CCQM WG on Electrochemical Analysis and Classical Chemical Methods CCQM-K19.2018 Key Comparison on pH of an unknown Borate Buffer Final report (24 November 2021)

Toshiaki Asakai and Igor Maksimov (NMIJ); Sergey Prokunin, Daria Vengina, Narine Oganyan, Vladimir Dobrovolskiy(VNIIFTRI);

Nagy Dániel and Nagyné Szilágyi Zsófia (BFKH); Lyudmila Dimitrova and Katya Bezeva (BIM); José Luis Ortiz Aparicio and Judith Velina Lara Manzano (CENAM); Matilda Roziková and Martina Vicarova (CMI); Joanna Dumańska and Monika Pawlina (GUM); Mabel Delgado and Paola Avendaño (IBMETRO); Fabiano Barbieri Gonzaga and Leonardo da Silva Pardellas (INMETRO); Mabel Puelles and Hernán Lozano (INTI); Raquel Quendera (IPQ); Simone Fajardo and Elizabeth Ferreira (LATU); Xiu Hongyu and Wu Bing (NIM); Nongluck Tangpaisarnkul and Patumporn Rodruangthum (NIMT); Frank Bastkowski and Beatrice Sander (PTB); Zuzana Hanková and Michal Máriássy (SMU); Vladimir Gavrilkin and Anton Petrenko (UkrCSM)

Abstract

This key comparison CCQM-K19.2018, as a repetition of the previous study CCQM-K19 from 2005, was performed to evaluate the degree of equivalence of measurement procedures of participating National Metrology Institutes (NMIs) and Designated Institutes (DIs) for the determination of pH of borate buffer solutions. The nominal pH value of the buffer was 9.2 at 25 °C and the suggested measurement temperatures were 5 °C, 15 °C, 25 °C, 37 °C and 50 °C. Good agreement of the results is demonstrated by most participants.

Metrology area

Amount of substance

Branch

Electrochemistry

Subject

Determinations of the acidity function at zero chloride molality by the primary Harned cell method or of the related pH value by secondary methods with a differential potentiometric cell or glass electrode for an unknown borate buffer (pH ~9.2 at 25 °C) at 5 °C, 15 °C, 25 °C, 37 °C and 50 °C.

Table of Contents

Abstract	.1
Metrology area	.1
Branch	.1
Subject	.1
Table of Contents	.2
Purpose	.3
Time schedule	.3
Coordinating laboratories and their roles	.4
Participants	.5
Sample preparation and bottling	.6
Solution homogeneity	.6
Solution stability	.7
Sample delivery	.8
Communication with participants	.9
Timetable of Measurements and Submission of Reports1	10
Measurement Technique	1
Results and Discussion1	13
Calculation of the KCRV and Uncertainty	27
Calculation of the Degrees of Equivalence	30
How far the light shines	35
Conclusion	35
Acknowledgment	36

Purpose

This key comparison has been performed to evaluate the degree of equivalence of measurement procedures to support the Calibration and Measurement Capabilities (CMCs) and to evaluate the capabilities of participants for the determination of the pH of borate buffer solutions.

This comparison was a repetition of the key comparison CCQM-K19 from 2005.

The comparison was open to NMIs or DIs of member or associate states of the Meter Convention. Only one result per temperature was accepted for report by each participant. No measurement method was prescribed for the comparison, but it was expected to be the highest metrological level of measurements available at each institute. Only results, obtained by the primary method, were used to calculate the Key Comparison Reference Value (KCRV).

In this comparison measurements of pH were performed at temperatures 15 °C, 25 °C and 37 °C with supplementary option of measurements at 5 °C and 50 °C.

Time schedule

Announcement of study:	20 April 2019, EAWG meeting, Sèvres
Invitation for participation	n: June 2019
Registration deadline:	31 July 2019
Dispatch of samples:	August 2020
Reporting deadline:	29 January 2021
Draft A1 report:	26 March 2021
First discussion:	20 to 21 April 2021, EAWG virtual meeting
Draft A2 report:	25 July 2021
Second discussion:	12 to 13 October 2021, EAWG virtual meeting
Draft B report:	15 October 2021
Final report:	24 November 2021

Coordinating laboratories and their roles

Russian Metrological Institute of Technical Physics and Radio Engineering (VNIIFTRI)

141570, Mendeleevo, Moscow Region, Russia

Contact person: Narine Oganyan Email: oganyan@vniiftri.ru Tel: +7 495 526 63 21

Alternative contact person: Sergey Prokunin Email: prokunin@vniiftri.ru Tel: +7 495 526 63 91

VNIIFTRI

National Metrology Institute of Japan (NMIJ)

1-1-1 Umezono, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8563, Japan

Contact person: Toshiaki Asakai Email: t-asakai@aist.go.jp Tel: +81 29 861 4162

Alternative contact person: Igor Maksimov Email: maksimov.igor@aist.go.jp Tel: +81 29 861 6881



- 1. NMIJ has announced the upcoming study in April 2019 in Sèvres. VNIIFTRI has prepared the formal invitation and has sent it to the CCQM-EAWG Chair for distribution.
- 2. VNIIFTRI has prepared the solution, carried out its homogeneity and stability characterization and shipped the samples to the participants.
- 3. NMIJ will present the comparison results for first discussion at the EAWG meeting, then VNIIFTRI will report the data of stability and homogeneity, based on the final pH values of the samples.
- 4. NMIJ will prepare the draft A and draft B reports including the calculations of candidate KCRVs and the degrees of equivalence.

Participants

Table 1 List of participants in key comparison CCQM-K19.2018.

