The heat of formation of solid solutions, formed at high temperature and quenched to 25 °C, has been measured calorimetrically.\textsuperscript{126} A phase diagram was calculated, based on the excess enthalpy of the liquid (assumed independent of temperature) given by Eq. (78), the liquidus of Bellanca,\textsuperscript{189} the heats of formation of solid solution at 25 °C\textsuperscript{126} and the assumption that the solid solution is regular over the experimental temperature range. The expression for the excess Gibbs energy of the solid is

\[
G^E (s) = x_A x_B \left( 11004 + 78.782 T \right. \\
- 12.0887 \ln T) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\] 

(79)

Other thermodynamic properties may be deduced from Eq. (79):

\[
H^E (s) = x_A x_B \left( 11004 + 12.0887 \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1},
\] 

(80)

\[
S^E (s) = x_A x_B \left( -66.694 + 12.088 \ln T \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1},
\] 

(81)

\[
C_p^E (s) = 12.088 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}.
\] 

(82)

The calculated minimum is 644 °C, \( x_B = 0.49 \), and Bellanca's liquidus is reproduced within 5 °C (one point is anomalous). The calculated consolute point for solid miscibility is 394 °C, \( x_B = 0.48 \). The experimental\textsuperscript{126} heats of formation of solid solution at 25 °C are reproduced within an r.m.s. deviation.
of 175 J mol\(^{-1}\). The miscibility gap envelope, as calculated, is symmetrical rather than skewed, as reported in one study.\(^{194}\) Thermodynamic analysis revealed that the solid solution is regular both at the liquidus temperature and at 25 °C; it was assumed, as a reasonable approximation, that it is also regular at intermediate temperatures, e.g., in the region of the consolute point. The earlier determination of the envelope,\(^{195}\) though apparently less precise, suggests that the envelope is more symmetrical than skewed.

**Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated liquidus**

(Fig. 25): ± 10 °C.

**Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated solidus**

(Fig. 25): ± 20 °C.

**Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated consolute temperature**

(Fig. 25): ± 30 °C.

**NaBr(A) + RbBr(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two reports,\(^{70,196}\) both obtained from thermal analysis. The liquidus of these two studies agree within 10 °C. The reported pure component melting points in both studies differ from accepted values (NaBr, 7 °C high; RbBr, 14 °C low). A summary of reported eutectic coordinates is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/°C</th>
<th>x_A</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samuseva and Plyushchev\(^{196}\) observed the eutectic temperature arrest in the interval 0.05 < x_A < 0.95. The limiting slopes of the experimental liquidus\(^{70,196}\) do not indicate appreciable solid solubility, and none was assumed in the present calculations.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been determined by direct calorimetry at 770 °C by Hersh and Kleppa,\(^{84}\) and their result is used here:

\[ H^E(l) = x_A x_B ( - 3452 - 460 x_A ) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eq. (84) representing the excess Gibbs energy of the liquid, independent of temperature. The calculated eutectic is 466 °C, x_B = 0.413, which is intermediate between the two experimental results.\(^{199,201}\)

**Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram**

(Fig. 27): ± 20 °C.

**KBr(A) + RbBr(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two studies,\(^{70,204}\) by thermal analysis\(^{70}\) and the visual-polythermal method.\(^{204}\) A shallow minimum near the RbBr extreme was found in both cases. The following is a summary of the

![Fig. 25: The system KBr(A) + NaBr(B).](image1)

![Fig. 26: The system NaBr(A) + RbBr(B).](image2)
reported data for the minimum and authors' melting points for RbBr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T /°C</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>mp RbBr /°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>0.6-0.95</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no reported determinations of the solids.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 770 °C by Hersh and Kleppa, whose result is used here.

\[ H^E(1) = 0. \] (85)

Solid solutions have been examined at 25 °C by x-ray diffraction at the 1:1 composition and over the entire composition range, and both studies indicate complete solid solubility at this temperature.

A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eq. (85) and the assumption that the solid is regular. The calculated diagram shown in the figure was derived with the use of Eq. (86) in order to reproduce the shape of the reported liquidus:

\[ G^E(s) = 2000x_Ax_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \] (86)

The calculated minimum is 689 °C, \( x_B = 0.76 \). The minimum is very shallow and close to the RbBr extreme, for whose melting point reported values differ significantly. For this reason the depth and position of the minimum cannot be determined with more precision than the discrepancy in the RbBr melting point. The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is \(-153 °C\), which is consistent with experiment.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 28): \( ± 15 °C \).

**CsBr(A) + KBr(B)**

Data defining the liquids have been tabulated in two studies from thermal analysis and visual-polythermal methods, respectively. Points on the solids also were determined by Plyushch and Samuseva by thermal analysis. All investigators describe this system as one with a minimum liquidus temperature and continuous solid solution. Data for the minimum liquidus temperature are summarized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T /°C</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>~0.4</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Ref. 187 the liquidus and solidus are reported to be 11 °C apart at the minimum, which is an impossible construction. The liquidus data of Ref. 207 are less scattered than those of Ref. 187 at the minimum, but the corresponding minimum temperatures are 11 °C apart.

A third temperature arrest was observed at 356 ± 6 °C over the composition range 0.05 < \( x_B < 0.97 \). This temperature arrest is ascribed to demixing of solid solutions. This ascription is unlikely to be correct, since the phase envelope is essentially isothermal over most of the composition range. These authors also examined solid solutions at room temperature by x-ray diffraction, and observed only pure components. Bokarev and Parshkov performed DTA and x-ray studies on the solid at the 1:1 composition. They conclude that solid solutions based on CsBr undergo a phase transformation similar to CsCl. There is, however, no evidence for a phase transition of CsBr itself. The solid state of this system has thus not well characterized from experiment.

It has been pointed out only very recently that solid CsBr and KBr have different crystal structures in the temperature range of the phase diagram (KBr, Pm3m and CsBr, Pm3m). This implies that there should be a region of solid-solid immiscibility, since the transition temperature at 1 atm of KBr has not been observed, and that of CsBr is estimated to be above the melting point. For calculating the phase diagram therefore, it was decided to treat the system as having a eutectic and two solid phases. The CsBr-based (\( \alpha \)) solid phase is treated as a Henrian solution. The KBr-based (\( \beta \)) solid phase is treated as a regular solution, with the use of the following expression for the Gibbs energy of the hypothetical Pm3m → Pm3m transition of CsBr:

\[ \Delta G_u = 4483 - 3.897T \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \] (87)

This expression incorporates the extrapolated transforma-
tion temperature of 880 °C. The enthalpy of transition, 4483 J mol⁻¹, was obtained by the present authors in the evaluation of the CsCl-CsBr system (see section on this system).

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 770 °C by direct calorimetry by Hersh and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

\[ H^E(l) = 377x_Ax_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (88)

For the α-solid phase, a Henrian activity coefficient for KBr in CsBr at the eutectic temperature given by

\[ RT \ln \gamma_n = 8000 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (89)

was used. For the β-phase, the expression:

\[ G^E(s, \beta) = 9000x_Ax_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (90)

was used. Both quantities were assumed independent of temperature. The phase diagram, calculated with Eqs. (87)-(90), shows a calculated eutectic at 571 °C, \( x_B = 0.400 \). The calculated limits of solid solubility at the eutectic temperature are \( x_B = 0.228 \) and 0.591. The calculated eutectic temperature is closer to the low minimum observed temperature than to the high temperature. The calculated limits of solid solubility are suggestive only, and were chosen to approximate the observed solidus points in the range 0.2 < \( x_B < 0.6 \). The calculated solidus and solid–solid phase boundary are to be regarded as tentative only, since the question of the location of the solid miscibility gap and the existence of two solid phases has not been resolved.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 29): ± 10 °C.

CsBr(A) + RbBr(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two studies with the use of thermal analysis and visual-polythermal methods, respectively. Thermal analysis (heating curves) was also used to obtain data for the solidus. The system is described by all investigators as having a eutectic and two solid phases. The CsBr-based (α) phase is treated as a Henrian solution. The RbBr-based (β) phase is treated as a regular solution, with the use of the following expression for the Gibbs energy of the hypothetical Pm3m → Pm3m transition of CsBr:

\[ \Delta_{\text{m}} G = 4483 - 3.897T \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (91)

This expression incorporates the extrapolated transformation temperature of 880 °C. The enthalpy of transition, 4483 J mol⁻¹, was obtained by the present authors in the analysis of the CsCl-CsBr system (see section on this system).

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 710 °C by Hersh and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

\[ H^E(l) = 230x_Ax_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (92)

For the calculation of the phase diagram, the Henrian activity coefficient of RbBr in CsBr (α-phase) at the eutectic temperature, relative to the solid standard state, is

\[ RT \ln \gamma_n = 3000 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (93)

here assumed to be temperature independent. For the β-phase, the expression

\[ \Delta_{\text{m}} G = 4483 - 3.897T \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]
was used, also assumed to be temperature independent. A phase

diagram was calculated with the use of Eqs. (91)–
(94). The calculated eutectic is 615 °C, \( x_B = 0.37 \), and the calculated limits of solid solubility at this temperature are \( x_B = 0.32 \) and 0.46. The calculated eutectic temperature is nearer the high observed “minimum” temperature\(^{206,211}\) rather than the low\(^{187,209,210}\). The calculated liquidus however, is close to the observed\(^{187,208}\) in the RbBr-rich region, where both studies\(^{187,208}\) are in better agreement with each other. Since the uncertainty in the nature of the solid state of this system is unresolved at present, the solid phase boundaries are suggestive only.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 30): \( \pm 20^\circ \mathrm{C} \).

**d. iodides**

**LiI(A) + NaI(B)**

There is one report of this system,\(^{213}\) in which liquidus points were determined from thermal analysis. The system is stated\(^{213}\) to be one with continuous solid solution at liquidus temperature, with a minimum at 430 °C, \( x_B = 0.1 \). The reported experimental melting points of LiI and NaI are 23 and 18 °C, respectively, lower than accepted values, and the authors give no details of the purity of the iodides or of the ambient atmosphere of the melt during the experiments. The liquidus points, read off the published phase diagram, were used only as a guide for the present calculations. There are no reported measurements of the solidus.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by Melnichak and Kleppa\(^{144}\) at 740 °C by direct calorimetry, and their result is used here:

\[
H^E(I) = x_A x_B (-3895 - 540x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \tag{95}
\]

A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eqs. (95) and (96)

\[
G^E(s) = 4000x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \tag{96}
\]

both quantities assumed to be independent of temperature. The calculated minimum is 450 °C, \( x_B = 0.207 \). The calculated liquidus follows but is not coincident with the experimental.\(^{213}\) Because the reported pure component melting points are significantly lower than accepted values, there is a corresponding irreducible uncertainty in the liquidus. The calculated solidus is suggestive only. From Eq. (96) it may be calculated that equilibrium solid–solid demixing occurs only below room temperature.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 31): \( \pm 15^\circ \mathrm{C} \).

**Kl(A) + LiI(B)**

Liquidus points of this system have been reported,\(^{215–217}\) obtained from cooling curves\(^{215,217}\) and the visualpolythermal method.\(^{216}\) Only in Refs. 216 and 217 are the data tabulated. A summary of the results is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T/°\mathrm{C} )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a discrepancy of 25 °C in the eutectic temperature. The reported Kl melting point of Ref. 216 is 20 °C higher than the accepted value; the reported LiI melting points\(^{215,216}\) are, respectively, 17 and 24 °C lower. All three groups\(^{215–217}\) attest to the difficulty of preparing sufficiently pure anhydrous LiI from the trihydrate. The most careful preparation was done by Sridhar et al.\(^{217}\) by dehydration in vacuo in stages of increasing temperature over a two week period. The salt was tested for dryness by addition of molten lithium; no gas evolution was observed. The salt itself was dissolved in water, the pH of which did not change, indicating the absence of LiOH or LiOAc. The cooling curve experiments were performed in a helium atmosphere. In view of the precautions taken in this work,\(^{217}\) these results, although confined to the composition interval 0.575 \( x_B \) < 0.7, were chosen as the basis of the present calculations.

