Problem Set 3 – Figures of Merit, Calibration and Least Squares Analysis

Complete all problems on separate paper. Show all work for credit. Correct use of significant figures is required for full credit. You can use a spreadsheet or other software package for this problem set but make sure that you also understand how to find all of the values and their associated uncertainties <u>by hand</u>.

1. Here are the mass spectrometric signals for known concentrations of methane in H₂:

| CH ₄ (vol %) | 0 | 0.062 | 0.122 | 0.245 | 0.486 | 0.971 | 1.921 |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Signal (mV) | 9.1 | 47.5 | 95.6 | 193.8 | 387.5 | 812.5 | 1671.9 |

a) Subtract the blank value (9.1 mV) from all other values. Then use the method of least squares to find the slope and intercept and their uncertainties. Construct a calibration curve.

From the attached Excel Sheet:

| m= | 870 | +/- | 30 mV/% |
|----|-----|-----|---------|
| b= | -22 | +/- | 20 mV |

| | x | у | ху | x ² | n | y _{calc} | d | d² | (y-y _{bar}) ² | Y Unknow | n | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|--------|---------|-----|-------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | -22.085 | 22.085208 | 487.76 | 203040 | | | | | | | |
| | 0.062 | 38.4 | 2.3808 | 0.0038 | | 31.801 | 6.5988458 | 43.545 | 169909 | | | | | | | |
| | 0.122 | 86.5 | 10.553 | 0.0149 | | 83.949 | 2.5507536 | 6.5063 | 132569 | | | | | | | |
| | 0.245 | 184.7 | 45.252 | 0.06 | | 190.85 | -6.152836 | 37.857 | 70703 | | 1800 | | | | | |
| | 0.486 | 378.4 | 183.9 | 0.2362 | | 400.31 | -21.91434 | 480.24 | 5212.8 | | 1600 - | | | | ۶ | |
| | 0.971 | 803.4 | 780.1 | 0.9428 | | 821.84 | -18.44475 | 340.21 | 124468 | | 1400 - | | | | | |
| | 1.921 | 1662.8 | 3194.2 | 3.6902 | | 1647.5 | 15.27712 | 233.39 | 1E+06 | | 1200 - | | | / | | |
| | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 1000 - | | / | / | | |
| | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 1000 | | | | | |
| | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | <u> </u> | 800 - | | / | | | |
| Sums | 3.807 | 3154.2 | 4216.4 | 4.948 | | 3154.2 | 6.608E-13 | 1629.5 | 2E+06 | | 600 - | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | 400 - | * | | | | |
| | D = | 20.143 | | | | D = (E12 | *F2)-(B12*B1 | 2) | | | 200 - | * | | | | |
| | m= | 869.135 | | | | m = ((D12 | 2*F2)-(C12*B | 312))/C14 | | | 0 🦊 | • | | | | |
| | b= | -22.085 | | | | b =((E12* | C12)-(D12*E | 312))/C14 | | | -200 | | 1 | | 2 | 3 |
| | S _y = | 18.0527 | | | | $S_y = SQR$ | RT(I12/(F2-2)) | | | | | | | v | | |
| | S _m = | 10.6422 | % S _m = | 1.2245 | | $S_m = SQF$ | RT((C17^2*F2 | 2)/C14) | | | | | | | | |
| | S _b = | 8.9474 | % S _b = | -40.51 | | $S_b = SQR$ | RT((C17^2*E1 | (2)/C14) | | | | | | | | |
| | S _x = | 0.02309 | % S _x = | 90.886 | | S _x =(C17/ | ABS(C15))*S | SQRT((1/1 |)+(C21^2 | 2*F2/C14 | 4)+(E12/0 | 214)-((2* | C21*B1 | 2)/C14 | ł)) | |
| | x _{unk} = | 0.02541 | | | | x _{unk} =(J2-0 | C16)/C15 | | | | | | | | | |
| | x-int.= | 0.02541 | | | | x-int.=-C1 | 6/C15 | | | | | | | | | |
| | S _{x-int.} = | 0.0101 | % S _{x-int.} = | 39.732 | | S _{x-int.} =(C ² | 17/C15)*SQF | RT((1/F2)+ | AVERAC | GE(C2:C | 11)^2/(C | 15^2*DE | VSQ(B | 2:B11)) |)) | |
| | $R^2 =$ | 0.99925 | | | | $R^2 = 1-(11)$ | 2/J12) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | t = TINV(0 |).05,F2-2) | | | | | | | | | |
| | value | unc. (s) | % rel un | ic. | | | 95% Confid | ence Inte | ervals | | t | = 2.570 | 6 | | | |
| m | 869.1349 | 10.642 | 1.2245 | | | | | m= | 869.13 | +/- | 27.35 | 7 | | | | |
| b | -22.0852 | 8.947 | -40.51 | | | | | b= | -22.09 | +/- | 2 | 3 | | | | |
| x | 0.0254 | 0.02309 | 90.886 | | | | | x _{unk} = | 0.0254 | +/- | 0.059 | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | x-int.= | 0.0254 | +/- | 0.02 | 5 | | | | |

b) Replicate measurements of an unknown gave 144.1, 144.9, 143.9, and 145.1 mV. Determine the concentration of the unknown and its uncertainty. Determine the 95% confidence interval for the unknown.

| Raw | Corrected | Vol % | |
|--------|-----------|----------|---|
| Signal | Signal | | |
| 144.1 | 135.0 | 0.180737 | |
| 144.9 | 135.8 | 0.181657 | |
| 143.9 | 134.8 | 0.180507 | |
| 145.1 | 136.0 | 0.181888 | |
| | | | |
| | Mean | 0.181197 | % |
| | Stdev | 0.000677 | % |
| | t | 3.182446 | |
| | CI | 0.001077 | % |

To use our calibration curve, we must subtract the blank signal off first.

