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1. Introduction. — Thermotropic liquid crystals in a single component nematic state have been the subject of intensive studies in the last decade [1, 2, 3]. They can be categorized broadly as addressing two aspects of the system, one dealing with the equilibrium properties of microscopic long range order and the other with the dynamic responses of the order either to spontaneous thermal fluctuations or to a variety of externally imposed force fields. The most successful of the theoretical tools for interpreting the equilibrium properties at the molecular level has been the mean field model of Maier and Saupe [4] in terms of the order parameter; the temperature dependence of order parameter has been formulated in the context of elastic free energy density given by Frank [5] and Oseen [6]. The corresponding theory of the dynamic properties is the linearized hydrodynamic equation of motion by Ericksen [7] and Leslie [8].

The principal interest in binary systems resides in gaining an additional degree of freedom in thermodynamic characterization of nematic substances. Beyond this, we are interested in extending the analogy between simple liquid crystal systems and biological aggregates which are in most cases complex composite systems such as cell membranes. Phospholipid bilayer membranes of various biological functions and origins are not constituted of one component, but of different phospholipids, proteins, carbohydrates and steroids [9]. Although the liquid crystalline property of these membranes under physiological conditions has been recognized [10] only a limited effort has been expended in delineating the structural changes attended by inclusion or exclusion of minor components except perhaps the effect of cholesterol [11]. A likely possibility is that there exist rather specific interactions in the membrane among the major and minor components. Thus, the necessity for understanding composite systems entails first clearly defining the limiting case where the interactions are non-specific within a binary system. This is the second reason why we have
embarked on a study of the MBBA-biphenyl nematic region.

In this paper, we first outline the theoretical bases of our analysis, then present the results of a macroscopic thermodynamic study in the form of a phase diagram. The non-specificity of interactions in this system will be proven. Next, a study of anisotropic optical properties is presented with the intent of relating them to the nematic order parameter as a function of temperature and composition. We will then show how these two degrees of freedom can be reduced to a single parameter defining the nematic order and a correspondence law between the two can be extracted. The entire analysis is built around the mean field model and the attraction of its simplicity is retained without being encumbered by varying degrees of sophistications [12]. The focus of this report may be stated as follows. Upon addition of a non-nematic component (solvent) to a thermotropic nematic (solvent), the order of the entire system is reduced according to a specific rule which is the correspondence principle between temperature and composition, and this relation is entirely predictable from the mean field theory.

2. Preliminary and background. — 2.1 Temperature and composition dependence of the order parameter. — A brief discussion of the Maier-Saupe model [4] is in order as the starting point. In the mean field theory, the order parameter of uniaxial medium is given by the solution of the following equations in terms of the second order spherical harmonics of the orientational direction [13] that a given molecule, denoted by $l$, assumes relative to the director of the rest of the system

$$S_l = \left\{ \frac{3}{2} \left\{ \int_0^1 e^{-\frac{D}{2} \cos^2 \theta_l} d(\cos \theta_l) \right\} \right\} = \frac{1}{2}$$

with

$$D = -\left( A/2 \overline{V}^2 \right) S(3 \cos^2 \theta_l - 1)$$

under the self-consistent condition of equilibrium for the nematic system,

$$S_l = S \quad \text{and} \quad dS/dS < 1 \quad \text{(3)}$$

Here, $\theta_l$ is the angle between the $l$th major molecular axis and the director. The definitions of notation may be summarized in combination with the assumptions invoked for the above equations as follows:

1) The intermolecular interaction energy ensuring nematic state is solely due to the dispersion terms (the second order perturbation) of the intermolecular forces. Electrostatic interactions, induction forces, as well as other perturbation interactions (multipole-multipole), etc. [14], are all assumed to be of negligible importance in establishing nematic order.

2) The short range repulsive interactions are somewhat artificially taken into account by arguing that these drive the system to form microscopic aggregates of few molecules each (the exact number being unspecified) within which the alignment of constituent molecules is absolutely uniform. Hence, the meaning of $\theta_l$ in eq. (1) and (2) is modified to refer to these aggregates.