Eutectic arrests were observed in two studies,\(^{215,217}\) the first covering a wider composition range 0.078 < \( x_B \) < 0.9. The limiting liquidus slopes at both extremes suggest that there is negligible solid solubility, and none was assumed here.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 740 °C by Melnichak and Kleppa,\(^{214}\) whose result is used here:

\[
H^E(I) = x_A x_B (-11393 - 2824x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \tag{97}
\]

**Fig. 30.** The system CsBr (A) + RbBr (B).

**Fig. 31.** The system LiI (A) + NaI (B).
A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eq. (97) together with a small entropy term:

$$S^E(1) = x_A x_B \left( -0.548 - 5.459 x_B \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. \quad (98)$$

The calculated eutectic is 285 °C, $x_B = 0.633$. This reproduces the chosen values\(^{217}\) and the calculated liquidus falls within 5 °C of the experimental\(^{217}\).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 32): ± 25 °C.

\[\text{LiI(A)} + \text{RbI(B)}\]

Data defining the liquidus have been reported in one study,\(^{217}\) from cooling curves. The data cover only a restricted range of compositions (0.28 < $x_B < 0.47$). The authors report a eutectic at 252 °C, $x_B < 0.38$ and a peritectic at 260 °C, $x_B = 0.4385$. A 1:1 stoichiometry for the compound is assumed\(^{217}\) but is not verified; there are no other determinations.

The extent of solid solubility in this system, if any, is unknown. Structurally, this resembles the other analogous halide systems LiF–RbF, LiCl–RbCl, and LiBr–RbBr. In none of these cases are there experimental data defining solid solubility; although the limiting liquidus slopes in these systems do not indicate extensive solubility. In the present case, there are not sufficient liquidus data for a comparison of limiting slopes. In common with the thermodynamic treatment of the fluoride, chloride, and bromide systems, no solid solubility is assumed in the present calculations.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 740 °C by Melnichak and Kleppa,\(^{214}\) whose result is used here:

$$H^E(1) = x_A x_B \left( - 15385 - 4351 x_A \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (99)$$

With the use of Eq. (99), two excess entropy coefficients were calculated:

$$S^E(1) = x_A x_B \left( - 7.188 + 12.507 x_B \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. \quad (100)$$

The calculated eutectic is 251 °C, $x_B = 0.375$ and peritectic 259 °C, $x_B = 0.430$. The calculated liquidus is within 10 °C of the experimental points.\(^{217}\) The calculated Gibbs energy of fusion of the compound, of nominal 1:1 stoichiometry 0.5(LiI–RbI), is

$$\Delta_{\text{fus}} G^\circ = 20168 - 37.643 T \text{ J/mol.} \quad (101)$$

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 33): ± 30 °C.

\[\text{CsI(A)} + \text{LiI(B)}\]

There are no reports on the phase diagram of this system. The excess enthalpy of the liquid has, however, been measured at 740 °C by direct calorimetry\(^{214}\) and the result

$$H^E(1) = x_A x_B \left( - 17364 - 7623 x_B \right) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (102)$$

is used here to construct a tentative phase diagram.

It is useful for this purpose to compare this system with other related phase diagrams in the same series. One such series is CsF–LiF, CsCl–LiCl, CsBr–LiBr, and CsI–LiI. Another is CsI–LiI, RbI–LiI, and CsI–NaI. Apart from the present system, all have been critically evaluated from experimental data. All are eutectic systems, with or without a peritectic. Although the limits of solid solubility have not been determined experimentally, in all cases the limiting liquidus slopes do not indicate significant solubility. Thus for the present system, as a first approximation, it is reasonable to use Eq. (102) together with the assumption of zero solid solubility and the presence of a eutectic. From the thermodynamic analysis of the series of systems, it is probable that the excess entropy of the liquid in this system, while nonzero, is small and negative. In the absence of experimental phase diagram data, a numerical assignment cannot be made and a reasonable assumption is

$$S^E(1) = 0. \quad (103)$$

The compound 2CsI–3LiI has been isolated and its crystal structure determined by x-ray diffraction measurements.\(^{218}\)

A phase diagram, calculated with the aid of Eqs. (102) and (103) and the assumptions indicated above, is shown in the figure. The calculated eutectic is 217 °C, $x_B = 0.66$. This eutectic temperature is consistent with those in the related systems:

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 34): ± 50 °C.

![Fig. 32. The system KI(A) + LiI(B).](image1)

![Fig. 33. The system LiI(A) + RbI(B).](image2)
PHASE DIAGRAMS AND THERMODYNAMICS OF BINARY ALKALI HALIDES

Equation (105) was based on the liquidus points of Refs. 219 and 220, the solid miscibility gap data of Ref. 123 and the heats of formation of solid solutions at 25 °C, Ref. 126. Other properties of the solid may be deduced from Eq. (105):

\[ H_E^f(s) = x_A x_B (10.014 + 3073 x_B) \]
\[ -1.8317 J \text{ mol}^{-1} \]  

\[ S_E^f(s) = x_A x_B (16.372 - 1.831 \ln T) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \]  

\[ C_p^f(s) = -1.831 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \]  

The calculated liquidus minimum temperature is 350 °C at \( x_B = 0.585 \), and the calculated liquidus lies within 5 °C of the experimental.219,220 The calculated solute point for solid demixing is 240 °C, \( x_B = 0.60 \). The calculated envelope follows the experimental curve within 10 °C on the NaI side, but less closely on the KI side. Equation (106) reproduces the experimental enthalpy of formation at 25 °C, Ref. 126, within 300 J mol\(^{-1}\).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 35): ± 10 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated consolute temperature (Fig. 35): ± 25 °C.

\[ \text{Kl(A) + NaI(B)} \]

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two independent studies, Ref. 50 and Refs. 219 and 220, from cooling curves and visual-polynothermal methods, respectively. The system is one with continuous solid solutions at the liquidus temperature, and data for the minimum liquidus temperature are summarized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T^\circ C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>219,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~585</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no measurements of the solidus.

The reported melting point of KI in Ref. 30 is 12 °C higher than the accepted value, while that of NaI in Refs. 219 and 220 is 7 °C lower. The later work219,220 was chosen as a guide for the present calculations.

Data defining the solid miscibility gap are found in two reports,123,175 obtained by optical transmission and x-ray diffraction methods, respectively. The later study123 reports the consolute point as 240 °C, \( x_B = 0.62 \). The results of the earlier study175 are not precise enough to locate this point, although the data suggest a temperature between 180 and 420 °C at \( x_B \approx 0.07 \).

The heat of formation of metastable solid solutions has been measured calorimetrically at 25 °C.126 These results were used in the present calculations, as indicated below.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry by Klepa and co-workers.84,214,223 The latest measurements14 were performed only near \( x_B = 0.5 \), while the earlier84,223 were done over the whole composition range. At \( x_B = 0.5 \), the results of the three reports agree within 60 J. The parameters at 700 °C (Ref. 84) are used here:

\[ H_E(l) = x_A x_B (-2113 - 209 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  

A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eq. (104) for the liquid, and Eq. (105) for the solid:

\[ G_E^f(s) = x_A x_B (10.014 + 3073 x_B) \]
\[ -18.205 T + 1.831 T \ln T \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  

\[ [\text{Kl(A) + NaI(B)}] \]

Liquidus, solidus, and solvus points for this system were obtained196 by thermal analysis, while data for liquidus only were found by the visual-polynothermal method.224 Ilyasov224 states that the system is one with a minimum liquidus temperature and continuous solid solution, without giving any information concerning the solidus or the consolute temperature for solid demixing. He does not acknowledge the earlier work,16 in which the system is described as eutectic, with appreciable solid solubility at both extremes. The following are the reported data for minimum and eutectic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T^\circ C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Refs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eutectic</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>0.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The liquidus points of Samuseva and Plyushchev196 all fall below the theoretical limiting slopes for zero solid solubility at both NaI and Rbl extremes; this suggests that this
liquidus \(^{196}\) is in error. The liquidus of II’yasov \(^{224}\) however, is consistent with solid solubility at both ends; this liquidus \(^ {224}\) was therefore chosen as being closer to true behavior.

The limits of solid solubility at the eutectic temperature are stated \(^ {196}\) as \(x_B = 0.15\) and 0.80. These were deduced from the results of thermal analysis only, and there are no confirmatory measurements by other methods.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry by Kleppa and co-workers \(^ {84,214}\) at 700 and 740 °C, respectively. In the later work \(^ {214}\) care was taken to exclude oxygen from the molten salts, and data were obtained over the complete concentration range, rather than near the 50–50 composition only. The later results \(^ {214}\) are used here:

\[
H^E(1) = x_A x_B ( - 3569 - 397 x_A ) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (109)
\]

The calculated phase diagram shown in the figure is based on Eq. (109), together with an excess entropy of the liquid given by

\[
\Delta S^E(1) = - 4.386 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. \quad (110)
\]

and excess Gibbs energy of the solid given by

\[
G^E(s) = 1590 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (111)
\]

The calculated eutectic is 505 °C, \(x_B = 0.50\) and the calculated limits of solid solubility at the eutectic temperature are \(x_B = 0.18\) and 0.82. The extent of solid solubility in this system has not been established unambiguously, and so this part of the diagram is suggestive only.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 36): ± 10 °C.

CsI(A) + NaI(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two studies \(^ {56,207}\) from thermal analysis and visual-polythermal methods, respectively. Eutectic data are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T / °C)</th>
<th>(x_B)</th>
<th>(\text{Ref.})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reported CsI melting point in Ref. 56 is 15 °C lower than the accepted value, and the liquidus points in this work show severe scatter near the eutectic. The agreement between the two liquidus \(^ {56,207}\) is poor in some parts of the diagram (80 °C) but good in others (1 °C). The liquidus of Ref. 207 was therefore taken as a guide for the present calculations.

Samusova and Plyushchev \(^ {56}\) observed eutectic arrests in the composition interval 0.025 < \(x_B < 0.975\). The limiting slopes of the experimental liquidus Ref. 207 suggest negligible solid solubility at the CsI extreme. At the NaI side, the limiting slope indicates that solid solubility could be significantly greater than the 2.5% maximum suggested in Ref. 56. However, in view of the imprecision in the experimental points and in the absence of conclusive evidence of solid solubility here, it is reasonable to assume no solubility for the purpose of calculating the phase diagram.

The excess Gibbs energy of the liquid over the temperature interval 657–777 °C has been determined by mass spectrometric measurements of the vapor \(^ {231}\). The \(G^E(1)\) thus deduced may be represented by the expression

\[
3374 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1},
\]

to within a rms deviation of 92 J mol\(^{-1}\).

This result—a positive excess Gibbs energy—is quite at variance with the negative calorimetric excess enthalpy discussed in the next paragraph.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by Kleppa and co-workers \(^ {84,214}\) by direct calorimetry at 700 and 740 °C, respectively. In the earlier work \(^ {84}\) measurements were done near the 50–50 composition only, while in the later, \(^ {214}\) the whole composition range was covered. The later result is used here:

\[
H^E(1) = x_A x_B ( - 5439 - 556 x_B ) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (112)
\]

A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eq. (112) and a small excess entropy:

\[
\Delta S^E(1) = x_A x_B (4.368 - 5.134 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. \quad (113)
\]

The calculated eutectic is 428 °C, \(x_B = 0.485\), identical to the experimental \(^ {207}\). The calculated liquidus follows the shape of, but does not coincide with, the experimental. \(^ {207}\)

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 37): ± 20 °C.

\[\text{Fig. 36. The system NaI(A) + RbI(D).}\]

\[\text{Fig. 37. The system CsI(A) + NaI(D).}\]
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K(A) + Rbl(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two studies, obtained from thermal analysis and visual-polymetal methods, respectively. The system is one with continuous solid solution at the liquidus temperature. The earlier work reports a minimum temperature for the solidus without a minimum in the liquidus, and the two curves are separated by as much as 55 °C. This construction violates the phase rule. Data for the minimum are summarized in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T /°C</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The melting points of the pure salts, as reported in Ref. 226 are both higher than accepted values (K1, by 13 °C; Rbl, by 9 °C). The very great discrepancy between Il'yasov's two reported minima is not commented upon by him; neither does he mention the early work. A rational choice for the position of the liquidus cannot be made from these reports alone.

