Formation of Green Rust Sulfate: A Combined in Situ Time-Resolved X-ray Scattering and Electrochemical Study
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The mechanism of green rust sulfate (GR-SO₄) formation was determined using a novel in situ approach combining time-resolved synchrotron-based wide-angle X-ray scattering (WAXS) with highly controlled chemical synthesis and electrochemical (i.e., Eh and pH) monitoring of the reaction. Using this approach, GR-SO₄ was synthesized under strictly anaerobic conditions by coprecipitation from solutions with known Fe(II)/Fe(III) ratios (i.e., 1.28 and 2) via the controlled increase of pH. The reaction in both systems proceeded via a three-stage precipitation and transformation reaction. During the first stage, schwertmannite (Fe₆O₈(OH)₄(SO₄)₂·12H₂O) precipitated directly from solution at pH 2.8-4.5. With increasing pH (>5), Fe(II) ions adsorb to the surface of schwertmannite and catalyze its transformation to goethite (α-FeOOH) during the second stage of the reaction. In the third stage, the hydrolysis of the adsorbed Fe(II) ions on goethite initiates a transformation to GR-SO₄ at pH > 7. The GR-SO₄ then continues to crystallize up to pH ~8.5. These results suggest that with an Fe(II)/Fe(III) ratio of ≤2 in the initial solution the structural Fe(II)/Fe(III) of the GR-SO₄ will be close to that of the starting composition.

1. Introduction

Green rust (GR) compounds are a unique class of layered double-hydroxide (LDH) phases with the general formula [Feₓ⁺(1−x)Fe.uml(OH)₄]²⁺·[(n/2)A⁻]·mH₂O where x = Fe(II)/Fe(III) Fe₆Σ⁺ A⁻ denotes interlayer anions whose charge is n, and m is moles of water molecules. The GR crystal structure consists of positively charged brucite-like layers of edge-sharing octahedrally coordinated Fe(II) and Fe(III) hydroxide units intercalated with anionic species and water molecules. The most studied GR phases are those with Fe(II)/Fe(III) ratios equal to 2 and 3, but a number of studies have indicated a range of Fe(II)/Fe(III) ratios from 1 to 3.4-8 A recent study by Christiansen et al.9 reported that the interlayer of green rust sulfate (GR-SO₄) also contains Na⁺ ions, leading to an ideal formula of NaₓFe₄₋ₙFe₃ₓ₋ₙ(SO₄)₂·12H₂O, although the Fe/OH ratio is the same in sodium and sodium-free GR structures. Various types of anions can be intercalated into the GR structure, including organic (e.g., lactate and formate),10-12 and inorganic species (e.g., SO₄²⁻, CO₃²⁻, and Cl⁻).13 Sulfate-containing GR structures are among the most studied forms and have been found to occur in a number of engineered and geoenvironmental systems.13,16-18 For example, GR-SO₄ was found to form as part of corrosion products on steel exposed to sulfate-rich seawater16-18 and at oxic-anoxic interfaces in hydromorphic soils.9,20

The presence of structural Fe\textsuperscript{II} means that GRs have the capacity to reduce a range of inorganic and organic species, including toxic metals\textsuperscript{21–23} (e.g., Cr\textsubscript{6+}, U\textsubscript{O2}\textsuperscript{-3}, and H\textsubscript{2}S\textsubscript{2}) and organic pollutants\textsuperscript{24} (e.g., trichloroethene (TCE)). These reduction processes lead to the breakdown of the organic molecules (e.g., TCE) or the formation of highly insoluble reduced inorganic phases (e.g., UO\textsubscript{2}(s)), thus reducing the environmental biodegradability of these toxic species. These unique properties have led to increasing interest in GRs as potential materials in pollution prevention and environmental waste minimization technologies such as engineered permeable reactive barrier systems (PRBs).\textsuperscript{25}

Understanding the formation and geochemical stability of GR in engineered and other environmental systems is key to assessing its potential role in the natural biogeochemical iron cycle and engineered environments (e.g., PRBs).

In the laboratory, GR compounds are commonly synthesized using either oxidation or coprecipitation techniques. The oxidation method involves progressive aeration sparging of an Fe\textsuperscript{II} solution (e.g., Fe\textsubscript{2}(SO\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{3} solution) at pH 7 to 8, which leads to the partial oxidation of Fe\textsuperscript{II} to Fe\textsuperscript{III}, both of which hydrolyze to form GR\textsuperscript{14,16}. During coprecipitation, an acidic solution containing a mixture of aqueous Fe\textsuperscript{2+} and Fe\textsuperscript{3+} cations in a sulfate or chloride medium is neutralized by the controlled addition of a basic solution.\textsuperscript{26} Previous studies of abiotic GR-SO\textsubscript{4} formation via coprecipitation at different Fe\textsuperscript{II}/Fe\textsuperscript{III} ratios indicated that the first phase to form at pH ~2.5 is a ferric phase referred to as ferric hydroxydioxide basic salt,\textsuperscript{27,28} though this phase has not been directly identified. With a further increase in pH, this ferric phase transforms into ferric oxyhydroxide (i.e., goethite, α-FeOOH) and subsequently into GR-SO\textsubscript{4}. Ruby et al.\textsuperscript{29} suggested that during this latter stage the adsorption of Fe\textsuperscript{2+} (aq) and SO\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{2-} ions onto the goethite surface induced its dissolution and leads to the transformation of goethite into GR-SO\textsubscript{4}. (Free Fe\textsuperscript{2+} and Fe\textsuperscript{3+} cations and total dissolved Fe\textsuperscript{III} and Fe\textsuperscript{II} in solution are deemed hereafter as Fe\textsuperscript{II}(aq), Fe\textsuperscript{III}(aq), Fe\textsuperscript{2+}_\text{tot}(aq), and Fe\textsuperscript{3+}_\text{tot}(aq), respectively.) However, the mechanisms of GR formation via these precursors have not been fully quantified.

