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Abstract

Phenolic compounds are commonly used for diverse applications such as in pharmaceuticals, chemicals, rubber, dyes and pigments. The objective of present research was to study the impact of Mr. Trivedi’s biofield treatment on physical and thermal properties of phenol derivatives such as o-nitrophenol (ONP), m-nitrophenol (MNP) and p-tertiary butyl phenol (TBP). The control and treated compounds were characterized using X-ray diffraction (XRD), differential scanning calorimetry (DSC), thermogravimetric analysis (TGA), and surface area analysis. XRD analysis showed increase in crystallite size by 16.05% in treated ONP as compared to control. However, the treated MNP showed decrease in crystallite size by 16.17% as compared to control. The treated TBP showed increase in crystallite size by 5.20% as compared to control. DSC of treated MNP exhibited increase in melting temperature with respect to control, which may be correlated to higher thermal stability of treated sample. However, the treated TBP exhibited no significant change in melting temperature with respect to control. TGA analysis of treated ONP and TBP showed an increase in maximum thermal decomposition temperature (T_{\text{max}}) as compared to control. However, the treated MNP showed slight decrease in T_{\text{max}} in comparison with control sample. Surface area analysis of treated ONP showed decrease in surface area by 65.5%. However, surface area was increased by 40.7% in treated MNP as compared to control. These results suggest that biofield treatment has significant effect on physical and thermal properties of ONP, MNP and TBP.
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Introduction

The nitro phenol compounds are the largest and widely known group of industrial chemicals in use today. These compounds are organic molecules that contain at least one –NO2 group attached to the aromatic ring [1]. Nitrophenols are commonly used in pharmaceuticals, wood preservatives, rubber chemicals, dyes, pigments, explosives and industrial solvents [2]. O-nitrophenol (ONP) and m-nitrophenol are important compounds which have been used as a reagent for synthesis of organic compounds [2]. Moreover, few nitrophenols are used as promising material for nonlinear optical and optoelectronic applications [3,4]. In order to attain this goal, these compounds not only have the presence of their electron donor “-OH” and electron acceptor “-NO2” substituents but also they can form strong hydrogen bonds with other compounds [5]. On the other hand, p-tertiary butyl phenol (TBP) is used for synthesis of TBP-formaldehyde resins due to their excellent oil solubility, adhesive property and low cost. However, the excess production of these phenol derivatives poses considerable challenge and health problems. Due to low biodegradability, high solubility, weak ionization capacity, phenol and its derivatives are commonly detected in surface water [6]. Hence, novel methods should be designed to modify the physicochemical properties of phenol based compounds in order to reduce the toxicity related issues. Biofield treatment had been altered the physical, crystalline and thermal properties of various metals powders [7-10].

Researchers have shown that human body functions as a macroscopic quantum system [11-14]. Feynman (1949) proposed scientific basis of quantum biology using quantum electrodynamics and chromodynamics [15]. In other words, each quantum system consists of quantum-domains which have some oscillators within that generate the potential field. Additionally, researchers have demonstrated that human physiology shows a high degree of order and stability due to their coherent dynamic states [16,17]. Thus, the human body emits the electromagnetic waves in form of bio-photon, which surrounds the body and it is commonly known as biofield. Therefore, the biofield consists of electromagnetic field, being generated by moving electrically charged particles (ions, cell, molecule etc.) inside the human body.

