Supporting Information

Studies of Aqueous U(IV) Equilibrium and Nanoparticle Formation Kinetics Using Spectrophotometric Reaction Modeling Analysis

Wansik Cha^{*}a, Hee-Kyung Kim^a, Hyejin Cho^a, Hye-Ryun Cho^a, Euo Chang Jung^a, Seung Yeop Lee^b

*Corresponding author (e-mail: wscha@kaeri.re.kr)

*aNuclear Chemistry Research Laboratory, bRadioactive Waste Management Research Division, Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute, 989-111 Daedeok-daero, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon 34057, Republic of Korea

[Ionic strength correction using SIT formula]

The measured conditional stability constant, $\log^*\beta_1$ was converted to the standard constants, $\log^*\beta_1^\circ$ at the standard condition (I = 0, T = 25°C) by correcting the effects of I and adopting activity coefficient terms ($\log \gamma$) as shown in Eq. (S1).

$${}^{*}\beta_{1} = \frac{[U(OH)^{3+}][H^{+}]}{[U^{4+}]}$$
$$\log {}^{*}\beta_{1} = \log {}^{*}\beta_{1}^{0} + \log \gamma_{U^{4+}} - \log \gamma_{UOH^{3+}} - \log \gamma_{H^{+}} + \log a_{H_{2}O}$$
(S1)

Equilibria involving H₂O(l) as a reactant or product require a correction for the water activity ($a_{H_{2O}}$). The $\log_{10} a_{H_{2O}}$ were calculated from the $a_{H_{2O}}$ values at 25 °C provided in NEA-TDB for NaClO₄ (see Table S1). The SIT formula for activity coefficients is:

$$\log_{10} \gamma_i = -z_i^2 D(I_m) + \sum_j \varepsilon(i, j) m_j$$
(S2)

where z_i is the charge of ion *i*.

$$D(I_m) = \frac{A\sqrt{I_m}}{1 + Ba_d\sqrt{I_m}}$$
(S3)

is a Debye-Hückel term where I_m is the molal ionic strength; A and B are Debye-Hückel constants; a_d is the size or effective diameter of the ion in angstrom; B· a_d in Eq. (S3) is considered as a constant (= 1.5). In Eq. (S2), the binary ion interaction coefficients (ϵ) for the pair of species *i* and *j* are assumed to be equal to zero for neutral species or for ions of the same sign. Thus, for the cations involved in 1:1 U(IV) hydrolysis the summation in Eq. (S1) is restricted to the ClO₄⁻ counter ion (= *j*) that was chosen for ionic strength control in this work. The values of a_{H20} and A, B· a_d used in this work are listed in Tables S1 and S2, which were extracted from the literature. For the B· a_d and a_{H20} terms we assume that these values are constant within the temperature range (0–30 °C) in this study, thus the values at RT in Tables S1 and S2 were used for the calculation of $log^*\beta_1^\circ$ at other temperatures, i.e., $log^*\beta_1^\circ$ (T).

[Tables]

| <i>I</i> (m) | $a_{ m H2O}$ |
|--------------|--------------|
| 0.02 | 0.9993 |
| 0.05 | 0.9983 |
| 0.10 | 0.9966 |
| 0.15 | 0.9948 |
| 0.51 | 0.9833 |
| 1.05 | 0.9660 |
| 2.09 | 0.9337 |

Table S1. Water activity used in this study (see Eq. (S1)).

Note. Values for $NaClO_4$ media are adapted from NEA-TDB (Ref. [3] in the main text). Some values are extrapolated.

| T (°C) | А | Ba _d |
|--------|--------|-----------------|
| 0 | 0.4913 | |
| 5 | 0.4943 | |
| 10 | 0.4976 | |
| 15 | 0.5012 | 1.5 |
| 20 | 0.5050 | |
| 25 | 0.5091 | |
| 30 | 0.5135 | |

Table S2. Debye-Hückel constants used in Eq. (S3).

