

## Compliance Voltage – How much is enough?

### Introduction

The compliance voltage of a potentiostat is the maximum voltage that the potentiostat can apply to the Counter electrode in order to control the desired voltage in the electrochemical cell. It is generally measured as the difference between the counter electrode and the working electrode. Most potentiostat manufacturers include the Compliance Voltage as one of the significant specifications in their data sheet.

Compliance Voltage is also one specification that users consider when purchasing a potentiostat. Although it is tempting to think “the higher the better,” a high compliance voltage is not without its price. The higher the compliance voltage, the higher the power requirements are within the potentiostat. Higher power means more complexity, more weight, and generally higher cost. The frugal electrochemist asks “How much compliance voltage do I really need?”

### A Simple Cartoon of Your Cell

The response of a potentiostat depends upon the nature of the electrochemical cell to which it is connected. This is true for compliance voltage as well. The manufacturer’s data sheet should also tell you the conditions under which the compliance voltage was measured. For example, the Gamry Series G™ 750 Potentiostat specifications give the compliance voltage as >15V @ 15 mA and >12V @ 500 mA, while the Reference™ 600 specifications give the compliance as >22V @ ~110 mA.

There are several components to the compliance voltage and we can evaluate them by looking at the schematic in Figure 1. Some of the components depend upon the nature of the electrodes and the electrolyte, while some depend upon the geometry of your cell.




Figure 1. The distribution of voltage drops across an electrochemical cell.

### Overloads – Control Overload

For the potentiostat to properly control the cell, the voltage difference between the counter electrode and the working electrode must be less than the manufacturer’s stated compliance voltage. This is true for galvanostatic as well as potentiostatic experiments. If your experiment demands a voltage higher than the compliance voltage limit then the potentiostat or your software should give you an indication of an “overload.” This overload might be called a “control amp overload”, “CA overload”, or a “control overload.”

This is not the only type of overload that is possible. Another common overload condition is a “current overload.” In the case of a “current overload”, the current may simply be too large for the current range that has been selected. Often the answer is to simply choose a less sensitive current range, or to allow the potentiostat to autorange and select the proper current measuring scale automatically.

## The Components of Compliance Voltage

If you can estimate the size of each of the four components shown in Figure 1, you can determine the compliance voltage that will be needed for your application, without triggering a “control amp overload.” The easiest to estimate is shown as  $V_{F,W}$ . It is the voltage drop across the electrical double layer at the working electrode. If you know something about the nature of the electrode and the nature of the electrolyte, you can probably make a good guess at its maximum value. It is simply the voltage required to cause the desired electrochemical reaction to occur at the working electrode. In aqueous electrolytes this is generally within the limits  $-2 < V_{F,W} < +2$ . Even in aprotic non-aqueous (organic) solvents, it is unusual for it to exceed  $\pm 3V$ .

The second voltage drop in our cartoon in Figure 1 is  $V_{iRu}$ . This is equivalent to the  $iR$  drop across the uncompensated resistance, the resistance between the tip of the reference electrode or Luggin tip and the working electrode. This obviously depends upon the geometry of your cell, but also depends upon the conductivity of the electrolyte and the current. In spite of these unknowns, we are safe in assuming that the  $iR$  drop,  $V_{iRu}$ , is about 1V or less. The rationale for this assumption is that we are actually trying to make a meaningful electrochemical measurement. If the  $iR$  drop is too large, its effect may obscure the phenomenon we are trying to study!

Remember that this voltage drop depends upon the current! A ten per cent change in current will change this voltage drop by as much as 100 mV,

or more. If you are performing a cyclic voltammetric experiment or a potentiodynamic scan, peaks or transitions might change by as much as 100 mV for this small change in current. Interpretation of the results will be obscured by the effects of the  $iRu$  voltage drop. If you attempt to correct for the effects of this voltage drop, either by post-run correction or by real-time correction using the positive feedback or current interrupt technique, a few per cent error in the  $Ru$  value for post-run or positive feedback correction, or a few percent error in the  $iRu$  drop using current interrupt, can give oscillations, noise, and unusual apparent current-voltage curves. Recognizing this, most manufacturers limit the automatic correction circuitry to a volt or two of  $iR$  correction.

