

Correlation for the Viscosity of Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF₆) from the Triple Point to 1000 K and Pressures to 50 MPa

Sergio E. Quiñones-Cisneros^{a)}

Instituto de Investigaciones en Materiales, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Apdo. Postal 70-360, México D.F. 04510, México

Marcia L. Huber

Thermophysical Properties Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 325 Broadway, MS 638.08, Boulder, Colorado 80305-3337, USA

Ulrich K. Deiters

Institute of Physical Chemistry, University of Cologne, Luxemburger Str. 116, 50939 Cologne, Germany

(Received 11 January 2012; accepted 22 March 2012; published online 23 April 2012)

A wide-ranging correlation for the viscosity surface of sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) has been developed that incorporates generalized friction theory (GFT). The approach requires, as the core thermodynamic model, a reference-quality equation of state (EoS). Here the EoS of Guder and Wagner has been selected for that purpose. All available experimental data, to the extent of our knowledge, were considered in the development of the model. The correlation performs best in the low-pressure (less than 0.33 MPa) region from 300 K to 700 K where the estimated uncertainty (considered to be combined expanded uncertainty with a coverage factor of two) is 0.3%. In the region from 300 K to 425 K for pressures less than 20 MPa, the estimated uncertainty is less than 1%. Where there were data available for validation at temperatures from 230 K to 575 K for pressures up to 50 MPa, the estimated uncertainty is 2%. The correlation extrapolates in a physically reasonable manner and may be used at pressures to 100 MPa and temperatures from the triple point to 1000 K. © 2012 by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce on behalf of the United States. All rights reserved. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3702441>]

Key words: generalized friction theory; sulfur hexafluoride; viscosity.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2	2. Dilute-gas model parameters for SF ₆	4
2. Model Formulation	3	3. Parameters for the second viscosity virial coefficient	5
2.1. Dilute-gas limit	4	4. Residual friction model parameters for sulfur hexafluoride	6
2.2. Initial density dependence	5	5. Primary data friction theory model results	7
2.3. Residual friction model	5	6. Secondary data friction theory model results	7
3. Regression and Results	6	7. Tertiary data friction theory model results	8
3.1. Low-density results	8	8. Sample points for computer verification of the model	10
3.2. Full-range results	8		
4. Computer-Program Verification	10		
5. Conclusion	10		
Acknowledgements	10		
6. References	10		

List of Tables

1. Summary of available experimental data. Considered sets: primary (1), secondary (2), and tertiary (3)	3
--	---

List of Figures

1. SF ₆ dilute-gas model (solid line) along with low-density primary data	4
2. SF ₆ dilute-gas model (solid line) along with low-density secondary and other data	4
3. Comparison of zero-density and atmospheric-pressure correlations in the literature	5
4. Second viscosity virial coefficient B_{η}	5
5. SF ₆ model η - T surface performance near the phase boundary	6

^{a)}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; Electronic mail: seqc@mac.com.
© 2012 by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce on behalf of the United States. All rights reserved.

6.	Overall SF ₆ model η - T surface performance	6
7.	Separation of the pressure into attractive and repulsive parts based on the internal pressure Eqs. (2) and (3) for the SF ₆ reference EoS of Guder (Ref. 8)	7
8.	Deviation- p - T diagram	8
9.	Low-density primary data model deviation	8
10.	Low-density secondary data model deviations	9
11.	Full density range primary data model deviations	9
12.	Full pressure range primary data model deviations	9
13.	Full temperature range primary data model deviations	9
14.	Full density range secondary data model deviations	9
15.	Full pressure range secondary data model deviations	9
16.	Overall deviation performance of all data considered in the regression	10

1. Introduction

Because of its chemical inertia and the almost spherical shape of its molecules, sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) has sometimes been called a synthetic noble gas. It has many technical applications, such as an insulator for high-voltage equipment,¹ thermoacoustic insulation of windows, and a newer application as an inert solvent for chemical reactions in supercritical fluids.² In addition, there are medical applications of SF₆ (Refs. 3 and 4) and it also is of interest to researchers involved with molecular simulations.^{5–7} At temperatures above 1000 K, decomposition can occur, and SF₆ begins to attack metal or silica surfaces. This leads to other technical applications such as surface fluorination or etching, but makes it difficult to obtain experimental data for pure SF₆ at these temperatures.

As SF₆ is an important industrial fluid, it is necessary to have accurate models for its thermophysical properties. Guder and Wagner⁸ reviewed the thermodynamic properties of SF₆ and developed a reference equation of state. Assael *et al.*⁹ recently developed a reference correlation for the thermal conductivity surface of SF₆. At present, as noted by Wilhelm *et al.*,¹⁰ a suitable reference viscosity surface is not available. Wilhelm *et al.*¹⁰ pointed out that the surface correlation presented by Altunin¹¹ was primarily based on only three data sets (Ulybin and Makarushkin,¹² Timrot *et al.*,¹³ and Grigorev *et al.*¹⁴), and the resulting correlation fails to represent the data of Hoogland *et al.*,¹⁵ as well as their own data. Similarly, the surface of Hafer^{16,17} also fails to adequately represent the data of Hoogland *et al.*¹⁵ In addition, both of these surfaces were developed prior to the availability of the extensive data provided by Wilhelm *et al.*¹⁰ In this work, we take advantage of the availability of the new

data of Wilhelm *et al.*¹⁰ to develop a wide-ranging viscosity correlation and provide comparisons to literature data and other correlations. The formulation is based on the generalized friction theory (GFT) method¹⁸ that can provide an accurate description of the viscosity surface, including the liquid, vapor and supercritical regions.

