

Standard Practice for Establishing and Controlling <u>Spark</u> Atomic Emission Spectrochemical Analytical Curves¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation E305; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ε) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This practice <u>covers guidanceprovides direction</u> for establishing and controlling <u>spark</u> atomic emission spectrochemical analytical curves. The generation of analytical curves and their routine control are considered as separate although interrelated operations. This practice is applicable to <u>spark</u> atomic emission spectrometers.

Note 1—X-ray emission fluorescence spectrometric applications are no longer covered by this practice. See Guides E1361 and E1621 for discussion of this technique.

iTeh Standards

1.1.1 Since <u>computersoftware</u> programs are readily available to <u>runcompute</u> multiple linear regressions that can be used to generate analytical curves and since most instruments include this feature, this practice does not go into detail on the <u>address this</u> procedure. However, some recommendations are given on <u>evaluatingto evaluate</u> the equations that are generated.

1.2 This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety safety, health, and health environmental practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.

<u>1.3 This international standard was developed in accordance with internationally recognized principles on standardization</u> established in the Decision on Principles for the Development of International Standards, Guides and Recommendations issued by the World Trade Organization Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Committee.

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:²

E135 Terminology Relating to Analytical Chemistry for Metals, Ores, and Related Materials

E1329 Practice for Verification and Use of Control Charts in Spectrochemical Analysis (Withdrawn 2019)³

E1361 Guide for Correction of Interelement Effects in X-Ray Spectrometric Analysis

E1621 Guide for Elemental Analysis by Wavelength Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence Spectrometry

3. Terminology

3.1 For definitions of terms used in this practice, refer to Terminology E135.

¹ This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee E01 on Analytical Chemistry for Metals, Ores, and Related Materials and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee E01.20 on Fundamental Practices.

Current edition approved June 1, 2013 May 15, 2021. Published July 2013 June 2021. Originally approved in 1966. Last previous edition approved in $\frac{20072013}{10.1520/E0305-13.10.1520/E0305-21.}$

² For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For Annual Book of ASTM Standards volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

³ The last approved version of this historical standard is referenced on www.astm.org.

NOTE 2—Spectrometer manufacturers tend to use the term "standardization" in their software. The correct technical term is "drift correction," which is used in this practice.

4. Summary of Practice

4.1 Systematic and random errors that occur in obtaining data are reviewed. Background corrections are considered as well as interferences from other elements. Calibration, standardization, drift correction, and verification procedures are discussed, including the use of reference materials and the generation of data. A basis is given for evaluating first, second, third, and higher degree analytical curves.

5. Significance and Use

5.1 This practice is intended as ato provide fundamental guidedirection for the calibration, standardization, drift correction, and dailyperiodic control of the analytical curves for spark atomic emission spectrometers.

5.2 It is assumed that this practice will be used by trained operators capable of performing the procedures described herein.

6. Precautions

6.1 Potential Errors:

6.1.1 *Bias Because of Incorrect Calibration*—In the procedure for quantitative spectrochemical analysis, the initial generation of the analytical curve relates element composition or relative composition to spectral intensity or intensity ratio. The accuracy of the calibration may be affected by a number of factors, such as incorrect values for element compositions, heterogeneity of the reference materials, spectral interferences, and matrix effects. These factors may cause a shift in the analytical curve, thereby leading to bias in the analytical data generated. It is the user's responsibility to apply calibration models designed to evaluate the effect of, and mathematically correct for, spectral interferences and matrix effects.

6.1.1.1 Calibration bias because of incorrect element eoncentrations are <u>compositions is</u> minimized by the use of certified reference <u>materials. materials (CRMs)</u>. These <u>calibrantsCRMs</u> may be augmented with one or more other reference materials for which the chemical compositions have been carefully determined by approved methods of analysis, such as ASTM or BSI (British Standards Institute). Standard Institution). The inclusion of production materials analyzed by independent methods permits determining whether bias exists because of differences between the metallurgical conditions of the <u>certified reference materials CRMs</u> and typical samples. In the absence of <u>certified reference materials</u>, <u>CRMs</u>, it is helpful to use several reference materials from a variety of sources to detect bias in these materials.