3) All molecules (strictly, the aggregates referred to above) in a nematic phase are in their ground electronic states, and to the anisotropic part of the transition moments from the ground state is ascribed the predominant contribution to the dispersion energy.

4) The distribution of the centers of mass of molecules (aggregates) is spherically symmetric within a macroscopic volume.

Thus, the meaning of $A$ in eq. (2) may be understood as the ratio of the averaged sum of the orientation dependent oscillator strengths to the corresponding transition energy from the ground state to the electronically excited states of a molecule; hence, $A$ is a characteristic material constant. The dependence of the dispersion energy on the spherically symmetric distribution of intermolecular separations introduces a $\overline{V}^2$ term in the denominator of eq. (2) where it stands for the square of the molar volume. One of our tools in studying a binary system is through this $R^{-6}$ dependence of the theory.

The solution of eq. (1) and (3) provides the following bounds:

A) The order parameter $S$ at the nematic to isotropic transition is roughly a universal constant of 0.44 independent of the nematicogenic substance.

B) The quantity of $A/kT_c \overline{V}_e^2$ has nearly the same value of 4.55 at the transition point with the temperature $T_c$ and the molar volume $\overline{V}_e$.

C) Hence, the degree of order $S$ is a unique function of $\overline{T} \overline{V}^2 / T_c \overline{V}_e^2$ within the nematic region for all such systems.

We now examine how $S$ is affected by dilation of the spacial distribution of these molecules upon addition of a passive second component whose effect is merely to expand the distance among the interacting nematicogenic molecules. Assume that there is no volume of mixing when the second component with mole fraction $X$ is added to a pure nematicogenic substance. Then,

$$V_e(T_c, X) = \overline{V}_1^0(T_c) + \left( \frac{X}{1-X} \right) \overline{V}_2^0(T_c)$$

$$= \overline{V}_1^0(T_c) \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{X}{1-X} \right) \phi(T_c) \right]$$

with $\phi(T_c) \equiv \overline{V}_2^0 / \overline{V}_1^0 < 1$ for the cases considered, where $V_e(T_c, X)$ is the volume of mixture required to contain one mole of solvent at the nematic to isotropic transition of the mixture, and $\overline{V}_1^0(T_c)$ and $\overline{V}_2^0(T_c)$ are
the molar volumes of the solvent and solute (non-nematicic by itself) at their respective pure states at $T_c$. If the thermal expansion coefficients of each component are assumed to be small [15] within the nematic phase region of the solution then

$$T_c(X) = A/4.55 kT_c^2(X)$$

$$= [A/4.55 kT_c^2(T_c)] \left( 1 + \frac{X}{1 - X} \varphi \right)^{-2}$$

$$= [A/4.55 kT_c^2(T_c)] \times$$

$$\times \left\{ 1 - 2 \varphi X + (3 \varphi - 2) \varphi X^2 + \cdots \right\}$$

(5)

provided $X < 0.5$. In the dilute solution, we then expect that

$$T_e(X) = T_e(0) (1 - 2 \varphi X)$$

(6)

where $T_e(0)$ is the transition temperature of pure solvent component. This simple result predicts that the transition temperature of a binary nematic system is a linear function of the concentration of non-nematicic solute in the dilute solution limit and its relative change from that of pure thermotropic one depends on the ratio of molar volumes of the two components. An implicit assumption here is that the molecular orientation of the solute component is spherically symmetric in the solution; this should be reasonable for spherical solute molecules such as carbon tetrachloride or methane but is less plausible for non-spherical molecules if their orientational distribution function in nematic solution deviates from the spherical symmetry. In such a case, the dilution effect of the solute would be less than that deduced using the spherical factor $2 \varphi T_e(0)$ and the relative deviation could in turn be used as a measure of the orientational order of the solute component [16].

Returning to the third prediction of the Maier-Saupe theory that the order parameter $S$ is a unique function of $TV^2(T)/T_c V^2_c(T_c)$ for pure thermotropic systems, a parallel conclusion can be drawn for binary solutions of the kind with which we are concerned. If we neglect thermal expansion as before, the order parameter of a binary system can be seen to be characterized by $T(X)/T_e(X)$ or by a reduced temperature defined as

$$\eta(T, X) \equiv \frac{T(X) - T_e(X)}{T_e(X)}$$

(7)

with

$$T_e(X) = T_e(0) (1 - 2 \varphi \sigma X)$$

(6')

in the dilute limit. In the above equation, a positive constant $\sigma \ll 1$ is introduced as a measure of the degree of anisotropy in the orientational distribution of the intercalated solute molecules.