Wilhelm *et al.*¹⁰ surveyed the viscosity surfaces and data available to 2005, provided a critical evaluation of the available literature data, and we have incorporated their recommendations in this work. Table 1 summarizes, to the best of our knowledge, all available viscosity data for SF₆,^{10,12–16,19–41} and includes the type of experimental apparatus, sample purity, author's estimated uncertainty, and the temperature and pressure ranges of the data. The data are identified as primary, secondary, or tertiary. The primary data were selected as those with the lowest uncertainties that cover a particular region; generally when there are overlapping regions, the sets with the larger uncertainties are considered secondary and are treated differently in the regression procedure described later in this document. Tertiary data were not used in the regression and were included only for comparison purposes. The primary set includes the extensive 2005 data of Wilhelm *et al.*¹⁰ that were made with a vibrating wire apparatus in a relative mode with uncertainties ranging from 0.25% to 0.4% that extend to 20.4 MPa. The earlier quartz oscillating disk measurements from the Vogel group³⁷ also were considered as primary data; these cover temperatures from room temperature to 681 K and were performed at 0.33 MPa, with an uncertainty ranging from 0.1% to 0.3%, with the highest uncertainty at the highest temperatures. Comparisons with their work indicate that many of the early measurements^{19,20,22,23} are several percent too high and these were considered tertiary. Although also subject to this problem, the set of Ellis and Raw²¹ was included as secondary to guide the extrapolation behavior to high temperatures, since the data extend to 1126 K. Several data sets from Kestin and coworkers^{25,28–31} that extend above room temperature are thought to have a temperature measurement error, as discussed by Vogel *et al.*,⁴² and were not included as primary data. The 1971 Kestin⁴³ data set at 298 K, however, agrees with the results of Strehlow and Vogel³⁷ to within 0.2% and was included in the primary set. The high-pressure region was supplemented with the secondary data set of Ulybin and Makarushkin¹² that extends to 51 MPa. Following the recommendations in Wilhelm *et al.*,¹⁰ we also include as primary data the capillary measurements of Hoogland *et al.* that were performed in an absolute mode¹⁵ and the measurements by Hurly *et al.*³⁸ at 298 K made in a Greenspan viscometer. Although a discussion detailing the apparatus has been published,¹⁷ the large experimental data set in the thesis of Hafer¹⁶ is not yet published in the literature and was considered as tertiary data. All data from this work, obtained from both forced-mode and free-mode measurements from a torsional crystal viscometer, are included in Table 1; however, Hafer used only the forced-mode data in the development of his correlation. Since the work of Wilhelm *et al.*,¹⁰ only two additional small data sets have been published: the

TABLE 1. Summary of available experimental data. Considered sets: primary (1), secondary (2), and tertiary (3)

1st author	Year	Method ^a	Purity, %	Unc., %	No. points	<i>T</i> (K)	<i>p</i> (MPa)	Sets
Earwicker ¹⁹	1954	CAP	n/a	n/a	2	295–373	0.1	3
McCoubrey ²⁰	1957	CAP	n/a	1	8	295–478	0.1	3
Ellis ²¹	1959	CAP	99	1	17	470–1126	0.1	2
Raw ²²	1963	CAP	95	1	4	303–342	0.0016	3
Dawe ²³	1970	CAP	99.9	1	20	293–873	0.1	3
Kestin ²⁴	1971	OD	99.99	0.10	2	296–303	0.1	1
Hellemans ²⁵	1973	OD	99.99	0.1–0.3	7	298–573	0.1	3
Ueda ²⁶	1974	OD	n/a	n/a	8	273–346	0.07	2
Timrot ^{13,27}	1975	OD	99.8	0.7	62	297–526	0.04–3.46	2
Kestin ²⁸	1976	OD	99.99	0.2	3	296–477	0.1	3
Kestin ²⁹	1977	OD	99.99	0.1–0.2	10	296–474	0.1	3
Kestin ³⁰	1977	OD	99.99	0.1–0.2	5	298–473	0.1	3
Grigorev ¹⁴	1977	CAP	99.78	0.7–1.1	131	245–473	2–40	2
Ulybin ¹²	1977	CAP	99.8	1	89	230–300	0.3–51.2	2
Abe ³¹	1979	OD	99.99	0.3	2	423–468	0.1	2
Harris ³²	1979	CAP	99.99	1.5	7	218–301	0.1	3
Tanaka ³³	1980	RB	99.5	1	12	298–348	0.1–0.2	3
Hoogland ³⁴	1982	CAP	n/a	0.2–1	13	318–323	3.7–4.1	2
Lukin ³⁵	1983	CAP	n/a	0.3	13	173–293	0.1	3
Hoogland ¹⁵	1985	CAP	n/a	0.1	31	298–333	0.1–9.6	1
Takahashi ³⁶	1987	OD	n/a	0.5	34	273–319	1.2–3.7	2
Strehlow ³⁷	1989	OD	99.95	0.1–0.3	86	298–691	0.33	1
Hafer ^{16,17}	1999	TOR	99.996	3–6	2074	225–327	0.03–34.5	3
Hurly ³⁸	2003	GRN	99.99	0.5	15	298	0.3–1.6	1
Wilhelm ¹⁰	2005	VW	99.995	0.25–0.4	677	300–425	0.03–20.4	1
Berg ^{39,40}	2005	CAP	99.99	0.04	1	298	0.1	1
Estrada ⁴¹	2008	GRN	99.99	0.6	8	273	0.3–1	2