Acronym	Country	Institute	Contact	Method
BFKH	Hungary HU	Government Office of the Capital City Budapest	Nagy Dániel Nagyné Szilágyi Zsófia	Primary
BIM	Bulgaria BG	Bulgarian Institute of Metrology	Lyudmila Dimitrova Katya Bezeva	Primary
CENAM	México MX	Centro Nacional de Metrología	José Luis Ortiz Aparicio Judith Velina Lara Manzano	Primary
CMI	Czech Republic CZ	Czech Metrology Institute	Matilda Roziková Martina Vicarova	Primary
GUM	Poland PL	Central Office of Measures	Joanna Dumańska Monika Pawlina	Primary
IBMETRO	Bolivia BO	Instituto Boliviano de Metrología	Mabel Delgado Paola Avendaño	Differential
INMETRO	Brazil BR	Instituto Nacional de Metrologia, Qualidade e Tecnologia	Fabiano Barbieri Gonzaga Leonardo da Silva Pardellas	Primary
INTI	Argentina AR	Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Industrial	Mabel Puelles Hernán Lozano	Glass
IPQ	Portugal PT	Instituto Português da Qualidade, I.P.	Raquel Quendera	Primary
LATU	Uruguay UY	Laboratorio Tecnológico del Uruguay	Simone Fajardo Elizabeth Ferreira	Differential
NIM	P.R.China CN	National Institute of Metrology, China	Xiu Hongyu Wu Bing	Primary
NIMT	Thailand TH	National Institute of Metrology (Thailand)	Nongluck Tangpaisarnkul Patumporn Rodruangthum	Primary
NMIJ	Japan JP	National Metrology Institute of Japan	Igor Maksimov Toshiaki Asakai	Primary
РТВ	Germany DE	Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt	Frank Bastkowski Beatrice Sander	Primary
SMU	Slovakia SK	Slovak Institute of Metrology	Zuzana Hanková Michal Máriássy	Primary
UkrCSM	Ukraine UA	State Enterprise All-Ukrainian State Research and production Center of Standardization Metrology, Certification and Consumers' Rights Protection (Ukrmetrteststandart)	Vladimir Gavrilkin Anton Petrenko	Primary
VNIIFTRI	Russia RU	Russian Metrological Institute of Technical Physics and Radio Engineering	Narine Oganyan Sergey Prokunin	Primary

Sample preparation and bottling

The comparison solution was prepared by dissolution of 3.8065 g of sodium tetrabrate Na₂B₄O₇·10H₂O per one kilogram of deionized water for the total volume of batch 52 L. The pH value of the borate buffer was around 9.2 and the mass fraction of water in the solution was $w(H_2O) = 0.99650$.

The homogeneity of the solution before the shipment of samples and its stability throughout the whole measurements' period were confirmed by the primary Harned cell method.

Basically, each participant received 4 bottles with the volume of 500 mL for the primary method measurements and 2 bottles for the secondary one.

Hydrochloric acid and chloride ion reagent were not provided by the coordinating laboratories. It was recommended to dry the alkali chloride at no less than 400 °C for at least 2 hours and then store it over a desiccant prior to use.

Solution homogeneity

The homogeneity of the material was tested before the shipment of samples; the pH values at 25 °C had the experimental standard deviation equal to 0.0004 for six tested bottles.





The limits of expanded uncertainty corresponds to k = 2.

Solution stability

The stability of the solution was confirmed by the Harned cell method from August 2020 to January 2021. The values of the acidity function obtained at 25 °C were equal to 9.2170, 9.2158, 9.2204, 9.2200, 9.2154, 9.2187 and 9.2188.

The resulted standard deviation being less than ± 0.003 , the solution was considered to be stable for the measurements' period.



Fig. 2 Results of test for long-term-stability.

Sample delivery

The samples were shipped by VNIIFTRI on 20 August 2020 via UPS (United Parcel Service of America, Inc.) and 28 August 2020 via UPS (United Parcel Service of America, Inc.). The timetable for sample deliveries and reporting are summarized in Table 2.

No visible signs of any damage to the samples were reported to the coordinating laboratories. To ensure the integrity of the received samples, each participant reported: the ambient pressure, temperature, relative humidity, balance reading, and the calculated mass of each bottle after air buoyancy correction. The relative change in bottle masses is shown in Fig. 3. All relative changes in bottle mass were acceptable for the comparison on pH.



Fig. 3 Relative change in bottle masses after the shipment

Communication with participants

- 20 Jan 2020 The coordinating laboratories announced to all participants that the shipment of the samples was delayed.
- 19 Mar 2020 The sample solutions were ready to be shipped; however, the coordinating laboratories decided to postpone the shipping for a few months to avoid any troubles with shipment limitations as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, and announced it to all participants.
- 21 Apr 2020 The coordinating laboratories asked the participants about implications due to the pandemic and for adjusting the schedule.
- 27 July 2020 The borders of Russia were re-opened for the international mail services. The coordinating laboratories asked the participants again about the current status.
- 6 Aug 2020 The coordinating laboratories decided to start the dispatch of samples and to fix 31 of November as the targeted reporting deadline. The EAWG chair asked the participants again about the possibility to perform the measurements until the targeted deadline.
- 26 Aug 2020 INMETRO informed that the package with the samples arrived in Brazil, but its delivery requires supplementary tax payment. The coordinating laboratory (VNIIFTRI) handled this issue and paid the taxes.
- 3 Sept 2020 NMIJ asked the coordinator (VNIIFTRI) to supply additional sample solutions (2 L) for the purpose to expand the measurements to 5 °C and 50 °C.
- 14 Sept 2020 CENAM informed about the customs problem with parcel clearing and asked for the supplementary invoice. The coordinating laboratory (VNIIFTRI) handled this issue and sent the required papers.
- 23 Nov 2020 IPQ informed about the four-weeks-delay with its report of results due to the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 26 Nov 2020 UkrCSM informed about over one-month-delay with its report of results due to the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 9 Dec 2020 The coordinating laboratories asked the participants about their current status for adjusting the schedule.
- 9 Dec 2020 CMI informed about sending its results within two weeks.
- 10 Dec 2020 UkrCSM replied about sending its results before 20 Dec 2020.
- 11 Dec 2020 CENAM declared withdrawal from the ongoing CCQM comparison due to some technical problems with the measurements by the primary method.
- 14 Dec 2020 IBMETRO informed about sending its results on 21 Dec 2020.
- 17 Dec 2020 IPQ informed that they expected to send their results by the end of Jan 2021.
- 24 Dec 2020 The coordinating laboratories announced to postpone the reporting deadline to January 29, 2021.

