



HAL
open science

How multivalency controls ionic criticality

Michael E. Fisher, Jean-Noël Aqua, Shubho Banerjee

► **To cite this version:**

Michael E. Fisher, Jean-Noël Aqua, Shubho Banerjee. How multivalency controls ionic criticality. Physical Review Letters, 2005, 95, pp.135701. 10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.135701 . hal-00083918

HAL Id: hal-00083918

<https://hal.science/hal-00083918>

Submitted on 23 Nov 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

How Multivalency controls Ionic Criticality

Michael E. Fisher, Jean-Noël Aqua,* and Shubho Banerjee†

Institute for Physical Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA

(Dated: August 13, 2018)

To understand how multivalency influences the reduced critical temperatures, $T_c^*(z)$, and densities, $\rho_c^*(z)$, of $z:1$ ionic fluids, we study equisized hard-sphere models with $z=1-3$. Following Debye, Hückel and Bjerrum, association into ion clusters is treated with, also, ionic solvation and excluded volume. In good accord with simulations but contradicting integral-equation and field theories, T_c^* falls when z increases while ρ_c^* rises steeply: that 80 – 90% of the ions are bound in clusters near T_c serves to explain these trends. For $z \neq 1$ interphase Galvani potentials arise and are evaluated.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Fh, 61.20.Qg, 64.60.Fr, 64.70.Fx

Multivalent ions play a significant role in condensed-matter, physicochemical, biophysical and, via the plasma transition, astrophysical contexts [1]. The effects of multivalency are, however, often hard to comprehend. One central issue—relevant to electrolyte solutions, molten salts, liquid metals, and dense plasmas [1]—arises in Coulomb-driven phase separation. The most basic model for such ionic fluids consists of $N = \rho V$ hard-core spherical ions of various species σ in a volume V of uniform dielectric constant D , with $N_\sigma = \rho_\sigma V$ ions of diameter a_σ carrying charges $q_\sigma = z_\sigma q_0$, where q_0 is an elementary charge. In the simple equisized $z:1$ charge asymmetric primitive models (C_z APMs), on which we focus here, one has $\sigma = +, -$, $a_+ = a_-$, and $q_+ = zq_0$, $q_- = -q_0$. The basic energy scale and associated reduced temperature and density are then $\varepsilon = zq_0^2/Da$, $T^* = k_B T/\varepsilon$, $\rho^* = \rho a^3$.

Monte Carlo simulations [2] show that (at least for $z \lesssim 5$) the C_z APMs exhibit “gas-liquid” phase separation; furthermore, the critical parameters, $T_c^*(z)$ and $\rho_c^*(z)$, are found to reasonable precision: see Table I and the open circles in Figs. 1 and 2. One observes that $T_c^*(z)$ falls with increasing z , while $\rho_c^*(z)$ rises sharply. But we ask: How can these trends be understood? Or accounted for semiquantitatively? To address this issue we review briefly previous work, including a pioneering field-theoretic attack [3], and then report on a recent study [4] which we believe provides significant insight. This extends an earlier analysis I [5] for the symmetric $z=1$ restricted primitive model (RPM) that was founded on the original Debye-Hückel (DH) approach but incorporated (i) Bjerrum ion pairs and (ii) their solvation in the residual ionic fluid. For $z=2$ and 3 larger ion clusters, trimers and tetramers, must be included [4, 6]; but then explicit results are also obtained for the interphase Galvani potential [7] that appears in any two-phase nonsymmetric ionic system [4, 7].

The field-theoretic analysis of Netz and Orland (NO) [3] was designed to address $z:1$ ionic fluids and colloids ($z \gg 1$) and to include correlations in a systematic manner. The Coulomb interaction, $q_\sigma q_\tau/r$, was transformed to yield a functional integral over an auxiliary potential $\phi(\mathbf{r})$. At the $\langle \phi^2 \rangle$ level the DH effective interaction,




FIG. 1: Reduced critical temperatures for $z:1$ charge asymmetric equisized hard-core primitive model electrolytes (C_z APMs) according to Monte Carlo (MC) simulations [2]; Debye-Hückel (DH) theory; field-theoretic approaches: NO [3] (with a factor $\frac{1}{10}$) and NMF [8]; approximate integral equations: MSA [9], SPB, and MPB [10]; and the present DHBjCI and DHBjCIHC solvated ion-cluster theory [4]; See text.