Characterizing the formation of GR under natural and laboratory conditions is inherently difficult because of the highly air-sensitive nature of GR phases. This is primarily due to the rapid oxidation (seconds to minutes) of structural Fe\textsuperscript{II} in the presence of favorable electron acceptors (e.g., NO\textsubscript{3} or molecular O\textsubscript{2}). Thus, to obtain detailed information on the mechanism and kinetics of GR-SO\textsubscript{4} formation during coprecipitation we have developed a novel synchrotron-based method that allowed the in situ and time-resolved analysis of solid particles forming and transforming in solution, under strictly anaerobic conditions, using a controlled chemical synthesis apparatus. This system permitted the simultaneous quantification of several chemical parameters in the aqueous solutions (i.e., pH, Eh, n\textsubscript{mol} of consumed base, and Fe\textsuperscript{2+}(aq) and Fe\textsuperscript{3+}(aq) concentrations) and the characterization of solid phases forming during in situ time-resolved wide angle X-ray scattering (WAXS). Using this combination of techniques, we aim to (a) demonstrate the effectiveness of the novel experimental procedure to concomitantly follow and quantify such complex aqueous and solid reactions and (b) observe and instrument information on the formation mechanism and stability of GR-SO\textsubscript{4} in the laboratory, which in turn provides some insight into the behavior of GR in engineered (e.g., PRBs) and natural systems (e.g., soils).

Figure 1. Schematic diagram of the experimental setup used for the synthesis of GR and the simultaneous collection of time-resolved WAXS data on stations MPW6.2 (SRS) and 122 (DLS). The reaction vessel contents were constantly circulated through a quartz capillary mounted in line with the incident X-ray beam.

2. Experimental Section

2.1. Synthesis of Green Rust. Two isothermal coprecipitation experiments were carried out to synthesize GR-SO\textsubscript{4} from mixed Fe\textsuperscript{II} (as Fe\textsubscript{2}(SO\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{3}·7H\textsubscript{2}O and Fe\textsuperscript{II} (as Fe\textsubscript{2}(SO\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{3}·6H\textsubscript{2}O) sulfate solutions with initial Fe\textsuperscript{II}/Fe\textsuperscript{III} ratios of 1.28:1 (R\textsubscript{1,28}) and 2:1 (R\textsubscript{2,0}), respectively. All solutions were prepared from oxygen-free deionized water inside a vinyl glovebox (Coy Laboratory Products Inc.) flushed with an H\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} gas mixture (5%:95%) at room temperature. The glovebox maintains a strict ≤5 ppm oxygen atmosphere through H\textsubscript{2}(g) that reacts with a palladium catalyst to remove residual oxygen. All reagents used in this study were high-purity analytical-grade chemicals (>99% purity). Prior to the mixing of the two solutions, each individual solution was filtered through 0.2 μm cellulose nitrate membrane filters to remove possible traces of insoluble Fe\textsuperscript{III} solids. The starting solution consisted of a mixture of 0.2 M Fe\textsubscript{2}(SO\textsubscript{4})·7H\textsubscript{2}O and 0.078 M Fe\textsubscript{2}(SO\textsubscript{4})·6H\textsubscript{2}O. The mixed solutions were transferred to an oxygen-free reactor (Figure 1, Infors, Switzerland) consisting of a double-jacketed glass reaction vessel fitted with an overhead stirrer, a NIST-calibrated pH electrode, a redox probe, ports for the addition of acid or base solutions, a gas inflow port (for N\textsubscript{2}(g)), an exit gas tube with a palladium catalyst, and two ports for the inflow and outflow of the solution through a closed circulation loop (Figure 1).

With this setup the pH, redox potential (Eh), and rate of base addition were recorded continuously via an automated control unit. During the titration experiments, the headspace of the reaction vessel as well as that of the bottle containing the base (2.0 M NaOH, degassed) were maintained at a positive pressure of N\textsubscript{2}(g) to
maintain anaerobicity. The reaction cell temperature was controlled at 21 ± 1 °C by circulating constant-temperature water through the cell jacket.

GR-SO₄ was synthesized via the stepwise base titration of the mixed Fe⁺³/Fe⁺² sulfate starting solutions. This was achieved by the computer-controlled addition of a degassed (carbonate- and O₂-free) 2.0 M NaOH solution to the reaction vessel. The base was added using a highly accurate peristaltic pump (±0.05 mL) to deliver small volumes of the degassed NaOH solution. The initial mixed iron solutions had a pH of ~1.8, and this was increased to pH 7.0 over 2.2 h (R₁₂₈) or 2.9 h (R₂₀). The pH was then held at 7 for ~6 h (R₁₂₈) to investigate the effect of aging at this pH on the stability and growth of GR. This extended time was not necessary in later experiments and thus the pH was then held at 7 for ~3.5 h for the R₂₀ experiment. Following this time at pH 7, the pH was increased to 10 over ~5 h in both the R₁₂₈ and R₂₀ systems. The volume of added base, pH, Eₜ, and reaction time were automatically recorded every 20 s.

2.2. In Situ Time-Resolved Scattering Experiments.

The in situ wide angle X-ray scattering (WAXS) measurements for the R₁₂₈ experiment were performed at station MWP6.2 of the Synchrotron Radiation Source (SRS), Daresbury Laboratory, U.K., whereas the R₂₀ experiment was performed at beamline I22, Diamond Light Source (DLS), Oxford, U.K. The automated reactor described above was mounted on the beamline, and an analogue peristaltic pump was used to circulate the solution/suspension continuously from the reaction vessel to a closed-loop tube directly connected to a sealed vessel consisting of a quartz capillary (1.5 mm i.d., 10 μm wall) that was directly aligned with the X-ray beam. The WAXS detector at station MPW6.2 is a multiframe gas detector based on the RAPID technology. The detector on station I22 is a HOTWAXS detector based on glass microstrip technology. The wavelength of the incident X-ray beam was 1.28). The pH was then held at 7 for ~3.5 h for the R₂₀ experiment. Following this time at pH 7, the pH was increased to 10 over ~5 h in both the R₁₂₈ and R₂₀ systems. The volume of added base, pH, Eₜ, and reaction time were automatically recorded every 20 s.