Timetable of Measurements and Submission of Reports

The dates of the sample receipts, measurements and reporting are given in Table 2.

Acronym	Bottle No.	Shipped	Received	Measured	Reported Revised
BFKH	37, 56, 76, 83, 99, 102	20.08.2020	24-Aug	19-Nov	30-Nov
BIM	21, 28, 45, 54, 70, 81	20.08.2020	25-Aug	24-Nov 25-Nov 26-Nov	30-Nov
CENAM	6, 18, 63, 87	28.08.2020	24-Sept		
CMI	36, 39, 66, 104	20.08.2020	25-Aug	29-Oct 16-Dec	17-Dec 28-Dec
GUM	1, 9, 23, 43, 55, 86	28.08.2020	1-Sept	15-Oct 26-Oct	1-Dec
IBMETRO	7, 25, 78, 96	28.08.2020	No information	25-Nov 26-Nov 18-Dec 19-Dec	24-Dec
INMETRO	4, 12, 30, 74	20.08.2020	9-Sept	7-Oct 22-Oct 28-Oct	19-Nov
INTI	42, 89	20.08.2020	27-Aug	5-Oct	1-Dec
IPQ	29, 52, 64, 90	20.08.2020	27-Aug	No information	No information
LATU	8, 27, 32, 69, 88, 100	20.08.2020	2-Sept	20-Nov 26-Nov 27-Nov 30-Nov	30-Nov 19-Mar
NIM	19, 41, 95, 98	20.08.2020	28-Aug	19-Sept	28-Oct
NIMT	15, 22, 79, 101	28.08.2020	10-Sept	23-Nov 24-Nov 25-Nov	30-Nov
NMIJ	26, 35, 51, 91	20.08.2020	27-Aug	8-Sept 14-Sept	10-Nov
РТВ	10, 46, 53, 75	20.08.2020	25-Aug	15-Sept	6-Nov
SMU	5, 61, 84, 103	20.08.2020	28-Aug	10-Sept	29-Sept
UkrCSM	17, 77, 80, 105	20.08.2020	4-Sept	9-Dec 10-Dec	29-Jan
VNIIFTRI	60,31			11-Sept	27-Nov

Table 2 Timetable of shipments and measurements.

Measurement Technique

The highest metrological measurement methods were required for each participant to perform pH measurements in the key comparison. The Harned cell method is the primary measurement method for pH and only its results were used for the calculation of the key comparison reference value (KCRV). Use of the secondary differential potentiometric cell or of the secondary method with a glass electrode was allowed if this is the highest metrological level of measurements available for participant. Table 1 provides the measurement technique used by each participant.

Primary method (Harned cell method)

The primary measurement method for pH (Harned cell) is based on the measurement of the potential difference of "Cell1" without liquid junction:

Pt |
$$H_2(g, p^\circ)$$
 | buffer, m_{Cl} | AgCl | Ag (Cell 1)

where m_{Cl} is the chloride ion molality added to the chloride free buffer to be measured. The potential difference $E_{Cell.1}$ of "Cell 1" corrected at the standard pressure, p° , is varied with the hydrogen ion activity, a_{H} , according to Equation 1:

$$E_{\text{Cell.1}} = E^{\circ} - \frac{RT \ln 10}{F} \cdot \left(\frac{a_{\text{H}}}{m^{\circ}}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{m_{\text{Cl}}Y_{\text{Cl}}}{m^{\circ}}\right)$$
(eq. 1)

where E° is the standard potential of the Ag/AgCl electrode, *R* the ideal gas constant, *T* the thermodynamic temperature, *F* the Faraday constant, $m^{\circ} = 1 \mod \text{kg}^{-1}$, m_{Cl} the chloride ion molality, and γ_{Cl} the activity coefficient of the chloride ion.

The standard potential of the Ag/AgCl electrodes is determined in "Cell 2" and obtained according to Equation 2:

$$Pt | H_2(g, p^{\circ}) | m_{HCl} | AgCl | Ag$$
 (Cell 2)

$$E^{\circ} = E_{\text{Cell.2}} - \frac{2RT \ln 10}{F} \cdot \log\left(\frac{m_{\text{HCl}}Y_{\pm \text{HCl}}}{m^{\circ}}\right) \quad (\text{eq. 2})$$

The nominal molality of the HCl, $m_{\rm HCl} = 0.01$ mol kg⁻¹, is usually used for the determination of the standard potential of the Ag/AgCl electrodes. The mean activity coefficient of the HCl at the different measurement temperatures for this nominal molality is given in the reference¹.

Values for the acidity function, pa, are calculated for each measured $E_{Cell.1}$ value according to Equation 3:

$$pa = \frac{E_{Cell.1} - E^{\circ}}{RT \ln 10} \cdot F + lg\left(\frac{m_{Cl}}{m^{\circ}}\right)$$
 (eq. 3)

In the primary procedure for pH, pa is measured as a function of m_{CI} . The reported result for the key comparison, the acidity function at zero chloride molality pa^0 is obtained from linear extrapolation of the set of values for the acidity function pa to $m_{CI} = 0$. The reported results for the key comparison CCQM-K19.2018 are pa^0 at different measurement temperatures.