^aCAP, capillary; GRN, Greenspan viscometer; OD, oscillating disk; RB, rolling ball; TOR, torsional crystal; VW, vibrating wire.

data of Berg^{39,40} and those of Estrada-Alexanders and Hurly.⁴¹ The single data point measured by Berg^{39,40} in 2005 in a capillary flow instrument designed for high accuracy (0.04%) absolute viscosity in gases was also included in the primary data set. The data of Estrada-Alexanders and Hurly⁴¹ were treated as secondary data, as they have slightly larger uncertainties. In this work, all temperatures have been converted to ITS-90 (Ref. 44) and all densities for the given state points are obtained from the equation of state (EoS) of Guder and Wagner⁸ for the reported temperature and pressure. This may introduce additional uncertainty, because the densities we used may not be identical to the values used by the original researchers in their data analysis procedures.

2. Model Formulation

For the development of the reference viscosity model for SF₆, the GFT approach proposed by Quiñones-Cisneros and Deiters¹⁸ has been applied. In general terms, a GFT model can be written as follows:

$$\eta = \eta_0 + \eta_f, \quad (1)$$

where η_0 corresponds to the dilute-gas limit and η_f is a friction term. The η_f is built upon a balance between repulsive and attractive contributions to the isotropic pressure. In the

GFT approach, this is achieved by making use of the internal pressure (π_T) concept according to the following definitions:

$$p_a = -\pi_T, \quad (2)$$

and

$$p_r = p - p_a = T \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial T} \right)_v. \quad (3)$$

In addition, as pointed out in the original GFT work,¹⁸ for an accurate description of the low-density phase, an explicit separation of the linear ideal-gas term is recommended,

$$p_r = p_{id} + \Delta p_r. \quad (4)$$

The ideal-gas term provides the linear initial density-viscosity dependence responsible for the behavior of the second viscosity virial coefficient. The final full model that has been used is similar to the GFT model that was used for water and CO₂,¹⁸

$$\eta_f = \kappa_a p_a + \kappa_r \Delta p_r + \kappa_i p_{id} + \kappa_{aa} p_a^2 + \kappa_{rr} \Delta p_r^2 + \kappa_{ii} p_{id}^2 + \kappa_{rrr} p_r^3 + \kappa_{aaa} p_a^3, \quad (5)$$

where the κ friction parameters depend only on temperature and an additional cubic term has been added in order to

achieve improved accuracy at high pressure. We note that, given the analytical nature of the EoS used for SF₆, the weak divergence of the viscosity in the near-critical region is not considered in this work. Nevertheless, as demonstrated by Quiñones-Cisneros and Deiters,¹⁸ the use of a renormalized EoS may also reproduce the non-classical weak viscosity divergence, in close agreement with experimental micro-gravity measurements. Nevertheless, if required, the viscosity critical anomaly could also be addressed theoretically, as was done by Sengers *et al.* for water.⁴⁵

2.1. Dilute-gas limit

For the dilute-gas limit, an empirical model as suggested for the GFT (Ref. 18) approach has been fitted to the primary low-density/low-pressure data (gas/vapor data up to 1 MPa). The model is of the form

$$\eta_0 = \left(d_0 + d_1 T_r^{1/4} + d_2 T_r^{1/2} + d_3 T_r^{3/4} + d_4 T_r \right), \quad (6)$$

where $T_r = T/T_c$ is the reduced temperature, and the value for the critical temperature is consistent with the one used in the EoS of Guder and Wagner, $T_c = 318.7232$ K. The model fit is done by combining Eqs. (1), (5), and (6), but using only low-pressure data and eliminating the third-order terms in Eq. (5). The parameters for this dilute-gas correlation are given in Table 2. The primary data used in the regression were those of Kestin *et al.*,⁴³ Hoogland *et al.*,¹⁵ Strehlow and Vogel,³⁷ Hurly *et al.*,³⁸ Berg,^{39,40} and Wilhelm *et al.*¹⁰ As secondary data, selected points from Ueda and Kigoshi,²⁶ Timrot *et al.*,¹³ Abe *et al.*,³¹ and Estrada-Alexanders and Hurly⁴¹ were considered. Only low-pressure secondary points outside the temperature range covered by the primary data were used.

Figure 1 shows all primary low-pressure gaseous state data up to 0.5 MPa along with the derived dilute-gas empirical model. As illustrated in Fig. 1, all primary data fall closely over the model curve. The dilute-gas correlation is based on primary data that range from 270 K to 700 K, although Eq. (6) can be extrapolated with reasonable confidence from the triple point, 223.555 K,⁴⁶ up to 1000 K. Figure 2 shows a comparison with the secondary and all other low-pressure data available, giving some indication of the reliability of extrapolation outside the 270 K to 700 K range. The data in Fig. 2 are from Hafer,^{16,17} Lukin *et al.*,³⁵ Tanaka *et al.*,³³ Harris *et al.*,³² Ulybin and Makarushkin,¹²

TABLE 2. Dilute-gas model parameters for SF₆

i	d_i (mPa s)
0	0.118561
1	-0.378103
2	0.416428
3	-0.165295
4	0.0245381




Fig. 1. (Color online) SF₆ dilute-gas model (solid line) along with low-density primary data.