2.2 Order Parameter Determination. — The optical technique for the determination of the order parameter has been formulated by Chandrasekhar and Madhusudana [17] by assuming the internal polarization field to be of the Lorentz-Lorenz type as VukS [18] has done with organic molecular crystals. The following expressions are given:

$$\frac{n_2^2 - 1}{n^2 + 2} = \frac{4 \pi N}{3} \left( \frac{2}{3} \Delta \alpha \right) S$$

(8)

or alternatively

$$\frac{n_2^2 - n_0^2}{n^2 + 2} = \frac{4 \pi N}{3} \left( \frac{2}{3} \Delta \alpha \right) S$$

(9)

where $n_4$ and $n_0$ are the extraordinary and the ordinary refractive indices respectively, the mean refractive index $n^2 = \frac{1}{2}(n_0^2 + n_2^2)$, the mean polarizability of a nematogenic molecule $\bar{a} = \frac{1}{2}(a_0 + 2 a_2)$, the anisotropy of molecular polarizability $\Delta \alpha = (a_0 - a_2)$, and $N$ is the number density of the nematogenic molecule. Assuming that the solute component does not contribute to the birefringence of the solution while it does to the order parameter through the $TV^2_c(X)$ term, the modification of eq. (8) for binary systems is accomplished by expressing the number density $N$ as

$$N(T, X) = N^0(T) (1 - X)$$

(11)

where $N^0(T)$ is the number density in a pure thermotropic system. The basis for expressing the number density of the solvent molecules by its mole fraction comes from the consideration of the nematic packing problem of Flory [19] and DiMarzio [20]. It may briefly be stated as follows. Consider a system consisting of cylinders of a given diameter with equal length which are uniformly aligned in a lattice. In the athermal limit [21] ($\Delta H_o = 0, \Delta V_o = 0, \Delta S_m \neq 0$), the introduction of a second component which has the same diameter but a different length into the lattice, produces a density decrease of the first component which is accounted for by the number fraction (or mole fraction) because each solute molecule samples the cylinder's cross sectional area (normal to the cylindrical axis) and this is the same for both components. If the solute were to pack normal to the alignment direction, it would sample the volume fraction. The density accounting by mole fraction is valid only when uniform alignment of nematic system is assumed and the alignment is not substantially perturbed by the introduction of solute. It should be noted here that the volume of solution necessary to contain one mole of solvent in eq. (4) is formulated without the uniform alignment constraint, hence the accounting procedure is different from $N(T, X)$. A further difference between $V_o(T, X)$ and $N(T, X)$ is that the former refers to the isotropic intermolecular distance of interacting moieties while the latter refers
to the macroscopic number density of optically anisotropic molecules.

Substitution of eq. (11) into eq. (10) yields the order parameter,

\[ S = \frac{3}{4\pi} \left( \frac{n_2 - n_0}{n_0^2 + 2} \right) \left[ N^0(T) (1 - X) \Delta \alpha \right]^{-1}. \]  

(12)

Through this equation the order parameter as a function of \( T \) and \( X \) can now be tested for its unique functional dependence with respect to the single variable of reduced temperature \( \tau(T, X) \).

In closing this section, we summarize the necessary background for the interpretation of our findings which will follow. If the binary system under consideration is in the athermal solution limit in dilute concentration of solute, then:

1) The nematic to isotropic transition temperature is predicted to be a linear function of concentration.

2) The equilibrium order is expected to be a function of \( \tau(T, X) \).

3) The order parameter \( S(T, X) \) is to be deduced from the macroscopic optical properties.

3. Experimental. — 3.1 Materials. — The nematicogenic substance, p-methoxybenzylidene-p'-butylaniline (MBBA) is synthesized from its precursors, p-butyralanine and p-methoxybenzaldehyde, by condensation in absolute ethanol according to the method of Verbit [22]. The raw product was extracted by anhydrous ether, dried over \( \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 \) for four days and then distilled under vacuum (10⁻⁵ torr) three times before the final middle fraction was collected for use. Freshly distilled MBBA had a nematic-isotropic transition of 46.1°C.

Biphenyl was purified by sublimation \textit{in vacuo} (10⁻³ torr) for 48 hours at room temperature.

3.2 Phase Study. — Samples of differing concentration were prepared by placing weighed amounts of each component (total 150 mg) in a glass tube, capped with a syringe septum and flushed with dry nitrogen through a pair of syringe needles across the cap. These samples were subsequently used for the phase study by observing the different phases visually; the identification of anisotropic phase is sometimes performed by means of its birefringence. The samples were preheated to the isotropic solution, quenched in liquid nitrogen, then held in a water bath whose temperature was slowly raised from 0°C. The heating rate of the bath was nominally maintained at 0.25°C/min because a slower rate of 0.04°C/min was tried without any detectable difference in the transition temperatures. The biphasic state where nematic liquid crystal was in equilibrium with isotropic liquid was confirmed to be reproducible and stable with negligible temperature hysteresis. The temperature measurements were made with a chromel-alumel thermocouple (combined with Leeds & Northrup K-3 potentiometer and L-N 9823-1 D. C. Null detector) which was calibrated against a calorimetry thermometer certified by N. B. S.

Concurrent with the visual method, differential scanning calorimetric (DSC) measurements were performed with a similar set of samples. The data from the two techniques, as shown in the next section, complement each other. Some phase transformations inaccessible by visual observation could be determined by the DSC method. The temperature scale as well as the endotherm peak area for a DuPont Thermal Analyzer [23] (Model 900) were calibrated with five samples of gallium (\( T_m = 29.78°C, \Delta h_f = 19.1\text{ cal/g} \)). Each sample was hermetically sealed in an aluminum planchet, preheated to the isotropic liquid state, then quenched in liquid nitrogen. The heating rates were programmed at 3.5°C/min and 7.0°C/min. The accuracy in the heating rate was within 5% and the linearity with respect to time within 1%. The two heating rates produced no difference in the results.

3.3 Optical Properties. — The technique of birefringence measurement on an aligned nematic system was that of Haller \textit{et al.} [24] with minor refinements. The cell was made by cutting in half a single microscopic slide glass which had been previously treated for alignment and forming into a wedge. The wedge angle was measured by mounting the cell with the apex at the center of a goniometer (Bridgeport rotary table, RT-15) and reflecting a laser beam from the two surfaces, so that the circular reflection from each plate was successively centered around a wire 15 feet away from the apex. The uncertainty in the wedge angle (2°-3°) was determined as 0.3%. The fringe spacing as observed by a polarizing microscope (90 X) with travelling stage, the wedge angle, and the wave length of the He-Ne laser light source are combined to determine the birefringence through a simple optical phase relationship. An uncertainty of 0.5% was assigned for the birefringence values for the isothermal run (23°C) for the concentration range of 0-8.35 mole % biphenyl, and 1.5% uncertainty for the constant composition run (8.13 mole % biphenyl) over the temperature range 16-26°C. Temperature was controlled by room thermostat and monitored by a thermometer and a thermocouple placed at the wedge surface.

The ordinary refractive index was measured by an Abbe refractometer (Carl Zeiss) with a diffuse He-Ne laser source. The refractometer was calibrated with doubly distilled benzene as the standard, using the value of \( n_{6328.20°C} \) (benzene) = 1.4975 and

\[ \frac{dn}{dT} = 6.4 \times 10^{-4}/°C. \]

Uncertainty in \( n_r \) values was assigned as ± 0.001.