¹ R. G. Bates and R. A. Robinson, "Standardization of silver-silver chloride electrodes from 0 to 60 °C", J. Sol. Chem. 9 (1980) 455–456.

Secondary method (with differential potentiometric cell or glass electrode)

A secondary method with differential potentiometric cell was performed by IBMETRO and LATU; a secondary method with glass electrode was performed by INTI. Both secondary potentiometric methods consist of measurements of the potential difference between the key comparison buffer and a primary standard solution with the same nominal composition. The differential electrochemical cell, "Cell 3", is used in the differential potentiometric cell method:

Pt |
$$H_2(g, p^\circ)$$
 | buffer S_1 || buffer S_2 | $H_2(g, p^\circ)$ | Pt (Cell 3)

where S_1 and S_2 represents two quasi-identical buffers (the key comparison buffer and a primary standard solution), || a physical barrier constructed of a porous diaphragm that separates two buffers. The pH of an unknown buffer (the key comparison buffer), pH(S_2), is given by Equation 4:

$$pH(S_2) = pH(S_1) - (E_{Cell.3} - E_j) \cdot \frac{F}{RT \ln 10}$$
 (eq. 4)

where $E_{Cell.3}$ is the potential difference determined in "Cell 3", E_j is the liquid junction potential that forms between the physically separated S₁ and S₂ buffer solutions. Provided that S₁ and S₂ are quasiidentical in composition, $| pH(S_2) - pH(S_1) | \le \pm 0.02$, and 3 < pH(S) < 11, then the relationship $E_j \le \pm 0.1 E_{Cell.3}$ is assumed.

Many commercial pH glass electrodes have the following cell, "Cell 4":

The glass electrode is affected with the hydrogen ion activity of buffers, then the potential difference between two Ag/AgCl electrodes at both ends is changed according to Equation 4 in practical. In many cases, a pH meter is calibrated with two different primary standard solutions, and then an unknown buffer solution is measured with the pH meter.

Conversion means become necessary when the reported values are pH values instead of acidity function ones. The Bates-Guggenheim Convention was used to convert pH according to Equations 5 and 6:

$$\log \Upsilon_{Cl}^{\circ} = \frac{-A\sqrt{I}}{1+1.5\sqrt{I}}$$
 (eq. 5)
$$pa^{0} = pH + \log \Upsilon_{Cl}^{\circ}$$
 (eq. 6)

where A represents the Debye-Hückel Constants, I the ionic strength. The values of log γ°_{Cl} were -0.058639 at 15 °C, -0.059596 at 25 °C and -0.060844 at 37 °C.

The uncertainty of γ°_{CI} was not needed to consider in this comparison because the participants used the same value.

Results and Discussion

The measurements in CCQM-K19.2018 were performed at 15 °C, 25 °C and 37 °C with supplementary option of measurements at 5 °C and 50 °C. Results from all participants are given in Table 3 and shown in Figs. 4-1 to 4-5. The digits of the standard uncertainties of the reported values were reduced to two significant digits².

		15 °C	25 °C	37 °C	5 °C	50 °C
Acronym	Method	p <i>a</i> º	р <i>а</i> 0	p <i>a</i> ^o	р <i>а</i> 0	p <i>a</i> º
		<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)				
DEVU	. .	9.3110	9.2125	9.1255		
BFKH	Primary	0.0027	0.0031	0.0019		
		9.3147	9,2245	9,1356		
BIM	Primary	0.0018	0.0019	0.0018		
CENAM						
		0 2012	0 2022	0 1100		
CMI	Primary	9.5012	9.2052	9.1169		
		0.0012	0.0012	0.0014	~	
GUM	Primary	9.3096	9.21//	9.1296	9.4236	9.0537
	,	0.0014	0.0013	0.0013	0.0016	0.0014
IBMETRO	Dif-not *		9.268			
	Diii pot.		0.005			
	Drimony	9.3149	9.2234	9.1344		
INIVIETRO	Fillidiy	0.0010	0.0014	0.0013		
	Class*		9.2244			
IINTI	Glass*		0.040			
IPQ						
		9.3277	9.2351	9.1497		
LATU	Difpot.*	0.0056	0.0056	0.0053		
		9 3135	9 2205	9 1 2 9 2		
NIM	Primary	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017		
		0.21/7	0.2125	0 1 2 6 7		
NIMT	Primary	9.5147	9.2123	9.1207		
		0.0000	0.0042	0.0044		
NMIJ	Primary	9.3113	9.2195	9.1317		
	-	0.0011	0.0011	0.0011		
РТВ	Primary	9.3116	9.2205	9.1327	9.4247	9.0586
	,	0.0007	0.0007	0.0006	0.0007	0.0006
SMU	Primary	9.3150	9.2232	9.1344		9.0595
51410	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.0013	0.0016	0.0018		0.0017
LIL/CCN4	Drimani	9.3457	9.2484	9.1548	9.4654	9.0822
UKICSIVI	Primary	0.0024	0.0024	0.0028	0.0026	0.0022
		9.3134	9.2204	9.1325	9.4253	9.0582
VNIFTRI	Primary	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0018

Table 3 Results pa^0 determination, CCQM-K19.2018.

*The values of pH were reported by IBMETRO, INTI and LATU which used the secondary methods with differential potentiometric cell or glass electrode. The reported values were converted to pa^0 by adding to pH the value of trace activity coefficient of chloride ions, log γ°_{CI} , equal to -0.058639 for 15 °C, -0.059596 for 25 °C and -0.060844 for 37 °C.

² ISO/IEC Guide 98-3: 2008, "Uncertainty of measurement - Part 3: Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement (GUM: 1995)", International Organization for Standardization, Geneva.