The excess Gibbs energy of solid solutions at 25 °C has been determined from isopiestic data of mixed saturated KI-Rbl aqueous solutions. The data were treated according to the McKay-Perring method. The results of this calculation may be represented by the following equation:

\[ G^E(s) = 1700 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  

which reproduces the observed values within 60 J mol\(^{-1}\).

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured, at the 50-50 composition only, by direct calorimetry by Kleppa and coworkers. In later work, at 740 °C, special care was taken to prevent oxidation of the iodides in the calorimeter. These results are used here and may be represented by

\[ H^E(l) = -80 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]

In order to calculate a phase diagram for this system, an estimate of the excess Gibbs energy of solid solutions at the liquidus temperature is needed. The published phase diagram data do not allow an unambiguous estimate to be made. A comparison may be made, however, of the thermodynamic properties of the present system with other K–Rbl halide binary systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H^E(l)/x_A x_B J mol(^{-1})</th>
<th>G^E(s)/x_A x_B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KF + RblF</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl + RblCl</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr + RblBr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI + RblI</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unknown G^E(s) most probably lies between zero and 4000 x_A x_B J mol\(^{-1}\); a convenient estimate for calculation purposes is Eq. (114).

A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eqs. (114) and (115). It has a shallow minimum at 643 °C, x_B = 0.74. The calculated liquidus–solidus separation is everywhere less than 5 °C. The existence of a minimum is not unequivocally indicated, since the thermodynamic properties of the solid cannot be more precisely specified (the experimental data themselves are inconclusive). If there is a minimum, it probably does not lie lower than 623 °C [result for G^E(s) = 4000 x_A x_B J mol\(^{-1}\)]. In any case, Il'yasov's very low reported minimum of 514 °C is not reasonable, since this would thermodynamically entail solid–solid separation at a temperature higher than 514 °C. The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is −172 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 38): ± 20 °C.

CsI(A) + KI(B)

Data defining the liquidus and solidus of this system are tabulated in one report, determined by thermal analysis. All investigators describe this system as one having a minimum liquidus temperature and continuous solid solutions, but the experimental liquidus is cusp-shaped at the minimum, which is not thermodynamically consistent. Available data for the minimum are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T /°C</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large discrepancy in minimum temperature between Il'yasov's later work and earlier reports is neither acknowledged nor discussed by him. It is not possible, from these data, to define the liquidus minimum temperature more precisely than this.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 700 °C and 740 °C by Kleppa and co-workers by direct calorimetry. Both determinations were performed near the 50-50 composition only. In the later work, precautions were taken to exclude oxygen from the mixed salts in the calorimeter; the results are used here in the form

\[ H^E(l) = -59 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]

This excess enthalpy was assumed to be independent of temperature.

It has not hitherto been pointed out in this context that solid CsI and KI have different crystal structures (KI, Fm3m and CsI, Fm3m). This implies that there should be a region of solid–solid immiscibility, since the transition temperatures of either CsI or KI have not been

---

FIG. 38. The system KI(A) + Rbl(B).

observed. For the purpose of calculating the phase diagram, therefore, the CsI-based \((\alpha)\) phase is treated as a Henrian solution, with a Henrian activity coefficient for KI in CsI at the eutectic temperature given by

\[ RT \ln \gamma_A = 15000 \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(117)

For the \(\beta\)-phase, the expression

\[ G^B(s_B) = x_A x_B (5000 + 15000 x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  

(118)

was used. Both quantities were assumed to be independent of temperature. The phase diagram, calculated with Eqs. (116)–(118) shows a calculated eutectic at 536 °C, \(x_B = 0.39\). The calculated limits of solid solubility at the eutectic temperature are \(x_B = 0.07, 0.65\). The solid phase boundaries, as calculated, are tentative only, since the question of the nature of the solid state of this system is unresolved. The calculated liquidus carries a significant uncertainty, since the spread in the reported minimum temperature is so great (65 °C).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 39): ± 40 °C.

**CsI(A) + RbI(B)**

Data defining the liquidus and solidus of this system have been tabulated in one study,\(^{226}\) obtained from thermal analysis. A minimum liquidus temperature is reported, with complete solid solubility. The experimental data\(^{764}\) show, however, the liquidus to be cusp-shaped at the minimum, which is thermodynamically inconsistent. Available data on the minimum are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T/°C)</th>
<th>(x_B)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this system has been assumed to be characterized by the presence of continuous solid solution at the liquidus temperature,\(^{256,257}\) this cannot be correct since, at these temperatures, CsI and RbI have different crystal structures (CsI, Pn3m and RbI, Fm3m). Thus there should be a region of solid–solid immiscibility and the system would then show a eutectic rather than a minimum. Markarov and Pankev\(^{235}\) prepared solid solutions at 25 °C from saturated aqueous solution. The solubility isotherm was obtained by radioactive isotopic analysis of Rb and Cs in the solid phases. In addition, the water activity of these solutions was determined by the isopiestic method. From a knowledge of the activities of the mixed salts in aqueous solution in equilibrium with the solid phase, activity coefficients in the solid could be inferred. The miscibility gap in solid solutions was found to be defined by \(x_B = 0.163, 0.922\). The excess Gibbs energy of homogeneous solid solutions outside this gap can be represented approximately by the following equation:

\[ G^B(s) = 5118 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(119)

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry by Kleppa and co-workers\(^{94,214}\) at 700 and 740 °C, respectively, at the 1:1 composition only. In the later work\(^{214}\) precautions were taken to exclude oxygen from the molten salts, and these results\(^{714}\) are used here.

\[ H^B(l) = 89 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

(120)

The calculation of the phase diagram for this system is unusually difficult, not only because the nature of the solid state is unresolved at present, but also by the small temperature range (−70 °C) covered by the diagram,\(^{226}\) which magnifies the effects of scatter in the data. It was decided to represent the solid state by the use of two Henrian activity coefficients, relative to the solid standard state at the eutectic temperature:

for CsI in RbI

\[ RT \ln \gamma_A = 4000 \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \]  

(121)

for RbI in CsI

\[ RT \ln \gamma_B = 4000 \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \]  

(122)

and these were assumed to be temperature independent. With the use of Eqs. (120) to (122) a phase diagram was calculated, which has a calculated eutectic at 580 °C, \(x_B = 0.493\). The calculated limits of solid solubility at this temperature are \(x_B = 0.36, 0.64\). The calculated solubility limits at 25 °C are \(x_B = 0.17, 0.84\), in good agreement with experiment.\(^{226}\) The calculated eutectic temperature is close to the most recently determined “minimum” (Ref. 232), and the calculated liquidus and solidus lie within the experimental phase boundaries.\(^{226}\) The calculated solid phase boundaries, for reasons cited earlier, are to be regarded as suggestive only.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 40): ± 25 °C.

### 3.2. Common-Cation Systems

**a. Lithium**

**LICl(A) + LIF(B)**

Liquidus data points were obtained in four studies\(^{234–237}\) by thermal analysis\(^{234,236,237}\) and the visual-polythermal method.\(^{235}\) Data were tabulated in Refs. 234–236 and appear in Ref. 237 only as points on a phase diagram. The liquidus curve defined by Johnson and Hathaway's\(^{237}\) points read off the published diagram coincided (within 3 °C) with that of Haendler et al.\(^{236}\) Reported eutectic data are summarized as follows:

---

**Figure 39.** The system CsI(A) + KI(B).
The reported eutectic temperatures cluster either near 485 or 500 °C. The two most recent independent liquidus data sets\(^{236,237}\) are virtually coincidental, and so the data of Ref. 236 were used for the present calculations.

Eutectic arrests were observed in three studies\(^{234,236,237}\) and can be bracketed by the interval 0.08 < \(x_B\) < 0.95. The limiting liquidus slopes indicate zero solubility, within experimental uncertainty. Zero solubility was assumed in the present work.

There are no reported measurements of the excess enthalpy of the liquid.

A phase diagram was calculated with an excess enthalpy of the liquid given by

\[
H^E(l) = -1000x_Ax_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}
\]
(123)

which was assumed to be independent of temperature, and with an excess entropy of zero. The calculated eutectic is 501 °C, \(x_B = 0.304\). The calculated liquidus lies within 5 °C of the experimental points.\(^{236}\)

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 41): ± 5 °C.

**LiBr(A) + LiF(B)**

Data defining the liquidus were obtained in two studies,\(^{178,234}\) both by means of thermal analysis. The data were tabulated in the earlier,\(^{234}\) but not in the later\(^{178}\) work; these latter were read off the published phase diagram.\(^{178}\) The following is a summary of reported eutectics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T/°C)</th>
<th>(x_B)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The liquidus of Refs. 234 and 178 lie within 5 °C of one another on the LiBr side, but on the other side Bochvar's\(^{234}\) is consistently below that of Ref. 178. The limiting slope of the liquidus\(^{178}\) corresponds to that expected for zero solid solubility at the LiF extreme. The fact that Bochvar's liquidus is everywhere below that of Ref. 178 suggests that the later results\(^{178}\) are closer to true behavior. The phase diagram of Ref. 178 was therefore adopted as a guide to the construction of the phase diagram.

Eutectic arrests were observed\(^{234}\) in the interval 0.12 < \(x_B\) < 0.97. This observation, together with the experimental limiting liquidus slopes, indicates limited, if any, solid solubility. None was assumed in the present calculations.

There is no report of the excess enthalpy of the liquid.

Two excess enthalpy and two excess entropy coefficients were obtained from an optimization performed on the liquidus data:\(^{178}\)

\[
H^E(l) = x_Ax_B(1677 + 8567x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1},
\]

(124)

\[
S^E(l) = x_Ax_B(9.431 + 0.812x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} K^{-1}.
\]

(125)

It must, however, be emphasized that the data are insufficient to permit both \(H^E\) and \(S^E\) to be determined independently. Hence, Eqs. (124) and (125) must be considered as only tentative, pending verification. The sum \(G^E = H^E - TS^E\) is probably quite accurate over the temperature range of the liquidus.

The phase diagram calculated with Eqs. (124) and (125) reproduced the experimental eutectic\(^{178}\) exactly, and the calculated liquidus is everywhere within 5 °C of the experimental.\(^{178}\)

Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated diagram (Fig. 42): ± 5 °C.

**LiF(A) + LiI(B)**

There is only one report on this system,\(^{237}\) in which tabulated liquidus data points were obtained from the thermal analysis. The experimental eutectic is 411 °C, \(x_B = 0.835\). The eutectic arrest was observed in the interval 0.1 < \(x_B\) < 0.95. The limiting liquidus slope at the LiI side indicates zero solid solubility there. At the LiF extreme, LiI solubility in LiF of 10 mol % or greater is possible, accord
Liquidus data points, obtained from cooling curves, have been tabulated in one report.\textsuperscript{234} The system is one with complete solid solubility at the liquidus temperature. Data on the minimum are summarized as follows:

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
$T/\degree C$ & $x_B$ & Ref. \\
\hline
522 & $\approx 0.36$ & 234 \\
522 & 0.40 & 182 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The experimental liquidus \textsuperscript{234} is shown to be quite flat over a 0.2-unit mole fraction range, so that the composition at the minimum is somewhat uncertain. There are no reported measurements of the solidus.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 630 $\degree C$ by Kleppa and coworkers.\textsuperscript{241,240} The later data\textsuperscript{242} are both more numerous and cover a wider composition range than the earlier.\textsuperscript{244} The result\textsuperscript{245} is used here:

\begin{equation}
H^E(l) = x_A x_B (80 + 113 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (128)
\end{equation}

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eqs. (128) and (129)

\begin{equation}
G^E(s) = 5000 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \quad (129)
\end{equation}

and both quantities were assumed to be independent of temperature. The calculated minimum is 522 $\degree C$, $x_B = 0.36$. The calculated liquidus agrees with the experimental\textsuperscript{234} on the LiBr side, but is consistently above experiment on the LiCl side. In a preliminary calculation, it was found that if the liquidus were to follow faithfully the experimental data on the LiCl side, an improbably asymmetric expression for $G^E(s)$—four terms in Eqs. (129)—would be required. Since the simple expression shown here by Eq. (129) allows the minimum to be reproduced accurately, we have constructed the phase diagram (Fig. 44) on this basis. Since there are no other existing liquidus or solidus data, this discrepancy cannot be resolved and the calculated phase boundaries are suggestive only. The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is 24 $\degree C$.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 44): $+20 \degree C$. 