4. Results and discussion. — 4.1 Phase Diagram. — As shown in figure 1, the phase diagram obtained by visual observation and the DSC method provides...
a coherent picture of phase transformations. The existence of a biphasic region between the nematic state and the isotropic solution is unmistakable. Although one observes a variety of metastable phases by the DSC method [25] (below the temperature scale in figure 1), we represent only a part of the entire phase diagram to restrict ourselves to the relevant features of this paper. An additional observation was noted in the biphasic region; when the fraction of either the nematic phase or the isotropic phase is dominant, i.e., in the vicinity of the coexistence curves, the whole system appeared as a single phase, either nematic or isotropic, for a period of time (5-30 min) following vigorous shaking before the phase boundary reappeared when allowed to stand. We attribute this phenomenon as the probable cause of the controversy [26] surrounding the existence of a biphasic region which is completely consistent with the first order phase transition [27]. Stability of a biphasic region was tested by letting one sample stand at ambient temperature for a period of over one-half year. No change was detected in the relative proportion of each phase.

The biphasic transition region precludes the observation of the temperature $T_c(X)$ at which isotropic and nematic liquids of composition $X$ are in equilibrium. The first appearance of isotropic liquid in a multicomponent system occurs at phase separation which will be at a temperature slightly lower than that at which the anisotropic free energy disappears ($T_c$). Bearing in mind that this is a small effect [25] we may consider $T_c$ to be satisfactorily approximated by the temperature at which the nematic is unstable with respect to phase separation.

The initial portion of the phase diagram confirms qualitatively the prediction of eq. (6) or (6'), meaning that the $R^{-6}$ dependence of the dispersion energy in the mean field theory is consistent with our observation. Detailed analyses are rendered as follows. The molar volume ratio $\varphi$ of biphenyl to MBBA is calculated from the densities of the two components, biphenyl in liquid state [28] at 70°C and MBBA in nematic state at 25°C. The calculated $\partial T_c(X)/\partial X$ is larger than the observed one by 40%. The discrepancy is expected as pointed out in Section 2 because of the alignment of the solute in the nematic solution. On this basis alone it would be insufficient to confirm or refute the hypothesis put forth in Section 2. We can, however, seek other supportive evidence; the composition dependence of the transition temperature has been investigated with several solute-solvent pairs by Peterson and Martire [29] as well as Hillenbrand [30] in this laboratory. These are collected in Table I, which demonstrate the validity of the hypothesis in as much as spherical or small solute molecules produce a full effect of dilution, i.e., $\sigma = 1$, whereas

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Observed $(\partial T_c(X)/\partial X)$ (°C/mole fraction)</th>
<th>Molar volume ratio</th>
<th>Calculated $(\partial T_c(X)/\partial X)$ (%)</th>
<th>$\sigma$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBBA/Biphenyl</td>
<td>- 250</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>- 402</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBPA/n-Heptane (#)</td>
<td>- 222</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>- 386</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB/MBF (#)</td>
<td>- 156</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>- 190</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBPA-Benzene (#)</td>
<td>- 222</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>- 234</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBPA/CCl₄ (#)</td>
<td>- 236</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>- 254</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(⁎) Calculated according to eq. (6).
(⁎) Calculated through eq. (6').
(⁎) $p$-methoxybenzylidene-$p'$-propylaniline; reference [29].
(⁎) $p, p'$-hexyloxyazoxybenzene in monofluorobenzene; reference [30].
asymmetric solutes either rigid or flexible, give rise to an attenuated effect. In fact, one can integrate the magnetic resonance studies of asymmetric solute dissolved in nematogenic solvent with thermodynamic analysis so as to quantify the anisotropic factor at the molecular level [31]. In any event, the phase study seems to lend support to the $R^{-6}$ dependence of the mean field theory under the assumption that there exists no specific interaction between the two components.

We will now present the experimental result to justify the athermal assumption. From the DSC method we obtain the specific latent heat by graphical integration of the thermograms at two transitions, crystal to nematic and nematic to isotropic. The results are displayed in figure 2 where the total specific latent heat is plotted against mole fraction of biphenyl. With the athermal assumption for the binary system, the expression for the total specific latent heat [32] is

$$\Delta h = \Delta h_1^0 + \frac{M_2}{M_1} (\Delta h_2^0 - \Delta h_2^0) X + \cdots \text{(cal/g)} \quad (13)$$

