Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Environmental Science: Nano. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2019

Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) for

Molecular–Scale Structures of Uranyl Surface Complexes on Hematite Facets

Xiaopeng Huang,^a Xiaojing Hou,^a Fan Wang,^a Binghuang Guo,^a Fahui Song,^a Lan Ling,^{*b} Jincai

Zhao^a and Lizhi Zhang^{*a}

^a Key Laboratory of Pesticide & Chemical Biology of Ministry of Education, Institute of

Environmental Chemistry, College of Chemistry, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079,

People's Republic of China

^b State Key Laboratory for Pollution Control, College of Environmental Science and Technology,

Tongji University, Shanghai 200092, China

12 pages, 2 texts, 6 figures, 7 tables

^{*} To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: <u>zhanglz@mail.ccnu.edu.cn</u> (L. Zhang); <u>linglan@tongji.edu.cn</u> (L. Ling). Phone/Fax: +86-27-6786 7535.

CONTENTS

Text S1. Preparation of hematite nanocrystals	.\$3
Text S2. Calculation of adsorbed uranyl site densities on hematite facets	.S4
Figure S1. Powder XRD patterns and Raman spectra	S5
Figure S2. Effect of initial pH and zeta potential	.85
Figure S3. XPS spectrum before and after adsorption	.86
Figure S4. The peak positions used to fit the spectrum	.S7
Figure S5. Effect of ionic strength on adsorption	.S7
Figure S6. The averaged EELS spectra	.S8
Table S1. The different configuration parameters and theoretical frequencies	.S9
Table S2. Parameters defining local coordination environment.	
Table S3. IR vibrations aqueous and coordinated uranyl ions	.S10
Table S4-6. Correlation between theoretical and experimental frequencies of urany	yl surface
complexes on HNPs-{001}, HNCs-{012} and HNRs-{110}	.S10
Table S7. Adsorption kinetics parameters	S12

Text S1. Preparation of Hematite Nanocrystals. The hematite nanoplates (HNPs), nanocubes (HNCs) and nanorods (HNRs) were synthesized following the hydrothermal or/and solvothermal methods reported previously.³³⁻³⁵ For the synthesis of HNPs,³³ 1.09 g of FeCl₃•6H₂O, 40.0 mL of ethanol, 2.8 mL of deionized water and 3.2 g of sodium acetate were mixed thoroughly by stirring at room temperature. Then, the mixture was stirred at room temperature until the complete formation of homogeneous solution. The solution was sealed in a Teflon-lined stainless steel autoclave (100mL) and heated in an oven at 180 °C for 12 hours. The precipitation was collected and washed thoroughly with deionized water and ethanol, and finally dried in a desiccator at 40 °C for 12 hours. As for the synthesis of HNCs,³⁴ 2.08 g of FeCl₃•6H₂O was added to the solution which was composed of 6.93 g sodium oleate, 35 mL ethanol and 4.3 mL oleic acid and then stirred for 2 hours. The resulting homogeneous solution was transferred into 100 mL Teflon-lined stainless steel autoclave, and heated at 180 °C for 12 hours. The resulting hematite precipitation was collected, rinsed with water and ethanol and finally dried at 40 °C for 12 hours. As for the synthesis of HNRs,³⁵ 1.35 g of FeCl₃•6H₂O was added to 77 mL of NH₄Cl aqueous solution (0.16 mol/L) and then stirred until the complete formation of homogeneous solution. The resulting homogeneous solution was sealed in a Teflon-lined stainless steel autoclave (100 mL), and heated at 120 °C for 12 hours. The resulting FeOOH precipitation was collected and washed thoroughly with deionized water and ethanol, and finally dried in a desiccator at 40 °C for 12 hours. The FeOOH sample was calcined at 520 °C for 2 hours with a heating rate of 10 °C/min in air to obtain the HNRs for use.

Text S2. Calculation of Adsorbed Uranyl Site Densities on Hematite Facets. If the adsorbed uranyl site densities (Q, $\#U/nm^2$) on the {001} and {110} facets of hematite were estimated as follows.

As
$$Q_{\text{HNPs}} = 84.3\% \times Q_{\{001\}} + 15.7\% \times Q_{\{012\}} \approx 84.3\% \times Q_{\{001\}}$$
 (S1)
 $Q_{\text{HNRs}} = 47.1\% \times Q_{\{001\}} + 47.1\% \times Q_{\{110\}} + 2.9\% \times Q_{\{120\}} + 2.9\% \times Q_{\{210\}}$
 $\approx 47.1\% \times Q_{\{001\}} + 47.1\% \times Q_{\{110\}}$ (S2)

where, Q_{HNPs} and Q_{HNRs} are uranyl site densities for HNPs and HNRs, respectively.

Thus $Q_{\{001\}} = 0.18$, $Q_{\{110\}} = 0.32$



Figure S1. (a) Powder XRD patterns of the different hematite nanocrystals. (b) Raman spectra of the different hematite nanocrystals.



Figure S2. (a) Effect of initial pH on the removal of U(VI) ions by the different hematite nanocrystals. (b) Relation between zeta potential and pH for the different hematite nanocrystals in the absence and presence of U(VI) ions.



Figure S3. XPS spectrum of different hematite nanocrystals before and after U(VI) adsorption. (a) Full–range XPS spectra of different hematite nanocrystals. (b) Full–range XPS spectra of different hematite nanocrystals after U(VI) adsorption. (c) U 4f XPS spectrum of different hematite nanocrystals after U(VI) adsorption. (d) O 1s XPS spectrum of HNPs. (e) O 1s XPS spectrum of HNCs. (f) O 1s XPS spectrum of HNRs. (g) O 1s XPS spectrum of HNPs after U(VI) adsorption. (h) O 1s XPS spectrum of HNCs after U(VI) adsorption. (i) O 1s XPS spectrum of HNRs after U(VI) adsorption.



Figure S4. The peak positions were held constant for the fitting of the spectra.



Figure S5. Effect of ionic strength on U(VI) ions adsorption. (a) ATR–FTIR spectra of U(VI) ions adsorption on HNPs as a function of NaCl solution. (b) ATR–FTIR spectra of U(VI) ions adsorption on HNCs as a function of NaCl solution. (c) ATR–FTIR spectra of U(VI) ions adsorption on HNRs as a function of NaCl solution. The NaCl concentration (bottom to top) were 0.1, 0.5, and 1.0 mol/L, respectively.



Figure S6. The $O_{4,5}$ edges of U(VI) adsorption on hematite nanocrystals (Gray curve for HNRs, orange for HNPs and blue for HNCs).

Configuration	E _{ads} (kJ/mol)	$R_{U=O}$ (Å)	R_{U-O} (Å)	R_{U-Fe} (Å)	Frequencies (cm ⁻¹)
² E-{001}	- 57.6	1.85	2.34	3.40	1040, 912, 811
² C-{001}	- 26.3	1.85	2.34	4.05, 4.20	1030, 925, 843
² E-{012}	- 67.1	1.85	2.34	3.82	1045, 907, 816
² C-{012}	- 76.0	1.85	2.34	4.02, 4.24	1026, 920, 841
² E-{110}	14.9	1.85	2.34	3.68	1052, 907, 809
² C-{110}	- 64.0	1.85	2.34	4.10, 3.98	1031, 922, 840

Table S1. The different adsorption configuration parameters and theoretical frequencies of U(VI) adsorbed on hematite facets.

Table S2. Parameters defining local coordination environment of U(VI) adsorbed on hematite nanostructures as determined by EXAFS spectroscopy.

entry	shell	CN	R (Å)	σ^2 (Å ²)
HNPs	U=O _{ax}	2.0	1.80	0.0021
	U–O _{eq}	5.3	2.32	0.0043
	U–Fe	0.9	3.43	0.0054
HNCs	U=O _{ax}	2.0	1.80	0.0017
	U–O _{eq}	5.5	2.41	0.0033
	U–Fe	1.46	4.06	0.0047
HNRs	U=O _{ax}	2.0	1.80	0.0029
	U–O _{eq}	5.2	2.30	0.0042
	U–Fe	0.9	3.41	0.0060
		0.75	4.11	0.0053

	anaaiaa	trmo			infrared	band positi	ons (cm	n ⁻¹)			ref
	species	type			1000		900			800	
	UO_{2}^{2+}				96	1		870			56
	UO_{2}^{2+}				96	2		870			57
0.0110.0110	$(UO_2)_2(OH)_2^{2+}$					943		853			57
aqueous	$(UO_2)_3(OH)_5^+$					923		835			57
	LIO 2+				06	1					this
	00_{2}^{-}				90	1					study
	hematite						906				57
	hematite					919/925					58
adsorbed	HNPs	² E	1048				909		823		
uranyl	HNCs	² C		1027		918		835			this study
	HNRs	^{2}E and ^{2}C	C 1051	1031		918	909	835	823		

Table S3. IR vibrations of aqueous and coordinated uranyl ions on the surface of hematite.

 Table S4. Correlation between theoretical and experimental frequencies of uranyl surface complexes

 on HNPs-{001}.

Madala	Experimental frequencies (cm ⁻¹)	Theoretical frequencies (cm ⁻¹)		
Widdels	U(VI)/HNPs-{001}	² E-{001}	$^{2}C-\{001\}$	
v(U–O)	1048	1040 (-8)*	1030 (-18)	
v ₃ (U=O)	909	912 (3)	925 (-16)	
v(U–O–Fe)	823	811 (-12)	843 (20)	
R ²	NA	0.99	0.99	
Slope	NA	1.01	0.82	
Intercept	NA	- 13.59	169.19	
Standard	NTA	10.42	22.14	
deviation	INA	10.42	22.14	

*The numbers in parenthesis = theoretical frequencies - experimental frequencies.

) (- 1 - 1 -	Experimental frequencies (cm ⁻¹)	Theoretical frequencies (cm ⁻¹)		
Models	U(VI)/HNCs-{012}	² E-{012}	² C-{012}	
v(U–O)	1027	1045 (18)*	1026 (-1)	
v ₃ (U=O)	918	907 (-11)	920 (2)	
v(U–O–Fe)	835	816 (-13)	841 (6)	
R ²	NA	1.00	1.00	
Slope	NA	1.20	0.98	
Intercept	NA	- 186.03	35.69	
Standard	NA	17.50	4.52	
deviation	NA	17.52	4.33	

Table S5. Correlation between theoretical and experimental frequencies of uranyl surface complexes on HNCs–{012}.

*The numbers in parenthesis = theoretical frequencies - experimental frequencies.

Madala	Experimental frequencies (cm ⁻¹)	Theoretical frequencies (cm ⁻¹)		
Models	U(VI)/HNRs-{110}	² E-{110}	$^{2}C-\{110\}$	
v(U–O)	1031	1052 (21)*	1031 (0)	
v ₃ (U=O)	918	907 (-11)	922 (4)	
v(U–O–Fe)	835	809 (-26)	840 (5)	
R ²	NA	1.00	1.00	
Slope	NA	1.24	0.98	
Intercept	NA	- 230.2	27.21	
Standard	NA	24.88	4.52	
deviation	INA	24.88	4.33	

Table S6. Correlation between theoretical and experimental frequencies of uranyl surface complexes on HNRs–{110}.

*The numbers in parenthesis = theoretical frequencies - experimental frequencies.

Table S7. Kinetics parameters of uranyl ions adsorption onto hematite nanocrystals.

Samples	SSA (m²/g)	$q_{ m e}$ (mg/m ²)	$\frac{k_2}{(\text{m}^2/(\text{mg min}))}$	R ²
HNPs	20.92	0.0724	0.6066	0.98
HNCs	20.41	0.1208	0.8874	0.99
HNRs	2.59	0.0928	0.5329	0.92