![Figure 42. The system LiBr(A) + LiF(B).](image)

![Figure 43. The system LiF(A) + LiI(B).](image)

![Figure 44. The system LiBr(A) + LiCl(B).](image)
PHASE DIAGRAMS AND THERMODYNAMICS OF BINARY ALKALI HALIDES

LiCl(A) + LiI(B)

Liquidus data points were determined by thermal analysis and tabulated in one study only.\(^\text{246}\) The eutectic was found to be 368 °C, \(x_B = 0.654\), and the eutectic arrest was observed in the composition interval 0.05 < \(x_B\) < 0.95. The limiting liquidus slopes at either extreme do not indicate the presence of solid solubility, and none was assumed in the present calculations.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid was measured by direct calorimetry at 633 °C by Melnichak and Kleppa,\(^\text{245}\) and their result is used here:

\[
H^E(l) = x_A x_B (1393 + 628 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \tag{130}
\]

Although Johnson and Hathaway's\(^\text{246}\) is the only measurement of the liquidus, it was performed with particular care, especially in the preparation of LiI, which is notoriously difficult to obtain in a sufficiently pure state. A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eq. (130) and two excess entropy coefficients from an optimization of the data\(^\text{246}\):

\[
S^E(l) = x_A x_B (2.204 - 3.122 x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \tag{131}
\]

The experimental eutectic is reproduced exactly, though the calculated liquidus falls slightly below the observed (within 10 °C).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 45): ± 10 °C.

LiBr(A) + LiI(B)

The only reported phase diagram data for this system are for the minimum only,\(^\text{247,248}\) obtained from thermal analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T/°C)</th>
<th>(x_B)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>≈0.6</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 633 °C by direct calorimetry by Melnichak and Kleppa,\(^\text{245}\) whose result is used here:

\[
H^E(l) = x_A x_B (818 + 17 x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \tag{132}
\]

That this system is one with a minimum and continuous solid solution is consistent with the fact that the other related systems \(M[Br, I (M = Na, K, Rh, or C)\) are all of the same type. A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eqs. (132) and (133)

\[
G^E(s) = 8000 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \tag{133}
\]

both quantities being assumed temperature independent. The calculated minimum is 418 °C, \(x_B = 0.63\). The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is 202 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 46): ± 15 °C.

b. Sodium

NaCl(A) + NaI(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in five studies,\(^\text{237,249-252}\) from thermal analysis\(^\text{237,249,250,252}\) and visual-polythermal\(^\text{251}\) methods. A eutectic summary is given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T/°C)</th>
<th>(x_B)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eutectic arrests were observed by Grjotheim et al.\(^\text{252}\) in the range 0.01 < \(x_B\) < 0.99. Wolters\(^\text{240}\) made optical studies of thin sections of solidified melts and concluded that solid phases were pure salts. Thus there is no appreciable solid solubility in this system, and this conclusion is corroborated by the limiting liquidus slopes of all investigators.\(^\text{237,249-252}\)

There are no reported measurements of the excess enthalpy of the liquid.

The most thorough and careful work on this system is found in the most recent studies.\(^\text{237,252}\) The combined liquidus points of these reports were used in the thermodynamic optimization. Two excess enthalpy terms for the liquid were calculated:

\[
H^E(l) = x_A x_B (1416 + 1283 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \tag{134}
\]

which were assumed to be independent of temperature.

FIG. 45. The system LiCl(A) + LiI(B).

FIG. 46. The system LiBr(A) + LiI(B).
Here, $S^E(1)$ was assumed to be zero. Equation (134) was used to calculate the phase diagram, and the calculated liquidus is everywhere within 5°C of the experimental points. The calculated eutectic is 681°C, $x_B = 0.333$.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 47): ± 5°C.

**NaBr(A) + NaF(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained by thermal analysis and by the visual-polythermal method. Results for the eutectic may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$ (°C)</th>
<th>$x_B$</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data of Ref. 51 are tabulated, and those of Ref. 259 are available only as points on a phase diagram. The melting point of NaBr reported in Ref. 259 is 18°C higher than the accepted value, and liquidus data points in this work all lie above those of the later. The data of Dombrovskaya and Koloskova were therefore taken as the basis of the present calculations.

In neither of these studies were eutectic arrests recorded. The limiting liquidus slope at the NaBr extreme does not suggest solid solubility; on the NaF side the data do not extend far enough in order to allow an estimate of solubility. In the present calculations, zero solid solubility was assumed at both extremes.

There are no reports of the excess enthalpy of the liquid. A thermodynamic optimization using the chosen liquidus data yielded the expression:

$$H^E(1) = x_A x_B (-700 + 4895 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \quad (135)$$

which quantity was assumed to be independent of temperature. $S^E(1)$ was assumed to be zero. The phase diagram calculated with the use of Eq. (135) showed a calculated eutectic of 640°C, $x_B = 0.28$, and the calculated liquidus lies within 10°C of the experimental points, allowing for the low reported melting point of NaF.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 48): ± 10°C.

**NaF(A) + NaI(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been reported in three studies from thermal analysis and visual-polythermal methods. The following table summarizes the reported eutectic data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$ (°C)</th>
<th>$x_B$</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liquidus data were tabulated only in Refs. 219 and 237. The data of Johnson and Hathaway appear to be the most carefully obtained of these reports, and were chosen as the basis of the present calculations. There are no reports of the excess enthalpy of the liquid.

Eutectic arrests were recorded only in Ref. 237 in the range 0.45 < $x_B$ < 0.95. The limiting liquidus slope at the NaF extreme suggests little or no solid solubility, and none was assumed in the present work. At the NaF extreme, the liquidus data of Ref. 219 extend only to $x_B = 0.2$, and thus a definite statement on solid solubility at this end cannot be made. Solid solubility cannot be ruled out, but if present it is probably not extensive, since similar systems M||F, I (M = Li,K,Cs) do not display solid solubility at this end. None was assumed in this work.

A thermodynamic optimization was performed on the liquidus data of Ref. 237, which yielded two excess enthalpy terms

$$H^E(1) = x_A x_B (8739 - 7663 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \quad (136)$$

which were assumed to be independent of temperature. $S^E(1)$ was assumed to be zero. A phase diagram calculated with Eq. (136) yielded a calculated eutectic of 596°C, $x_B = 0.814$. The calculated liquidus lies within 10°C of the combined experimental points.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 49): ± 10°C.

**NaBr(A) + NaCl(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been reported in four studies, all from thermal analysis. All show a
Fig. 49. The system NaF(A) + NaI(B).

shallow minimum and complete solid solubility at the liquidus temperature. Data for the minimum are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/°C</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>965</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Refs. 189, 263, and 264 have been tabulated and in Ref. 259 appear on a phase diagram only. Liquidus data of Refs. 189, 263, and 264 show up to 10 °C scatter, especially near the minimum. One reported melting point is lower than accepted (Ref. 264, by 5 °C) and two NaCl melting points higher (Refs. 263 and 189, by 7 and 4 °C, respectively). Thus, as a guide for the present calculations the data points of Gromakov and Gromakova264 on the NaCl side, and of Amadori262 and Bellanca189 on the NaBr side were retained.

Solidus data points were obtained from cooling curves in Refs. 189 and 264. These solidi differ by as much as 10 °C. The data of Bellanca189 indicate that liquidus and solidus are 2–3 °C apart at the minimum, which is not thermodynamically allowed.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry by Kleppa and co-workers244,245 and others,193,266 in the range 800–860 °C. The most extensive data are the most recent of Kleppa244 at 811 °C and are used here:

\[ H^E(1) = x_A x_B (293 + 105x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  

(137)

The activity of NaBr in the liquid has been deduced from emf measurements at 800 °C266–271.

The enthalpy of formation of metastable solid solutions at 25 °C has been measured calorimetrically in two independent studies.126,267 Data of both studies may be represented by the equation:

\[ H^E(s) = 5490x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  

(138)

with a rms deviation of 40 J mol\(^{-1}\).

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eqs. (137) and (139):

\[ G^E(s) = x_A x_B (5490 - 2.3737) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  

(139)

with the assumption that \( S^E(1) = 0 \). Equation (139) was based on Eq. (138) and the liquidus defined by data of Refs. 189, 263, and 264. The calculated minimum is 741 °C, \( x_B = 0.24 \). The calculated liquidus is within 5 °C of the selected reference data points.189,263,264 The calculated solidus falls closer to Bellanca’s189 than to Gromakov’s264 on the NaCl side, where differences are not masked by experimental scatter. Equation (139) reproduces the excess enthalpies of Eq. (138) exactly. The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is 15 °C (there are no experimental data for comparison).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 50): ± 5 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus (Fig. 50): ± 10 °C.

**NaCl(A)+NaI(B)**

Data defining the liquidus were obtained from thermal analysis237,272 and the visual-polythermal method.273 Data were tabulated in each case. Reported eutectic data are summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/°C</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The liquidus of the most recent work237 was taken as a guide for the present calculations.

The limits of the eutectic isothermal were determined from thermal analysis by Ref. 272 as \( x_B = 0.04, 0.75 \) and by Ref. 265 as \( x_B = 0.023, 0.76 \). In addition, Amadori272 obtained two points on the NaI solidus. The activity of NaBr in the liquid at 800 °C has been deduced from emf measurements.269

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 812245 and 860 °C.274 The data of Melnichak and Kleppa245 are both more numerous and cover a wider concentration range than the earlier work274 and these245 therefore are used here:

\[ H^E(1) = x_A x_B (1619 + 640x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \]  

(140)

Two excess entropy terms for the liquid were included.
\[ S^E(1) = x_A x_B (0.2 + 4.6 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \] (141)
in order to reproduce the experimental liquidus.\textsuperscript{237}

Two solid solution Henrian activity coefficients, relative to the solid standard state, were calculated to reproduce the experimental limits of solid solubility\textsuperscript{265,272} at the eutectic temperature. They were assumed to be temperature independent. For NaI in NaCl:

\[ RT \ln \gamma_A = 21,066 \text{ J mol}^{-1}; \] (142)

and for NaCl in NaI:

\[ RT \ln \gamma_A = 9,649 \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \] (143)

A phase diagram calculated with Eqs. (140)–(143) showed a calculated eutectic of 574 °C, \( x_B = 0.60 \). The calculated limits of solid solubility at the eutectic temperature are \( x_B = 0.04, 0.76 \). The calculated liquidus falls with 5 °C of the experimental,\textsuperscript{237} and the calculated NaI solidus is within 10 °C of the two experimental points.\textsuperscript{272}

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 51): \( \pm 10 \) °C.

### NaBr(A) + NaI(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained from thermal analysis and tabulated in two studies.\textsuperscript{263,275} Reported data for the minimum are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T ) /°C</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>0.7084</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum is shallow and neither its temperature nor composition is known very precisely. Of the two tabulated sets of data,\textsuperscript{263,275} Obukhov\textsuperscript{275} reports a NaI melting point 10 °C higher than the accepted value; Amadori's\textsuperscript{263} is 2 °C higher. Thus although Amadori's is the older work, it was chosen for the present calculations since the minimum is on the NaI side of the diagram. On the NaBr side, the two liquid\textsuperscript{263,275} agree within 5 °C. The activity of NaBr in the liquid at 800 °C has been deduced from emf measurements.\textsuperscript{260}

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 812 °C by Melnichak and Kleppa,\textsuperscript{245} whose result is used here:

\[ H^E(1) = x_A x_B (632 + 21 x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \] (144)

The enthalpy of formation of metastable solid solutions has been measured calorimetrically at 25 °C\textsuperscript{126} and the results can be represented by the following equation:

\[ H^E(s) = 10,041 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1} \] (145)

within 120 J mol\textsuperscript{−1}. An x-ray study of a 1:1 solid at room temperature revealed limited solubility.\textsuperscript{149} There are no reported measurements of the solidus.