Furthermore, a human has ability to harness the energy from environment/universe and can transmit into any object (living or non-living) around the Globe. The object(s) always receive the energy and respond into useful way that is called biofield energy. Mr. Mahendra K. Trivedi*Corresponding author: Snehashis Jana, Trivedi Science Research Laboratory Pvt. Ltd., Hall-A, Chinar Mega Mall, Chinar Fortune City, Hoshangabad Rd., Bhopal- 462026, Madhya Pradesh, India, Tel: +91-755-6660006; E-mail: publication@trivedisrl.com
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XRD was conducted to study the crystalline nature of ONP, MNP, and TBP after biofield treatment. The XRD diffractogram of control and treated ONP are presented in Figure 1. The XRD graphs of control ONP showed the presence of intense crystalline peaks at 2θ equals 12.25°, 15.37°, 17.99°, 18.66°, 23.2°, 24.66°, 26.97°, 27.34°, 27.65° and 29.12°. Whereas the treated sample showed peaks at 2θ equals 12.24°, 12.45°, 15.27°, 15.51°, 18.70°, 23.33°, 27.00°, 27.34°, 19.13°, and 30.05°. The comparative evaluation showed that after biofield treatment the intensity of XRD peaks was decreased as compared to control. This may be correlated with the reduction in crystallinity of the treated ONP. It is hypothesized that biofield treatment may disturb the symmetrical order of the crystals that reduced the crystallinity. Crystallite size was calculated using Scherrer formula (crystallite size = kλ/(bCosθ)), and results are presented in Table 1 and Figure 2. The crystallite size is one of the crystallographic factors associated with the formation of dislocations and point defects in the crystalline structure.
showed that elevation in processing temperature caused the increase in nuclear density and elevation in crystallite size. It was also reported that increase in temperature reduced the thermodynamically driven force that caused a decrease in nuclear densities and thus increased in crystallite size [27,28]. Gaber et al. showed that elevation in processing temperature caused the decrease in dislocation density and increase in number of unit cell that ultimately increased the crystal growth [29]. Hence, it is assumed that biofield treatment may provide energy to ONP that leads to depression in nuclear density and elevation in crystallite size.

XRD diffractogram of control and treated MNP are shown in Figure 3. The control sample showed crystalline peaks at 2θ equals to 13.88°, 15.45°, 16.05°, 16.34°, 16.75°, 17.11°, 17.28°, 18.35°, 18.72°, 20.62°, 20.75°, 21.17° and 21.52°. It was observed that intensity of few XRD peaks were increased due to alteration in crystalline nature of the treated sample. Crystallite size of control TBP was 79.73 nm, whereas the treated TBP showed 83.88 nm. The increase in crystallite size of treated TBP was 5.20% with respect to control. Biofield treatment on TBP probably caused depression in dislocation density hence increase in crystallite size [27]. Carballo et al., reported that rate of reaction can be significantly improved by increase in crystallite size [30]. Hence, treated ONP and TBP due to high crystallite size may improve the reaction rate and percentage yield during synthesis of organic compounds.

DSC studies

DSC was used to investigate the melting nature and latent heat of fusion of the compounds (ONP, MNP and TBP). The melting temperature and latent heat of fusion of the compounds are shown in Table 2. The treated and control ONP did not show melting temperature peak in the DSC result. The control MNP showed (Table 2) endothermic peak at 98.07°C due to melting temperature of the sample [31]. Whereas the treated MNP showed an increase in melting temperature and it was observed at 99.50°C. This increase in melting temperature may be related to the higher thermal stability of the treated MNP. The control TBP showed an endothermic peak at 101.16°C; mainly due to melting of the control sample. However, the treated TBP showed melting endothermic peak at 101.33°C. The result showed no significant change in melting temperature of treated TBP in comparison with control.

The treated MNP showed an increase in ∆H value by 6.21% with respect to control. Similarly, the treated TBP compound showed the marked increase in ∆H by 14.48% as compared to control sample. It was reported that a material consists of strong intermolecular forces that significantly improve the reaction rate and percentage yield during synthesis of organic compounds.

| Sample                | Control (nm) | Treated (nm) |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| o-nitrophenol         | 80.96        | 93.96        |
| m-nitrophenol         | 104.67       | 87.74        |
| p-tert butyl phenol   | 79.73        | 83.88        |

Table 1: Crystallite size (nm) of o-nitrophenol, m-nitrophenol and p-tertiary butyl phenol.

which directly influences the material properties [26]. The control ONP showed crystallite size 80.96 nm, however, it was increased to 93.96 nm in treated ONP. The increase in crystallite size was 16.05% in the treated ONP as compared to control sample. In a previous work, it was shown that increase in temperature causes a considerable impact on crystallite size. It was also reported that increase in temperature reduced the thermodynamically driven force that caused a decrease in nuclear densities and thus increased in crystallite size [27,28]. Gaber et al. showed that elevation in processing temperature caused the decrease in dislocation density and increase in number of unit cell that ultimately increased the crystal growth [29]. Hence, it is assumed that biofield treatment may provide energy to ONP that leads to depression in nuclear density and elevation in crystallite size.