TABLE I: Monte Carlo (MC) estimates [2] for the reduced critical parameters for $z:1$ equisized hard-sphere electrolytes, values calculated from DHBjCIHC theory (CI) [4], and approximate estimates based on ion cluster statistics: see text.

z	critical temp.		$10^2 T_c^*(z)$		critical density		$10^2 \rho_c^*(z)$	
	MC	CI	E_{DH}	E_{MC}	MC	CI	E_ρ	E_κ
1	4.93 ₃	5.56 ₉	5.45	4.93 ₅	7.50	2.61 ₄	2.72	2.37
2	4.70	4.90 ₇	5.11	4.65	9.3	6.26 ₁	4.27	3.49
3	4.10	4.33 ₄	4.85	4.44	12.5	11.90	6.96	5.40

$v_{DH} \propto e^{-\kappa r}/r$ is captured with

$$\kappa^2(T; \{\rho_\sigma\}) = 4\pi(q_0^2/Dk_B T) \sum_\sigma z_\sigma^2 \rho_\sigma. \quad (1)$$

The reduced free energy density, $\bar{f}(T; \rho) \equiv -F/Vk_B T$, was computed to eighth order in ϕ but a momentum cutoff is essential: NO adopted $|\mathbf{k}_\Lambda| = 2\pi/a$ thereby incorporating the ionic diameter and, for the $z:1$ case, leading to




FIG. 2: Reduced critical densities $\rho_c^*(z)$, for the C_z APM electrolyte as in Fig. 1 (except that the NO plot is not rescaled).

$\kappa^2 a^2 = 4\pi\rho^*/T^*$. Since this treatment of the hard cores is approximate, accurate predictions for $T_c^*(z)$ and $\rho_c^*(z)$ are not expected. Nevertheless, one might anticipate reliable *trends* when z varies in contrast to DH theory which yields *no dependence* on z with (after I)

$$\text{DH: } \kappa_c a = 1, \quad T_c^* = \frac{1}{16}, \quad \rho_c^* = 1/64\pi \simeq 0.005. \quad (2)$$

In fact, as NO report, “the [predicted] deviations from DH theory are pronounced” for $z > 1$: see the bold dashed plots in Figs. 1 and 2.

But evidently the NO results are not merely quantitatively wrong; the *trends* are quite incorrect since T_c^* is asserted to rise rapidly (instead of falling) while ρ_c^* falls sharply for small $z-1$ (instead of rising) and *then* increases but much too slowly. While one may blame the approximate treatment of the hard cores, we believe this is *not* the primary culprit. Indeed, a recent field-theoretic analysis paid closer attention to the ion-ion repulsions [8]; but the subsequent “new mean-field” (NMF) results still exhibit strong increases in T_c^* and an overly weak variation of ρ_c^* : see the NMF plots in Figs. 1 and 2 [8].

Integral equation theories are hardly better: see Figs. 1 and 2. The *mean spherical approximation* (MSA), like DH theory, predicts *no variation* of T_c^* and ρ_c^* with z [9]. A *symmetric Poisson-Boltzmann* (SPB) theory [10] *does* predict the correct falling and rising trends for T_c^* and ρ_c^* , but the degree of variation is woefully inadequate. Moreover, the *modified Poisson-Boltzmann* (MPB) approximation, that the same authors [10] argue should be more reliable, yields the *wrong* trend for T_c^* .

In order to better understand the effects of multivalency we turn to recent calculations [4, 6] based on the *solvated ion-cluster* view [5] of the C_z APM near criticality that is supported ‘pictorially’ by simulations [2]. In brief, the aim is to construct the free energy density, $\bar{f}(T; \{\rho_\sigma\})$, for ionic species σ consisting (i) of + and – *monomers*, i.e., isolated, $n_+ = n_- = 1$ single, unassociated




FIG. 3: Coexistence curves predicted for $z:1$ equisized primitive models by the DHBjCI and DHBjCIHC theories (solid and dashed lines, respectively) together with Monte Carlo estimates (MC) based on [11].

ions of valency $z_+ = z$ and $z_- = -1$; (ii) a set of associated *primary* clusters, $\sigma = 2, 3, \dots$, dimers, trimers, \dots , each consisting of one “central” + ion and $m_\sigma = \sigma - 1$ “satellite” counterions for a total of $n_\sigma = m_\sigma + 1$ ions in a cluster of valency $z_\sigma = z - m_\sigma$; up to (iii), the largest primary cluster, the *neutral* or ‘molecular’ $(z+1)$ -mer of one z_+ ion and z negative ions [4, 6].