2.3. Data Analysis.

Experimental data were normalized using the XOTOKO software to compensate for variations in the intensity of the incident beam due to the decay of the synchrotron beam current. Diffraction peaks within individual WAXS patterns were fitted using pseudo-Voigt profile functions implemented in the XFIT program. This procedure was used to evaluate peak positions, areas, and the fwhm of each diffraction peak. The changes in peak areas with time were normalized to give the degree of reaction, \( \alpha = \frac{I(t)}{I_{max}} \) where \( I(t) \) represents the peak area at a given time and \( I_{max} \) is the maximum peak area during the reaction. Assuming that the diffraction peak shape can be described by a Gaussian function, the crystallite size can be approximated via the Scherrer equation:

\[
D = \frac{k \lambda}{\beta \cos \theta} \times \frac{360}{2\pi}
\]

where \( D \) is the crystallite size (Å), \( \lambda \) is the wavelength of the incident X-ray beam, \( \beta \) is the Scherrer constant, which is related to the hkl index and crystal shape, and \( \theta \) is the Bragg angle. The instrumental broadening was corrected for by subtracting the fwhm of the Si standard (SRM 640c) from the measured peaks.

2.4. Ex Situ Analyses.

Solid and solution samples were collected during a series of complementary ex situ experiments that were conducted in an equivalent manner to the online in situ experiments described above, but with no WAXS data collection. Aliquots of all intermediate solid phases as well as end product GR-SO₄ were collected at various pH values, separated from the solutions by filtration (<0.2 μm polycarbonate filters), washed with oxygen-free deionized water, and air dried inside an O₂-free glovebox. The dried solids collected at pH >6.0 were coated with a thin layer of glycerol (purity >99%) prior to XRD analysis using a Philips PW1050 goniometer with a Cu Kα radiation X-ray tube (\( \lambda = 1.5418 \) Å) and a scan time of 2–4 h. Washed and dried solids collected at pH <6.0 were analyzed by XRD with a scan time of 14 h. Subsets of the air-dried solids were placed on Al stubs and coated with Pt (3 nm layer), and the particles were imaged using field-emission gun scanning electron microscopy (FEG-SEM) (Leo Gemini 1530 FEG-SEM, Cambridge, U.K.) at 3.0 keV. High-resolution images were also recorded using a transmission electron microscope (TEM) (Philips CM20TEM, Oxford Instruments at 80 keV) after deposition on holey-carbon-coated copper TEM grids. Both TEM imaging and selected-area electron diffraction (SAED, Philips CM20TEM) were employed to characterize the crystal morphology and structure. Finally, the samples were analyzed using a diamond-attached automated total reflection Fourier transform infrared (ATR-FTIR) spectrometer (MicroLab, A2 Technologies) for the IR spectral range between 4000 and 650 cm⁻¹. Throughout the experiments and at the same time steps as for the solids, solution samples were also removed from the reactor via one of the ports and immediately filtered and preserved with 6 N HCl. The concentrations of total dissolved Fe (\( \text{Fe}_{\text{tot}}(aq) \)) and \( \text{Fe}^{III}_{\text{tot}}(aq) \) in these solutions were determined using the Ferrozine photometric method, and \( \text{Fe}^{III}_{\text{tot}}(aq) \) was determined by difference.

3. Results and Discussion

A three-dimensional representation of the time-resolved WAXS data recorded in situ for the R₁₂₈ experiment is shown in Figure 2. At low pH (<2.8) the WAXS pattern consisted of only a large hump caused by scattering from the solution but with no diffraction peaks indicating the absence of any crystalline material. At pH >2.8, on top of the broad hump a broad feature centered between 22 and 23° (2.5–2.6 Å) formed (Figure 2). The position of this feature corresponds to the maximum intensity diffraction peak for schwertmannite (2.55 Å, 212), and this feature transformed into a broad peak with time. This stage coincided with an increase in the optical density of the suspension.


above approximately pH 2.2 and a gradual change in color to orange-yellow at pH ∼2.8 (Figure S1, Supporting Information). Above pH 5.0, the broad peak for schwertmannite decreased and in a second crystallization stage a peak centered at ∼13.8° 2θ appeared. This peak corresponds to the maximum intensity diffraction peak for goethite (4.18 Å, (101)). Lastly, in the third stage of crystallization starting at pH ∼6.8 to 7.0, several sharp diffraction peaks appear that correspond to GR-SO₄. This stage of the reaction coincided with a change in the color of the precipitate to olive green (Figure S1). The WAXS data obtained from the R₁₂₈ experiment (Figure S2) also shows the same three-stage reaction profile as the R₁₂₈ experiment (i.e., schwertmannite—goethite—GR-SO₄). As noted before, the electrochemical and titration data (i.e., Eh, pH, and millimoles of OH⁻ added) from the R₁₂₈ and R₂₀ experiments were recorded simultaneously with the scattering data (WAXS). Similar to the correspondence between the results from the WAXS data for both experiments, the titration data from both the R₁₂₈ and R₂₀ experiments (Figure S4) shows almost identical trends in OH⁻ consumption and equivalent trends in Eh and pH, with the only difference being the time spent at pH 7.0. The data from both experiments reveals that the reaction leading to the formation of GR-SO₄ follows three main stages: (i) formation of schwertmannite (pH 2.8—5.0), (ii) transformation of schwertmannite to goethite (pH 5—6.8), and (iii) formation and growth of GR-SO₄ (pH > 6.8). These processes are discussed in detail in the following sections.

### 3.1. Schwertmannite Formation (pH 2.0—5.0)

The data for the pH and base added for the first stage of the reaction (R₁₂₈) are shown in Figure 3a. During this stage and up to pH ∼4.5, the measured pH deviated considerably from the programmed pH. This indicates that the rate of base addition was not adequate to maintain the programmed pH increase (i.e., the OH⁻ consumption due to hydrolysis in solution was faster than the maximum rate of base addition that the reactor-controller could supply).