XRD diffractogram of control and treated MNP are shown in Figure 3. The control sample showed crystalline peaks at 2θ equals to 13.88°, 15.45°, 16.05°, 16.34°, 16.75°, 17.11°, 17.28°, 18.35°, 18.72°, 20.62°, 20.75°, 21.17° and 21.52°. It was observed that intensity of few XRD peaks were increased due to alteration in crystalline nature of the treated sample. Crystallite size of control TBP was 79.73 nm, whereas the treated TBP showed 83.88 nm. The increase in crystallite size of treated TBP was 5.20% with respect to control. Biofield treatment on TBP probably caused depression in dislocation density hence increase in crystallite size [27]. Carballo et al., reported that rate of reaction can be significantly improved by increase in crystallite size [30]. Hence, treated ONP and TBP due to high crystallite size may improve the reaction rate and percentage yield during synthesis of organic compounds.

DSC studies

DSC was used to investigate the melting nature and latent heat of fusion of the compounds (ONP, MNP and TBP). The melting temperature and latent heat of fusion of the compounds are shown in Table 2. The treated and control ONP did not show melting temperature peak in the DSC result. The control MNP showed (Table 2) endothermic peak at 98.07°C due to melting temperature of the sample [31]. Whereas the treated MNP showed an increase in melting temperature and it was observed at 99.50°C. This increase in melting temperature may be related to the higher thermal stability of the treated MNP. The control TBP showed an endothermic peak at 101.16°C; mainly due to melting of the control sample. However, the treated TBP showed melting endothermic peak at 101.33°C. The result showed no significant change in melting temperature of treated TBP in comparison with control.

The treated MNP showed an increase in ∆H value by 6.21% with respect to control. Similarly, the treated TBP compound showed the marked increase in ∆H by 14.48% as compared to control sample. It was reported that a material consists of strong intermolecular forces that
hold them tightly on their positions. The energy needed to overcome the intermolecular force is known as latent heat of fusion. This latent heat of fusion is stored as potential energy in the atoms during its phase transition from solid to liquid [32,33]. It is assumed that biofield treatment may alter the internal potential energy in treated MNP and TBP that leads to increase in $\Delta H$ as compared to control.

**TGA studies**

TGA was used to evaluate the thermal stability of the organic compounds. TGA thermogram of the control and treated ONP are shown in Figures 5 and 6 respectively. Thermogram of control sample showed (Figure 5) single step thermal degradation pattern. The thermal degradation commenced at around 118°C and terminated at around 158°C. During this step, the sample lost 62.54% of its weight. TGA thermogram of treated ONP showed (Figure 6) that thermal degradation started at around 125°C and stopped at around 170°C. During this thermal process, the sample lost 66.94% of its weight. DTA thermogram of control sample showed an endothermic peak at 146.03°C; however, the treated sample showed the increase in endothermic peak (152.71°C). DTG thermogram of control sample showed maximum thermal decomposition temperature ($T_{\text{max}}$) at 136.40°C. However, the treated sample showed an increase in $T_{\text{max}}$ value at 144.91°C; that may be correlated to the higher thermal stability of the treated sample.