Kestin *et al.*,²⁸ Hellemans *et al.*,²⁵ Kestin *et al.*,⁴³ Dawe *et al.*,²³ Raw and Tang,²² Ellis and Raw,²¹ McCoubrey and Singh,²⁰ and Earwicker and Fear.¹⁹ As shown in Fig. 2, with the exception of the Ellis and Raw²¹ data, all low-density gaseous data are in reasonable agreement with the dilute-gas model. Ellis and Raw²¹ noted that at temperatures above 1023 K the experimental data are unreliable, due to thermal dissociation.

Figure 3 shows comparisons with some other zero-density and atmospheric-pressure formulations in the literature. The formulation of Altunin¹¹ is valid from 218 K to 873 K and has an estimated uncertainty of 1%; Equation (6) is in agreement with this curve to within this level of uncertainty. The “individual” correlation from Strehlow and Vogel³⁷ has an estimated uncertainty of about 0.3% for the temperature range from room temperature up to 700 K and is in agreement with Eq. (6) to within its estimated uncertainty. At temperatures below room temperature, the estimated uncertainty of the correlation from Strehlow and Vogel³⁷ (as well as our correlation) is larger due to the underlying data—the low-temperature data of Harris *et al.*³² upon which the individual correlation was based have an estimated uncertainty of 1.5%.³⁷ Until additional low-temperature data of low




Fig. 2. (Color online) SF₆ dilute-gas model (solid line) along with low-density secondary and other data.




Fig. 3. (Color online) Comparison of zero-density and atmospheric-pressure correlations in the literature.

uncertainty become available, it is not possible to improve any correlation in this region. The correlation of Trengove and Wakeham⁴⁷ has an uncertainty of 0.3% at room temperature, rising to 1.5% at 220 K and 2% at 900 K, and is in agreement with Eq. (6) to within their estimated uncertainties. The formulation of Zarkova and Hohm⁴⁸ incorporated the data of Strehlow and Vogel³⁷ and is in good agreement with Eq. (6) and the correlation of Strehlow and Vogel³⁷ at low temperatures. Larger deviations are seen at high temperatures, but the agreement is still within the uncertainty of the data. Finally, Fig. 3 shows reasonable agreement with the correlation of Boushehri *et al.*,⁴⁹ claimed to be valid from 250 K to 3000 K.

2.2. Initial density dependence

Subsequent to the derivation of the dilute-gas-limit model, a model for the initial density dependence (second viscosity virial coefficient) of SF₆ was derived. This was done in order to ensure agreement with the Rainwater–Friend⁵⁰ theory. The second viscosity virial coefficient is defined as

$$B_\eta = \frac{1}{\eta_0} \left(\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \rho} \right)_{\rho=0}. \quad (7)$$

In terms of the formulation given in Eq. (5), this reduces to

$$B_\eta = \frac{RT}{\eta_0} \kappa_i. \quad (8)$$

The κ_i is parameterized according to the recommended form for the GFT,

$$\kappa_i = (c_0 + c_1\psi_1 + c_2\psi_2)/T_r, \quad (9)$$

where

$$\psi_1 = \exp(T_r^{-1}) - 1 \quad (10)$$

and

$$\psi_2 = \exp(T_r^{-2}) - 1. \quad (11)$$

TABLE 3. Parameters for the second viscosity virial coefficient, Eq. (9)

i	c_i $\left(\frac{\text{mPa s}}{\text{bar}} \right)$
0	5.38783×10^{-5}
1	1.63805×10^{-6}
2	-2.08160×10^{-5}

The fitted parameters in Eq. (9) for the second viscosity virial coefficient are reported in Table 3. Figure 4 shows a comparison between the reduced second viscosity virial coefficient calculated by the model derived in this work, and the model of Vogel *et al.*⁴² using the SF₆ intermolecular parameters of Strehlow and Vogel³⁷ ($\epsilon/k_B = 215.0$ K and $\sigma = 0.5205$ nm), along with reduced B_η values derived from the experimental results of Strehlow and Vogel³⁷ and Wilhelm *et al.*¹⁰ The reducing parameters used in Fig. 4 are the critical temperature T_c and the critical volume v_c . The model performance is in basic agreement with the Rainwater–Friend⁵⁰ theory and shows reasonable agreement, being in the right order of magnitude with the experimental values, as shown in Fig. 4.

2.3. Residual friction model

The mathematical form for the temperature-dependent residual friction coefficients is essentially similar to that originally proposed.¹⁸ The proposed temperature dependence of the friction constants is of the form,

$$\kappa_a = (a_0 + a_1\psi_1 + a_2\psi_2)/T_r, \quad (12)$$

$$\kappa_r = (b_0 + b_1\psi_1 + b_2\psi_2)/T_r, \quad (13)$$

$$\kappa_{aa} = (A_0 + A_1\psi_1 + A_2\psi_2)/T_r^3, \quad (14)$$

$$\kappa_{rr} = (B_0 + B_1\psi_1 + B_2\psi_2)/T_r^3, \quad (15)$$

$$\kappa_{ii} = (C_0 + C_1\psi_1 + C_2\psi_2)/T_r^3, \quad (16)$$




Fig. 4. (Color online) Second viscosity virial coefficient B_η .