Note. All values are adapted from Ref.[3] in the main text.

| $\Delta \epsilon^{a}$ (kg/mol) | References |
|--|------------------------|
| $-(0.14 \pm 0.05)$ | Ref. [3] |
| $-(0.21 \pm 0.04)$ | this work ^b |
| $\Delta \varepsilon_1 = -(0.28 \pm 0.03)$ $\Delta \varepsilon_2 = 0.28 \pm 0.06$ | Ref. [4] |
| $\Delta \varepsilon_1 = -(0.30 \pm 0.05)$ $\Delta \varepsilon_2 = 0.32 \pm 0.08$ | this work ^c |

Table S3. Comparison of the binary ion interaction coefficient ($\Delta \epsilon$) obtained in this work and those from literatures.

^a $\Delta \varepsilon$ at I = 0 (= ε (UOH³⁺, j) + ε (H⁺, j) - ε (U⁴⁺, j), j = ClO₄⁻).

 $^b\Delta\epsilon$ was calculated by adding $\epsilon(H^+,ClO_4^-)$ to $\Delta\epsilon'$ presented in Table 1 in the main text.

^c Based on the two-parameter SIT model in Ref. [4]; $\Delta \varepsilon = \Delta \varepsilon_1 + \Delta \varepsilon_2 \log I$

Table S4. Dependence of $\Delta_r H_m$ and $\Delta_r S_m$ on *I*. Each conditional constant was calculated from the individual van't Hoff plots $(\log^* \beta_1 \text{ vs. } 1/\text{T})$ in Fig. 4(b).

| Test (pH _c) | I (mol/kg) | T (°C) | $\Delta_{\rm r} H_{\rm m}$ (kJmol ⁻¹) | $\frac{\Delta_{\rm r}S_{\rm m}}{(\rm JK^{-1}mol^{-1})}$ |
|----------------------------|---------------|-----------|---|---|
| | 0.02 | 0~30 | 41.4 ± 0.5 | 121 ± 2 |
| | 0.05 | | 42.8 ± 0.6 | 124 ± 2 |
| С | 0.10 | | 41.3 ± 0.5 | 117 ± 2 |
| (1.70) | 0.20 | | 40.2 ± 0.6 | 111 ± 2 |
| | 0.51 | | 40.1 ± 0.5 | 109 ± 2 |
| | 1.05 | | 38.1 ± 0.4 | 100 ± 2 |

| Т (°С) | Ι | $\Delta_{\rm r} H_{\rm m}$ (kJmol ⁻¹) | $\frac{\Delta_{\rm r}S_{\rm m}}{(\rm JK^{-1}mol^{-1})}$ | References |
|-------------|--------|---|---|--|
| 0 - 30 | 0 | $43.4\pm3.0^{\text{a}}$ | 136 ± 11^{a} | this work |
| | 0.15 m | $41.6\pm2.8^{\rm a}$ | 117 ± 10^{a} | uns work |
| 10 - 150 | 0 | 46.9 ± 9.0 | 147 ± 30 | Ref. [3] |
| 25 - 150 | 0 | 42.9 ± 3.3^{b} | 135 ± 10^{b} | Ref. [4] |
| 0 - 150 | 0 | $43.3 \pm 2.2^{\circ}$ | $136 \pm 7^{\circ}$ | this work |
| 15.2 – 24.7 | 0.19 M | 44.3 ± 6 | 126 ± 20 | Ref. [S1], re-estimated in Ref.[5] |
| 10, 43 | 0.5 M | 46.9 ± 3 | 129 ± 10 | Ref. [S2], re-estimated in Ref.[5] |
| 25 - 100 | 0.5 m | 42 ± 7 | - | Ref. [S3]. |
| 50 - 125 | 0.99 m | 45 ± 7 | - | re-estimated in |
| 25 - 150 | 0 | 46 ± 4 | 143 ± 14 | Ref.[5] |

Table S5. Comparison of the reaction enthalpy and entropy data measured in this work and those from literatures for the first hydrolysis of U^{4+} in aqueous H/NaClO₄ solution.

^a Data taken from Table 3 in the main text.

^b Data calculated from the plot of Fig. S6 using $\log^* \beta_1^{\circ}$ values listed in Table 9.6 of Ref. [4].