The reported uncertainties for pH did not include the contribution of Bates-Guggenheim Convention for calculation of log γ°_{Cl} .

Traceability sources of standard buffers used in these secondary methods were:

- NIST SRM 187e (Sodium Tetraborate Decahydrate (Borax) pH Standard) for IBMETRO;

NIST SRM 186 (pH Standards Potassium Dihydrogen Phosphate (186-I-g) and Disodium Hydrogen Phosphate (186-II-g)), NIST SRM 188 (Potassium Hydrogen Tartrate (pH Standard)) and NIST SRM 191 (Sodium Bicarbonate (191d-I) and Sodium Carbonate (191d-II) (pH Standard)) for INTI;
NIST SRM 187e (Sodium Tetraborate Decahydrate (Borax) pH Standard) for LATU.



Fig. 4-1 Results of pa⁰ determination at 15 °C, CCQM-K19.2018. •: primary; x: secondary.

Each bar corresponds to the combined standard uncertainty.

















Other information reported by the participants using the primary Harned cell method: the measurement methods for HCl standardization are given in Table 4; the standard potentials are shown in Table 5 and Figs. 5-1 to 5-5; the pa^0 values and slopes are presented in Figs. 6-1 to 6-5 and Fig. 7-1 to 7-5. The digits of the uncertainties of the reported values were reduced to two significant digits.

Acronym	Method	Molality, mol kg ⁻¹	<i>u</i> (mol kg⁻¹)
BFKH	Coulometric titration	0.010 0676	0.000 0053
BIM	Titrimetric method with NaOH (Sigma-Aldrich)	0.010 20	0.000 017
CENAM			
CMI	Coulometric titration	0.010 000 0	0.000 001 0
GUM	Coulometric titration	0.010 000 1	0.000 002 1
IBMETRO			
INMETRO	Coulometric titration	0.010 000	0.000 002
INTI			
IPQ			
LATU			
NIM	Coulometric titration	0.010 000	0.000 005
NIMT	NMIJ CRM 3201-a07 (0.1 mol/kg HCl)	0.010 00	0.000 04
NMIJ	Coulometric titration	0.010 000	0.000 003
РТВ	Coulometric titration	0.010 016	0.000 002
SMU	Coulometric titration	0.009 998 9	0.000 005 8
UkrCSM	Coulometric titration	0.010 001 9	0.000 007 2
VNIIFTRI	Coulometric titration	0.010 00	0.000 01

Table 4 Information on the assay of HCl reported by participants using the primary cell

	15 °C	25 °C	37 °C	5 °C	50 °C
Acronym	<i>E°</i> / V	E°/V	<i>E°</i> / V	<i>E°</i> / V	E°/V
	u(E)/v	u(E) / v	u(E) / v	u(E)/v	u(E) / v
	0 228 808	0 222 750	0 212 578	pu siope	pu slope
BEKH	0.228 808	0.222739	0.213 378		
DIRI	-0 4498	-0 4219	-0 5047		
	0.22855	0 22234	0 21424		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
BIM	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001		
Biiti	-0.4267	-0.4237	-0.454		
CENAM					
	0.227 97	0.221 71	0.213 05		
CMI	0.000 025	0.000 025	0.000 026		
	8.5821	12.882	13.599		
	0.228 704	0.222 520	0.214 358	0.234 213	0.204 669
GUM	0.000 023	0.000 025	0.000 027	0.000 032	0.000 032
	0.1491	0.1807	0.2119	0.1158	0.3654
IBMETRO					
	0.228 751	0.222 487	0.214 366		
INMETRO	0.000 021	0.000 019	0.000 030		
	-0.2516	-0.1686	-0.0415		
INTI					
IPQ					
LATU					
	0.228 652	0.222 500	0.214 473		
NIM	0.000 042	0.000 045	0.000 044		
	-0.1022	-0.1370	-0.0977		
	0.228 955	0.222 729	0.214 023		
NIMT	0.000 046	0.000 080	0.000 026		
	-0.5281	-0.3930	-0.4558		
	0.228 699	0.222 580	0.214 434		
NMIJ	0.000 044	0.000 044	0.000 044		
	-0.2408	-0.2103	-0.1727		
	0.228 993	0.222 804	0.214 584	0.234 514	0.204 832
PTB	0.000 086	0.000 080	0.000 077	0.000 082	0.000 074
	-0.272	-0.255	-0.205	-0.296	-0.157
	0.228 719	0.222 533	0.214 291		0.204 412
SMU	0.000 045	0.000 046	0.000 047		0.000 048
	-0.2470	-0.2673	-0.3153		-0.2539
	0.228 680	0.222 333	0.214 031	0.233 939	0.203 456
UKrCSIVI	0.000 039	0.000 040	0.000 041	0.000 037	0.000 043
	-0.848	-0.701	-0.982	-1.148	-0.052
	0.229165	0.222465	0.215079	0.234/38	0.205335
VINIFIKI	0.000074	0.000074 _0 5844	0.000074	0.000074	0.000074
	2.0732	0.0044	T.JTJT	0.0700	J.ZJJI

Table 5 Information on the Ag/AgCl standard potential E° , its standard uncertainty $u(E^{\circ})$ and the slope of the pa extrapolation to the zero chloride molality $b_{Cl} = 0$ mol kg⁻¹



Fig. 5-1 Reported values of Ag/AgCl standard potential and their combined standard uncertainties at 15 °C.



Fig. 5-2 Reported values of Ag/AgCl standard potential and their combined standard uncertainties at 25 °C.



Fig. 5-3 Reported values of Ag/AgCl standard potential and their combined standard uncertainties at 37 °C.



Fig. 5-4 Reported values of Ag/AgCl standard potential and their combined standard uncertainties at 5 °C.



Fig. 5-5 Reported values of Ag/AgCl standard potential and their combined standard uncertainties at 50 °C.



Fig. 6-1 Results of the inspection for anomalous pa^0 values at 15 °C.



Fig. 6-2 Results of the inspection for anomalous pa^0 values at 25 °C.



Fig. 6-3 Results of the inspection for anomalous pa^0 values at 37 °C.



Fig. 6-4 Results of the inspection for anomalous pa^0 values at 5 °C.



Fig. 6-5 Results of the inspection for anomalous pa^0 values at 50 °C.



Fig. 7-1 Comparison of the pa and its slope at 15 °C.



Fig. 7-2 Comparison of the pa and its slope at 25 °C.



Fig. 7-3 Comparison of the pa and its slope at 37 °C.



Fig. 7-4 Comparison of the pa and its slope at 5 °C.



Fig. 7-5 Comparison of the pa and its slope at 50 °C.

In general, the reported Ag/AgCl standard potentials agree quite well to the literature reference value³ and are close to each other except for CMI's one. The standard potentials of CMI are significantly smaller than the others. Although this deviation has no impact within the framework of the primary measurement procedure, CMI's p*a* values are significantly lower than the median as well.

The inspection for anomalous pa^0 values shown in Figs. 6-1 to 6-5 could indicate the underestimation of uncertainty of an the anomalous pa^0 value of a participant. For this estimation, the relative consistency is described by the function: $[pa^{0}_{i} - median (pa^{0})] / u(pa^{0}_{i})$. The calculated value of CMI and UkrCSM is far from zero. Figures 6-1 to 6-5 suggest that:

- the pa^0 result reported by CMI is anomalously lower than the median of the participants' results, or the reported $u[pa^0]$ is underestimated.

- the pa^0 result reported by UkrCSM is anomalously higher than the median of the participants' results, or the reported $u[pa^0]$ is underestimated.

Figures 7-1 to 7-5 show a relationship between pa^0 and the pa extrapolation slope. More positive pa extrapolation slopes generally show a tendency to make pa^0 values lower. The result of CMI had such a tendency.

The results of most participants lay within 0.01 in pH, and are in good agreement.

³ R. G. Bates and J. B. Macaskill, "Standard potential of the silver-silver chloride electrode", *Pure Appl. Chem.* 50 (1978) 1701–1706.

Calculation of the KCRV and Uncertainty

Four possibilities for determination of the KCRV are listed in Tables 6-1 and $6-2^{4,5}$. For each estimator, only the p a^0 results determined by the primary measurement technique are used in the calculation and only results obtained using primary method were used to calculate candidate KCRVs.

EAWG (EAWG meeting of April 20th, 2021) decided to omit the results of CMI and UkrCSM from the calculation of the KCRV with both concerned institutes kindly accepting this correction. CMI informed that they found that the reason of deviation in their results being the rough calculation error. UkrCSM noticed some unidentified problem with the measurements procedure.

	15	°C	25	25 °C		37 °C	
Estimator	Value, pa ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	Value, p <i>a</i> ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> º) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> º)	Value, p <i>a</i> ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	
Arithmetic Mean	9.3148	0.0030 0.0060	9.2206	0.0031 0.0061	9.1322	0.0025 0.0049	
Weighted Mean*	9.3123	0.0020 0.0040	9.2193	0.0023 0.0046	9.1316	0.0015 0.0031	
Median / MAD _E	9.3135	0.0038 0.0076	9.2205	0.0039 0.0077	9.1321	0.0031 0.0062	
DerSimonian -Laird	9.3145	0.0030 0.0060	9.2206	0.0030 0.0060	9.1321	0.0023 0.0046	
Birge ratio	5.2	4	5.8	51	4.0	6	

Table 6-1a Values of candidate estimators for the KCRV for CCQM-K19.2018.

* The uncertainty of the weighted mean is corrected for the observed dispersion of Birge ratio.

	15	°C	25	25 °C		°C
Estimator	Value, pa ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	Value, p <i>a</i> ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	Value, p <i>a</i> ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)
Arithmetic Mean	9.3130	0.00062 0.0012	9.2195	0.00132 0.0026	9.1312	0.00107 0.0021
Weighted Mean*	9.3126	0.00059 0.0012	9.2205	0.00073 0.0015	9.1321	0.00072 0.0014
Median / MAD _E	9.3135	0.00088 0.0018	9.2205	0.00153 0.0031	9.1321	0.00141 0.0028
DerSimonian -Laird	9.3128	0.00068 0.0014	9.2204	0.00085 0.0017	9.1317	0.00091 0.0018
Birge ratio	1.4	15	1.8	32	1.8	32

Table 6-1b Values of candidate estimators for the KCRV for CCQM-K19.2018 (CMI and UkrCSM excluded).

* The uncertainty of the weighted mean is corrected for the observed dispersion of Birge ratio.

⁴ CCQM13-22: 2013, "CCQM Guidance note: Estimation of a consensus KCRV and associated Degrees of Equivalence, v10".

⁵ NIST Consensus Builder: 2017, National Institute of Standards and Technology, MD, USA.

	5 °	С	50°	50°C	
Estimator	Value, pa ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	Value, pa ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	
Arithmetic Mean	9.4348	0.0102 0.0204	9.0624	0.0050 0.0101	
Weighted Mean*	9.4267	0.0052 0.0103	9.0592	0.0028 0.0055	
Median / MAD _E	9.4250	0.0128 0.0256	9.0586	0.0063 0.0126	
DerSimonian -Laird	9.4345	0.0101 0.0201	9.0623	0.0049 0.0098	
Birge ratio	8.8	3	5.6	51	

Table 6-2a Values of candidate estimators for the KCRV for CCQM-K19.2018.

* The uncertainty of the weighted mean is corrected for the observed dispersion of Birge ratio.