For each species, \bar{f} contains an ideal-gas term $\bar{f}^{\text{id}}(T, \rho_\sigma)$, and an electrostatic term $\bar{f}_\sigma^{\text{el}}(T, \{\rho_\tau\})$, that, following DH, incorporates *Cluster solvation* in the partially associated *Ionic fluid*: this description is thus dubbed “DHBjCI” [4]. By adding a **H**ard **C**ore free-volume term, $\bar{f}^{\text{HC}}(\{\rho_\sigma\})$, as in I, one may also account for those excluded volume effects not *already* encompassed in the basic solvation and association calculations [4, 5], so generating a “DHBjCIHC” theory [4]. (The effective HC virial coefficient $B_\sigma^{\text{bcc}} = 4a_\sigma^2/3^{3/2}$ has been adopted [4, 5].) Examination of Figs. 1 and 2 reveals that these solvated ion-cluster theories are surprisingly successful! Not only are *both* the downward trend in $T_c^*(z)$ and the rapid rise of $\rho_c^*(z)$ well captured, but the *quantitative* agreement with each of the MC estimates is significantly better than achieved by other approaches.

One must recognize that (all) these theories are of mean-field character: thus 5 to 15% over-estimates of $T_c^*(z)$ are to be expected. Indeed, neglected fluctuations typically depress T_c by such amounts and also flatten the *coexistence curves* as seen in Fig. 3. Second, note that the hard-core terms have a small effect on $\rho_c^*(z)$ while reducing $T_c^*(z)$ values by only 5–10%. Nevertheless, Fig. 3 reveals that the liquid phases, especially for $\rho^* \gtrsim 0.15$, are sensitive to \bar{f}^{HC} : but, recall the discussion in I. In fact, the crucial feature of DHBj-type theories—not represented in field-theoretic or standard integral-equation treatments—is the *chemical equilibrium* maintained be-

tween the cluster species via the Law of Mass Action:

$$\rho_\sigma = K_{m,z}(T) \rho_+ \rho_-^m \exp[\mu_+^{\text{Ex}} + m\mu_-^{\text{Ex}} - \mu_\sigma^{\text{Ex}}], \quad (3)$$

for $\sigma = m + 1 \geq 2$, with the excess chemical potentials $\mu_\sigma^{\text{Ex}} = -(\partial/\partial\rho_\sigma)[\bar{f}^{\text{HC}} + \sum_\sigma \bar{f}_\sigma^{\text{El}}]$, while the *association constants* are taken as [4, 5]

$$K_{m,z}(T; R) = \frac{1}{m!} \prod_{i=1}^m \int_a^R d\mathbf{r}_i \exp\left(-\frac{\mathcal{E}_{m,z}(\{\mathbf{r}_i\})}{k_B T}\right), \quad (4)$$

in which $\mathcal{E}_{m,z}(\{\mathbf{r}_i\})$ is the electrostatic energy of an isolated $(m + 1)$ -mer with satellite coordinates $\{\mathbf{r}_i\}$. The lower limits a and the condition $\mathcal{E}_{m,z} = +\infty$ for $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| < a$, represent hard cores. Following Bjerrum [5], the necessary cut-off radius R is chosen so that $(\partial K_{m,z}/\partial R)$ is minimal. The resulting 3-fold $K_{2,z}$ integral is manageable but the 6-fold integral for $K_{3,3}$ requires a Padé approximant study of the low- T expansion cross-checked to a part in 10^3 by MC evaluations [4]. It transpires, however, that T_c^* and ρ_c^* are *insensitive* to the $K_{m,z}$ values [4].