^c Reestimated values from the combined data from Table 3 and Ref. [4](see Fig. S6).

| Temp. (°C) | I (mol kg ⁻¹) | $\log^*\beta$ (accepted) | $\log^*\beta$ +6D-loga(H ₂ O) | Reference |
|---------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| 25 | 0.017 | $-(0.92 \pm 0.17)$ | -0.587 | |
| 25 | 0.033 | $-(1.07 \pm 0.17)$ | -0.634 | |
| 25 | 0.035 | $-(1.00 \pm 0.17)$ | -0.553 | |
| 25 | 0.045 | $-(1.10 \pm 0.17)$ | -0.608 | |
| 25 | 0.063 | $-(1.14 \pm 0.17)$ | -0.582 | |
| 25 | 0.111 | $-(1.22 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.540 | |
| 25 | 0.111 | $-(1.28 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.600 | |
| 25 | 0.121 | $-(1.23 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.530 | D-£ [94] |
| 25 | 0.121 | $-(1.29 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.590 | Kel. [84] |
| 25 | 0.274 | $-(1.35 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.450 | |
| 25 | 0.513 | $-(1.53 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.468 | |
| 25 | 0.534 | $-(1.50 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.427 | |
| 25 | 0.534 | $-(1.49 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.417 | |
| 25 | 0.565 | $-(1.44 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.353 | |
| 25 | 1.06 | $-(1.54 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.289 | |
| 25 | 2.21 | $-(1.59 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.153 | Ref. [4] |
| 25 | 3.5 | $-(1.88 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.331 | Ref. [S5] |
| 25 | 2.21 | $-(1.64 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.203 | Ref. [S6] |
| 25 | 3.5 | $-(1.58 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.031 | Ref. [S7] |
| 24.7 | 0.192 | $-(1.08 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.270 | Ref. [S1] |
| 25 | 1.05 | $-(1.61 \pm 0.09)$ | -0.361 | Ref. [S8] |
| 25 | 3.5 | $-(1.55 \pm 0.10)$ | -0.001 | Ref. [S9] |
| 25 | 0.25 | $-(1.44 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.564 | |
| 25 | 0.36 | $-(1.30 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.330 | |
| 25 | 0.48 | $-(1.39 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.345 | |
| 25 | 0.51 | $-(1.21 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.149 | |
| 25 | 0.65 | $-(1.31 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.186 | Ref. [S3] |
| 25 | 0.75 | $-(1.44 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.278 | |
| 25 | 0.86 | $-(1.54 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.343 | |
| 25 | 0.99 | $-(1.68 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.446 | |
| 25 | 1.09 | $-(1.72 \pm 0.20)$ | -0.461 | |
| 26 | 0.02 | $-(0.94 \pm 0.06)$ | -0.586 | |
| 26 | 0.05 | $-(1.05 \pm 0.07)$ | -0.541 | |
| 26 | 0.101 | $-(1.17 \pm 0.06)$ | -0.506 | This work |
| 26 | 0.202 | $-(1.25 \pm 0.04)$ | -0.425 | |
| 26 | 0.513 | $-(1.37 \pm 0.05)$ | -0.311 | (Table 3 of the main text) |
| 26 | 1.051 | $-(1.48 \pm 0.05)$ | -0.228 | |
| 26 | 2.091 | $-(1.55 \pm 0.03)$ | -0.131 | |

Table S6. Stability constants for the first hydrolysis of U^{4+} , which were used in Fig. S5.

[Figures]



Fig. S1. Electronic energy states of U^{4+} (*5f*²). The arrow denotes for the transition to the UV region. (adapted from Ref. [23] in the main text)



Fig. S2. Absorption spectra of D₂O solutions containing U(IV) (0.7 mM) in the UV region (OPL = 1 mm, $I \sim [DCIO_4]$, H/D in solution = ~ 0.01). The absorption spectra are nearly identical with those obtained in the HClO₄/H₂O solution as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 in the main text.



Fig. S3. Temperature-dependent changes of the absorption spectrum of aqueous solutions at $pH_c = 1.70$ and I = 0.15 m in the (a) UV region and (b) visible regions (OPL = 1 mm and 10 mm; [U(IV)], 0.7 mM and 2.8 mM, respectively).