6.1.1.2 In general, the use of a large number of reference materials will aid in the detection and rejection of those that appear to be inaccurate. Caution should be exercised in <u>Exercise caution when</u> rejecting data that appears to be inaccurate as it may be reflecting complicated matrix effects or the impact of unknown variables.

6.1.1.3 It is advisable that analyzed materials used as <u>calibrants</u> <u>calibration reference materials</u> (RMs) be tested initially for <u>homogeneity</u>.

6.1.2 *Bias Because of Experimental Variations*—Bias may arise from experimental variations occurring within the operational procedure (for example, change in optics, source parameters, and so forth). etc.). Such changes may result in bias because of changes in sensitivity or background resulting in displacement of the analytical curve. The analyst may attempt to reduce bias from experimental variations during the initial calibration procedure by replication and by measuring the reference materials in random order; but bias may be detected later during subsequent operations, as described in 8.3.1.

6.2 Random Errors:

6.2.1 *Measurement Error*—Measurement repeatability may be assessed using an estimate of standard deviation of repeated measurements. While the true standard deviation is designated σ , an estimate of standard deviation calculated from a limited number of values is designated by the symbol *s*,

where:

 $s = \sqrt{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2 / (n-1)}$



and where:

- x_i = are individual values
- \overline{x} = average x_i , and
- n = number of measurements.

6.2.1.1 Errors in determining the average signal intensity or intensity ratio from reference materials occur because of statistical variation, less than optimum excitation parameters, and <u>elevated</u> specimen <u>inhomogeneity</u>. Increasing the number of replicate measurements and using the average of the values will reduce the effect of statistical variation and minor <u>elevated</u> specimen <u>inhomogeneity</u>. The use of optimum excitation conditions, including sufficient preburn and integration times, will also reduce statistical variations and increase accuracy.

7. Calibration

7.1 *Spectral Background*—Background intensities vary throughout the spectral regions. Correcting for the background in measurements of weak spectral line intensities (those slightly more intense than background) can improve the measurements. However, the effectiveness of the correction must be evaluated. The need for background correction varies with the type of material being analyzed. Ensure that background correction is necessary and can be accomplished consistently before proceeding.

Note 2—The need for background correction varies with the type of material being analyzed. Ensure that background correction is necessary and can be accomplished consistently before proceeding.

7.1.1 *Background Correction*—Methods of background correction may use either a dynamic correction or a shifting of spectra through exit slits to read background near a line,

7.1.1.1 In a dynamic background correction, a selected portion of the background of a spectrum is integrated simultaneously with analytical signals. When this integrated measurement is strong and broad enough to give a consistent sampling, it can be used to subtract out background. A background area <u>signal</u> may be made to have a strong signal <u>strengthened</u> by using a wide exit slit or by using an extra-sensitive detector, or by a combination of these. Because the dynamic approach is difficult to control and may depend on maintaining consistent response from two detectors, it is rarely used in photomultiplier systems. It can be used more effectively with solid-state detector systems.

STM E305-21

NOTE 3—Measurement of spectral intensity may not be truly simultaneous even with solid-state detectors. Some spectrometer designs read multiple regions of a detector in rapid succession, not in true simultaneity. Such a design can be subject to instrument drift.

7.1.1.2 Shifting to read background has validity only if the generation of background intensity shows little variation from burnmeasurement to burnmeasurement.

7.2 Generation of the Analytical Curve:

7.2.1 *Calibrants, Calibration Reference Materials (RMs)*, preferably eertified reference materials <u>CRMs</u> as described in 6.1.1.1, should span the composition ranges and types of materials expected. Extrapolation should be avoided. It is recommended that the number of ealibrants to be calibration RMs used for each curve be twice the number of coefficients to be determined by regression. This includes the curve parameters and any correction coefficients. If the composition range exceeds one order of magnitude or if several calibrants are close to each other in composition, the use of more calibrants is recommended, preferable at least three per order of magnitude, spaced as equally apart as possible.

7.2.1.1 Minimally, there should be at least one more data point than the number of coefficients or constants in the equation. If this minimum is not met, the calculation of a supposed regression fit will merely make the resulting curve go through each data point as if each was absolutely correct, negating the purpose of making a least square fit of data. In fact, reputable curve fitting software will reject such an attempt to calculate the parameters, citing that there is insufficient data.