Table 6-2b Values of candidate estimators for the KCRV for CCQM-K19.2018 (CMI and UkrCSM excluded).

	5 °	°C	50	°C
Estimator	Value, pa ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	Value, pa ⁰	<i>u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰) <i>U</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)
Arithmetic Mean	9.4245	0.00050 0.0010	9.0575	0.00130 0.0026
Weighted Mean*	9.4246	0.00032 0.0006	9.0580	0.00097 0.0019
Median / MAD _E	9.4247	0.00064 0.0013	9.0584	0.00060 0.0012
DerSimonian -Laird	9.4246	0.00021 0.0004	9.0575	0.00128 0.0026
Birge ratio	0.5	54	1.9)3

* The uncertainty of the weighted mean is corrected for the observed dispersion of Birge ratio.

By considering the Birge ratios and the number of participants for the KCRV calculations, the coordinating laboratories recommended "the weighted mean with dispersion" at 15 °C, 25 °C, 37 °C and 50 °C; "the weighted mean without dispersion" at 5 °C. The recommendations were agreed by the participants.

The following equations were used for the KCRVs (KCRV) and their standard uncertainties $(u(KCRV))^4$:

$$KCRV = \sum_{i=1}^{m} w_i x_i \qquad (eq. 7)$$

where

$$w_i = \frac{\left(\frac{1}{u(x_i)}\right)^2}{\sum_{j=1,m} \left(\frac{1}{u(x_j)}\right)^2} \qquad (eq.8)$$

a) Uncorrected for observed dispersion:

$$\frac{1}{u^2(\text{KCRV})} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{u^2(x_i)}$$
 (eq. 9)

b) Corrected for observed dispersion:

$$u_{\rm corr}^2(\rm KCRV) = \frac{\chi_{\rm obs}^2}{m-1} u^2(\rm KCRV) \qquad (eq. 10)$$

where

$$\chi^2_{\rm obs} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(x_i - \text{KCRV})^2}{u^2(x_i)}$$
 (eq. 11)

Table 7 KCRV and its standard uncertainty for CCQM-K19.2018.

15 °C	25 °C	37 °C	5 °C	50 °C
KCRV, pa ^o	KCRV, pa ⁰	KCRV, pa ^o	KCRV, pa ^o	KCRV, p <i>a</i> ⁰
u(KCRV)	u(KCRV)	u(KCRV)	u(KCRV)	<i>u</i> (KCRV)
9.31263	9.22050	9.13210	9.42462	9.05801
0.00059	0.00073	0.00072	0.00060	0.00097

Calculation of the Degrees of Equivalence

The degree of equivalence for each participant, d_i , is given by:

$$d_i = pa_i^0 - KCRV \qquad (eq. 12)$$

For the results used in calculation of the KCRV, the standard uncertainty for the degree of equivalence, $u(d_i)$, is given by:

a) Uncorrected for observed dispersion:

$$u(d_i) = \sqrt{u^2(x_i) - u^2(\text{KCRV})}$$
 (eq. 13)

b) Corrected for observed dispersion:

$$u_{\rm corr}(d_i) = \sqrt{u_{\rm corr}^2({\rm KCRV}) + (1 - 2w_i)u^2(x_i)}$$
 (eq. 14)

For the results determined by the secondary method and other results, which were not used in calculation of the KCRV, $u(d_i)$, is given by:

$$u(d_i) = \sqrt{u^2(x_i) + u^2(\text{KCRV})}$$
 or $\sqrt{u^2(x_i) + u^2_{\text{corr}}(\text{KCRV})}$ (eq. 15)

The expanded uncertainties, $U(d_i)$, are calculated with a coverage factor, k, equal to 2.

Minimum standard uncertainties ($u(CMC_{min})$) of CCQM-K19.2018 were calculated based on "EAWG guideline for claims of Calibration and Measurement Capabilities, v13" as follows:

The best estimate x_i reported by an institute i in the supporting key comparison is assumed to be consistent with the KCRV of the key comparison, if

$$|d_i| \le U(d_i) \tag{eq. 16}$$

then, the minimum standard measurement uncertainty $u(CMC_{min})$ is given by:

$$u(CMC_{\min,i}) = u(x_i)$$
 (eq. 17)

The best estimate x_i reported is assumed to be inconsistent with the KCRV of the key comparison, if

$$|d_i| > U(d_i)$$
 (eq. 18)

then, the minimum standard measurement uncertainty $u(CMC_{min})$ is given by:

$$u(CMC_{\min,i}) = \sqrt{u^2(d_i) + \left(\frac{d_i}{2}\right)^2} \qquad (eq. 19)$$

The expanded uncertainties, U(CMC_{min,i}), are calculated with a coverage factor, k, equal to 2.

The values of E_n are given by:

$$E_{\rm n} = \frac{d_i}{\sqrt{U^2(x_i) + U^2(\text{KCRV})}}$$
 (eq. 20)

Acronym	di	U(d _i)	<i>d_i / u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	U(CMC _{min})	En
BFKH	-0.0016	0.0054	-0.60	0.0054	-0.29
BIM	0.0021	0.0036	1.15	0.0036	0.55
CMI	-0.0114	0.0026	-9.69	0.0117*	-4.33
GUM	-0.0030	0.0029	-2.16	0.0042*	-1.00
INMETRO	0.0023	0.0021	2.27	0.0031*	0.98
LATU	0.0151	0.0112	2.71	0.0188*	1.35
NIM	0.0009	0.0034	0.51	0.0034	0.24
NIMT	0.0021	0.0106	0.39	0.0106	0.19
NMIJ	-0.0013	0.0022	-1.18	0.0022	-0.52
РТВ	-0.0010	0.0015	-1.47	0.0014	-0.56
SMU	0.0024	0.0027	1.82	0.0026	0.83
UkrCSM	0.0331	0.0049	13.78	0.0334*	6.69
VNIIFTRI	0.0008	0.0035	0.44	0.0035	0.21

Table 8-1 Degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties of CCQM-K19.2018 on pH for borate buffer at 15 °C.