A phase diagram was calculated, based on Eq. (144), with \( S^E(1) = 0 \), and the following temperature-independent excess Gibbs energy of the solid:

\[ G^E(s) = x_A x_B (6730 - 1600 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \] (146)

The calculated minimum is 645 °C, \( x_B = 0.69 \). The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is 92 °C, and the calculated limits of solubility at 25 °C are \( x_B = 0.11 \) and 0.78. These results are consistent with experiment.\textsuperscript{149} The calculated liquidus lies within 5 °C of the experimental data.\textsuperscript{263}

Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated liquidus (Fig. 52): \( \pm 5 \) °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated solidus (Fig. 52): \( \pm 10 \) °C.

### c. Potassium

KCl(A) + KF(B)

Data defining the liquidus were obtained from thermal analysis and tabulated in Ref. 249. In that report the experimental melting point of KF is 11 °C higher than the accepted value. A summary of reported eutectic data is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T ) /°C</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plato\textsuperscript{249} observed eutectic arrests in the interval 0.1 < \( x_B < 0.92 \). The limiting liquidus slope at the KF extreme does not suggest the presence of solid solubility there. At the KCl extreme, the slope is consistent with a solid solution of as much as 8 mol % KF in KCl at the eutectic temperature. In the absence of other data, however, this figure

---

**Fig. 51.** The system NaCl(A) + NaI(B).

**Fig. 52.** The system NaBr(A) + NaI(B).
cannot be sustained. Zero solid solubility was therefore assumed at both extremes in the present calculations.

There are no reports of the excess enthalpy of the liquid, and so three coefficients were calculated from a thermodynamic optimization performed on the data:

\[
H^E(I) = x_A x_B (3066 - 10.621 x_B + 9125 x_B^2) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\]

This quantity was assumed to be independent of temperature. Here, \(S^E(I)\) was assumed to be zero. A phase diagram calculated with the use of Eq. (147) shows a calculated eutectic of 605 °C, \(x_B = 0.45\). The calculated liquidus lies within 5 °C of the experimental data.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 53): ± 15 °C.

**KBr(A) + KF(B)**

Data defining the liquidus were obtained from thermal analysis and by the visual-polythermal method. The data are tabulated in Refs. 51 and 278 and appear only as points on a phase diagram in Ref. 178. In this latter case, the data points were read off the published diagram. A summary of the liquids data is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>(x_B)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liquid of Refs. 178 and 51 are consistent with each other, while that of Ref. 278 differs as much as 20 °C from Refs. 51 and 178. The data were chosen for the present calculations. There are no reported measurements of the excess enthalpy of the liquid.

Eutectic arrests were observed in the interval 0.03 ≤ \(x_B\) < 0.97, and the limiting liquidus slopes indicate little or no solid solubility at either extreme. None was assumed in the present work.

Two excess enthalpy coefficients were calculated from the combined liquidus data points of Refs. 51 and 178:

\[
H^E(I) = x_A x_B (2230 - 6473 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\]

This quantity was assumed to be independent of temperature. Here, \(S^E(I)\) was assumed to be zero. A phase diagram calculated with Eq. (149) shows a calculated eutectic of 580 °C, \(x_B = 0.403\). The calculated liquidus lies within 10 °C of the experimental points.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 54): ± 10 °C.

**KF(A) + KI(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained in two studies, both by thermal analysis. Only in Ref. 219 are the data tabulated, and these were taken as a guide for the present calculations. In neither case were eutectic arrests reported. The data for the eutectic may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>(x_B)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>219, 220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The limiting liquidus slopes at either extreme do not indicate solid solubility, and none was assumed in the present work.

There are no reported measurements of the excess enthalpy of the liquid. Two coefficients were calculated from an optimization of the liquidus data:

\[
H^E(I) = x_A x_B (2230 - 6473 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.
\]

This quantity was assumed to be independent of temperature. Here, \(S^E(I)\) was assumed to be zero. A phase diagram calculated with Eq. (149) shows a calculated eutectic of 543 °C, \(x_B = 0.67\). The calculated liquidus lies within 10 °C of the experimental data.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 55): ± 10 °C.

**KBr(A) + KCl(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained in several studies, all by thermal analysis. The data are tabulated in Refs. 189, 279, and 280 and appear only as points on a phase diagram in Refs. 145 and 259. A summary of data for the minimum is given as follows.
The differences between observed and accepted melting points of the pure salts are appreciable: KBr (−2 to +10 °C) and KCl (−2 to +19 °C). In this respect the latest report is closest to accepted values, and so the true minimum temperature is taken to be more probably nearer to 790 °C than to the higher observed values.

The activity of KBr in the liquid at 800 °C has been deduced from emf measurements. The activity of KBr in the liquid at 800 °C has been deduced from emf measurements.

Points on the solubility curve were obtained by thermal analysis in two of the studies. The two experimental solubilities are in poor agreement. Solid solutions, prepared from quenched melts, were examined by x-ray diffraction at room temperature. The results indicate complete miscibility.

The excess enthalpy of the solid has been measured calorimetrically at 25 °C by a number of authors. The solutions were prepared from quenched melts or by crystallization from aqueous solution. The results of all these studies can be represented by the expression:

\[ H^E(s) = (3780 + 400)x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

The excess Gibbs energy of solid solutions at 25 °C was derived from the solubilities of the single and mixed salts in aqueous solution and the measured activity coefficients in saturated aqueous solution. The results may be represented by the following equation:

\[ G^E(s) = (3300 ± 170)x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]

The excess Gibbs energy of solid solutions at 700 °C was derived from equilibration of solutions with HCl-HBr mixtures, and the result is

\[ G^E(s) = (5020 ± 840)x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]

A third determination of \( G^E(s) \) is reported by Miller and Skudlarski from mass spectrometry:

\[ G^E(s) = (1944 ± 123)x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]

Equations (150)–(153) suggest that the excess entropy of the solid is close to zero.

Mustajoki measured the heat capacity of mixed crystals and the pure salts by an adiabatic method in the temperature interval 50–450 °C. His results were not precise enough to be used in an optimization.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at temperatures between 800 and 900 °C. The earlier data are very sparse, and so Kleppa's later results are used here:

\[ H^E(l) = x_A x_B (146 + 109x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eqs. (154) and (155):

\[ G^E(s) = 3500x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  

Both quantities being assumed independent of temperature. The calculated minimum is 717 °C, \( x_B = 0.36 \). The calculated solubility temperature for solid demixing is −66 °C. The phase diagram, as calculated, is deemed to be a reasonable representation of the experimental data, which are not in good accord among themselves. In addition, the value chosen for \( G^E(s) \), Eq. (155), is consistent with experimentally derived values, Eqs. (151) and (152).

Probable maximum inaccuracies in calculated diagram (Fig. 56): ±15 °C.

**KCl(A)+KBr(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in six reports and appear only as points on a phase diagram in Ref. 259. Le Chatelier recorded the temperature at which crystals first appeared; the other investigators used thermal analysis. The system has been regarded by some as one within a minimum and complete solid solubility as a eutectic with limited solid solubility. The data for the minimum and eutectic may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/°C</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 56.** The system KCl(A) + KBr(B).
The scatter among the liquidus data points of the later investigators is as much as 24 °C, and the minimum temperature is not well defined.

Points on the solidus were obtained by thermal analysis in Refs. 279, 280, and 292. All reports indicate extensive solid solubility on the KI side; this is confirmed by the limiting liquidus slope. On the KCl side, the limiting slope indicates quite clear only limited solubility. Thus Wronsey's experimental solidus is in error, and support is given instead to Amadori’s data. His earlier data indicate a KI solubility in KCl of 10 mol%, and his later re-investigation indicates 5 mol%.

Wronsey reported third temperature arrests, which are about 100 °C below his reported solids. He ascribes this envelope to demixing of solid solutions. This is unlikely, as the envelope as reported is concave upward, whereas a solubility gap is indicated by a curve which is concave downward. Tamman and Ruppel recorded the onset and completion of turbidity in slowly heated and cooled solidified melts, as shown by transmitted light. At a given composition the transformation from complete translucence to complete turbidity occupied a temperature interval of 50 and 100 °C. The data do not allow any unambiguous conclusion to be drawn, although the suggested general shape of the envelope is concave downward. Thus the nature of the solid state of this system has not been resolved by experiment.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 812 °C by Melnichak and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

\[ H^E(l) = x_A x_B (1238 + 268x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eq. (156) following Amadori, with the assumption of limited solid solubility at the KCl side. Here, \( S^E(l) \) was assumed to be zero. A Henrian activity coefficient for KI in KCl at the eutectic temperature was used:

\[ RT \ln \gamma_B = 20000 \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \]

and the solid solution at the KI side was taken to be regular with an excess Gibbs energy given by

\[ G^E(s) = 13500x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]

The quantities in Eqs. (156)–(158) were all assumed to be temperature independent. The calculated eutectic is 598 °C, \( x_B = 0.497 \) and the calculated liquidus is within 10 °C of experiment. The calculated limits of solid solubility are \( x_B = 0.04, 0.55 \) at the eutectic temperature. The calculated solidus on the KI side falls below the experimental, and for reasons stated above the solid phase boundaries of this system remain poorly defined.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 57): ± 10 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus (Fig. 57): ± 25 °C.

**KBr(A) + KI(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained in four studies, all through thermal analysis. The data in Refs. 279 and 280 are tabulated and appear only as points on a phase diagram. Points were read off the diagram in the latest work. Data for the minimum may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T°C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The liquidus of Refs. 280 and 294 are remarkably concordant (within 2 °C). The high minimum temperature of Ref. 259 is rejected because the melting points of the pure salts are 16 and 24 °C higher than accepted values. The low value is rejected also because it entails a consolute temperature for solid–solid demixing of \( \approx 450 °C \), which is not supported by experimental data. The liquidus of Refs. 280 and 294 were therefore chosen as a basis for the present calculations.

Data defining the solidus have been obtained by thermal analysis. For the reason given above, Wronsey’s experimental data are rejected and the data of the later work are retained. The data were read off the published phase diagram.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 812 °C by Melnichak and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

\[ H^E(l) = x_A x_B (452 - 13x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]

The solid state of this system has been the object of a number of studies. Lattice constants of quenched solid solutions, obtained by x-ray diffraction, are reported. The optical transmission during heating and cooling was recorded. The excess enthalpy of metastable quenched single-phase solid solutions has been measured calorimetrically at 25 °C and the results may be represented by the following equation:

\[ H^E(s, 25 °C) = 7354x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]

with a rms deviation of 74 J mol\(^{-1}\). The excess Gibbs energy has been determined from the aqueous solubility isotherm, together with data from isopiestic measurements on saturated solutions of the single and mixed salts at 25 °C. The results may be represented by the following equation:

\[ G^E(s, 25 °C) = 5151x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]
with a rms deviation of 47 J mol$^{-1}$. Although the determination of this quantity is indirect, its magnitude is of the same order as $H^S(1)$ in Eq. (160). This is its significance for the present considerations. The limits of solid solubility at 25 °C have been determined from x-ray studies and from the aqueous solubility isotherm. The results are summarized here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_B$</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.07, 0.76</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>aq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.06, 0.75</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>aq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..., 0.80-0.85</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>x ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.16, 0.89</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>aq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.14, 0.80</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>aq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.14, 0.79</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>aq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.12, 0.80</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>x ray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From their x-ray study, Luova and Tannila deduce a consolute point for solid–solid demixing of 205 °C, $x_B = 0.34$. From the optical transmission work, it can be concluded only that the consolute temperature is above 200 °C and that the phase envelope is skewed toward the KBr side.