Lastly, one needs to account for the solvation of *all* the ion species, σ , by the free ions and charged clusters via the electrostatic terms [4, 5, 6]

$$\bar{f}_\sigma^{\text{El}}(T; \{\rho_\tau\}) = \frac{4\pi\rho_\sigma}{Dk_B T} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{u_{2l}(\kappa a_\sigma)}{a_\sigma^{2l+1}} \sum_{m=-l}^l \langle |Q_{lm}^\sigma|^2 \rangle, \quad (5)$$

where the $u_{2l}(x)$ are related to the spherical Bessel functions $k_l(x)$ [4]; the second sum requires the cluster electric multipole moments, Q_{lm}^σ , thermally averaged [4] over the ionic configurations that already enter in the $K_{m,z}(T)$.

Finally, a_σ is an *effective cluster diameter*, i.e. the radius of the approximating sphere (centered to minimize $\bar{f}_\sigma^{\text{El}}$) that substitutes for the true, thermally fluctuating, hard-core exclusion domain: see I and [4]. One concludes, as in I, that a most reasonable choice for a_σ is the average over solid angle of the radial distance to the true exclusion surface of the ground-state cluster: this yields $a_2 = (\frac{3}{4} + \frac{3}{8} \ln 3) \simeq 1.162a$, $a_3 = 1.250a$ and $a_4 = 1.375a$. For $z=1$ the values of T_c^* and ρ_c^* vary by less than $\pm 2\%$ over plausible alternatives for a_2 [4]; but the sensitivity to a_3 and a_4 for $z=2$ and 3 is greater. As a result, this hard-to-avoid approximation contributes significantly to the overall quantitative uncertainties.

From the total free energy $\bar{f}(T, \{\rho_\sigma\})$, all thermodynamic properties follow [4, 5]. One may then conclude from Figs. 1 and 2 that the principal defect of the field-theoretic and integral-equation approaches is a failure to account effectively for strong ionic association near criticality. But can the actual *trends* of T_c^* and ρ_c^* with z be demonstrated in a direct, transparent way? To answer, consider the *fractions*, $y_\sigma = n_\sigma N_\sigma/N$, of ions bound in clusters of n_σ ions with $\rho_\sigma = (y_\sigma/n_\sigma)\rho$. The critical point

TABLE II: Inverse screening length κ and fractions, $y_\sigma = n_\sigma N_\sigma/N$, of ions in clusters of n_σ ions at criticality, as percentages, according to DHBjCIHC theory [4].

z	$\kappa c a$	y_+^c	y_-^c	y_2^c	y_3^c	y_4^c
1	1.04	9.14	9.14	81.72	—	—
2	1.37	1.31	10.33	15.43	72.93	—
3	1.57	0.34	8.04	3.32	11.13	77.17

values that result from DHBjCIHC theory [4, 12] are displayed in Table II. A significant fact is the rapid decrease in y_+^c , the fraction of unassociated z_+ ions, from 9.1 to 1.3 to 0.3%. But more can be learned!

To understand the variation of $T_c^*(z)$ let us regard the electrolyte in the critical region as a mixture of clusters with fixed mole fractions $x_\sigma = (y_\sigma/n_\sigma)/\sum_\tau (y_\tau/n_\tau)$. A pair (σ, τ) will either mutually repel *or* attract with pairwise binding energies, say, $\varepsilon_{\sigma\tau}$. Thus unlike monomers attract with $\varepsilon_\pm = \varepsilon$. However, a *dimer* attracts only *negative monomers* with $\varepsilon_{2-} = (z - \frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/z$; but repels all $z_+ \geq +2$ ions. Two dimers repel when $z \geq 3$; but one has $\varepsilon_{2,2}/\varepsilon \simeq 0.586$ and 0.345 for $z=1$ and 2. And so on.