TABLE 4. Residual friction model parameters for SF₆

i	$a_i \left(\frac{\text{mPa s}}{\text{bar}} \right)$	$b_i \left(\frac{\text{mPa s}}{\text{bar}} \right)$	$A_i \left(\frac{\text{mPa s}}{\text{bar}^2} \right)$	$B_i \left(\frac{\text{mPa s}}{\text{bar}^2} \right)$
0	-6.87811×10^{-4}	1.72737×10^{-4}	9.99563×10^{-8}	-8.98256×10^{-8}
1	8.22661×10^{-4}	-2.02448×10^{-4}	-9.64167×10^{-9}	-8.49428×10^{-8}
2	-3.54867×10^{-4}	1.95952×10^{-4}	-7.54196×10^{-9}	0
	$C_i \left(\frac{\text{mPa s}}{\text{bar}^3} \right)$	$D_i \left(\frac{\text{mPa s}}{\text{bar}^3} \right)$	$E_i \left(\frac{\text{mPa s}}{\text{bar}^3} \right)$	
0	-8.53432×10^{-6}	0	0	
1	1.14404×10^{-5}	0	-5.69402×10^{-11}	
2	-5.65762×10^{-6}	2.27980×10^{-11}	2.92190×10^{-11}	

$$\kappa_{\text{rrr}} = (D_0 + D_1\psi_1 + D_2\psi_2) / T_r, \quad (17)$$

and

$$\kappa_{\text{aaa}} = (E_0 + E_1\psi_1 + E_2\psi_2) / T_r. \quad (18)$$

3. Regression and Results

The final model parameters are given in Table 4 where, as in Table 3, in order to facilitate the numerical implementation of the model, the reported units for the values of the parameters are distinctively given as units of viscosity for the numerator and pressure for the denominator. There are a total of five parameters for the dilute-gas correlation and 21 for the residual terms. The parameters were fitted through an iterative regression method that used all of the primary and secondary data reported in Table 1. There are two main differences between the treatments of the primary and secondary data: (1) no secondary data that overlapped with the primary data were considered and (2) the primary data were not modified in any way, whereas the considered secondary data points were smoothed through the regression process. Tertiary data were not used at all in the regression, the principal reason being that most of the data overlapped with the

primary data, which were considered to be of higher accuracy.

All of the regressions were iteratively made through a process that consisted of (1) performing a regression, (2) locating the point of highest deviation (excluding primary data), (3) if the highest deviation point was above a given tolerance, the point was smoothed by replacing it with the average between the point itself and the value predicted with the correlation. This smoothing process was iterated until a tolerance for the highest deviation of 0.5% was achieved.

The final behavior of the model is depicted in Figs. 5 and 6, showing a smooth uniform viscosity surface. In the original GFT work,¹⁸ it was demonstrated that the GFT approach allows for the physics present in the EoS to be mapped onto the viscosity surface. In the original GFT work, CO₂ and water were used to illustrate the difference in the physics that results from the internal-pressure-based attraction-repulsion balance. In the case of CO₂, a clear attraction-repulsion separation is derived, while in the case of water at low temperature an inversion in the sign of the internal pressure develops. This anomalous behavior, in the case of water, was then linked to the low-temperature viscosity anomaly that water develops at high pressure.¹⁸ In the case of SF₆, the internal pressure calculations that follow from the Guder and Wagner⁸ EoS show no anomalous behavior, resulting, as




FIG. 5. (Color online) SF₆ model η - T surface performance near the phase boundary.




FIG. 6. (Color online) Overall SF₆ model η - T surface performance.

depicted in Fig. 7, in a clear attraction-repulsion separation similar to the one reported in the case of CO₂.¹⁸ It can therefore be argued that the regular behavior shown in Figs. 5 and 6 follows from the regular behavior that the Guder and Wagner⁸ EoS shows for the SF₆ internal-pressure-based attraction-repulsion separation.

Table 5 shows the deviation results for the SF₆ primary data,^{10,15,37–40,43} where the AAD, Bias, and root-mean-square error (RMS) values are defined as follows:

$$\text{AAD} = 100 \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{\eta_{i, \text{calculated}} - \eta_{i, \text{experimental}}}{\eta_{i, \text{experimental}}} \right|, \quad (19)$$

$$\text{Bias} = 100 \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\eta_{i, \text{calculated}} - \eta_{i, \text{experimental}}}{\eta_{i, \text{experimental}}} \right), \quad (20)$$

$$\text{RMS} = 100 \times \left[\frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\eta_{i, \text{calculated}} - \eta_{i, \text{experimental}}}{\eta_{i, \text{experimental}}} \right)^2 \right) \right]^{1/2}. \quad (21)$$

Most of the primary data are reproduced within the uncertainty reported by the authors and cover pressure and temperature ranges in the area of industrial application. In the case of the secondary data,^{12–14,21,26,31,34,36,41} Table 6 appears to




Fig. 7. (Color online) Separation of the pressure into attractive and repulsive parts based on the internal pressure Eqs. (2) and (3) for the SF₆ reference EoS of Guder (Ref. 8). Only stable branches are depicted at 220 K, 240 K, 260 K, 280 K, 300 K, T_c , 350 K, 400 K, 500 K, and 600 K.