In the present analysis the solid solubility limits at room temperature were taken as the basis, together with Eqs. (160) and (161), for the thermodynamic properties of the solid state at low temperature. The phase diagram calculated with the use of Eqs. (159) and (162), with $S^S(1) = 0$, shows a calculated minimum at 663 °C, $x_B = 0.67$, and the calculated liquidus and solidus lie within 2 °C of experimental data. The calculated limits of solid solubility at 25 °C are $x_B = 0.14, 0.86$, in good agreement with the experiment. The calculated excess Gibbs energy at 25 °C, from Eq. (162), is 6250 $x_A x_B$ J mol$^{-1}$, which compares favorably with the experiment, Eqs. (160) and (161). However, the calculated consolute point for solid–solid demixing is 88 °C, $x_B = 0.5$, which is significantly different from the experiment. It is thus not possible to reconcile all the reported data on the solid state, and the calculated solid–solid phase boundary is only suggestive.

Provable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 58): ± 2 °C

Provable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus (Fig. 58): ± 4 °C

d. Rubidium

RbCl(A) + RbF(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained by the visual-polythermal method and tabulated in Ref. 302. The reported eutectic is 545 °C, $x_B = 0.47$. Another determination of the eutectic alone was reported as 532 °C, $x_B = 0.53$. Eutectic arrests were observed only in the interval 0.3 $< x_B < 0.6$. The limiting liquidus slope at the RbF extreme suggests little or no solid solubility; the data on the RbCl side do not extend far enough in order to allow an estimate of solubility. Zero solid solubility was assumed at both extremes.

No experimental excess enthalpy of the liquid is available, and so two coefficients for this quantity were calculated from the experimental data:

$$H^S(1) = x_A x_B (5207 - 6894 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}$$

(163)

which were assumed to be temperature independent. $S^S(1)$ was assumed to be zero. A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eq. (163) and the calculated eutectic is 543 °C, $x_B = 0.48$. The observed melting point of RbF is 13 °C lower than the accepted value. The calculated liquidus lies within 10 °C of the experimental points.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 59): ± 15 °C.

RbBr(A) + RbF(B)

Data defining the liquidus are available in one study obtained by thermal analysis. The data appear only as points in a phase diagram, from which they were read. The reported eutectic is 509 °C, $x_B = 0.46$. The authors observed the eutectic arrest only near the eutectic composition; the limiting liquidus slopes at either extreme indicate, however, little or no solid solubility. None was assumed in the present calculations. There are no reported data for the excess enthalpy of the liquid.

Three excess enthalpy coefficients for the liquid were calculated from the experimental liquidus data:

![Fig. 58. The system KBr(A) + KI(B).](image)

![Fig. 59. The system RbCl(A) + RbF(B).](image)
PHASE DIAGRAMS AND THERMODYNAMICS OF BINARY ALKALI HALIDES

\[ H^F(1) = x_A x_B ( - 1628 - 407 x_B - 2254 x_B^2 ) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  (164)

This quantity was assumed to be temperature independent and \( S^F(1) \) was taken to be zero. A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eq. (164). The calculated eutectic is identical to the experimental and the calculated liquidus lies within 2 °C of the experimental points.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 60): ± 5 °C.

**RbF(A) + Rbl(B)**

No phase diagram or excess thermodynamic property data are available for this system. A tentative phase diagram can however be calculated, based on a few assumptions drawn from analogous alkali halide binary systems, all of which have been evaluated. Thus the present system is a member of the series M||F,I (M = Li,Na,K,Rb,Cs). All the other members of this series are simple eutectics with little or no solid solubility (the same is true for the system RbBr||F,Br). Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that the present system is a simple eutectic with zero solid solubility.

An estimate of the excess Gibbs energy of the liquid is needed. Systems closely analogous to the one under discussion are M||F,I (M = K,Cs), and Rb||F,Br. The excess enthalpy of the liquid at \( x = 0.5 \) for these three systems, deduced from the phase diagram data, are \(-252, -1620, \) and \(-599 \text{ J mol}^{-1}\), respectively (the excess entropy of the liquid was assumed to be zero in all cases). On the assumption that, for the present system, \( S^E(1) = 0 \) and that the liquid is a regular solution with an excess enthalpy given by

\[ H^E(1) = -3700 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \]  (165)

i.e., approximately a mean of the neighboring analogous systems M||F,I (M = K,Cs), a phase diagram was calculated. The calculated eutectic is 485 °C, \( x_B = 0.57 \). This eutectic temperature is a reasonable interpolation from the two neighboring analogous systems, as may be seen in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melting points (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF (837)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbF (793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsF (703)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI (861)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rbl (647)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsI (640)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eutectic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>°C</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>0.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 61): ± 30 °C.

**RbBr(A) + RbCl(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained by the visual polythermal method and tabulated in two reports. A summary of the available data for the minimum is given by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T/°C )</th>
<th>( x_B )</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum temperature cannot be defined easily in this work, since the melting points of the pure components (RbBr, 694 °C; RbCl, 720 °C) are quite close. In addition, the observed melting points deviate from the accepted values appreciably: RbBr (–4, –13, and –4 °C) and RbCl (+6 °C for all three reports). In Ref. 303 the liquidus is flat in the interval \( 0 < x_B < 0.65 \).

Solid solutions over the entire composition range were examined by x-ray diffraction at 25 °C. All reports indicated homogeneous solution. Hovi estimated a consolute temperature for solid demixing of –100 °C, from theoretical considerations.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry in three reports at 800, 860, and 731 °C, respectively. The earlier data are very sparse, but the later work was performed over the entire composition range at a temperature closest to the liquidus temperatures. These results are used here:

\[ H^E(1) = x_A x_B (121 + 46 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  (166)
A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eqs. (166) and (167)

\[ G^E(s) = 2000x_Ax_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \quad (167) \]

where both quantities were assumed to be temperature independent. \( S^E(l) \) was assumed to be zero. The calculated minimum is 682 °C, \( x_B = 0.38 \), which is approximately the mean of the observed values, 303–305. The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is \(-154^\circ\text{C}\).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 62): \( \pm 15^\circ\text{C} \).

**RbCl(A) + Rbl(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in two reports\textsuperscript{309,310} from thermal analysis\textsuperscript{310} and the visual-polythermal method.\textsuperscript{309,310} Different investigators have described this system as having a eutectic or a minimum; data for the eutectic or minimum may be summarized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T / °C</th>
<th>x_B</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no consensus on the extent of solid solubility in this system. Data defining the solidus were obtained\textsuperscript{309} by thermal analysis. These investigators\textsuperscript{309} state that solid solutions exist in the interval 0.125 < x_B < 1. On the RbCl side the liquidus of both studies\textsuperscript{309,310} agree with 10 °C, but not elsewhere. The solidus points of Ref. 309 on the RbI side clearly suggest solid solubility as far as the eutectic. The limiting slopes of both solidus,\textsuperscript{309,310} however, are consistent only with zero solid solubility on this side of the diagram. Thus although both reported liquidi are remarkably concordant in this composition region, both are thermodynamically inconsistent with their authors’ assumption of extensive solid solubility. There are no reported investigations of the solid state of this system at lower temperatures, which might help to resolve this question.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at \( 740^\circ\text{C} \) \textsuperscript{233} and the result is used here:

\[ H^E(l) = x_Ax_B(1138 - 63x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (168) \]

For the calculation of the phase diagram of this system, the choice between eutectic and minimum temperature types cannot be unambiguously made from reported data\textsuperscript{309,310} Preliminary attempts to reproduce the observed liquids by treating the system as a eutectic, with no or extensive solid solubility on both sides, were unsatisfactory. The calculated diagram shown in the figure was obtained with the assumption of complete solid solubility and the use of Eqs. (168) and (169) (both quantities were assumed to be temperature independent) and with \( S^E(l) = 0 \):

\[ G^E(s) = x_Ax_B(8943 + 4450x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (169) \]

The calculated minimum is 560 °C, \( x_B = 0.58 \). The calculated liquidus falls between the experimental points\textsuperscript{309,310} on the RbCl side, but above the experimental points on the RbI side. This poor fit follows from the thermodynamic inconsistency mentioned earlier between the observed limiting liquidus slopes and the assumption of complete solid solubility. The analogous systems M[Cl, I] (M = Na, K, or Cs) have all been treated successfully as involving extensive (but not complete) solid solubility. The entire phase diagram, as calculated, is tentative since it has not been possible to reconcile all the pertinent reported data. The calculated consolute point for solid–solid demixing is 440 °C, \( x_B = 0.50 \).

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 63): \( \pm 20^\circ\text{C} \).

**RbBr(A) + Rbl(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained by the visual-polythermal method and tabulated in Ref. 304. The reported minimum is 618 °C, \( x_B = 0.50 \). A re-determination of the minimum alone\textsuperscript{312} showed 617 °C, \( x_B = 0.5 \). Alder\textsuperscript{50,315} examined solid solutions over the whole composition range by x-ray diffraction, and reported a consolute point for solid demixing at 76 °C, \( x_B = 0.35 \). The excess enthalpy of solid solution has been measured at 25 °C by solution calorimetry at the 1:1 composition\textsuperscript{314} and in the intervals \( x_B < 0.31, \) \( x_B > 0.74 \).\textsuperscript{314} Koski’s\textsuperscript{314} result is \( H^E(s) = 1380 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \) at \( x = 0.5 \). From later x-ray measurements on the solid, it was reported that the consolute point is 149 °C, \( x_B = 0.35 \), and that the miscibility limits at room temperature are \( x_B = 0.04, 0.82 \).\textsuperscript{312}

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by
direct calorimetry at 740 °C by Melnichak and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

$$H^\circ(1) = x_A x_B (418 - 59 x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (170)

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eqs. (170) and (171),

$$G^\circ (s) = x_A x_B (3700 + 3700 x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (171)

in which both quantities were assumed to be temperature independent. $S^\circ (1)$ was assumed to be zero. The calculated minimum is 618 °C, $x_B = 0.52$. The calculated liquidus follows the experimental points within the error in the observed melting points of the pure salts (RbBr, 13 °C; RbI, 5 °C). The calculated consolute point for solid demixing is 115 °C, $x_B = 0.34$, which reproduces the observed asymmetry. In addition, the temperature-independent $G^\circ (s)$ at $x = 0.5$, according to Eq. (171), is 1306 J mol$^{-1}$, which is the same as Koski's result at 25 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy of calculated diagram (Fig. 64): ± 10 °C.

e. Cesium

CsCl(A) + CsF(B)

The only reported datum for this system is a determination of the eutectic by Bukhalova and Sementsova, who supply neither tabulated nor plotted phase diagram data. Their result is 440 °C, $x_B = 0.49$. There are no data concerning solid solubility, but consideration of other eutectic systems of this type (Cs|F|Br and Rb|F|Cl) suggests little or no solubility; none was assumed in the present calculations.

A phase diagram was calculated, based on an excess enthalpy of the liquid given by

$$H^\circ (l) = x_A x_B (2700 - 7713 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (172)

which was assumed to be temperature independent. The calculated eutectic is 440 °C, $x_B = 0.496$, which agrees with the experimental datum. The calculated Pm3m$\rightarrow$Fm3m transition for CsCl on the liquidus is 470 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 65): ± 20 °C.

CsBr(A) + CsF(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained by both thermal analysis and the visual-polythermal method and tabulated in Ref. 316. The observed eutectic is 438 °C, $x_B = 0.485$. The eutectic arrest was observed in the interval 0.025 < $x_B < 0.975$ indicating little if any solid solubility. The limiting slopes at both extremes confirm this finding, and so zero solid solubility was assumed in the present calculations.

There are no reported data for the excess enthalpy of the liquid. Two excess enthalpy coefficients were calculated by an optimization performed on the observed data:

$$H^\circ (l) = x_A x_B (-3414 - 1213 x_B) \text{ J mol}^{-1}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (173)

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eq. (173), with $S^\circ (l) = 0$, and the calculated eutectic is 436 °C, $x_B = 0.485$. The average deviation of the calculated liquidus from the experimental data in °C is 10 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 66): ± 10 °C.