When pH ∼2.2 was reached, orange-yellow sol-like particles were observed, resulting in an increase in the optical density of the solution (Figure S1). The analysis of Fe in solution indicates that above pH 2 the concentration of Fe⁴⁺ tot (aq) decreased rapidly and approached zero by pH ∼3.5 (Figure 5), which was a consequence of the precipitation of a ferrie-bearing phase (i.e., schwertmannite; see below). However, the concentration of Fe⁴⁺ tot (aq) in this pH range remained virtually unchanged. Concomitantly, a sharp drop in Eh from +636 to +410 mV was recorded. Because of the high concentration of Fe⁴⁺ tot (aq), the Eh of the solution will be controlled by the Fe⁴⁺/Fe³⁺ redox couple; therefore, the increase in the Fe⁴⁺/Fe³⁺ ratio in this pH range would have caused a significant decrease in Eh.

The formation of the colored precipitate (Figure S1, movie) and the rapid consumption of base in the system suggest that above pH ∼2.0 Fe⁴⁺ (aq) hydrolysis and precipitation occurred (Figure 3a). In Figure 2, at pH < 5, the center of the broad WAXS peak at 22.6° 2θ (2.55 Å) was assigned to the most intense schwertmannite peak (212). This assignment was confirmed by a diffraction pattern measured ex situ from an air-dried sample collected at pH 2.8 ± 0.1 (Figure 4a) that revealed that schwertmannite was the sole phase present. Figure 5 shows a decrease in Fe³⁺ tot (aq) concentration at pH ∼2, but schwertmannite was detected only at pH 2.8 (Figures 2 and 4). This indicates that the initially formed solid was very poorly ordered and crystallized only to a sufficient degree for detection by WAXS as the pH increased. Using the fwhm of the schwertmannite (212) peak in Figure 4a, the average crystallite size of schwertmannite particles calculated using the Scherrer equation (eq 1) was ∼5 nm, which is in agreement with results obtained by Davidson et al. The nanosize nature of the schwertmannite particles explains the observed broad diffraction peaks in the ex situ XRD data and the in situ WAXS data (Figures 2 and 4). The WAXS data suggest that the schwertmannite peak reaches its maximum at pH 3 to 4.
but when the pH further increases to pH ∼5.0 this broad feature begins to decline (Figure 2).

Figure 6 presents ATR-FTIR spectra of solid samples collected at different pH values during the synthesis of GR-SO$_4$ from an offline experiment carried out in an equivalent manner to the online $R_{1.28}$ experiment. Data from samples collected at pH 3 and 4.5 show a broad band between ∼1000 and ∼1150 cm$^{-1}$ and a sharper band at ∼975 cm$^{-1}$. Peaks at these positions are consistent with IR band positions for schwertmannite; they are indicative of the outer-sphere coordination of SO$_4^{2-}$ (samples were washed with deionized water, under strict anoxic conditions, prior to analysis) and are not due to the presence of residual surface-adsorbed SO$_4^{2-}$. These results are consistent with the crystal structure of schwertmannite in which SO$_4^{2-}$ ions reside as counterions in the internal channels of the crystal structure. The other bands at 780–890 cm$^{-1}$ (spectrum at pH 4.5) correspond to structural Fe–OH groups ($\delta$OH) in the lattice of Fe phases.

The solution species in the reaction were modeled with PHREEQC$^{46,47}$ (WATEQ4F thermodynamic database) using

Figure 3. (a) $Eh$–pH vs time (up to 2 h) profile from the $R_{1.28}$ GR-SO$_4$ coprecipitation experiment. (b) $Eh$–pH vs time profile from the $R_{1.28}$ GR-SO$_4$ coprecipitation experiment. The time and pH at which schwertmannite, goethite, and GR-SO$_4$ started to form are marked with a star (*). (c) Normalized peak area vs time for the GR-SO$_4$ (101) and the goethite (101) diffraction peaks, with open symbols representing experimental data.

Figure 4. XRD pattern of (a) a schwertmannite sample collected at pH 2.8 and (b) goethite collected at pH 5.7 from an offline experiment carried out in an equivalent manner to the online $R_{1.28}$ experiment. The Miller indices of the goethite (GT) and schwertmannite (SW) diffraction peaks are given in parentheses.

The solution species in the reaction were modeled with PHREEQC$^{46,47}$ (WATEQ4F thermodynamic database) using


the data obtained from the ferrozine analyses from an off-line experiment conducted in the same manner as the R1.28 experiment. The modeling (Figure 7a) revealed that at the low pH (<3.5) and high SO\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{2-} concentration in the solution (434 mmol L\textsuperscript{-1}) the predominant Fe\textsuperscript{III} species in solution were FeSO\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+}(aq) and Fe(SO\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{2-}(aq) whereas the concentration of Fe\textsuperscript{3+}(aq) was negligible. These results suggest that the formation of schwertmannite occurred via the hydrolysis and polymerization of the aqueous ferric and ferric sulfate complexes and that the sulfate ions complexed to the iron in solution became incorporated into the solid structure once precipitated.

The equation for the formation of schwertmannite from solution has been shown to be\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{align*}
8\text{Fe}^{3+}(aq) + \gamma\text{SO}_4^{2-}(aq) + \frac{24 - 2\gamma + x}{2}\text{H}_2\text{O}(l) & \rightleftharpoons \\
\text{Fe}_8\text{O}_8\text{(OH)}_4(\text{SO}_4)_\gamma(s) + (24 - 2\gamma)\text{H}^+(aq)
\end{align*}

where $8 - \gamma = 2\gamma$ and $1.0 \leq \gamma \leq 1.75$.