TABLE 5. Primary data friction theory model results

Author	T -range (K)	p -range (MPa)	Auth. Unc. (%)	AAD (%)	Bias (%)	RMS (%)	n
Kestin <i>et al.</i> ⁴³	296–303	0.1	0.1	0.27	−0.27	0.27	2
Hoogland <i>et al.</i> ¹⁵	298–333	0.1–9.6	0.10	0.29	−0.28	0.34	31
Strehlow and Vogel ³⁷	299–691	0–0.3	0.1–0.3	0.09	0.02	0.10	77
Hurly <i>et al.</i> ³⁸	298–298	0.3–1.6	0.50	0.17	0.12	0.19	15
Wilhelm <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰	300–425	0–20.4	0.25	0.20	−0.02	0.29	677
Berg ^{39,40}	298–298	0.1	0.04	0.04	−0.04	0.04	1

TABLE 6. Secondary data friction theory model results

Author	T -range (K)	p -range (MPa)	Auth. Unc. (%)	AAD (%)	Bias (%)	RMS (%)	n
Ellis and Raw ²¹	470–1126	0.1	1.00	3.05	−2.99	3.81	17
Ueda and Kigoshi ²⁶	273–346	0.1	4.00	0.70	0.58	0.77	8
Timrot <i>et al.</i> ¹³	297–526	0–3.5	0.7	0.58	−0.48	1.00	62
Ulybin and Makarushkin ^{12,a}	230–318	3–51.2	1.00	1.39	0.56	2.88	85
Grigorev <i>et al.</i> ¹⁴	245–473	2–40	0.7–1.1	2.33	−0.88	4.49	131
Abe <i>et al.</i> ³¹	423–468	0.1	0.30	0.55	−0.55	0.70	2
Hoogland and Trappeniers ^{34,b}	319–323	3.8–4.1	0.1–1	6.92	−6.92	8.70	13
Takahashi <i>et al.</i> ^{36,c}	273–319	1.2–3.7	0.50	1.56	1.54	1.96	34
Estrada-Alexanders and Hurly ⁴¹	273–273	0.3–1.0	0.60	1.65	0.06	2.57	8

^aIncludes sat. liquid, sat. vapor, excluding critical region points.

^bCritical isochore.

^cSaturated vapor.




FIG. 8. (Color online) Deviation- p - T diagram.

show larger overall discrepancies. However, more illustrative are the results shown in the deviation diagram presented in Fig. 8. This deviation diagram shows that for the main region of application covering a temperature range between 250 K and 500 K and pressures up to 50 MPa, the model also reproduces most of the secondary data within 1%. In fact, the largest deviations related to the secondary data are mostly found in the region of overlap with the primary data, i.e., a region where only primary data were considered in the regression. The primary data have overall deviations under 0.5%. For the high-temperature region, high-pressure data are unavailable. Nevertheless, the core of the GFT model is the Guder–Wagner EoS, and therefore, following Guder and Wagner,⁸ we expect that the viscosity model can also be extrapolated with physically reasonable behavior to high temperatures and pressures beyond the range of data availability used in the regression of the EoS (triple point to 625 K and up to 150 MPa). This is further supported by the smooth and regular behavior shown in Figs. 5 and 6.

Table 7 reports the model deviation results for the tertiary data.^{16,19,20,22,23,25,28–30,32,33,35} As shown in the table, most of the data are reproduced within or close to the reported




FIG. 9. (Color online) Low-density primary data model deviation. Calculated value: η_{calc} , experimental value: η_{exp} .

uncertainty. It should be noted that the main reason that most of the tertiary data were not considered was simply because of their overlap with the primary data.

3.1. Low-density results

Figures 9 and 10 show the percentage deviations of the low-density (less than 100 kg m^{-3}) primary and secondary data. The temperature range for the low-density data can be seen in Figs. 1 and 2. The deviation values in these figures can be considered to be controlled mainly by the dilute-gas limit model. Therefore, based on comparisons with data, the dilute-gas model is estimated to have an uncertainty of 0.3% (at a coverage factor of two) for the temperature range 298 K to 700 K, rising to 1.5% at both the lowest (the triple point) and highest (1000 K) values of its recommended temperature range.

3.2. Full-range results

Figures 11–13 show the FT model viscosity deviation trends with density, pressure, and temperature with respect

TABLE 7. Tertiary data friction theory model results

Author	T -range (K)	p -range (MPa)	Auth. Unc. (%)	AAD (%)	Bias (%)	RMS (%)	n
Earwicker and Fear ¹⁹	296–373	0.1	n/a	1.27	−1.27	1.35	2
McCoubrey and Singh ²⁰	295–478	0.1	1	1.90	−0.47	2.08	8
Raw and Tang ²²	303–342	0	1.00	2.77	−2.77	2.78	4
Dawe <i>et al.</i> ²³	293–873	0.1	1.00	0.55	−0.40	0.67	20
Hellemans <i>et al.</i> ²⁵	298–573	0.1	0.1–0.3	0.34	−0.34	0.36	7
Kestin <i>et al.</i> ²⁸	296–477	0.1	0.2	0.46	−0.46	0.48	3
Kestin <i>et al.</i> ²⁹	296–474	0.1	0.1–0.2	0.38	−0.38	0.44	10
Kestin <i>et al.</i> ³⁰	298–473	0.1	0.1–0.2	0.29	−0.29	0.33	5
Harris <i>et al.</i> ³²	218–302	1	1.00	0.22	0.05	0.26	7
Tanaka <i>et al.</i> ³³	298–348	0.1–0.2	1.00	0.71	−0.10	0.80	12
Lukin <i>et al.</i> ^{35,a}	173–293	0.1	0.30	1.91	−1.91	1.94	7
Hafer ^{16,b} (forced mode)	225–326	0.07–34.5	3–6	3.26	−2.00	4.09	1108
Hafer ^{16,b} (free mode)	226–327	0.03–4.46	3–6	3.64	−3.19	4.67	967

^aExcludes points below triple point.