CsF(A) + CsI(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained by both thermal analysis and visual-polythermal methods and tabulated in Ref. 316. The observed eutectic is 430 °C, $x_B$
= 0.535. The eutectic arrest was observed in the interval 0.025 < \chi_B < 0.975, indicating little or no solid solubility. This was confirmed by the limiting liquidus slopes at either extreme, and hence zero solid solubility was assumed in the present calculations. There are no reported data for the excess enthalpy of the liquid, and three coefficients were calculated from an optimization performed on the phase diagram data.\(^{116}\)

\[
H^E(1) = x_A x_B (-6523 + 5342 x_B - 10 \times 517 x_B^2) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (174)
\]

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eq. (174), with \(S^E(1) = 0\), which shows a calculated eutectic of 431 °C, \(x_B = 0.53\). The calculated liquidus lies within 10 °C of the experimental points,\(^{316}\) except near the CsI extreme; the observed\(^{316}\) melting point of CsI is however 19 °C lower than the accepted value.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated diagram (Fig. 67): ±15 °C.

**CaBr(A)+CsCl(B)**

Data defining the liquidus have been obtained by the visual-polymel method and tabulated in Ref. 517. The system is described as\(^{317}\) one having a minimum at 613 °C, \(x_B = 0.425\). These authors assumed complete solid solubility at the liquidus temperature. Natarajan et al.\(^{318}\) reported in another context the datum that the melting point of a solid solution at \(x_B = 0.4\) was 614 °C. For the purpose of calculating a phase diagram, Il'yasov's\(^{317}\) data were adopted as guide for the location of the liquidus. The temperature range covered by the solid-liquid phase diagram is remarkably small (\(≈ 30 °C\)), which might magnify the effect of errors in the observed\(^{317}\) melting points of the pure salts (CaBr, +6 °C; CsCl, −5 °C).

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured by direct calorimetry at 731,\(^{245}\) 800,\(^{244}\) and 860 °C.\(^{274}\) The most recent results\(^{240}\) are also the most complete, and are used here in the form:

\[
H^E(1) = -63 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (175)
\]

The solid state of this system has been the object of numerous studies (Refs. 143, 149, 150, 156, 159, 160, 161, 281, 318, 319, 320, and 330. X-ray diffraction was used at room temperature\(^{140,150,281,318,319,330}\) and at high temperature\(^{143,151,318,330}\) Also used were thermal analysis\(^{143,156,161,318,330}\) and conductivity.\(^{161,330}\) At room temperature the system is completely homogeneous. The Pm\(3m\) → Fm\(3m\) transition temperature of CsCl is raised by the addition of CsBr; the composition dependence\(^{161,318,330}\) is obscured somewhat by apparent thermal hysteresis. Weijma and Arends\(^{161}\) used both conductivity and thermal analysis, and the results of these methods are quite concordant. Their results are accordingly used here as a guide for the solid solution behavior of this system. Since the data\(^{161}\) appear only in a diagram, points were read off the envelope at 0.1-mole fraction intervals, in the range 0.5 < \(x_B< 1\). The temperature spread of all reported CsCl transition temperatures, at a given composition, is between 30 and 50 °C.\(^{161,318,330}\)

Since, at the observed liquidus temperature, CsBr and CsCl exhibit different crystal structures, the phase diagram is expected to be one with a eutectic rather than a minimum and with a region of coexistence of the two solid phases. The phase diagram has been calculated on the assumption of the existence of two solid phases (α, CsCl-structure; β, NaCl-structure). The α → β transition for CsBr is hypothetical, since the α-solid melts before transforming. Nevertheless, an extrapolated transition temperature of 880 °C\(^ {161}\) is assumed, with the following Gibbs energy of transformation:

\[
\Delta_{\text{tr}} G (\text{CsBr}) = 4483 - 3.89 T \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \quad (176)
\]

Weijma and Arends\(^{161}\) obtained the hypothetical transition temperature by combining the known transition properties of CsCl with their measurements of the variation of the CsCl enthalpy of transition with CsBr content in solution. A simple thermodynamic equilibrium equation was used. The enthalpy and entropy of CsBr transition shown in Eq. (176) are not those deduced by Ref. 161, but are adjustable parameters obtained by fitting the calculated phase diagram to experimental data. The transition properties of CsCl and CsBr used in the present calculations may be compared in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T_{\text{tr}} (°C)</th>
<th>\Delta_{\text{tr}} H (J mol^{-1})</th>
<th>\Delta_{\text{tr}} S (J mol^{-1} K^{-1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CsCl</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>3766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsBr</td>
<td>880*</td>
<td>4483*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where the asterisk indicates a hypothetical quantity. The data for CsCl in this table were taken from the standard reference used in the present work.\(^{2}\) The two solid phases were assumed to be regular, with temperature-independent excess Gibbs energies given by

\[
G^E(s,α) = 1123 x_A x_B \text{ J mol}^{-1}, \quad (177)
\]

\[
G^E(s,β) = 0. \quad (178)
\]

A phase diagram was calculated with the use of Eqs. (175) to (178). The calculated eutectic is 613 °C, \(x_B = 0.43\), identical with the reported\(^{317}\) minimum. The calculated liquidus agrees with the experimental\(^{317}\) within the error limits of the melting points of the pure salts. The solid solubility limits at the eutectic temperature are \(x_B = 0.39, 0.47\); such a narrow two-phase region is not easily detected by thermal
analysis or x-ray diffraction at high temperature. The calculated two-phase region, terminating at pure CsCl, falls within the envelope reported by Weijma and Arends. The calculated solid-liquid two-phase regions are very narrow (± 2°C), which is corroborated by the results of zone-melting experiments. The complete phase diagram [Figs. 68(a) and 68(b)], as calculated, represents experimental solid-liquid and solid-solid data in a thermodynamically consistent and faithful manner, given the uncertainties in experimental quantities. The solid phase boundaries must remain tentative, however, until more refined experimental work is done.

Possible maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus [Fig. 68(a)]: ± 5°C.

CsCl(A) + CsI(B)

Data defining the liquidus have been tabulated in one investigation, obtained by the visual-polythermal method. The reported eutectic is 502°C, x_B = 0.47. Other authors, using thermal analysis, reported solid solubility defined by x_B = 0.15, 0.80, and a eutectic at 493°C, x_B = 0.48. Weyant, who investigated this system briefly using thermal analysis, confirmed that the system is eutectic and reported solid solubility limits of x_B < 0.1 and > 0.88. He also reported that the CsCl Pm3m → Pm3m transformation temperature was decreased in the presence of CsI.

The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 698°C by direct calorimetry by Melnichak and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

\[ H^E(l) = x_A x_B (745 - 167x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (179)

Since, at the liquidus temperature, CsCl and CsI exhibit different crystal structures, two solid phases were assumed in order to calculate the phase diagram. A Henrian activity coefficient, relative to the solid standard state, was assigned to each phase:

For CsI in CsCl (NaCl-type structure)

\[ RT \ln \gamma_B = 8418 \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (180)

For CsCl in CsI (CsCl-type structure)

\[ RT \ln \gamma_B = 12118 \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (181)

The quantities in Eqs. (179) to (181) were all assumed to be temperature independent. A phase diagram was calculated with the use of these three quantities, which shows a eutectic of 502°C, x_B = 0.46, and solid solubility limits of x_B = 0.24, 0.88 at the eutectic temperature. The transformation temperature of pure CsCl is 470°C, but this is not shown in the calculated diagram since there are no quantitative data on its composition dependence. The solid phase boundaries remain suggestive only, since there are few experimental data. The calculated liquidus is everywhere within 5°C of the experimental points.

Possible maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 69): ± 10°C.

CsBr(A) + CsI(B)

Data defining the liquidus are tabulated in one study, obtained by the visual-polythermal method. The observed minimum is 578°C, x_B = 0.48. There are no data for the solidus. The excess enthalpy of the liquid has been measured at 698°C by direct calorimetry by Melnichak and Kleppa, whose result is used here:

\[ H^E(l) = x_A x_B (364 - 15x_A) \text{ J mol}^{-1}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (182)

The limits of solid solubility at 25°C have been determined by x-ray diffraction on the quenched melt and by a radio isotopic analysis of the solid solution prepared from saturated aqueous solutions. The results are indicated as follows.

\[ \text{Fig. 68a. The system CsBr(A) + CsI(B), high temperature.} \]
\[ \text{Fig. 68b. The system CsBr(A) + CsI(B), low temperature.} \]
\[ \text{Fig. 69. The system CsCl(A) + CsI(B).} \]
The excess enthalpy of the solid at $x = 0.5$ has been measured by solution calorimetry at 25 °C, and was found to be 2200 J mol$^{-1}$. A phase diagram was calculated, with the use of Eqs. (182) and (183)

$$G^E(s) = 6500x_Ax_B \text{ } \text{J mol}^{-1}$$

both quantities being assumed independent of temperature. Equation (183) is a reasonable estimate, since the excess enthalpy (or excess Gibbs energy) of the solid at 25 °C may be represented by the function $8800x_Ax_B$. The calculated minimum is 578 °C, $x_B = 0.49$. The calculated liquidus lies within 1 °C of the experimental on the CaBr side, and within 8 °C on the CaI side, where there is much greater scatter in the measured data. The calculated solid miscibility limits at 25 °C are $x_B = 0.12, 0.88$, which are in good agreement with experiment. The calculated consolute temperature for solid demixing is 113 °C.

Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated liquidus (Fig. 70): ± 10 °C.
Probable maximum inaccuracy in calculated solidus (Fig. 70): ± 15 °C.
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5. Appendix

In this section we present summaries of basic data input to (Table A1) and output from (Tables A2–A6 inclusive).
### Table A1. Melting points ($T_m$) and Gibbs energies of fusion ($\Delta_{\text{fus}} G^*$) of pure halides (\(\Delta_{\text{fus}} G^* = a + bT + cT^2 + dT^3 + eT \ln T + f/T \text{ J mol}^{-1}\)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comp.</th>
<th>$T_m$ (K)</th>
<th>$a \times 10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$c \times 10^3$</th>
<th>$d \times 10^6$</th>
<th>$e$</th>
<th>$f \times 10^{-5}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiF</td>
<td>1121.3</td>
<td>14.518</td>
<td>128.435</td>
<td>8.709</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-21.494</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF</td>
<td>1269.0</td>
<td>10.847</td>
<td>156.584</td>
<td>4.950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-23.978</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF</td>
<td>1130.0</td>
<td>13.763</td>
<td>127.035</td>
<td>7.211</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-20.962</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbF</td>
<td>1066.0</td>
<td>2.388</td>
<td>251.453</td>
<td>19.268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-39.367</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsF</td>
<td>976.0</td>
<td>3.451</td>
<td>176.219</td>
<td>8.872</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-27.372</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl</td>
<td>883.0</td>
<td>4.420</td>
<td>197.318</td>
<td>16.435</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-31.966</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>1073.8</td>
<td>7.735</td>
<td>202.091</td>
<td>11.925</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-31.824</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl</td>
<td>1044.0</td>
<td>4.755</td>
<td>215.359</td>
<td>12.734</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-33.381</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbCl</td>
<td>993.0</td>
<td>7.759</td>
<td>96.729</td>
<td>5.209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-15.899</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsCl</td>
<td>918.0</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>116.390</td>
<td>2.469</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-17.673</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiBr</td>
<td>823.0</td>
<td>2.079</td>
<td>215.437</td>
<td>20.682</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-35.070</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr</td>
<td>1020.0</td>
<td>18.327</td>
<td>75.124</td>
<td>6.657</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.418</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr</td>
<td>1007.0</td>
<td>17.680</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td>-22.782</td>
<td>7.304</td>
<td>-0.703</td>
<td>-3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbBr</td>
<td>967.0</td>
<td>10.054</td>
<td>110.999</td>
<td>5.335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-18.410</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsBr</td>
<td>908.0</td>
<td>1.890</td>
<td>189.667</td>
<td>5.419</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.874</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TlH</td>
<td>747.0</td>
<td>6.591</td>
<td>171.310</td>
<td>14.046</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.775</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI</td>
<td>933.0</td>
<td>13.940</td>
<td>88.680</td>
<td>6.027</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-19.975</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>954.0</td>
<td>4.656</td>
<td>211.209</td>
<td>14.460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-33.547</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rbl</td>
<td>920.0</td>
<td>12.280</td>
<td>107.227</td>
<td>5.502</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-18.410</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsI</td>
<td>913.0</td>
<td>48.639</td>
<td>-358.103</td>
<td>-21.213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47.488</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data have been taken from the standard Ref. 9 unless otherwise indicated.