So the confidence interval is 0.181 ± 0.001 %

c) A blank gave 8.4, 9.3, 10.8, 8.8, 9.6, 7.4 and 7.3 mV when measured multiple times. Determine the limit of detection at the 99% confidence level for the procedure.

From these values, the standard deviation of the blank signal is 8.77 mV with a standard deviation of 1.13 mV. Therefore our signal at the detection limit is:

8.77mV + 3(1.13) = 12.17 mV

Again, to use the calibration relationship, we need to subtract the blank signal (9.1 mV) from this value: 12.17-9.1 = 3.07 mV.

Now we convert this to a concentration using the calibration relationship to find the LOD

LOD = (3.07-(-20))mV/(870 mV/%) = 0.027%

 Pure water containing no mercury was spiked with 0.40 μg mercury /L. Seven replicate determinations gave 0.39, 0.40, 0.38, 0.41, 0.36, 0.35, and 0.39 μg/L mercury. Find the mean percent recovery of the spike and the detection limit for the method.

| | μg mercury/L | %recovery |
|-------|--------------|-----------|
| | 0.39 | 97.5 |
| | 0.40 | 100 |
| | 0.38 | 95 |
| | 0.41 | 102.5 |
| | 0.36 | 90 |
| | 0.35 | 87.5 |
| | 0.39 | 97.5 |
| | | |
| Mean | 0.382857 | 95.71429 |
| Stdev | 0.021381 | 5.345225 |
| LOD | 0.064143 | |

The percent recovery is $100\%x(C_{spiked sample} - C_{unspiked sample})/C_{added}$. In our case $C_{unspiked sample} = 0 \ \mu g \ mercury/L \ and \ C_{added} = 0.40 \ \mu g \ mercury/L$

To find the LOD, we need the standard deviation of the measurements. Since they are already in concentration units and since we assume that a 0 μ g mercury/L sample would give 0 concentration, our LOD is simply 3 times the standard deviaton of the sample concentrations. LOD = 3(0.021381 μ g mercury/L) = **0.06 \mug mercury /L**

- 3. An unknown sample of Cu²⁺ gave an absorbance of 0.262 in an atomic absorption analysis. Then 1.00 mL of a solution containing 100.0 ppm (i.e. μg/mL) Cu²⁺ was mixed with 95.0 mL of the unknown and the mixture was diluted to 100.0 mL in a volumetric flask with DI water. The absorbance of the new solution was 0.500.
 - a. Denoting the initial, unknown concentration as $[Cu^{2^+}]_i$, write an expression for the final concentration, $[Cu^{2^+}]_f$, after dilution. Units of concentration are ppm.

$$[Cu^{2+}]_{f} = (95 \text{ mL}/100 \text{ mL})[Cu^{2+}]_{i}$$

b. In a similar manner, write the final concentration of added standard Cu^{2+} , designated as $[S]_{f}$

 $[S]_{f} = (1 \text{ mL}/100 \text{ mL})[S]_{I} = (1/100)x100.0 \text{ ppm} = 1.000 \text{ ppm}$

c. Find $[Cu^{2+}]_i$ in the unknown.

 $\frac{I_S}{I_{S+Cu}} = \frac{0.262}{0.500} = \frac{[Cu]_i}{1.000 + 0.95[Cu]_i}$ After some algebra, $[Cu^{2+}]_i = 1.04$ ppm A constant volume standard addition experiment is performed. Five flasks containing 25.00 mL of a serum with unknown concentration of Na⁺ are labeled 1-5. Into each, varying volumes (see below) of 1.940 M NaCl standard is added. Each flask is then diluted to 50.00 mL.

| Flask | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Volume of standard added (mL) | 0 | 1.000 | 2.000 | 3.000 | 4.000 |
| Na ⁺ atomic emission signal (mV) | 3.13 | 5.40 | 7.89 | 10.30 | 12.48 |

a. Use Excel or Minitab to prepare a standard addition graph and find the concentration of Na+ in the serum.

| volume | concentration | signal |
|--------|---------------|--------|
| added | added | |
| (mL) | (M) | |
| 0 | 0 | 3.13 |
| 1 | 0.0388 | 5.4 |
| 2 | 0.0776 | 7.89 |
| 3 | 0.1164 | 10.3 |
| 4 | 0.1552 | 12.48 |

From a least-squares analysis, we find the equation of our line to be:

Signal in mV = 60.825mV/M(concentration) + 3.12mV

Solving for the x-intercept (y=0)

0 mV = 60.825 mV / M(concentration) + 3.12 mVConcentration = -(-3.12 mV/(60.825 mV /M)) = 0.05129 M Since this was in the solution that was measured, we must account for dilution to determine the original concentration: 0.05129M(50.00 mL/25.00 mL) = **0.1025 M**

b. Determine the uncertainty in the result.

Here we need the $s_{x-intercept}$, which from our least squared analysis is 0.00173 or 3.367% relative standard deviation. So our uncertainty in the final concentration is 0.003367(0.1025 M) = 0.000345M

So our final result would be $0.1025 \pm 0.0003 \text{ M}$, where we have estimated our uncertainty using the standard deviation. We could convert that to a confidence interval by multiplying by the appropriate t-value (t=3.1824 for 3 degrees of freedom)