Fig. S4. Van't Hoff plot using $\log^* \beta_1^{\circ}(T)$ calculated from the ionic strength correction shown in Fig. 4(c) (Test C at pH_c = 1.70, 0 – 30 °C). Dotted lines indicate linear fit results. The standard state constants, $\Delta_r H_m^{\circ}$ and $\Delta_r S_m^{\circ}$, were determined to 43.0 ± 3.2 kJmol⁻¹ and 134 ± 11 JK⁻¹mol⁻¹, respectively, which are within the uncertainty range of the representative values in this work as shown in Table 3.



Fig. S5. Ionic strength dependence of $\log^*\beta_1$ for the first hydrolysis of U⁴⁺ in perchlorate media. All available stability constants at 25 °C in the literature and those in Table 3 in the main text are combined, which are listed in Table S6. The solid line is the non-linear regression fitting result for the whole data by using the two-parameter SIT model ($\Delta \varepsilon = \Delta \varepsilon_1 + \Delta \varepsilon_2 \log I$, see Eq. (S4)) as described in Ref. [4]. As a result two terms of ion-interaction coefficients ($\Delta \varepsilon_1$ and $\Delta \varepsilon_2$) and $\log^*\beta_1^{\circ}$ are derived and summarized in the table below.

$$Y = \log^* \beta_1 + 6D(I_m) - \log a_{H_2O} = \log^* \beta_1^{\mathbf{o}} - I_m (\Delta \varepsilon_1 + \Delta \varepsilon_2 \log I_m)$$
(S4)

| $\Delta \epsilon_1$ (kg mol ⁻¹) | $\Delta \epsilon_2$ (kg mol ⁻¹) | $\log^* \beta_1^\circ$ |
|--|---|------------------------|
| $-(0.30 \pm 0.05)$ | 0.32 ± 0.08 | $-(0.59 \pm 0.08)$ |

* Note that non-weighted regression analysis and Levenberg Marquardt iteration algorithm were used.



Fig. S6. Van't Hoff plot using the combined $\log^*\beta_1^{\circ}(T)$ data from (a) this work (Table 3 in the main text) and (b) Ref. [4] (Table 9.6, 25 - 150 °C). The dotted line indicates a weighted linear fit result. The new standard state constants, $\Delta_r H_m^{\circ}$ and $\Delta_r S_m^{\circ}$, are determined to $43.3 \pm 2.2 \text{ kJmol}^{-1}$ and $136 \pm 7 \text{ JK}^{-1}\text{mol}^{-1}$, respectively. The constants calculated for the data only from (b) are also shown in Table S5.



Fig. S7. Residual plot (bottom) obtained after the kinetic reaction modeling analysis of the spectrophotometric data set of Fig. 6(a) in the main text.



Fig. S8. Kinetic spectral data demonstrating the irreversible evolution of the intermediate (M) at 60 °C (OPL = 10 mm; [U(IV)] = 1.0 mM; pH 2.2; I = 0.1 m). The reaction temperature lowered to 25 °C after 10 min when the B_M3 band of M was evident. In the (c) spectrum the peak of the B_M3 did not disappear, instead, it increased during the period of temperature change from 60 to 25 °C. This strongly supports that the first step (k_1) of the proposed U(IV)-NP formation scheme is kinetically irreversible.

[References]

- S1. R. H. Betts, Can. J. Chem., 1955, 33, 1775-1779.
- S2. K.A. Kraus, F. Nelson, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1955, 77, 3721-3722.
- S3. N. M. Nikolaeva, Izv.Sib.Otd. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Khim. Nauk, 1978, 4, 91-95.
- S4. K.A. Kraus, F. Nelson, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1950, 72, 3901-3906.
- S5. S. Hietanen, Acta Chem. Scand., 1956, 10, 1531-1546.
- S6. J.C. Sullivan, and J.C. Hindman, J. Phys. Chem., 1959, 63, 1332-1333.
- S7. I. Grenthe, G. Bidoglio, N. Omenetto, Inorg. Chem., 1989, 28, 71-74.
- S8. C. Ekberg, P. Brown, J. Comarmond, and Y. Albinsson, *Mater. Res. Soc. Symp. Proc.*, 2001, 663, 1091–1099.
- S9. C. Manfredi, V. Caruso, E. Vasca, S. Vero, E. Ventimiglia, G. Palladino, and D. Ferri, *J. Solution Chem.*, 2006, **35**, 927–937.