The next voltage drop in our cartoon of Figure 1 is the voltage drop across the bulk solution resistance of the cell,  $V_{iRBULK}$ . We shall return to this component of the required compliance voltage in the next section.

Finally, there is the faradaic reaction at the counter electrode. As with the working electrode, it is unusual for the voltage drop across the counter electrode interface,  $V_{F,C}$ , to be larger than 2V in magnitude. In a well-designed cell, the area of the counter electrode should be several times the area of the working electrode. This minimizes the current density at the counter electrode and reduces the activation- and polarization- overvoltages at the counter electrode.

In the absence of a large bulk solution resistance, we can sum the components and expect a voltage magnitude of about 5V ( $= 2+1+2$ ) between working and counter electrodes in the most extreme case.

## The Bulk Resistance of Your Cell

The one component of the compliance voltage that has the widest variability is the  $iR$  drop across the bulk resistance of your cell,  $V_{iRBULK}$ . The size of this voltage drop depends upon the current

passed, but it also depends upon the electrolyte, its concentration, and the design of your cell. We will give a few examples to establish some guidelines.

The data presented here was obtained using a Gamry EuroCell™ Kit and a Reference 600 Potentiostat. The Reference 600 Potentiostat was selected because it has the capability to easily record the voltage output of its control amplifier. This voltage is nominally the same as the counter electrode voltage. The two voltages are separated only by the voltage drops across the cell switch and counter electrode cable. For the data shown, both of these voltage drops are not significant. The control amplifier voltage is internally divided by a factor of ten so that it may be read on the  $\pm 3.276$  V full scale A/D converter. For other Gamry Potentiostats, an external voltage divider is required to read the counter electrode voltage.

Figure 2 shows the current voltage curves obtained for 430 Stainless Steel in 0.1M H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The counter electrode voltage is also shown on this plot. The blue curves show the data

obtained using the standard graphite rod counter electrode that is standard for the EuroCell Kit. About 3 cm of this 6 mm diameter rod were immersed in the electrolyte (about 6 cm<sup>2</sup>). The working electrode was a cylindrical sample of 430 stainless steel, fabricated according to ASTM standard dimensions (5/8" diameter, 1/2" long). The exposed area of the working electrode was about 5 cm<sup>2</sup>. The red curves were recorded using the same cell and 430 SS sample, but using the isolated counter electrode accessory, 990-194. This accessory consists of a platinum wire counter electrode and a glass tube with a coarse sintered glass frit at the end (See Fig 3). The isolation tube is placed into the cell so that the electrolyte fills the inside of the tubing (through the sintered glass frit) to a depth of a few centimeters. The platinum counter electrode is placed inside the isolation tube, immersed in the electrolyte.

For the curve recorded with the graphite rod counter electrode (blue) the counter electrode voltage (light blue) reaches a maximum of about 5V at the start of the experiment where the current is the largest, about 200 mA. The counter electrode voltage was plotted against the




Figure 2. The current voltage curves for 430 Stainless Steel in 0.1M H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The darker curves are the current voltage data. The lighter curves are the control amplifier output recorded at the same time. Blue: graphite counter electrode. Red: isolated Pt counter electrode.






Figure 4. Current (blue) and Counter Electrode Voltage (green) vs. Working Electrode Voltage. The horizontal green lines mark the published compliance voltage limits of the potentiostat:  $\pm 22$  V. Red marks points with a “Control Amplifier Overload.”

This crude estimate was checked with an EIS experiment without moving the electrodes. Because the resistance from the reference electrode to the counter electrode was to be measured, the working and working sense electrode leads were connected to the isolated platinum electrode. The counter electrode lead was connected to the 430SS sample. The impedance spectrum was recorded at 0 V vs. Open Circuit and the high frequency data was fit to a simplified Randles cell model, but with the capacitor replaced with a constant phase element (CPE). The fit gave a “solution resistance” of  $284 \pm 4$  ohms. Because of the non-traditional connection to the potentiostat, this represents the solution resistance between the reference electrode and the isolated platinum electrode. The tortuous path through the sintered glass frit substantially raises the resistance across the frit, even in reasonably good conducting media.