where $\Delta h_1^0$ and $\Delta h_2^0$ are the specific latent heats of pure solvent and solute respectively, and $M_1$ and $M_2$ are the corresponding molecular weights. Thus, eq. (13) provides a means to interpret the result of figure 2 in the dilute solution limit. It can be accomplished if $\Delta h_1^0$ and $\Delta h_2^0$ are known from other measurements or a linear approximation of the data in figure 2 yields a sensible set of the values. We choose to proceed along the former route. The value of $\Delta h_1^0$ is estimated as follows. From the coexistence line of the solid and nematic phases in the phase diagram, one determines the molar latent heat of pure MBBA at the solid-nematic transition with the aid of van't Hoff’s law; the result is

$$\Delta H_{KN} = 3.70 \pm 0.15 \text{ kcal/mole}.$$
of the birefringence with the ordinary refractive index measurement yields a full determination of \( n_1 \) and \( n_0 \), and these are displayed in figure 4. The purpose here is to demonstrate that the order parameter determined through eq. (12) is uniquely characterized by the reduced temperature \( \tau(T, X) \). A major consequence of such a characterization is that one is able to map out the order parameter over the entire nematic region by performing only a limited number of scans with respect to \( T \) and \( X \).

The hypothesis is verified in the following manner. We first plot \([S \Delta x N^0(T)]\) against \( \tau(T, X) \) for pure MBBA and then for the isothermal data at 23 °C, and compare the two. For the case of pure MBBA, we use the data of Haller et al. [24] against \( \tau(T, 0) \) and in the second the data in figure 4 are plotted against \( \tau(296 \text{ K}, X) \) where the expression for \( \tau(T, X) \) is as in eq. (7). The results are shown in figure 5 and the agreement between the two is excellent. The main reason for presenting the data by means of \([S \Delta x N^0(T)]\) instead of \( S \) is to avoid introducing \( \Delta x \) as an adjustable parameter in the absence of any available experimental data, which may appear to weaken the case. Despite our inability to deduce the absolute value of \( S \), the predicted correspondence between \( T \) and \( X \) with respect to the order parameter is apparent from figure 5. It should also be noted that \( \tau(T, X) \) for the composition scan is calculated through eq. (6') and (7) with the values of \( T_\tau(0) = 319 \text{ K} \) and \( \sigma = 0.6 \). Complementary evidence of the validity of \( T-X \) scaling is offered as follows. Instead of the CMV scheme of inferring the nematic order from the optical properties, a further approximation is effected by neglecting the internal polarization field as in Chatelain's original proposal [36] to let \( S \) be proportional to the observed birefringence. Since we do not have on hand the values of ordinary refractive index as a function of temperature at \( X = 0.081 \), we resort to the Chatelain approximation in order to extract \( S \) [for the data in Fig. 3 (8)]. Thus, we plot \( \Delta n/(1 - X) \) against \( \tau(T, 0.081) \) and compare it to that obtained for pure MBBA [24]. With use of \( T_\tau(0) = 319 \text{ K} \) and \( \sigma = 0.6 \) as before, the results are as shown in figure 6 which demonstrates an excellent agreement. This comparison has been between two parallel temperature scans separated by a constant composition of 8.1 mole % of biphenyl whereas the previous one was between two perpendicular scans in \( T-X \) plane of the phase diagram.

These two pieces of evidence offered above make it obvious that a correspondence principle of \( T \) and \( X \) is well established for the MBBA/biphenyl system. Whether such a scaling principle is of general applicability to any athermal mixture remains to be tested. The molecular basis for the correspondence, as outlined in Section 2, is seen to be consistent with the mean field model of Maier and Saupe. Thus equipped with the \( T-X \) scaling, we now proceed to map out the \( S \)-surface relative to \( T \) and \( X \) via eq. (6') and (7). An \( S \)-surface so constructed is shown in figure 7. The significance of such a surface is to provide a
set of equi-order lines projected on $T$-$X$ plane which are approximately parallel to the coexistence line of nematic-isotropic transition. One should note that they are not strictly parallel to the coexistence line because there is an evidence for further reduction in $S$ of the anisotropic phase in equilibrium with isotropic phase as we have observed by the NMR linewidth study [30]. The detail of such a study will be the subject of future publications.
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\[ \Delta h = \Delta h_1^0 + \frac{M_2}{M_1} (\Delta h_2^0 - \Delta h_1^0) X + \ldots \]

which is eq. (13).