The melting point of RbF is that of Holm\textsuperscript{24} who took particular care in its purification. The heat of fusion at this temperature is 22 930 J mol\textsuperscript{-1}, obtained from the heat content measurements of Kaylor, Walden, and Smith (Ref. 325).

The melting point of RbCl has been updated (Ref. 136).

The values given are for the $\beta$-form (high temperature) of CsCl. For the $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ transition of this salt, the following thermodynamic quantities were used: $T_m$ \(= 743 \text{ K}, \Delta_{\text{fus}} G^* = -1806 + 87.776T + 8.580 \times 10^{-4}T^2 - 13.874/T\) J mol\textsuperscript{-1}.

The $\Delta_{\text{fus}} G^*$ of RbBr has been calculated on the assumption that the heat of fusion at the melting point is 22 868 J mol\textsuperscript{-1}. This corrected value was obtained from the entropy of fusion $23.648 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$, estimated by the interpolation method of Richter and co-workers (Ref. 326 and 327).

The melting point of RbBr has been updated (Ref. 184).

The $\Delta_{\text{fus}} G^*$ of RbI has been calculated on the assumption that the heat of fusion is 24 560 J mol\textsuperscript{-1}, as measured calorimetrically (Ref. 328).

The melting point of RbI has been revised upward. A more recent representative value was taken from a standard reference (Ref. 329).

The melting point of CsI has been revised upward (Ref. 207).

### Table A2. Excess enthalpy and entropy of the liquid state for the 40 common-anion systems expressed as Legendre polynomials

\(H^E(1)/x_A x_B = a_0 + a_1(2x_B - 1) + a_2(6x_B^2 - 6x_B + 1) \text{ J mol}^{-1}\)  
\(S^E(1)/x_A x_B = b_0 + b_1(2x_B - 1) + b_2(6x_B^2 - 6x_B + 1) \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>A-B</th>
<th>(a_0)</th>
<th>(a_1)</th>
<th>(a_2)</th>
<th>(b_0)</th>
<th>(b_1)</th>
<th>(b_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiF-NaF</td>
<td>-7.381</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.109</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiF-KF</td>
<td>-18.275</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>-2.948</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiF-RbF</td>
<td>-20.292</td>
<td>3138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8.991</td>
<td>7.512</td>
<td>-5.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiF-CsF</td>
<td>-15.695</td>
<td>3726</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-KF</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.541</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-RbF</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.156</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
<td>-0.784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-CsF</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>-1399</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF-RbF</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF-CsF</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbF-CsF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-NaCl</td>
<td>-4.686</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-KCl</td>
<td>-17.758</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.148</td>
<td>-2.479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-RbCl</td>
<td>-20.933</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>-10.715</td>
<td>-3.363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-CsCl</td>
<td>-24.694</td>
<td>3723</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>-18.699</td>
<td>-1.643</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-KCl</td>
<td>-2.186</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-RbCl</td>
<td>-3.389</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.300</td>
<td>-3.623</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-CsCl</td>
<td>-4.101</td>
<td>-209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.695</td>
<td>-5.822</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl-RbCl</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl-CsCl</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbCl-CsCl</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiBr-NaBr</td>
<td>-3.264</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A2. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>$a_0$</th>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
<th>$b_0$</th>
<th>$b_1$</th>
<th>$b_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiBr-KBr</td>
<td>-14428</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>-1.441</td>
<td>-1.819</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiBr-RbBr</td>
<td>-18857</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiBr-CaBr</td>
<td>-22552</td>
<td>3242</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>-6.648</td>
<td>-11.029</td>
<td>2.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-KBr</td>
<td>-2259</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-RbBr</td>
<td>-3682</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-CaBr</td>
<td>-4832</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr-RbBr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr-CaBr</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbBr-CaBr</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiI-NaI</td>
<td>-4165</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiI-KI</td>
<td>-12805</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.277</td>
<td>2.730</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiI-RbI</td>
<td>-17560</td>
<td>2176</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.934</td>
<td>6.254</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiI-CaI</td>
<td>-21175</td>
<td>3812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI-KI</td>
<td>-2217</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI-RbI</td>
<td>-3767</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI-CaI</td>
<td>-5717</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>2.567</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI-RbI</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI-CaI</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbI-CaI</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A3. Excess enthalpy and entropy of the liquid state for the 30 common-cation systems, expressed as Legendre polynomials

\[
H_E^{\infty}(1) = a_0 + a_1(2x_B - 1) + a_2(6x_B^2 - 6x_B + 1) \ \text{J mol}^{-1}
\]

\[
S_E^{\infty}(1) = b_0 + b_1(2x_B - 1) + b_2(6x_B^2 - 6x_B + 1) \ \text{J mol}^{-1}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>$a_0$</th>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
<th>$b_0$</th>
<th>$b_1$</th>
<th>$b_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiF-LiCl</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiF-LiBr</td>
<td>5960</td>
<td>-4284</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.837</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiF-LiI</td>
<td>-1391</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.356</td>
<td>4.386</td>
<td>-1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-LiBr</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-314</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-LiI</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-NaCl</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>-642</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-NaBr</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>-2448</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-NaI</td>
<td>4907</td>
<td>-3832</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-NaBr</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-NaI</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>-320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-NaI</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF-KCl</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF-KBr</td>
<td>-833</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF-KI</td>
<td>-1007</td>
<td>-3237</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC1-KBr</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl-KI</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>-134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr-KI</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbF-RbCl</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>3447</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbF-RbBr</td>
<td>-2583</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>-376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbF-RbI</td>
<td>-3700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbCl-RbBr</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbCl-RbI</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbBr-RbI</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsF-CsCl</td>
<td>-1156</td>
<td>3857</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsF-CsBr</td>
<td>-4020</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsF-CsI</td>
<td>-7358</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>-1753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsCl-CsBr</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsCl-CsI</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsBr-CsI</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE A4. Gibbs energies of fusion and of formation (from pure liquid components) of intermediate solid compounds calculated in this work
\[
\Delta_{nf} G^\circ = a + b T(K) \text{ J mol}^{-1}
\]
\[
\Delta_{f} G^\circ = a' + b' T(K) \text{ J mol}^{-1}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(a')</th>
<th>(b')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(LiF)0.5(CaF)0.5</td>
<td>17 950</td>
<td>-23 400</td>
<td>-22 300</td>
<td>18 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LiF)0.5(RbF)0.5</td>
<td>13 700</td>
<td>-18 316</td>
<td>-18 811</td>
<td>14 093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LiCl)0.5(RbCl)0.5</td>
<td>8 128.9</td>
<td>-13 575</td>
<td>-13 445</td>
<td>10 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LiCl)0.67(CaCl)0.33</td>
<td>16 340</td>
<td>-24 519</td>
<td>-22 172</td>
<td>24 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LiBr)0.5(RbBr)0.5</td>
<td>10 176</td>
<td>-18 550</td>
<td>-12 382</td>
<td>8 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LiI)0.5(CaI)0.5</td>
<td>11 559</td>
<td>-19 802</td>
<td>-11 438</td>
<td>6 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LiI)0.5(RbI)0.5</td>
<td>20 168</td>
<td>-37 643</td>
<td>-22 505</td>
<td>28 274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE A5. Summary of the thermodynamic properties of the solid state in common-anion systems. Units: J mol\(^{-1}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System (A)-(B)</th>
<th>(G^\circ (s) / x_A x_B)</th>
<th>Henrian solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-LiBr</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiBr-LiI</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-NaBr</td>
<td>5490 - 2.373 T(K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-NaI</td>
<td>6730 - 1600 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr-Kr</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl-Kr</td>
<td>((\beta)-solid) 13 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbBr-RbI</td>
<td>7067 - 2.743 T(K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbI-RbCl</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbBr-RbCl</td>
<td>8943 + 4450 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbCl-RbI</td>
<td>3700 + 3700 x_A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsCl-CsI</td>
<td>((\alpha)-solid) 1123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((\beta)-solid) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CsCl-CsI</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbBr-CsI</td>
<td>10 418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE A6. Summary of the thermodynamic properties of the solid state in common-anion systems. Units: J mol\(^{-1}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System (A)-(B)</th>
<th>(G^\circ (s) / x_A x_B)</th>
<th>Henrian solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiF-NaF</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-KF</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF-RbF</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbF-CsF</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-NaCl</td>
<td>9800 - 5200 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl,Kr</td>
<td>14 777 + 7778 x_B - 77 7067 x_B T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-RbCl</td>
<td>5957 + 6044 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbCl-CsCl</td>
<td>5957 + 6044 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiBr-NaBr</td>
<td>8500 - 1500 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-KBr</td>
<td>11 004 + 78 7827 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr-RbBr</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr-CsBr</td>
<td>((\beta)-solid) 9000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbBr-CsBr</td>
<td>((\beta)-solid) 1000 + 2000 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiI-NaI</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI-KI</td>
<td>10 014 + 3073 x_A - 18 203 T(K) + 1 831 T x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI-RbI</td>
<td>15 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI-Rb</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI-CsI</td>
<td>((\beta)-solid) 5000 + 15 000 x_B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbI-CsI</td>
<td>15 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 71. The three Legendre polynomial coefficients \(a, a_1, a_2, a_3\) for the excess entropy function \(H^\circ (1) / x_A x_B\) of the Li-containing common-anion systems. Source: Table A2. Unit: J mol\(^{-1}\). The abscissa is the function of ionic radii, used by Reiss, Katz, and Kleppa (Ref. 324) and described in the text.

TABLE A7. Classification of the 70 binary alkali halide phase diagrams according to type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common anion</th>
<th>Common cation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple eutectic*</td>
<td>LiF-LiCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-RbF</td>
<td>LiF-LiF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF-CsF</td>
<td>LiF-CsF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-KCl</td>
<td>LiCl-LiCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-CsCl</td>
<td>NaF-NaCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-Kr</td>
<td>NaF-NaBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-RbBr</td>
<td>NaF-NaI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-CsBr</td>
<td>KF-KCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiI-KI</td>
<td>KF-KBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiI-CsI</td>
<td>KF-KF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI-CsI</td>
<td>RbF-RbCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI-RbI</td>
<td>RbF-RbBr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eutectic (limited SS)b

| LiF-NaF | NaF-KF |
| NaCl-RbCl |

Eutectic (extensive SS)c

| KF-CsF | NaCl-NaI |
| KBr-CsBr | NaCl-Kr |
| RbBr-CsBr | NaCl-Kl |
| NaI-RbI | KI-CsI |
| RbI-CsI |
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TABLE A7. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common anion</th>
<th>Common cation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Eutectic (with compound)**
| LIF-RbF | LiCl-LiBr |
| LIF-CdF | LiCr-Li |
| LiCl-RbCl | NaCl-NaBr |
| LiCl-SrCl | KCl-KBr |
| LiBr-RbBr | KCl-KBr |
| LiBr-CsBr | CsBr-Cr |
| LiI-Rbl | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KF-RbF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbF-CdF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiCl-NaCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl-KCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl-RbCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl-CsCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RbCl-CsCl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiBr-NaBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr-KBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr-RbBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiBr-Nal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaI-KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI-Rbl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very limited or no solid solubility, no compounds.
* Solid solubility less than 10 mol %.
* Solid solubility greater than 10 mol %.
* Congruent or incongruent melting compound.

| Table A8. Phase diagram types among series of binary alkali halide systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eutectics</th>
<th>Complete solid solubility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common anion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, K</td>
<td>[X(X = F, Cl, Br, I)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Rb</td>
<td>[X(X = F, Cl, Br, I)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Cs</td>
<td>[N(X = F, Cl, Br, I)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na, Rb</td>
<td>[X(X = F, Cl, Br, I)]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common cation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M[Cl, Br][M = Li, Na, K, Rb, Cs]</td>
<td>M[Cl, Br][M = Li, Na, K, Rb, Cs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X = Cl, Br, I)</td>
<td>(X = Cl, Br, I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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