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ABSTRACT

A number of ternary oxides have been identified in the gas phase by mass spectrometry, while vaporizing MgO, CaO, SrO and SnO₂ + Sn from Mo and W crucibles. The approximate stabilities of the gaseous molecules MgMoO₃, CaMoO₄, SrMoO₄, MgWO₄, CaWO₄, SrWO₄, SrMoO₃, CaWO₃, CaMoO₃, SnWO₄ and Sn₂WO₅ were deduced from the measurements. The dissociation energies (kcal/mole) into gaseous oxides are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-MoO₃</th>
<th>-WO₃</th>
<th>-MoO₂</th>
<th>-WO₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MgO-</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>125*K</td>
<td>135*K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO-</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>145*K</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrO-</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SnO-</td>
<td>125*K</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SnO-</td>
<td>185*K</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*K Estimated
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INTRODUCTION

Recent mass-spectrometric studies of the vaporization of MgO, CaO and SrO \(^{(1)}\), and of a mixture of Sn and SnO\(_2\) \(^{(2)}\) from Mo and W cells have shown the presence in the gas phase of a number of ternary oxides. Other investigations carried out under similar conditions had shown the presence of gaseous molybdates and tungstates of barium \(^{(3)}\), of beryllium \(^{(4)}\), of indium \(^{(5)}\) and of lithium \(^{(6)}\). Measurements of the stability of such species however have not been made thus far. The present paper reports on the stability of the molecules: MgMoO\(_3\), CaMoO\(_3\), SrMoO\(_3\), MgWO\(_3\), CaWO\(_3\), SrWO\(_3\), MgWO\(_4\), CaWO\(_4\), SrMoO\(_3\), CaWO\(_3\), SrWO\(_3\), SnWO\(_3\) and SnW\(_2\)O\(_5\). Other complex gaseous binary oxides of Sn with Mo and W have been identified but their stability was not calculated.

EXPERIMENTAL

The experimental conditions under which the molybdates and tungstates of Mg, Ca and Sr were observed during the vaporization of MgO, CaO and SrO from molybdenum and tungsten cells have been described in a preceding paper \(^{(1)}\). The tin tungstates and molybdates were observed during the vaporization of Sn+SnO\(_2\) mixtures from tungsten and molybdenum Knudsen cells in the temperature interval 840 - 950°C. In all instances the gaseous species issuing from the heated cell were collimated, ionized by low-energy electrons (5-25eV) and subsequently mass analyzed in a single focussing 60°, 20 cm radius of curvature instrument equipped with a secondary electron multiplier.

Identification of the molecules.

All the species were identified from their mass, isotopic distribution and appearance potential. A movable beam defining slit intersecting the molecular beam showed all to originate from the Knudsen cell. The ions observed are listed with measured approximate appearance
potentials (in brackets) in table I. The latter were measured by the linear extrapolation method; the energy scale was calibrated with the known ionization potentials of Mg, Sr and Sn\(^7\) after ascertaining that they did not result from fragmentation of the more complex species by comparing their appearance potential with that of the \(\text{H}_2\text{O}^+\) ion\(^8\).

The appearance potential and relative intensity data indicated that all the molybdate and tungstate ions, \(\text{MMeO}_4\) where \(\text{M}\) denotes Mg, Ca, Sr or Sn, and \(\text{Me}\), Mo or W, result from the direct ionization of the corresponding neutral species. The ionization efficiency curves for the ions \(\text{MO}^+\), \(\text{MMeO}_2^+\) and \(\text{MMeO}_3^+\) indicated that the gaseous molybdates and tungstates also fragment appreciably under electron impact above 13 eV. This was already mentioned previously and taken into account in evaluating partial pressures for the \(\text{MO}\) molecules\(^1\). The ionization efficiency curves of the \(\text{MMeO}_3^+\) ions showed that at low energy they are formed by direct ionization of the corresponding molecules.