At these high iron and sulfate concentrations, it is reasonable to assume the highest value for $\gamma = 1.75$, and thus the overall reaction leading to the precipitation of schwertmannite can be
written as

$$8\text{Fe}^{3+}(aq) + 1.75\text{SO}_4^{2-}(aq) + 12.5\text{H}_2\text{O}(l) \leftrightarrow 4\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3(\text{OH})_{1.5}(\text{SO}_4)_{1.75}(s) + 21.5\text{H}^+(aq) \quad (3)$$

The data presented in Figure 5 shows that a significant reduction in Fe$^{\text{III}}_{\text{tot}}(aq)$ concentration occurs at pH 2.5–2.8 with virtually no dissolved Fe$^{\text{III}}$ present at pH > 3.5; therefore, the complete reaction in eq 3 requires 199.9 mmol of OH$^-$ to precipitate all of the Fe$^{\text{III}}$ in the system as schwertmannite. As shown in Figure 3a, the addition of ~200 mmol of OH$^-$ raised the pH to ~3.6, which coincides with the complete removal (> 98%) of all Fe$^{\text{III}}$ from solution (Figure 5) and suggests that all OH$^-$ added to the system in this pH range was consumed during the precipitation of schwertmannite. The results from this study suggest a stability field of schwertmannite in the pH range of 2.8–5.0 and the beginning of the transformation to goethite above pH 5. This stability field is similar to that reported in acid mine drainage environments where schwertmannite has been shown to be stable in the pH range of 2.5–4.5$^{32,49,50}$ in waters containing between 10.41 and 31.23 mmol of SO$_4^{2-}$ L$^{-1}$. The slight difference in the upper stability limit is likely due to the relatively fast pH increase during the coprecipitation experiments, which may not have given sufficient time for the transformation to goethite to be initiated between pH 4.5 and 5.0.

3.2. Schwertmannite-to-Goethite Transformation (pH 5–7). Above pH ~5, the time-resolved WAXS data (Figures 2 and 3c) show the formation of a peak centered at 13.7° 20 ($d = 4.18$ Å) that corresponds to the goethite (101) diffraction peak, and this coincides with the disappearance of the schwertmannite (212) peak (Figure 2). Ex situ X-ray diffraction data from a sample collected at pH 5.7 from an equivalent experiment (Figure 4b) show only peaks for goethite, suggesting a complete transformation of schwertmannite into goethite as the solution pH approaches 6.0. These results are in agreement with WAXS data in Figure 3c that suggest that goethite reaches its maximum intensity at pH ~6.0. WAXS data from the $R_2$ experiment show a similar trend, with goethite starting to form at pH 5.75 and reaching its maximum intensity at pH 6.9 (Figure S3b).

The ATR-FTIR data (Figure 6) for samples collected at pH 5.7 and 6.0 ($R_2$, Figure 8a) show that the goethite particles are < 50 nm in size with a slightly elongated shape. This particle size is consistent with the particles being “nanogoethite”, which is thought to be one of the dominant reactive iron phases in many natural environments (e.g., marine sediments).$^{52}$ The nanosize of goethite particles formed is also responsible for the broad diffraction peaks observed in the WAXS and offline XRD data (Figures 2 and 4).

3.2.1. Mechanism of Goethite Formation. A number of studies have shown that synthetic schwertmannite is thermodynamically unstable with respect to goethite in the pH range of 3–6 and that above pH 4 schwertmannite transforms to goethite and releases the structurally bound sulfate from its lattice.$^{36,55}$ Calculations based on data by Jonsson et al.$^{54}$ indicated that the transformation of natural schwertmannite to goethite at pH 6 under oxic conditions was incomplete even after 514 days. In the current study, schwertmannite transformed to goethite in ~1.0 h over a small pH range (> 4.5 and < ~6.0), which suggests that this transformation is not solely dependent on pH change but that other factors must be considered. Recently, Burton et al.$^{32,35}$ showed that the presence of adsorbed Fe$^{3+}(aq)$ catalyzed the transformation of schwertmannite to goethite at a rate of 22.7% h$^{-1}$ at pH 6.5, which is several orders of magnitude greater than the values reported in the absence of Fe$^{3+}(aq)$. Burton et al.$^{35}$ suggested that the adsorption of Fe$^{3+}$ ions onto schwertmannite may be significant at pH > 5. The Fe data (Figure 5) support these findings because they show a steady decrease in Fe$^{III}_{\text{tot}}(aq)$ with increasing pH beyond ~4.5, which is likely due to adsorption onto the suspended ferric oxyhydroxide particles. The speciation analysis (Figure 7b) of the dissolved iron in solution from experiment $R_1$ shows that at pH 4.0 ~50% of the dissolved Fe$^{III}$ is present as free Fe$^{3+}$ ions, with the remaining iron being

(52) van der Zee, C.; Roberts, D. R.; Rancourt, D. G.; Slomp, C. P. Nano-goethite is the dominant reactive oxyhydroxide phase in lake and marine sediments. Geology 2003, 31, 993–996.

Figure 7. Distribution of dissolved (a) Fe$^{II}$ and (b) Fe$^{III}$ species as a function of pH simulated using PHREEQC. The open symbols represent experimental data for Fe$^{III}_{\text{tot}}(aq)$ and Fe$^{III}_{\text{tot}}(aq)$. Solid lines represent the concentration of free and complexed Fe$^{II}$ and Fe$^{III}$ species in solution obtained from PHREEQC simulation.
Figure 8. Photomicrographs of precipitates formed during the synthesis of GR-SO₄ in the R₁₋₂₈ experiment: (a) SEM image of goethite (<50 nm) formed at pH 5.7. (b) SEM image of GR-SO₄ and the goethite sample formed at pH 7 (t = 2.2 h). (c) TEM image of hexagonal GR-SO₄ particles at pH 7.5. The inset is an SAED pattern of GR-SO₄ showing the distinctive hexagonal diffraction pattern of GR. (d) SEM image of GR-SO₄ particles formed at pH 8.5.