^bIncludes liquid, vapor, and supercritical states.




FIG. 10. (Color online) Low-density secondary data model deviations. Calculated value: η_{calc} , experimental value: η_{exp} .




FIG. 13. (Color online) Full temperature range primary data model deviations. Calculated value: η_{calc} , experimental value: η_{exp} .




FIG. 11. (Color online) Full density range primary data model deviations. Calculated value: η_{calc} , experimental value: η_{exp} .




FIG. 14. (Color online) Full density range secondary data model deviations. Calculated value: η_{calc} , experimental value: η_{exp} .




FIG. 12. (Color online) Full pressure range primary data model deviations. Calculated value: η_{calc} , experimental value: η_{exp} .




FIG. 15. (Color online) Full pressure range secondary data model deviations. Calculated value: η_{calc} , experimental value: η_{exp} .




Fig. 16. (Color online) Overall deviation performance of all data considered in the regression.

to the primary data. The largest deviation is observed near the critical point which is located at 742.3 kg m^{-3} , 3.755 MPa , and 318.7 K . Figures 14 and 15 show the FT model pressure deviation trends for the secondary data showing a good high-pressure/density trend. The deviations shown are computed with the full original data sets, not the reduced secondary data (after eliminating the points overlapping with the primary data) used in the regression process. Figures 14 and 15 report the full sets of secondary data. Figure 16, on the other hand, shows the combined primary and secondary data deviations, from the triple point to 700 K , but eliminating the secondary data that overlap with the primary data, i.e., eliminating the non-considered secondary data. Figure 16 shows the full-range model performance. It should be noted that the data points that fall outside the $\pm 2\%$ band correspond to data points below 300 K . Also, Fig. 16 is presented in a density range up to 2000 kg m^{-3} , which is higher than the maximum density for 100 MPa and temperatures above 300 K (1920 kg m^{-3} at 300 K). Overall, considering both the primary and secondary performance, outside the critical region, the model delivers reasonable unbiased high-pressure as well as high-temperature trends in relation to the considered data. As depicted in Fig. 16, the density trends above 300 K are mostly confined within the $\pm 1\%$ bandwidth, and therefore it would be reasonable to assume that, for temperatures above 300 K and densities below 2000 kg m^{-3} (conditions up to 100 MPa), the expected model performance should fall within the $\pm 2\%$ bandwidth, i.e., an uncertainty of approximately 2% – 3% for extrapolations up to 100 MPa above 300 K .

TABLE 8. Sample points for computer verification of the model

Temperature (K)	Density (kg m^{-3})	Viscosity ($\mu\text{Pa s}$)
300	0	15.2887
300	5.92	15.3043
300	1345.1	117.417
400	0	19.6796
400	278.47	24.4272
400	1123.8	84.7835

4. Computer-Program Verification

Table 8 is provided to assist in computer-program verification. The viscosity calculations are based on the tabulated temperatures and densities.

5. Conclusion

We have developed, based on GFT and available experimental data, a wide-ranging model for the viscosity surface of SF_6 that is valid from the triple point to 1000 K . It has been validated with experimental data up to 50 MPa , and extrapolates in a physically reasonable manner up to 100 MPa . The formulation has been developed with the EoS of Guder and Wagner,⁸ and provides a viscosity surface for SF_6 valid over the entire fluid region including liquid, gas and supercritical states.

The correlation reproduces most of the primary data close to or within the reported uncertainty (0.1% – 0.5%). It performs best in the low-pressure (less than 0.33 MPa) region from 300 K to 700 K where the estimated uncertainty (considered to be combined expanded uncertainty with a coverage factor of two) is 0.3% . In the region from 300 K to 425 K for pressures less than 20 MPa , corresponding to the region measured by Wilhelm *et al.*,¹⁰ the estimated uncertainty is less than 1% . Where there were data available for validation at temperatures from 230 K to 575 K for pressures up to 50 MPa , the estimated uncertainty is 2% .

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Arno Laesecke (NIST), Professor Christian Boned (University of Pau, France), and Professor Marc Assael (Aristotle University, Greece) for helpful suggestions.

6. References

- L. G. Christophorou and R. J. Vanbrunt, *IEEE Trans. Dielect. Electr. Insul.* **2**, 952 (1995).
- E. C. Ihmels and J. Gmehling, *Int. J. Thermophys.* **23**, 709 (2002).
- Y. Z. Zhao, Y. K. Luo, Y. Zhang, X. G. Mei, and J. Tang, *Ultrasound Med. Biol.* **31**, 537 (2005).
- F. Höhn, A. Mirshahi, and L. O. Hattenbach, *Ophthalmologie* **107**, 328 (2010).
- A. Olivet and L. F. Vega, *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 144502 (2007).
- G. S. Pawley, *Mol. Phys.* **43**, 1321 (1981).
- D. Dellis and J. Samios, *Fluid Phase Equilib.* **291**, 81 (2010).
- C. Guder and W. Wagner, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **38**, 33 (2009).
- M. J. Assael, I. A. Koini, K. D. Antoniadis, M. L. Huber, I. M. Abdulagatov, and R. A. Perkins, "Reference Correlation of the Thermal Conductivity of Sulfur Hexafluoride from the Triple Point to 1000 K and up to 150 MPa " *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* (in press).
- J. Wilhelm, D. Seibt, E. Bich, E. Vogel, and E. Hassel, *J. Chem. Eng. Data* **50**, 896 (2005).
- V. V. Altunin, *Tr. Mosk. Energy Inst.* **622**, 12 (1984).
- S. A. Ulybin and V. I. Makarushkin, *High Temp.* **15**, 1022 (1977).
- D. L. Timrot, M. A. Serednitskaya, and S. A. Traktueva, *High Temp.* **13**, 1031 (1975).
- V. A. Grigorev, A. S. Keramidi, V. K. Grachev, and Y. L. Rastorguev, *Therm. Eng.* **24**, 66 (1977).
- J. H. B. Hoogland, H. R. Vandenberg, and N. J. Trappeniers, *Physica A* **134**, 169 (1985).
- R. F. Hafer, MS thesis, University of Colorado, 1999.
- R. F. Hafer and A. Laesecke, *Meas. Sci. Technol.* **14** (2003).