The \(\text{Sn}_2\text{MoO}_5^+\), \(\text{Sn}_2\text{W}_5^+\) and \(\text{Sn}_3\text{W}_2\text{O}_9^+\) ions were considered to be parent ions. The other ions between brackets in the \(\text{Sn}+\text{SnO}_2+\text{Mo}\) system have not been identified with certainty. The accurate analysis of the isotopic distribution or ionization efficiency curve of the tin molybdates proved difficult because of their low ionic intensity and because their masses superposed with the more abundant binary tin oxide polymer ions and their fragments. It may thus be quite possible that the \(\text{Sn}_2\text{MoO}_8^+\) ion was also present in small concentration. Insufficient resolving power also hindered the isotopic distribution analysis of \(\text{Sn}_3\text{Mo}_2\text{O}_3^+\) and \(\text{Sn}_4\text{Mo}_2\text{O}_{10}^+\). Because of these experimental difficulties the stability of the tin molybdates was not calculated.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Because of rapid variations in the nature of the condensed phase it was judged preferable, whenever possible, to calculate thermodynamic data from all gas-phase reactions for which only relative pressures are necessary. Thus the stability of the molybdates and tungstates of Mg, Ca and Sr were obtained from the reactions:

\[ \text{MMeO}_4(g) + 4O(g) \rightleftharpoons 4O_2(g) + M(g) + Me(s) \]  
\[ \text{MMeO}_4(g) + 3M(g) \rightleftharpoons 4MO(g) + Me(s) \]  
\[ \text{MMeO}_4(g) + 4MeO_2(g) \rightleftharpoons 4MeO_3(g) + M(g) + Me(s) \]

Likewise the stability of the molybdites and tungstites of Ca and Sr were derived from the reactions:

\[ \text{MMeO}_3(g) + 30(g) \rightleftharpoons 30_2(g) + M(g) + Me(s) \]  
\[ \text{MMeO}_3(g) + 2M(g) \rightleftharpoons 3MO(g) + Me(s) \]  
\[ \text{MMeO}_3(g) + 3MeO_2(g) \rightleftharpoons 3MeO_3(g) + M(g) + Me(s) \]

No pressure-independent reaction could be used to calculate the stability of SnWO_4 and Sn_2WO_5. The reactions used:

\[ \text{SnWO}_4(g) + 3Sn(s) \rightleftharpoons 2SnO_2(g) + W(s) \]  
\[ \text{Sn}_2\text{WO}_5(g) \rightleftharpoons \text{SnWO}_4(g) + \text{SnO}(g) \]

required absolute pressure calibrations. These were obtained from the known equilibrium constant of the reaction SnO_2(g) + 2SnO(g)^{(2)}.

Because of the variation on the ionic intensity ratios due to changes in composition of the solid phases and also because of the large stoechiometric coefficients of the above equilibria, rather large deviations from the mean values are present in part of the results. This fact and the limited temperature ranges investigated made it difficult to obtain results from a 2nd law treatment.
of the data. A 3rd law procedure was therefore adopted to obtain
dissociation energies from the measured ionic intensities. This
procedure necessitated the estimation of relative ionization
cross-sections and secondary electron multiplier yields, as well
as the estimation of the free energy functions of all newly iden-
tified molecules.

For such complex species about which except for the chemical
formula nothing is known, uncertainties due to estimates of rela-
tive ionization cross-sections and secondary electron multiplier
yields may be relatively important. It was assumed here, for all
molecules considered that the relative ionization cross-sections
(σ) and additivity rules proposed by Otvos and Stevenson(10) are
sufficient approximations. The multiplier yields (γ) were estimated
in the usual manner, from a mass-calibration curve corrected for
molecular effects(11).

The free energy functions of gaseous O, O2, Mr, Ca, Sr and of
condensed Sn, Mo and W were taken from Stull and Sinke's(12) compi-
lations, those of gaseous MoO2, MoO3, WO2 and WO3 from De Maria,
Burns, Drowart and Inghram (9) and those of gaseous MpO, CaO and SrO
from Brewer and Chandrasekharaih(13) as discussed previously(1).
The free energy function of gaseous SnO was taken from Kelley and
King(14), that of Sn2O3 was deduced from the data for the Sn2O3(p) →
2SnO(g) equilibrium (2). For consistency the enthalpies of formation
of MoO2, MoO3, WO2 and WO3 and Sn2O3 were taken from the same
sources as the free energy functions.