TGA thermogram of control and treated MNP are depicted in Figure 7 and 8, respectively. TGA thermogram of MNP showed onset temperature at around 193°C and it stopped at around 233°C (end set). During this step the control sample lost 60.30% of its weight. However, the treated sample started to degrade at around 188°C and this process terminated at around 242°C. The control sample showed 52.39% weight loss. The DTA thermogram of control MNP showed two endothermic peaks. The first peak at 97.21°C was attributed to melting of the sample and second endothermic peak was due to thermal decomposition of control (217.94°C). DTA thermogram of treated MNP showed (Figure 8) no significant change in melting temperature but it showed an increase in decomposition temperature (220.10°C) as compared to control. However, the DTG thermogram of control showed the $T_{\text{max}}$ at 209.81°C; whereas the treated sample showed the $T_{\text{max}}$ at 208.21°C. This showed no significant alteration in thermal stability of treated MNP as compared to control.

TGA thermogram of control and treated TBP are shown in Figures 9 and 10 respectively. The control TBP showed one-step thermal degradation pattern. The thermal degradation commenced at around 137°C and terminated at around 198°C. The control sample lost 58.08% of its compound weight (Figure 9). The TGA thermogram of treated TBP also showed one-step thermal degradation pattern. The thermal degradation commenced at around 142°C (onset) and terminated at around 204°C (end set). DTA thermogram of the control TBP showed two endothermic peaks. The first peak at 102.55°C was due to melting and second peak at 175.54°C was due to decomposition of the sample. However, DTA thermogram of treated TBP showed (Figure 10) first endothermic peak at 103.54°C and the second peak was observed at

| Sample       | Melting Temperature (°C) | $\Delta H$ J/g | % Change in $\Delta H$ |
|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| o-nitrophenol | NO                       | NO             | NO                     |
| m-nitrophenol| 98.07                    | 99.50          | -141.45                |
| p-tert butyl phenol | 101.16               | 101.33         | -143.00                |

| NO—not observed |

Table 2: DSC data (Melting temperature and change in $\Delta H$) of o-nitrophenol, m-nitrophenol and p-tert butyl phenol.
180.13°C. The former peak was mainly due to melting temperature and latter peak was due to thermal decomposition of the compound. The DTG thermogram of control TBP showed $T_{\text{max}}$ at 162.13°C. Additionally, the $T_{\text{max}}$ of treated TBP (167.40°C) was increased as compared to $T_{\text{max}}$ of the control sample. Szabo et al. showed that gamma radiation influenced the thermal stability of poly (3-hexadecylthiophene). They reported that increase in gamma radiation dose causes elevation in thermal stability due to crosslinking and conformational changes in the side alkyl groups [34]. Hence, it is assumed that biofield treatment may cause crosslinking in ONP and TBP molecules that lead to increase in thermal stability.

**Surface area analysis**

Surface area of the control and treated compounds were analyzed by using BET method and the results are presented in Table 3. The surface area of control ONP was 0.429 m$^2$/g; however, it was decreased in treated ONP (0.147 m$^2$/g). The decrease in surface area was 65.5%
as compared to control sample. This significant decrease in surface area may be due to increase in particle size of the treated ONP. It was reported that decrease in particle size increases the surface area and vice versa [35,36].

The surface area of control and treated MNP are reported in Table 3. The control MNP showed surface area of 0.214 m$^2$/g; however, it was increased in treated MNP (0.301 m$^2$/g). The increase in surface area was 40.7% in treated MNP as compared to control. The increase in surface area may be due to decrease in particle size of the treated MNP after biofield treatment. A similar increase in surface area was observed by Bergamaschi et al., during their studies on lignin [37].
Conclusion

This research work evaluated the influence of biofield treatment on physical and thermal properties of phenolic compounds such as ONP, MNP and TBP. XRD study revealed increase in crystallite size of the treated ONP and TBP as compared to control. However, the treated MNP showed a decrease in crystallite size with respect to control. The treated MNP showed increase in melting as compared to control sample. However, TBP did not show a significant change in melting temperature. TGA analysis showed the enhanced thermal stability of the treated ONP and TBP as compared to control. However, no significant change in thermal stability of treated MNP was observed with respect to control. Overall, the results showed that biofield treatment has the significant impact on physical and thermal properties of the ONP, MNP and TBP.
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