present as the FeSO₄⁶(aq) complex. Previous studies have also highlighted the role of Fe²⁺ ions in catalyzing the abiotic transformation of other poorly ordered ferrihydrite (Fe₂O₃·H₂O) to more crystalline phases such as goethite and lepidocrocite (γ-FeOOH).⁵⁶⁻⁵⁸ We suggest that a similar Fe²⁺-catalyzed transformation process explains the rapid transformation of schwertmannite to goethite in the current study. This transformation occurs first by the adsorption of Fe²⁺ to the surface of schwertmannite (increasingly significant at pH >5), which facilitates electron transfer between Fe³⁺ in the solid phase and surface-bound Fe²⁺ ions. This reaction decreases the stability of the schwertmannite crystal and causes a rearrangement of the structure and therefore the transformation of schwertmannite to goethite.⁴⁸⁻⁶⁰ This reaction can be described as follows:

$$Fe₄O₅(OH)₄(SO₄)₁,₇₅(s) + 3.5OH^-(aq) \xrightarrow{Fe^2⁺} 8FeOOH(s) + 1.75SO₄²⁻(aq) \quad (4)$$

According to eq 4, the complete transformation of schwertmannite to goethite requires the addition of 34 mmol of OH⁻ for the R₁₋₂₈ experiment (i.e., a total of ~234 mmol OH⁻ up to this point in the reaction), which corresponds to pH ∼5.8 as shown in Figure 3b. This is consistent with the time-resolved WAXS data (Figure 3c) that indicate that the goethite diffraction peak reaches its maximum intensity at pH ∼6.0. The 0.2 pH difference is likely to be due to the kinetics of goethite formation and that the pH was constantly increased with time, therefore the formation of goethite would finish above pH 5.8.

3.3. Formation of GR-SO₄. The WAXS data (Figure 4c) for the R₁₋₂₈ experiment show that at pH ∼6.9 (t = 2.28 h) the goethite (101) diffraction peak begins to decrease in intensity; this decrease coincides with the beginning of the formation and growth of narrow and distinct peaks for GR-SO₄. After ∼6 h (pH 7), there is an approximate 40% decline in the goethite integrated peak area and an associated increase in the GR-SO₄ peak area to ∼40% of its final maximum intensity (Figure 4c). Only a small drop in the intensity of the goethite peak occurred between t = 5.81 and 8.9 h (R₁₋₂₈), during which time the pH was held constant at 7.0. After this period, the pH was increased to 10 over 4.4 h. During this phase of the reaction, there was a second sharp decline in the intensity of the goethite (101) peak and an associated increase in the intensity of GR-SO₄ peaks (Figures 2 and 3) until GR-SO₄ was the only crystalline product at pH 8.5–10. During the formation of GR-SO₄, the concentration of Fe²⁺ₙₙₙₙ(aq) (Figure 5) dropped significantly (>pH ∼6) until it reached almost zero at pH ∼8. This was mirrored by a significant drop in Eh from −245 mV at pH 7 to −340 mV at pH ∼8.0 (Figure 3b), a decrease that is primarily due to the increase in pH.

The SEM micrograph of a sample (R₁₋₂₈) collected at pH 7 (Figure 8b) shows an aggregated mixture of nanoparticulate goethite and platelike particles of GR-SO₄. The TEM image of a sample collected at pH 7.5 (Figure 8c) clearly shows that

GR-SO₄ particles exhibit a thin (<20 nm), hexagonal, platelike morphology with an average particle size of <1 μm. The inset in Figure 8c shows an SAED pattern that displays a hexagonal diffraction pattern indicative of GR. As the pH increased to 8.5, the solids were pure GR-SO₄ with no more goethite present (Figure 8d). These observations are consistent with WAXS diffraction data collected at pH 8.5 and 9.9 in the R₁₂₈ experiment (Figure 9) that show that at pH > 8.5 the product is purely GR-SO₄ with no goethite peaks.

Although the WAXS data for the R₂₀₀ experiment (Figure S3b) show a similar trend to the R₁₂₈ experiment (GR-SO₄ formation at pH > 6.95 and a simultaneous decrease in the intensity of the goethite diffraction peak), the final product in the R₂₀₀ experiment (even at pH 10) was not pure GR-SO₄ but still contained small amounts of goethite. The ATR-FTIR data (R₂₀₀) at pH 7.5 and above (Figure 6) show that the two bands at 1130 and 1050 cm⁻¹ are replaced by a more intense, narrow band at 1100 cm⁻¹ with a small shoulder around 1145 cm⁻¹. These bands can be attributed to SO₄²⁻ within the interlayer of the GR structure (split ν₃ mode), indicating that the SO₄²⁻ ions that were adsorbed to the surface of goethite became intercalated within the newly forming GR-SO₄ structure. This is in accordance with literature data that revealed that such splitting is indicative of sulfate intercalation within the LDH structure and nonsymmetric interactions with the Fe(OH)₆ octahedra. Finally, the broad band at 776 cm⁻¹ attributable to lattice Fe–OH⁶ in the GR-SO₄ structure is at a substantially lower wavenumber than the structural Fe–OH peak for goethite (∼790 cm⁻¹), again supporting the WAXS data that showed GR-SO₄ to be the dominant end product in the R₂₀₀ experiment.

Changes in the unit cell parameters of GR-SO₄ during its formation and crystallization are shown in Figure 10. The average unit cell parameters of GR-SO₄ in the R₁₂₈ experiment were a = 3.19 Å and c = 11.07 Å, which are consistent with previously published parameters for GR-SO₄. There is virtually no change in the a-axis dimension during crystallization, indicating that there is no rearrangement or ordering within the a–b plane during its formation. However, the c-axis length decreases slightly (~0.005 Å) during crystallization, which may indicate the ordering of interlayer water and/or sulfate molecules as the particles grow. The crystal size of the diffraction pattern from the (003) peak using the Scherrer analysis indicates a thickness of the GR-SO₄ platelets of ~70 Å in the pH range of 7 to 7.5 and an increase to ~150 Å by pH 8.5 (Figure 10). The average particle diameters (a–b crystallographic plane) of GR-SO₄ determined from the SEM images were 430 and 709 nm at pH 7.0 and 8.5, respectively. The estimated average thickness of the GR-SO₄ hexagonal plates at pH 9.0, determined from the SEM micrographs, was ~16 nm, excluding ~3 nm of Pt coating on both sides of the GR plate, which is comparable to the thickness obtained using Scherrer analysis (i.e., 15 nm). These results indicate that during the formation of GR, particle growth was predominantly in the a–b crystallographic plane with a significantly slower growth rate along the c axis.