The free energy functions of the gaseous molybdates, tungstates,
molybdites and tungstites were calculated from usual statistical
mechanical formulae (15).

A nearly tetrahedral arrangement of O atoms around the Mo and W
atoms has been adopted for the tungstates and molybdates by analogy
with the structure in the condensed phases and in the MoO4<sup>2-</sup>
and WO4<sup>2-</sup> ions in solution (16). The interatomic distance Mo-O and W-O were
taken the same as in crystalline Li2WO4 (17). The Mr, Ca, Sr and Sn
atoms were supposed attached to two of the O atoms forming planar closed structures. Interatomic distances, Mg-O, Ca-O, Sr-O, Sn-O, Mo-O and W-O were estimated to be the same as in the corresponding molecules \((13,18)\). Of the 12 vibration frequencies, 9 were taken identical to those of the \(\text{MoO}_4^{2-}\) and \(\text{WO}_4^{2-}\) ions \((16)\). They are 218 (doubly degenerate, d.d.), 360 (triply degenerate, t.d.), 944, 896 (t.d.) cm\(^{-1}\). The remaining 3 were estimated to be 300 cm\(^{-1}\) (d.d.) and 700 cm\(^{-1}\).

The model assumed for the gaseous molybdates and tungstates is in many ways analogous to that for the molybdates and tungstates. These molecules were assumed to have planar closed structures with the same interatomic distances, but with only 3 oxygens surrounding the Mo or W atoms. Six of the vibration frequencies were taken by analogy with \(\text{MoO}_4^{2-}\) and \(\text{WO}_4^{2-}\). They are 218 (t.d.) and 896 (t.d.) cm\(^{-1}\). The other 3 were estimated to be 300 cm\(^{-1}\) (d.d.) and 700 cm\(^{-1}\).

The electronic partition functions of the gaseous molybdates and tungstates were assumed to be the same as for \(\text{MoO}_3\) and \(\text{WO}_3\) \((9)\) and those of the gaseous molybdates and tungstates equal to those of \(\text{MoO}_2\) and \(\text{WO}_2\) \((9)\).

Free energy functions were calculated in detail for gaseous \(\text{MgWO}_4\), \(\text{SrWO}_4\), \(\text{SrWO}_3\) and \(\text{SrMoO}_3\), the values for the other molecules were estimated by analogy. The numerical values (in cal/mol\(^{\circ}\)K) for the binary oxides of Mg, Ca and Sr are tabulated in Table 2 for different temperatures. The values estimated for \(\text{SnWO}_4\) are 88, 90 and 92 cal/mole\(^{\circ}\)K at 1100, 1200 and 1300\(^{\circ}\)K respectively, while a value of 120 cal/mole\(^{\circ}\)K at 1200\(^{\circ}\)K was estimated for \(\text{Sn}_2\text{WO}_6\).

The enthalpies of the reaction 1-8 are given in Table 3. For each molecule the equilibrium considered is given along with the accompanying enthalpy change (col.2), the number of experimental points (col.3) and the dissociation energy into oxides obtained.
therefrom (col.4) through use of thermochemical cycles. The auxiliary data used to obtain the dissociation energies are:

\[
\begin{align*}
O_2(\text{g}) & \rightarrow 2O(\text{p}) & D_0^0 &= 117.96 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(12)} \\
\text{MnO}(\text{p}) & \rightarrow \text{Mn}(\text{p}) + O(\text{p}) & D_0^0 &= 85.0 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(1)} \\
\text{CaO}(\text{g}) & \rightarrow \text{Ca}(\text{p}) + O(\text{g}) & D_0^0 &= 92.2 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(1)} \\
\text{SrO}(\text{g}) & \rightarrow \text{Sr}(\text{p}) + O(\text{g}) & D_0^0 &= 101.9 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(1)} \\
\text{MoO}_3(\text{g}) & \rightarrow 3O(\text{p}) + \text{Mo}(\text{s}) & \Delta H_0^0 &= 254.0 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(9)} \\
\text{WO}_3(\text{g}) & \rightarrow 3O(\text{p}) + W(\text{s}) & \Delta H_0^0 &= 243.3 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(9)} \\
\text{MoO}_2(\text{g}) & \rightarrow 2O(\text{p}) + \text{Mo}(\text{s}) & \Delta H_0^0 &= 104.4 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(9)} \\
\text{WO}_2(\text{p}) & \rightarrow 2O(\text{g}) + W(\text{s}) & \Delta H_0^0 &= 96.0 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(9)} \\
\text{Mo(}\text{s}) & \rightarrow \text{Mo(}\text{p}) & \Delta H_0^0 &= 157.1 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(12)} \\
\text{W(}\text{s}) & \rightarrow \text{W(}\text{p}) & \Delta H_0^0 &= 199.7 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(12)} \\
\text{Sn(}\text{s}) & \rightarrow \text{Sn(}\text{p}) & \Delta H_0^0 &= 72.0 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(12)} \\
\text{SnO(}\text{g}) & \rightarrow \text{Sn(}\text{p}) + O(\text{g}) & D_0^0 &= 125.8 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(2)} \\
\text{Sn}_2\text{O}_2(\text{p}) & \rightarrow 2\text{SnO(}\text{g}) & D_0^0 &= 69.7 \text{ kcal/mole}^{(2)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The proposed dissociation energies of the gaseous binary oxides into their constituent oxides are given in column 6.

The error limits given in Table 3, col.4 are statistical 95\% probabilities: \(\sigma = 2 \left( \frac{\chi^2}{n-1} \right)^{1/2} \). For the reasons given above, these are quite large in some cases. The values obtained for the dissociation energies (col.5) however are in most cases in satisfactory agreement. The error limits given in col.5 further include possible systematic errors. A factor of 2.5 has been allowed for the \(\sigma \gamma\) products, a factor of 2 in the ionizing electron voltage corrections\(^{(1)}\) and 1\% in the temperature, the different possible sources of error being considered to be independent of one another. With the average statistical deviations the uncertainty in the change in free energy (\(\Delta G_1^0\)) accompanying the dissociative reactions:
$\text{MMeO}_{3.4}(p) + \text{Mo}(p) + \text{MeO}_{2.3}(p)$ is 17 kcal/mole. Overall uncertainties of ±15 kcal/mole are estimated for the reaction enthalpies by assuming the changes in free functions to be accurate within 6 cal/mole°K. The relative values of the stability molecules are probably correct within ±8 kcal/mole.

The atomization energy of these species can be calculated by coupling the reaction enthalpies given in Table 3 with the data presented above. The values (in electron volts) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{MgMoO}_4) &= 27.9 \pm 1.0 \text{ eV} \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{CaMoO}_4) &= 29.1 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{SrMoO}_4) &= 30.0 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{MgWO}_4) &= 29.6 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{CaWO}_4) &= 30.8 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{SrWO}_4) &= 31.7 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{MgMoO}_3) &= 20.3 \pm 1.5 \text{ N} \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{CaMoO}_3) &= 21.4 \pm 1.5 \text{ N} \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{SrMoO}_3) &= 22.3 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{MgWO}_3) &= 22.5 \pm 1.5 \text{ N} \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{CaWO}_3) &= 23.6 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{SrWO}_3) &= 24.5 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{SnMoO}_4) &= 28.7 \pm 1.5 \text{ N} \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{SnWO}_4) &= 30.4 \pm 1.0 \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{Sn}_2\text{MoO}_5) &= 35.8 \pm 2.0 \text{ N} \\
\Delta H^0_{\text{nat}} (\text{Sn}_2\text{WO}_5) &= 38.7 \pm 1.5 \text{ N}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{N Estimated.}
All the molecules for which dissociation energies into oxides are given show a surprising stability, which is possibly due to important ionic contributions in the intramolecular forces. The behavior of these molecules under electron impact is also comparable to that of other "ionic" molecules such as the alkali halides and the metaborates and could be another argument in the same direction.

The stability of such molecules reflects on the other hand their importance in vaporization processes of oxides in the presence of molybdenum or tungsten and the need to take their presence into account in the interpretation of weight loss experiments.