- ¹⁸S. E. Quiñones-Cisneros and U. K. Deiters, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **110**, 12820 (2006).
- ¹⁹G. A. Earwicker and E. J. P. Fear, *Chem. Ind. (London)*, **29**, 903 (1954).
- ²⁰J. C. McCoubrey and N. M. Singh, *Trans. Farad. Soc.* **53**, 877 (1957).
- ²¹C. P. Ellis and C. J. G. Raw, *J. Chem. Phys.* **30**, 574 (1959).
- ²²C. J. G. Raw and H. Tang, *J. Chem. Phys.* **39**, 2616 (1963).
- ²³R. A. Dawe, G. C. Maitland, M. Rigby, and E. B. Smith, *Trans. Farad. Soc.* **66**, 1955 (1970).
- ²⁴J. Kestin, E. Paykoç, and J. V. Sengers, *Physica* **54**, 1 (1971).
- ²⁵J. M. Hellemans, J. Kestin, and S. T. Ro, *Physica* **65**, 376 (1973).
- ²⁶K. Ueda and K. Kigoshi, *J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem.* **36**, 989 (1974).
- ²⁷D. L. Timrot and S. A. Traktueva, *Therm. Eng.* **22**, 105 (1975).
- ²⁸J. Kestin, H. E. Khalifa, and W. A. Wakeham, *J. Chem. Phys.* **65**, 5186 (1976).
- ²⁹J. Kestin, H. E. Khalifa, S. T. Ro, and W. A. Wakeham, *Physica* **88A**, 242 (1977).
- ³⁰J. Kestin, H. E. Khalifa, and W. A. Wakeham, *J. Chem. Phys.* **67**, 4254 (1977).
- ³¹Y. Abe, J. Kestin, H. E. Khalifa, and W. A. Wakeham, *Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem.* **83**, 271 (1979).
- ³²E. J. Harris, G. C. Hope, D. W. Gough, and E. B. Smith, *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 1* **75**, 892 (1979).
- ³³Y. Tanaka, M. Nakajima, H. Kubota, and T. Makita, *J. Chem. Eng. Jpn.* **13**, 155 (1980).
- ³⁴J. H. B. Hoogland and N. J. Trappeniers, in *Proceedings 8th Symposium on Thermophysical Properties*, edited by J. V. Sengers (American Society of Mechanical Engineers, New York, 1982), p. 440.
- ³⁵V. I. Lukin, B. A. Ivakin, and P. E. Suetin, *Zh. Tekh. Fiz.* **53**, 931 (1983).
- ³⁶M. Takahashi, C. Yokoyama, and S. Takahashi, in *Proceedings of the Eighth Japan Symposium on Thermophysical Properties* (Japanese Thermophysical Properties Society, Tokyo, 1987), p. 125.
- ³⁷T. Strehlow and E. Vogel, *Physica A* **161**, 101 (1989).
- ³⁸J. J. Hurly, K. A. Gillis, J. B. Mehl, and M. R. Moldover, *Int. J. Thermophys.* **24**, 1441 (2003).
- ³⁹R. F. Berg, *Metrologia* **42**, 11 (2005).
- ⁴⁰R. F. Berg, *Metrologia* **43**, 183 (2006).
- ⁴¹A. F. Estrada-Alexanders and J. J. Hurly, *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* **40**, 193 (2008).
- ⁴²E. Vogel, C. Küchenmeister, E. Bich, and A. Laesecke, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **27**, 947 (1998).
- ⁴³J. Kestin, S. T. Ro, and W. A. Wakeham, *Trans. Farad. Soc.* **67**, 2308 (1971).
- ⁴⁴H. Preston-Thomas, *Metrologia* **27**, 3 (1990).
- ⁴⁵J. V. Sengers, R. A. Perkins, M. L. Huber, and D. G. Friend, *Int. J. Thermophys.* **30**, 374 (2009).
- ⁴⁶M. Funke, R. Kleinrahm, and W. Wagner, *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* **34**, 735 (2002).
- ⁴⁷R. D. Trengove and W. A. Wakeham, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **16**, 175 (1987).
- ⁴⁸L. Zarkova and U. Hohm, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **31**, 183 (2002).
- ⁴⁹A. Boushehri, J. Bzowski, J. Kestin, and E. A. Mason, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **16**, 445 (1987).
- ⁵⁰J. C. Rainwater and D. G. Friend, *Phys. Rev. A* **36**, 4062 (1987).