3.3.1. Mechanisms of GR Formation. The normalized peak area (α) versus time of goethite and GR-SO₄ for the R₁₂₈ experiment (Figure 3c) shows that after 5.0 h at pH 7 the amount of goethite is reduced by ~40% and is not detectable by pH 8.5. This reduction in goethite is mirrored by an equivalent increase in GR-SO₄ formed. These results suggest the complete transformation of goethite to GR-SO₄ and that all initial Fe²⁺ and Fe³⁺ were consumed during the formation of GR-SO₄ at pH > 8.5. This is supported by the electron microscopy image data that indicate that only goethite and GR-SO₄ are present above pH 7 and that GR-SO₄ is the final and only material formed at pH > 8.5. Thus, the overall reaction leading to the formation of GR-SO₄ from initial Fe²⁺/Fe³⁺ = 1.28:1 is given in eq 5.

\[
3.13\text{Fe}^2\text{+}(\text{aq}) + 9\text{SO}_4^{2-}(\text{aq}) + 4\text{Fe}^2\text{+}(\text{aq}) + 15.39\text{OH}^- (\text{aq}) \leftrightarrow \\
\text{Fe}^{II}_4\text{Fe}^{III}_{13}\text{OH}_{15.39}\text{SO}_4(\text{s}) 
\]

\[
2\text{Fe}^3\text{+}(\text{aq}) + 3\text{SO}_4^{2-}(\text{aq}) + 4\text{Fe}^2\text{+}(\text{aq}) + 12\text{OH}^- (\text{aq}) \leftrightarrow \\
\text{Fe}^{II}_4\text{Fe}^{III}_2\text{OH}_{12}\text{SO}_4(\text{s}) 
\]

\[
3.13\text{Fe}^3\text{+}(\text{aq}) + 9\text{SO}_4^{2-}(\text{aq}) + 4\text{Fe}^2\text{+}(\text{aq}) + 15.39\text{OH}^- (\text{aq}) \leftrightarrow \\
\text{Fe}^{II}_4\text{Fe}^{III}_2\text{OH}_{12}\text{SO}_4(\text{s}) + 1.13\text{FeOOH}(\text{s}) + 1.13\text{H}_2\text{O}(\text{l}) 
\]

For the reaction in eq 5 to reach completion, a total of 385 mmol of OH⁻ must be added to the system in order to form GR-SO₄ with no residual goethite. The experimental data presented in Figure 3b show that in the R₁₂₈ experiment ~390 mmol of OH⁻ was added to reach pH 8.5, which is in good agreement with the above calculations. In the R₂₀₀ experiment, GR-SO₄ reaches its maximum at pH 8.0, at which ~312 mmol of OH⁻ was consumed (Figure S3a). This is also in good agreement with calculations from eq 6 that indicates that the reaction should consume 300 mmol of OH⁻. The small differences between the calculated and experimental values of consumed OH⁻ are likely due to be due to changes in sulfate speciation with increasing pH (i.e., H₂SO₄ ⇒ HSO₄⁻ ⇒ SO₄²⁻), which would consume OH⁻. These chemical data suggest that for the R₁₂₈ experiment the structural Fe²⁺/Fe³⁺ ratio in the GR-SO₄ that is formed is 1.28, which supports the results from the WAXS and electron microscopy images. For the R₂₀₀ experiment, if GR-SO₄ was formed with a Fe²⁺/Fe³⁺ ratio of 2.0, then this necessitated the presence of ~36% of the original Fe³⁺ as FeOOH at the end of the reaction (eq 7). The data presented in this study suggest that all of the Fe²⁺ ions from
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solution were consumed during the formation of GR-SO₄ and that any α-FeOOH transformed gradually with increasing pH. Also, note that there was no evidence of Fe(OH)₂ (white rust) or Fe₃O₄ (magnetite) formation at any stage during the reaction. The formation of GR-SO₄ with an FeII/FeIII ratio of <2 is in agreement with the study of Mazeina et al., who synthesized GR-SO₄ by coprecipitation and oxidation methods at FeII/FeIII ratios of 0.5, 1.21, and 1.34. In addition, Géhin et al. reported structural FeII/FeIII ratios of ~0.5~3.0 in the mineral fougerite (IMA 2003-057), which is thought to belong to the GR family of compounds. However, Géhin et al. prepared GR-SO₄ by coprecipitation using initial FeII/FeIII ratios of 0.3~3.0 and indicated that the structural FeII/FeIII of the GR formed was 2 in all cases, although no direct analysis of GR-SO₄ samples synthesized at FeII/FeIII ratios <2.0 were presented. Conversely, Refait et al. using Mössbauer analysis on an aged solid phase produced by coprecipitation using an initial FeII/FeIII ratio of 1 showed that at pH 8.1 the product was a mixture of GR-SO₄ (FeII/FeIII = 2), goethite, and magnetite. These authors suggested that the formation of GR-SO₄ is independent of the initial FeII/FeIII ratio in solution. In the present study, data from the R₂₀ experiment indicate that GR-SO₄ was not fully formed until pH 8.5 and any GR-SO₄ formed at a lower pH may have FeII/FeIII ≠ 2; therefore, we suggest that the composition of the GR may be partially controlled by the pH of the solution. As the pH is increased, goethite reacts to form GR. However, the final composition is not achieved until GR has fully formed above pH 8.2~8.5, and any GR samples collected below this pH may have a higher FeII/FeIII ratio. This is supported by the solution analyses that show that the rate at which Fe₃⁺tot(aq) declines is faster than the rate of goethite consumption (Figures 3 and 5) because most of the dissolved Fe₃⁺ is consumed before all of the goethite is depleted. Therefore, any GR-SO₄ formed before the GR formation is complete may have a higher FeII/FeIII ratio than the stoichiometry of the initial solution. The changing FeII/FeIII ratio during formation would be facilitated by electron-transfer processes within the octahedral layers. These results illustrate the advantages of in situ characterization throughout the GR formation process without the preparations required for ex situ analyses (e.g., washing, freeze drying, and aging), which could cause artifacts due to recrystallization or oxidation (e.g., changes in the FeII/FeIII ratio or oxidation to form goethite/magnetite).