The identification of such molecules indicates further the interest of extending mass spectrometric studies, which have until now been performed mainly for binary compounds to ternary compounds.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>T°K</th>
<th>Ions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MnO+Mo</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>( \text{Mn}^+, \text{MnO}^+, \text{O}^+ (14.0), \text{O}_2^+ (11.9), \text{MoO}^+, \text{MoO}_2^+ (9.2), \text{MoO}_3^+ (11.8), \text{MnMoO}_3^+, \text{MnMoO}_4^+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO+W</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>( \text{Mn}^+, \text{MnO}^+, \text{O}^+ (11.9), \text{WO}_2^+ (9.8), \text{WO}_3^+ (11.9), \text{MnWO}_3^+, \text{MnWO}_4^+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO+Mo</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>( \text{Ca}^+, \text{CaO}^+ (6.5), \text{O}^+ (6.5), \text{MoO}^+, \text{MoO}_2^+, \text{MoO}_3^+, \text{CaMoO}_3^+, \text{CaMoO}_4^+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO+W</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>( \text{Ca}^+, \text{CaO}^+, \text{O}^+ (6.5), \text{WO}_2^+, \text{WO}_3^+, \text{CaWO}_3^+ (6.7), \text{CaWO}_4^+ (9.8) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrO+Mo</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>( \text{Sr}^+, \text{SrO}^+ (6.1), \text{Sr}_2\text{O}^+ (4.8), \text{O}^+ (6.1), \text{MoO}^+, \text{MoO}_2^+, \text{MoO}_3^+, \text{SrMoO}_2^+ (11.0), \text{SrMoO}_3^+ (6.2), \text{SrMoO}_4^+ (9.2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrO+W</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>( \text{Sr}^+, \text{SrO}^+, \text{Sr}_2\text{O}^+ (4.8), \text{O}^+ (6.1), \text{WO}_2^+, \text{WO}_3^+, \text{SrWO}_3^+ (6.4), \text{SrWO}_4^+ (9.4) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn+SnO(_2)+Mo</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>( \text{Sn}^+, \text{SnO}^+ (10.5), \text{Sn}_2\text{O}^+ (14.0), \text{Sn}_2\text{O}_2^+ (9.8), \text{Sn}_3\text{O}^+ (9.8), \text{Sn}_3\text{O}_3^+ (9.8), \text{Sn}_4\text{O}_2^+ (9.2), \text{Sn}_4\text{O}_4^+ (9.2), \text{Sn}_5\text{MoO}_4^+, \text{Sn}_6\text{MoO}_6^+, (\text{Sn}_7\text{MoO}_7^+), (\text{Sn}_8\text{Mo}_2\text{C}_9^+) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn+SnO(_2)+W</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>( \text{Sn}^+, \text{SnO}^+, \text{Sn}_2\text{O}^+, \text{Sn}_2\text{O}_2^+, \text{SnWO}_3^+, \text{SnWO}_4^+ (10.8), \text{Sn}_2\text{WO}_5^+ (8.4), \text{Sn}_2\text{WO}_7^+, \text{Sn}_2\text{WO}_8^+, \text{Sn}_3\text{WO}_9^+ )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.