To estimate T_c^* for this mixture we adopt a van-der-Waals approach as in [2(d)]. Thus, for the overall cluster density $\hat{\rho}$ ($= \rho \sum_\sigma y_\sigma/n_\sigma$), we take $p/\hat{\rho}k_B T \simeq Z(B_0\hat{\rho}) + B_1(T^*)\hat{\rho}$ with $Z(u) = 1 + u + \dots$ in which the second virial coefficient has been decomposed as $B(T^*) = B_0 + B_1(T^*)$ where B_0 ($= b_0 a^3$, say) represents the hard-core repulsions while $B_1(T^*)$ embodies the attractions. Solving $\partial_\rho p = \partial_\rho^2 p = 0$, as usual, yields ρ_c^* and $B_c^* \equiv B_1(T_c^*)/b_0 a^3$. At low T , which is relevant here, one has

$$B_1(T^*) \approx - \sum_{\sigma,\tau} b_{\sigma\tau} a^3 x_\sigma x_\tau \exp(\varepsilon_{\sigma\tau}^*/T^*), \quad (6)$$

where $\varepsilon_{\sigma\tau}^* \equiv \varepsilon_{\sigma\tau}/\varepsilon$, while $b_{\sigma\tau} a^3$ specifies the volume of mutual attractions: this *vanishes* if σ and τ repel.

Now, the $x_+ x_-$ term dominates in $B_1(T^*)$ at low T with corrections of relative order $(x_2^2/x_+ x_-)e^{-0.414/T^*}$ for $z=1$ and $2(x_2/x_+)e^{-1/2zT^*}$ for $z \geq 2$. We may then *calibrate* $B_1(T_c^*)/a^3$ by using pure DH theory (2) for which, since association is not considered, $x_+ = x_- = \frac{1}{2}$. Thereby we obtain the E_{DH} estimates

$$T_c^*(z) \simeq 1/(16 + |\ln 4x_+^c(z)x_-^c(z)|), \quad (7)$$

in which $x_+^c \propto y_+^c$ and $x_-^c \propto y_-^c$ follow from Table II.

The resulting predictions are listed in Table I under E_{DH} . In light of the heuristic nature of the arguments, they reflect the trend of the MC and CI values surprisingly well. Certainly the contention that association is a prime factor is well confirmed. By replacing 16 by 20.27 (or 17.96) in (7), and the factor 4 by $1/x_+^c(1)x_-^c(1)$, one calibrates $B_1(T_c^*)$ on the MC (or CI) values for the RPM. Column E_{MC} in Table I lists the MC-calibrated values: for $z=2$ and 3 these match the Monte Carlo estimates to within 1% and 8%, respectively [13].




FIG. 4: Reduced Galvani potentials, $\Delta\bar{\phi} = q_0\Delta\phi/k_B T$, vs. T/T_c for $z:1$ electrolytes according to pure DH theory (dotted) and DHBjCI(HC) theories : solid (dashed) plots.

Now, for the critical density, the significance of ion pairing is already clear in *pure* DHBj theory for the RPM [5]. The heavy depletion of the free ions (which, in DHBj theory, drive the transition *alone*) means that to reach criticality the overall density $\rho (= \rho_+ + \rho_- + 2\rho_2)$ must be increased until the DH criterion $\rho_+^* + \rho_-^* = \rho_{\text{DH}}^{*c} = 1/64\pi$ is met : see (2). Does the same depletion-by-association mechanism account for the z -dependence of $\rho_c^*(z)$?

To progress, rewrite (1) generally as $\kappa^2 a^2 = 4\pi\rho^\dagger/T^*$, with the *effective, depleted ionic density*

$$\rho^\dagger \equiv \rho^* \sum_{\sigma} z_{\sigma}^2 y_{\sigma}(T; \{\rho_{\sigma}\}) / z n_{\sigma}. \quad (8)$$

If one accepts the DH criterion and uses Table II, the estimates E_{ρ} , in Table I, result. Although these fall short of the Monte Carlo values by 74, 54 and 44% for $z = 1-3$, they reproduce the accelerating increase with z (by factors 1.57, 1.63 vs. 1.24, 1.34).

An alternative approach adopts the DH value $\kappa_c a = 1$: see (2) but note from Table II that DHBjCIHC theory implies that $\kappa_c a$ rises from 1.04 for the RPM to 1.57 for $z = 3$. Then using the E_{DH} values for T_c^* , in Table I, leads to the E_{κ} predictions for $\rho_c^*(z)$: these are all rather low but the increases with z , by factors 1.47, 1.55, again reflect the correct behavior.

