PCCP

CORRECTION

View Article Online
View Journal | View Issue

Cite this: *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2019, **21**, 929

Correction: Comment on "Negative effective Li transference numbers in Li salt/ionic liquid mixtures: does Li drift in the "Wrong" direction?" by M. Gouverneur, F. Schmidt and M. Schönhoff, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, 20, 7470

Kenneth R. Harris

DOI: 10.1039/c8cp91941k

rsc.li/pccp

Correction for 'Comment on "Negative effective Li transference numbers in Li salt/ionic liquid mixtures: does Li drift in the "Wrong" direction?" by M. Gouverneur, F. Schmidt and M. Schönhoff, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 7470' by Kenneth R. Harris, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 30041–30045.

Table 2 of the published Comment has several incorrect entries for the literature effective transport numbers in column 2. Those from ref. 12 of the Comment should have been taken from Table S1 of the Supplementary Information of that paper, not Table 1. This has been pointed out by Schönhoff *et al.* in their Reply (*Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 30046–30052). The two entries for ref. 30 have also been corrected. The reference numbers in the Table are those of the original Comment.

Table 2 Comparison of "effective" cation transport numbers t_{eff} measured by electrophoretic NMR for pure salts[1,12,14,30] and those predicted by eqn (7)

IL	$t_{+,eff}$ (ENMR)	$t_{+,eff}$ (eqn (7))
[EMIM][Tf_2N][1]	0.60 ± 0.05	0.72
[EMIM][BF_4][1]	0.37 ± 0.04	0.44
[EMIM][BF_4][12]	0.42 ± 0.07	0.44
[EMIM][BF_4][14]	0.56 ± 0.03	0.44
[EMIM][BF_4][30]	0.53	0.44
[EMIM][$(FSO_2)_2N$][30]	0.45	0.62
[BMIM][PF_6][a,12]	0.51 ± 0.10	0.51
[BMIM][Tf_2N][12]	0.44 ± 0.09	0.67
[Pyr_{14}][Tf_2N][b,12]	0.51 ± 0.10	0.66
[EMIM][CF_3SO_3][14]	0.46 ± 0.03	0.57

[a] $[BMIM]^+$ = 1-butyl-3-methylimidazolium. [b] $[Pyr_{14}]^+$ = *N*-butyl-*N*-methylpyrrolidinium.

For the results of Schönhoff *et al.* (ref. 12 of the Comment), these changes improve the agreement between the "effective" cation transport numbers measured with electrophoretic NMR and those determined from the Sundheim rule, eqn (7), for [EMIM][BF_4] and [BMIM][PF_6], but worsen that for [BMIM][Tf_2N] and [Pyr_{14}][Tf_2N]. See Fig. 1 of the Schönhoff Reply and the related discussion. The disparity with the measurements on [EMIM][BF_4] made by Umecky *et al.* (ref. 30 of the Comment) is also increased. So the observation that the results are somewhat scattered remains unchanged.

The author apologises for the necessity to make these amendments.

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.

School of Physical, Environmental and Mathematical Sciences, The University of New South Wales, Australian Defence Force Academy, PO Box 7916, Canberra BC, ACT 2610, Australia. E-mail: k.harris@adfa.edu.au