Estimated values (in cal/mole degree) of the free energy functions of the gaseous molybdates, tungstates, molybdites and tungstates of Mg, Ca and Sr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecule</th>
<th>T(^\circ)K 2000</th>
<th>T(^\circ)K 2100</th>
<th>T(^\circ)K 2200</th>
<th>T(^\circ)K 2300</th>
<th>T(^\circ)K 2400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MnMoO(_4)</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>110.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaMoO(_4)</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrMoO(_4)</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>112.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnWO(_4)</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>108.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaWO(_4)</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>110.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrWO(_4)</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>111.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrMoO(_3)</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaWO(_3)</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>109.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrWO(_3)</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td>110.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecule</td>
<td>Equilibrium</td>
<td>no exp.</td>
<td>$\Delta H^\circ$</td>
<td>$D_0^{\circ}(\text{Mo-Mo}_2, \text{O})$</td>
<td>Proposed value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgMoO$_4$</td>
<td>$\text{MgMoO}_4 + 3\text{Mg} + 4\text{MoO}_3 + (\text{Mo})$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>147.3</td>
<td>147±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{MgMoO}_4 + 4\text{MoO}_2 + \text{Mg} + 4\text{MoO}_3 + (\text{Mo})$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-107.0</td>
<td>152.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaMoO$_4$</td>
<td>$\text{CaMoO}_4 + 4\text{MoO}_2 + \text{Ca} + 4\text{MoO}_3 + (\text{Mo})$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-84.6±6.6</td>
<td>167.6</td>
<td>168±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrMoO$_4$</td>
<td>$\text{SrMoO}_4 + 3\text{Sr} + 4\text{SrO}_3 + (\text{Mo})$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>122.0±4.0</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>177±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{SrMoO}_4 + 4\text{MoO}_2 + \text{Sr} + 4\text{MoO}_3 + (\text{Mo})$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-62.3±3.1</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgWO$_4$</td>
<td>$\text{MgWO}_4 + 3\text{Mg} + 4\text{MoO}_3 + (\text{W})$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142.2±5.0</td>
<td>153.9</td>
<td>155±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{MgWO}_4 + 4\text{WO}_2 + \text{Mg} + 4\text{WO}_3 + (\text{W})$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-105.3±1.6</td>
<td>155.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaWO$_4$</td>
<td>$\text{CaWO}_4 + 4\text{O}_2 + \text{Ca} + (\text{W})$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>173.5</td>
<td>175±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{CaWO}_4 + 3\text{Ca} + 4\text{CaO} + (\text{W})$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>141.3±3.0</td>
<td>174.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{CaWO}_4 + 4\text{WO}_2 + 4\text{WO}_3 + \text{Ca} + (\text{W})$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-76.7±10.1</td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrWO$_4$</td>
<td>$\text{SrWO}_4 + 4\text{O}_2 + \text{Sr} + (\text{W})$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55.8±21.0</td>
<td>182.4</td>
<td>186±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{SrWO}_4 + 3\text{Sr} + 4\text{SrO} + (\text{W})$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>131.7±6.1</td>
<td>194.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{SrWO}_4 + 4\text{WO}_2 + 4\text{WO}_3 + \text{Sr} + (\text{W})$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-61.5±3.7</td>
<td>182.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecule</td>
<td>Equilibrium</td>
<td>no exp. point</td>
<td>( \Delta H_0^{\circ} )</td>
<td>( D_0^{\circ}(\text{MO-Me}_2O_3) )</td>
<td>Proposed value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrMoO_3</td>
<td>( \text{SrMoO}_3 + 2\text{Sr} \rightarrow 3\text{Sr} + (\text{Mo}) )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.6±2.0</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>156±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{SrMoO}_3 + 3\text{MoO}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{MoO}_3 + \text{Sr} + (\text{Mo}) )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-85.7±2.8</td>
<td>156.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaWO_3</td>
<td>( \text{CaWO}_3 + 2\text{Ca} \rightarrow 3\text{CaO} + (\text{W}) )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.5±3.0</td>
<td>154.9</td>
<td>156±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{CaWO}_3 + 3\text{WO}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{WO}_3 + \text{Ca} + (\text{W}) )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-95.8±1.9</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrWO_3</td>
<td>( \text{SrWO}_3 + 3\text{O}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{SrO} + (\text{W}) )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>168.8</td>
<td>168±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{SrWO}_3 + 2\text{Sr} \rightarrow 3\text{SrO} + (\text{W}) )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>171.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{SrWO}_3 + 3\text{WO}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{WO}_3 + \text{Sr} + (\text{W}) )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-81.9</td>
<td>162.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SnWO_4</td>
<td>( \text{SnWO}_4 + 3\text{Sn} \rightarrow 2\text{Sn}_2\text{O}_2 + (\text{W}) )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74.0±3.0</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>132±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn( \text{W}_2\text{O}_5 )</td>
<td>( \text{SnW}_2\text{O}_5 \rightarrow \text{SnWO}_4 + \text{SnO} )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65.6±0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Note): bracketed symbols represent elements at unit activity and in the condensed phase; unbracketed symbols represent gaseous species.*
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