### Poorly Conducting Media

The change to alternative fuels will require examination of the corrosion properties of materials in these poorly conducting media.

Alternative fuels based on ethanol and other alcohols will certainly have some water content (ca. 1%), and may contain acetic acid as well (10-100 ppm). To see the compliance requirements in these media we tested our 430 Stainless Steel sample in isopropanol (2-Propanol) to which 1% aqueous 0.1N Acetate Buffer had been added. This electrolyte contained 1% water and about 60 ppm acetate. The potentiodynamic scan recorded for the 430 stainless steel is shown in Figure 5. The currents are smaller than those observed in Figure 2, as we would expect.

The counter electrode voltage is also shown in Figure 5 (green line). Even though the currents are smaller, the counter electrode voltage is considerably higher. Since a graphite rod immersed directly in the test solution was used as the counter electrode, the higher counter electrode voltage is due to the low conductivity of this electrolyte. We can estimate the bulk resistance from the counter voltage (23.5 V) and current (1.3 mA) near the end of the scan. This yields about 18 kohm ( $= 23.5 \text{ V} / 1.3 \text{ mA}$ ) for the resistance.




Figure 5. 430 Stainless Steel in 2-Propanol to which 1% aqueous 0.1N Acetate Buffer had been added. This mixture approximates an alternative fuel mixture. Experimental details: Gamry EuroCell™, Graphite rod counter electrode (not isolated), SCE Reference Electrode, Ref. Electrode Bridge Tube filled with isopropanol electrolyte.

Plotting the counter electrode voltage against current (linear plot) also allows us to estimate the bulk resistance (Figure 6). From this plot, the resistance is estimated to be 17.1 kohm. EIS was also used to measure the bulk resistance, and the value was consistent with the 17-18 kohm values already calculated. However, the analysis of the data was complicated by artifacts introduced by the high impedance nature of this electrolyte. These artifacts and possible solutions will be the subject of a separate Application Note.

### Factors Influencing $R_{\text{BULK}}$

The compliance requirements are strongly controlled by the resistance of the bulk of the solution. If we can minimize the bulk resistance, then we will minimize the compliance voltage required. The value of a resistor can be calculated from:

$$R = \rho l / A$$

where  $R$  is the resistance ( $\Omega$ )

$\rho$  is the resistivity of the medium ( $\Omega\text{-cm}$ )

$l$  is the length of the resistor (cm)

$A$  is the cross-sectional area of the resistor

in  $\text{cm}^2$ .

Often we do not have control over the resistivity,  $\rho$ , such as in our last example. We cannot increase the ionic concentration without changing the electrolyte. We can, though, change  $l$  or  $A$ . If we place the counter electrode closer to the working electrode we will reduce the length,  $l$ , of our bulk resistance. This will reduce the bulk resistance. If we increase the area of our counter electrode, we will increase the cross-sectional area,  $A$ , of our "resistor," and the bulk resistance will decrease.

Increasing the size of the working electrode also increases the area of our "resistor," but it will not help. It also increases the current! The  $iR$  product, and the compliance voltage requirements, will remain the same!

### Summary

We hope that the three examples presented here will provide you with some feel for the compliance voltage requirements in some common applications, and have provided you with some ways to estimate the required compliance in your electrochemical cell.

For a non-isolated counter electrode, commonly employed electrolyte concentrations (0.1M or above) generally require compliance voltages of 10 V or less. Substantially lower ionic concentrations (such as 0.002M) or non-aqueous media may require more than 10 V for currents in excess of 1 mA. For isolated counter electrodes, the frits commonly used for isolation

can dramatically increase the bulk resistance, even in concentrated electrolytes.

©Gamry Instruments Copyright 2007 Rev. 1




Figure 6. Counter Electrode Voltage vs. Current. The slope of the least squares fit gives the bulk resistance of the solution, 17.14 kohms.