Finally, we note that the Galvani potential, $\Delta\phi$, that arises between coexisting phases in charge asymmetric fluids is readily calculated [4, 7]. The predictions from pure DH theory are shown dotted in Fig. 4 : one finds $\Delta\phi_{\text{DH}} \propto (1 - z^{-1})$. The other plots result from the DHBjCI and DHBjCIHC theories [4]. Surprisingly, the calculations suggest no clear trend with z . It is natural to conjecture that $\Delta\phi$ vanishes as $G_0(T_c - T)^{\beta}$; moreover to the extent that the expected mean-field value $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ is realized, the present results support this.

In conclusion, we have elucidated the mechanisms underlying how multivalency influences critical behavior.

Specifically, we have summarized briefly analytical calculations for 3:1, 2:1 and 1:1 equisized charged hard-sphere fluids [4] that, for the first time, reasonably reflect the true variation of critical temperatures and densities, $T_c^*(z)$ and $\rho_c^*(z)$ (as revealed by simulations [2]). On that basis, supported by analysis that correlates $T_c^*(z)$ and $\rho_c^*(z)$ with the increasingly depleted populations of free ions and charged clusters as z increases, it is clear that recognizing ionic association is inescapable for a successful theory. Previous treatments [3, 8, 9, 10], lacking allowance for ion clusters fail seriously. The ion-cluster solvation theories also yield quantitative results for the interphase Galvani potentials.

National Science Foundation support via Grants CHE 99-81772 and 03-01101 is gratefully acknowledged.

* Present address: École normale supérieure de Lyon, 69364, Lyon, France

† Present address: Department of Physics, Rhodes College, Memphis TN 38112

- [1] See, (a) articles in *Elementary Processes in Dense Plasmas*, edited by S. Ichimaru and S. Ogata (Addison-Wesley, New-York, 1995); (b) A. A. Lika'ter, Phys. Uspekhi **43**, 777 (2000); (c) A. Yu. Grosberg *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 329 (2000); (d) H. Weingärtner and W. Schröer, Adv. Chem. Phys. **116**, 1 (2001); (e) Y. Levin, Rep. Prog. Phys. **65**, 1377 (2002).
- [2] (a) P. J. Camp and G. N. Patey, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 9000 (1999); (b) Q. Yan and J. J. de Pablo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2054 (2001); (c) A. Z. Panagiotopoulos and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 045701 (2002); (d) Y. C. Kim and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 185703 (2004).
- [3] R. R. Netz and H. Orland, Europhys. Lett. **45**, 726 (1999).
- [4] J.-N. Aqua, S. Banerjee, and M. E. Fisher, cond-mat/0410692 [submitted for publication].
- [5] (a) M. E. Fisher and Y. Levin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3826 (1993); (b) Y. Levin and M. E. Fisher, Physica A **225**, 164 (1996); to be denoted I.
- [6] M. N. Artyomov *et al.*, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 6394 (2003).
- [7] M. J. Sparnaay, *The Electrical Double Layer* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1972), pp. 4, 338; P. B. Warren, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 4683 (2000); I. Iosilevski and A. Chigvintsev, J. Phys. IV France **10**, Pr5-451 (2000); A. R. Muratov, Zh. Éksp Teor. Fiz. **120**, 104 (2001) [Sov. Phys. JETP **93**, 89 (2001)].
- [8] J.-M. Caillol, Mol. Phys. **103**, 1271 (2005); we quote the (most favorable) "MSA regularization" results.
- [9] E. Waisman and J. L. Lebowitz, J. Chem. Phys. **56**, 3086 (1972); E. Gonzalez-Tovar, Mol. Phys. **97**, 1203 (1999).
- [10] A. K. Sabir *et al.*, Mol. Phys. **93**, 405 (1998); C. W. Outhwaite, Cond. Matt. Phys. **7**, 719 (2004).
- [11] Y. C. Kim, M. E. Fisher, and E. Luijten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 065701 (2003).
- [12] While the y_{σ}^c are *not* very sensitive to the a_{σ} , they cannot be determined unequivocally via simulations.
- [13] The arguments based on (6) extend naturally to charged

hard dumbbell models and their variants : see J. M. Romero-Enrique *et al.*, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 041204 (2002).