Results from the R₂₀ experiment show that although GR is the dominant reaction product there is some goethite present at the end of the experiment (pH 10, Figure S3), and thus the FeII/FeIII ratio of the GR-SO₄ formed was >2. However, because of the dominance of GR-SO₄ diffraction peaks in the WAXS data relative to those for goethite, it is likely that the GR FeII/FeIII ratio is close to 2. These results seem to be inconsistent with the R₂₀ experiment and previous studies that suggest an ideal stoichiometry for GR-SO₄ of 2 and GR-SO₄ as the only end product. The reason for the presence of goethite at the end of the R₂₀ experiment but not the R₂₀ experiment may be due to the stability of the goethite formed during the second stage of the reaction (pH 5~6.9). In the R₂₀ experiment, the FeII/FeIII ratio in the system is significantly higher than in the R₂₀ experiment (36% higher), which could lead to an increased rate of goethite crystallization. Also, in the R₂₀ experiment the pH was increased to >2.9 h whereas in the R₂₀ experiment it was 2.2 h. Both of these factors may have led to an increase in the crystallinity and/or particle size of the goethite formed during the second stage of the reaction. This more crystalline goethite may take longer to transform to GR above pH 6.9, but given long enough, it is likely that the small amount of residual goethite may fully transform to GR with time. If goethite crystallization is the controlling factor in the final GR composition, its presence highlights the potential influence of the precursor phases on the stoichiometry of the GR formed during the coprecipitation synthesis methods.

Data from the solution analyses (Figure 5) indicate that there is a decrease in the concentration of FeIItot(aq) that coincides with the formation of GR-SO₄ at pH ~7 (Figure 3c). This decrease in FeIItot(aq) is due to Fe⁺⁺ hydrolysis and its incorporation into solid GR particles, although the mechanism by which this occurs is unclear. Below pH 7, Fe⁺⁺ does not hydrolyze but will adsorb to the surface of FeOOH. This adsorbed Fe⁺⁺ has been shown to ion exchange rapidly (hours) and completely with the structural Fe⁺³ in goethite via electron-transfer reactions, but at low pH
(<7), the Fe\textsuperscript{2+} formed is released back into solution.\textsuperscript{66} As the pH increases, the electron-transfer reaction between Fe\textsuperscript{2+} and Fe\textsuperscript{3+} will continue to occur, but as the solubility of Fe\textsuperscript{2+} decreases, it will no longer be released into solution but instead will become incorporated into the iron oxyhydroxide structure. We propose that this process occurs above pH 7 and leads to the formation of mixed Fe\textsuperscript{II}/Fe\textsuperscript{III} brucite octahedral sheets, which are stabilized in the solution by adsorbed sulfate ions. These sheets are the primary structural units of GR-SO\textsubscript{4} that will form and grow as Fe\textsuperscript{2+} hydrolysis continues to occur (Figure 11). GR-SO\textsubscript{4} growth will be predominantly in the \(a\)-\(b\) crystallographic plane to form platelike GR-SO\textsubscript{4} particle morphology,\textsuperscript{28} which is supported by particle size analysis during the crystallization reaction from the WAXS (Figure 10) and SEM (Figure 8) data evaluations. Ruby et al.\textsuperscript{28} indicated a similar mechanism of GR-SO\textsubscript{4} formation but suggested that brucite-like Fe\textsuperscript{II} clusters form in solution and are then attracted to the surface of FeOOH particles and trap a layer of sulfate ions between the FeOOH surface and the Fe\textsuperscript{II} sheet. The data from this study do not support this hypothesis because it is likely that the Fe\textsuperscript{II} ions hydrolyze on the surface of the FeOOH (i.e., goethite) particles and direct bonding of the Fe\textsuperscript{2+} ion onto the surface facilitates the electron-transfer process that is key to initiating the recrystallization process.\textsuperscript{66} It is also unlikely that large clusters of Fe\textsuperscript{II} species will form in solution because most of the Fe\textsuperscript{II} is associated with the solid phase by pH 7. The pathway for the formation and growth of GR-SO\textsubscript{4} is summarized in Figure 11.

4. Conclusions

The potentiometric titration of mixed Fe\textsuperscript{II}/Fe\textsuperscript{III} sulfate solutions under anoxic conditions with initial Fe\textsuperscript{II}/Fe\textsuperscript{III} ratios of 1.28 and 2.0 showed that the composition of GR-SO\textsubscript{4} is dependent on the initial Fe\textsuperscript{II}/Fe\textsuperscript{III} ratio and the final pH of the synthesis. The in situ and ex situ XRD data and ATR-FTIR data provided evidence of the formation of schwertmannite at low pH and its transformation to goethite due to the catalytic effect of surface-adsorbed Fe\textsuperscript{2+} ions. The proposed mechanism for the formation of GR-SO\textsubscript{4} is via the hydrolysis of surface-adsorbed Fe\textsuperscript{2+} coupled with electron-transfer processes at the solid/solution interface, which leads to the transformation of goethite to GR-SO\textsubscript{4}.

This mechanistic information provides key parameters that can tailor the production of GR to industrial applications and its formation and stability to the natural environment. First, GR-SO\textsubscript{4} can be formed at variable Fe\textsuperscript{II}/Fe\textsuperscript{III} ratios by fixing the ratio of the starting solution and titrating the solution to pH > 8.5 to ensure full transformation to GR. Second, the stability of GR-SO\textsubscript{4} covers a wide range of pH; therefore, GR-SO\textsubscript{4} may be quite prevalent in natural anoxic systems such as hydromorphic soils.
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