* The reported values are inconsistent with KCRV.

Table 8-2 Degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties of CCQM-K19.2018 on pH for borate buffer at 25 °C.

Acronym	di	U(d _i)	<i>d_i / u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	U(CMC _{min})	En
BFKH	-0.0080	0.0063	-2.58	0.0102*	-1.26
BIM	0.0040	0.0039	2.11	0.0056*	0.98
CMI	-0.0173	0.0028	-14.79	0.0175*	-6.27
GUM	-0.0025	0.0028	-1.92	0.0026	-0.84
IBMETRO	0.0471	0.0104	9.17	0.0482*	4.54
INMETRO	0.0029	0.0030	2.07	0.0028	0.92
INTI	0.0040	0.0798	0.10	0.0798	0.05
LATU	0.0146	0.0113	2.60	0.0185*	1.29
NIM	0.0000	0.0035	0.00	0.0034	0.00
NIMT	-0.0080	0.0085	-1.90	0.0084	-0.94
NMIJ	-0.0010	0.0024	-0.90	0.0022	-0.37
PTB	0.0000	0.0017	0.00	0.0014	0.00
SMU	0.0027	0.0033	1.69	0.0032	0.77
UkrCSM	0.0279	0.0050	11.63	0.0284*	5.56
VNIIFTRI	-0.0001	0.0036	-0.06	0.0035	-0.03

* The reported values are inconsistent with KCRV.

Acronym	di	$U(d_i)$	<i>d_i / u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	U(CMC _{min})	En
BFKH	-0.0066	0.0039	-3.47	0.0077*	-1.62
BIM	0.0035	0.0037	1.94	0.0036	0.90
CMI	-0.0132	0.0032	-9.36	0.0136*	-4.17
GUM	-0.0025	0.0028	-1.92	0.0026	-0.84
INMETRO	0.0023	0.0028	1.77	0.0026	0.77
LATU	0.0176	0.0106	3.34	0.0206*	1.65
NIM	-0.0029	0.0035	-1.71	0.0034	-0.79
NIMT	-0.0054	0.0089	-1.23	0.0088	-0.61
NMIJ	-0.0004	0.0024	-0.38	0.0022	-0.16
РТВ	0.0006	0.0015	1.00	0.0012	0.32
SMU	0.0023	0.0037	1.28	0.0036	0.59
UkrCSM	0.0227	0.0058	8.11	0.0234*	3.93
VNIIFTRI	0.0004	0.0036	0.23	0.0035	0.11

Table 8-3 Degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties of CCQM-K19.2018 on pH for borate buffer at 37 °C.

* The reported values are inconsistent with KCRV.

Table 8-4 Degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties of CCQM-K19.2018 on pH for borate buffer at 5 °C.

Acronym	di	U(d _i)	<i>d_i / u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	U(CMC _{min})	En
GUM	-0.0010	0.0030	-0.64	0.0032	-0.30
PTB	0.0001	0.0008	0.11	0.0014	0.04
UkrCSM	0.0408	0.0054	15.68	0.0411*	7.64
VNIIFTRI	0.0007	0.0032	0.41	0.0034	0.19

* The reported values are inconsistent with KCRV.

Table 8-5 Degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties of CCQM-K19.2018 on pH for borate buffer at 50 °C.

Acronym	di	U(d _i)	<i>d_i / u</i> (p <i>a</i> ⁰)	U(CMC _{min})	En
GUM	-0.0043	0.0031	-3.08	0.0053*	-1.27
PTB	0.0006	0.0018	0.98	0.0012	0.26
SMU	0.0015	0.0037	0.88	0.0034	0.38
UkrCSM	0.0242	0.0048	11.00	0.0247*	5.03
VNIIFTRI	0.0002	0.0039	0.10	0.0036	0.05

* The reported values are inconsistent with KCRV.



Fig. 8-1 Unilateral degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties (k = 2) at 15 °C for CCQM-K19.2018.



Fig. 8-2 Unilateral degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties (k = 2) at 25 °C for CCQM-K19.2018.



Fig. 8-3 Unilateral degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties (k = 2) at 37 °C for CCQM-K19.2018.



Fig. 8-4 Unilateral degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties (k = 2) at 5 °C for CCQM-K19.2018.



Fig. 8-5 Unilateral degrees of equivalence and expanded uncertainties (k = 2) at 50 °C for CCQM-K19.2018.

How far the light shines

Borate buffer solution is widely used in an alkaline pH range and is a 'core capability' buffer in primary Harned cell measurements. Participants that successfully took part in the CCQM-K19.2018 key comparison demonstrate their capability to measure the pH of borate buffer by the primary Harned cell method, the secondary differential potentiometric cell method, or the secondary glass electrode method in the pH range 8.5 to 9.5 at the temperature range 5 °C to 50 °C. The corresponding measurement uncertainties for each temperature must be assessed in reviewing CMC claims. Participants that successfully took part in this key comparison by the secondary glass electrode method may claim wider measurement ranges than 8.5 to 9.5 when provided the uncertainty and the calibration procedure are appropriate.

Conclusion

Comparability of measurement results was successfully demonstrated by many participating NMIs for the measurement of pH of a borate buffer within related expanded uncertainties. It is expected that the performance of each participant in the present key comparison is representative for measurement of pH of a borate buffer with the same technique as used in the present comparison.

Acknowledgment

The coordinating laboratory gratefully acknowledges the contributions of all participants and of the members of the CCQM-EAWG for their support in this comparison.