7.2.1.2 If the composition range exceeds one order of magnitude or if several calibration RMs are close to each other in composition, the use of more calibration RMs is recommended, preferably at least three per order of magnitude, spaced as equally apart as possible.

7.2.2 Drift Correction Samples and Verifiers—All materials that may be useful in monitoring and normalizing calibrations should

∰ E305 – 21

be <u>burned</u>measured in a random order along with <u>ealibrants</u>. <u>calibration RMs</u>. Control and drift correction samples shall be <u>homogeneous</u> such that they give <u>have reasonably low heterogeneity that provide</u> repeatable measurements over time. The repeatability standard deviation for suitable material shall be less than or equal to the interlaboratory repeatability goal for the test method. In general, <u>calibrants calibration RMs</u> should not be used as drift correction samples or verifiers.

7.2.3 *Number of <u>Replications for Each Reference Material</u>—<u>Replications</u>—The number of replications for each <u>calibrant</u>, <u>calibration RM</u>, drift correction sample, and verifier shall be at least as great as the number replications to be made for each specimen in a determination.*

7.3 Generating Multiple Linear Regression—As stated in 1.1.1, computer programs software can provide the needed multiple linear regression for developing equations of first, second, third, and higher order polynomials and incorporate corrections for interferences from other elements. When using higher order polynomials, the useable portion of a curve must not be near to a maximum or a minimum nor include a point of inflection. See 7.3.2.2.

7.3.1 Typically, the data used for calibration are relative intensities, the ratio of intensity of a spectral line to an internal standard line. When the scope of an analysis involves significant change in the composition of the internal standard element, the relative intensity of the spectral line is plotted against a relative mass fraction, that is, the known mass fraction of the ealibrant calibration <u>RM</u> divided by the mass fraction of the matrix element, and usually multiplied by 100. The computer program software must be able to convert relative mass fractions to actual mass fractions.

7.3.1.1 *Additive Effect*—The addition of a signal from another element. The regression must include an additional term that will define the factor needed to subtract this interference as a function of mass fraction of the interfering element. In practice, this may sometimes be an addition rather than a subtraction.

7.3.1.2 *Multiplicative Effect*—An effect on the ealibrant calibration RM signal that depends on both the analyte signal and the mass fraction of the interfering element. The regression must include an additional term that will define a factor such as k in $(1 \pm kc)x$, where c is the mass fraction of the interfering element, and x is either the intensity for the analyte or a preliminary estimate of its mass fraction.

7.3.1.3 Introducing corrections for elemental interferences may pose a problem. Even if the interference seems well supported by ealibrants, calibration RM, the increased variability from additional factors may be greater than the level of correction being made, in which case it would be better to opt for defining a family of calibrations instead of defining a general system. The downsidelimitation of utilizing a family of calibrations is that such a restriction might require many more calibrants.many more calibration RMs might be required.

7.3.2 *Precautions in Generating Non-Linear Curves*—Non-linear analytical curves should be plotted to see that they present a reasonable looking observe the graphical relationship. Mathematical checks can also be used to calculate where any maxima, minima, or points of inflection occur.

7.3.2.1 By their nature, quadratic equations (second degree) always have a maximum or a minimum. These extremes pose no problem if they are not near the useful analytical range. If the mass fraction, y, is expressed as a quadratic equation:

$$y = a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 \tag{1}$$

where:

 $a_{\overline{0}}, a_{\overline{1}}, \dots a_{\overline{n}} =$ the coefficients of the polynomial, and $a_{0}, a_{\overline{1}}, \dots a_{\overline{n}} =$ the coefficients of the calibration equation, and x = the reading obtained in a determination.

Eq 1 will reach a maximum or a minimum when the first order derivative of the equation is equal to zero, or:

$$dy/dx = a_1 + 2a_2x = 0$$

from which:

$$x = -a_1/2a_2 \tag{2}$$

7.3.2.2 A third degree equation is commonly used. Since its first order derivative has two roots it may have both a maximum and a minimum, unless the roots are imaginary. It However, it will always have a point of inflection, however, inflection that should be considered. The third degree equation can be expressed as: