Stability of Studtite in Aqueous Suspension: Impact of HCO$_3^-$ and Ionizing Radiation on the Dynamics of Dissolution
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ABSTRACT: In a geological repository for spent nuclear fuel, studtite (UO$_2$O$_2$(H$_2$O)$_4$) may form on the fuel surface when in contact with groundwater under certain conditions. Studtite has a very low solubility and could thereby reduce the reactivity of spent nuclear fuel toward radiolytic oxidants. This would inhibit the dissolution of the fuel matrix and thereby also the spreading of radionuclides. It is therefore important to investigate the stability of studtite under conditions that may influence its stability. In this work we have studied the kinetics of studtite dissolution in aqueous suspensions containing no added HCO$_3^-$ and with 10 mM HCO$_3$-. The same type of experiment was performed also with solutions containing 0.2 mM H$_2$O$_2$. The solubility of studtite in the suspensions containing no added HCO$_3^-$ is very low as expected, while the solubility in solutions containing 10 mM HCO$_3^-$ is significantly higher. This is attributed to the formation of uranyl−carbonate and uranyl−peroxo−carbonate complexes. In 0.2 mM H$_2$O$_2$ and 10 mM HCO$_3^-$ the observed solubility of U(VI) seems unaffected by the presence of H$_2$O$_2$. Again, this can be rationalized by the formation of uranyl−peroxo−carbonate complexes. It is interesting to note that H$_2$O$_2$ appears to be catalytically decomposed in solutions containing uranyl−carbonate complexes. In addition, γ-radiation-induced dissolution of studtite in HCO$_3^-$ deficient solutions and in 10 mM HCO$_3^-$ was studied. The dissolution rate was found to be extremely high in HCO$_3^-$ under γ-irradiation. This is attributed to a combination of radiolytic degradation of H$_2$O$_2$ and the formation of uranyl−peroxo−carbonate complexes keeping the concentration of free H$_2$O$_2$ at a very low level and thereby driving the dissolution process.
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INTRODUCTION

In several countries, deep geological repositories are considered the safest alternative for long-term disposal of spent nuclear fuel. Given the enormously long-time spans during which the integrity of the barriers used in the repository must remain intact to guarantee the safety of the repository, it is of utmost importance to study every possible process that could affect the barriers. To be able to assess the consequences of multiple barrier failure, it is also essential to study the kinetics and mechanisms of processes that could occur when the spent nuclear fuel comes in contact with groundwater, in particular processes that affect the spreading of radionuclides from the spent nuclear fuel. The most common types of commercial nuclear fuel are based on UO$_2$, and since the fissile fraction of uranium in the fuel is fairly low, UO$_2$ is also the main constituent of the spent nuclear fuel. In addition to UO$_2$, spent nuclear fuel contains ca. 5% radioactive fission products and heavier actinides. Radiotoxic nuclides are assumed to be released to the groundwater, mainly upon dissolution of the UO$_2$−matrix. At potential deep geological repository sites, the groundwater is usually reducing, and under these conditions the solubility of UO$_2$ is very low. However, the ionizing radiation emitted from the spent nuclear fuel will be absorbed by the groundwater, resulting in water radiolysis. Radiolysis of water produces oxidants (HO$_2$, H$_2$O$_2$, and HO$_2^-$) as well as reductants (e$_{aq}^-$, H$_2$, and H$_2$O). For kinetic reasons, the surface reactions will, at least initially, be dominated by the oxidants which drastically increase the solubility of the UO$_2$−matrix (U(VI) being several orders of magnitude more soluble than U(IV)). The dissolution process is further accelerated by the common groundwater constituent HCO$_3^-$ since UO$_2^{2+}$ readily forms highly soluble carbonate complexes. Among the radiolytic oxidants, H$_2$O$_2$ has been shown to dominate the oxidative dissolution of UO$_2$ under repository conditions. UO$_2$ can react with UO$_2^{2+}$ to form studtite, (UO$_2$)$_2$O$_2$(H$_2$O)$_4$ or its dehydration product metastudtite, (UO$_2$)$_2$O$_2$(H$_2$O)$_2$. These two phases have very low solubilities, and to the best of our knowledge, never been reported. However, in HCO$_3^-$ deficient systems, studtite or metastudtite was found to precipitate on
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the surface of UO₂ and thereby reduce its reactivity. In the presence of H₂O₂, studtite formation is thermodynamically favorable over formation of uranyl oxide hydrates and uranyl silicates. The existence of studtite and metastudtite on the surface of commercial spent nuclear fuel was confirmed by Hanson et al. after immersing fuel fragments in deionized water over 2 years at room temperature. In their experiments, X-ray diffraction (XRD) showed that studtite and UO₂ were the major phases in all the samples, while metastudtite was only identified in the solids floating at the sample air-water interface. The source of H₂O₂ in these experiments was water radiolysis. Moreover, oxidative dissolution experiments on UO₂ were performed by Clarens et al. and have shown that at a low H₂O₂ concentration (0.5 mM), a steady-state concentration increased as a function of time. However, at a higher H₂O₂ concentration (0.5 mM), a steady-state concentration of uranium as well as a yellow precipitate were observed. The latter was identified as studtite. Hence, the formation of studtite on the surface of spent nuclear fuel could affect the long-term stability of spent nuclear fuel in a repository after the intrusion of groundwater. Recently, Kim et al. studied the kinetics of studtite dissolution under various conditions of geochemical relevance.

It is interesting to note that even though the solubility of studtite is quite low in general, there is a growing body of evidence showing that nanocluster formation can efficiently solubilize studtite under certain conditions. Uranyl peroxide nanoclusters can also be formed from other solid uranium compounds than studtite. In addition, uranyl has been shown to form various complexes with hydrogen peroxide and carbonate. Interestingly, the presence of carbonate prevents the formation of larger clusters.

In this work, the dissolution dynamics of studtite in HCO₃⁻ deficient and 10 mM HCO₃⁻ solution have been studied experimentally to assess the impact of HCO₃⁻. The released H₂O₂ and U(VI) were monitored as a function of time. Moreover, the influence of H₂O₂ on the stability of studtite as well as the influence of studtite on the stability of H₂O₂ were investigated experimentally. To study the effects of irradiation, dissolution experiments in the presence and absence of HCO₃⁻ under continuous exposure to γ-radiation were conducted.

### EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

All solutions used during the experiments were prepared using Milli-Q water (18.2 MΩ cm). Chemicals were of reagent grade unless otherwise stated.

The concentrations of H₂O₂ were measured using the Ghormley triiodide method where I⁻ is oxidized to I₃⁻ by H₂O₂. The absorbance of I₃⁻ was measured at λ = 360 nm by UV/vis spectrophotometry.

The concentrations of U(VI) were measured using the Arsenazo III method, where uranyl forms a complex with the Arsenazo III reagent in acid media. The absorbance of the complex is measured at λ = 555 nm by UV/vis spectrophotometry.

**Synthesis of Studtite.** For each individual experiment a batch of 40 mg of studtite was precipitated from aqueous solution by adding 40 mM H₂O₂ to 4.3 mM uranyl nitrate (UO₂(NO₃)₂·6H₂O). The uranyl solution was prepared by dissolving 34 mg of uranyl nitrate in 25 mL of water with an initial pH of 3.5 (acidified by HCl). An excess of H₂O₂ was used to maximize product formation. The synthesis was carried out at room temperature with stirring for 24 h and was protected from light. After the synthesis, the uranyl concentrations were measured and found to be below the detection limit of the method. The synthesized studtite powder was washed twice with water to remove the remaining H₂O₂ and unreacted uranyl nitrate. During each washing step, the original liquid was replaced with 25 mL of water. Afterward, the suspension was left to resediment overnight before the second washing step.

**Solid Phase Characterization.** Synthesized studtite was characterized using powder X-ray diffraction (XRD). XRD patterns were recorded at room temperature on a PANalytical X'Pert PRO diffractometer using a Bragg–Brentano geometry and Cu Kα radiation (1.5418 Å) in a 2θ range between 10° and 110°. The powder sample was grounded manually in an agate mortar, and a silicon wafer was used as sample holder.

**Studtite Dissolution Kinetics.** After washing each 40 mg studtite batch with water (as described above), we replaced the excess solution once more with 25 mL of aqueous solution containing no added HCO₃⁻ or containing 10 mM HCO₃⁻ (the latter was added to the solution after weighing an appropriate amount of NaHCO₃). Immediately after adding the aqueous solution, we measured the concentrations of H₂O₂ and U(VI) as a function of time. Each sample container was sealed with a rubber septum and continuously purged with N₂ at room temperature. For each H₂O₂ and U(VI) measurement, 1.5 mL of aliquots were taken from the studtite suspension and filtered through 0.2 μm cellulose acetate syringe filters. For each measurement, the H₂O₂ and U(VI) determinations were done in duplicate. The difference between the duplicate measurements was less than 4.5 μM and 14 μM, respectively, for H₂O₂ and U(VI). All experiments were performed at least three times. The error bars in the figures reflect the results of these experiments and are based on the standard deviation derived from the three repetitions of each experiment.

The influence of H₂O₂ on the studtite dissolution kinetics in bicarbonate-deficient and 10 mM bicarbonate solutions was studied by adding H₂O₂ to a concentration of 0.2 mM at the start of the experiment.

The pH values of the solutions were measured before and after each experiment. No buffer was added to the solutions without added HCO₃⁻.

**Irradiation Experiments.** γ-Irradiation experiments were carried out after adding 25 mM of aqueous solution containing no added or containing 10 mM HCO₃⁻ to the washed precipitate. The glass vials containing the aqueous powder suspensions were sealed by rubber septa and irradiated in a Cs-137 gamma source for 8 h (Gammacell 1000 Elite, MDS Nordion). The dose rate of 0.11 Gy s⁻¹ was determined by Fricke dosimetry. All suspensions were continuously purged with N₂ or N₂/O₂. Next, 1.5 μL aliquots were taken from the powder suspensions before irradiation and then every hour to measure the concentrations of H₂O₂ and U(VI). The pH values of the solutions were measured before and after exposure to ionizing radiation.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Solid Phase Characterization.** The solid product from the synthesis was originally dried in a glovebox under Ar atmosphere. To assess the impact of the atmosphere during drying, we also dried solid samples in air at room temperature for 24 h. The resulting powder XRD patterns are shown in Figure 1.

It is interesting to note that the sample dried in the glovebox under Ar atmosphere is identified as metastudtite while the sample dried in air is identified as studtite. The reason for forming metastudtite when drying the solid in the glovebox is probably the extremely dry (low humidity) atmosphere of the glovebox that promotes dehydration of the product.

**Studtite Dissolution Kinetics.** As the synthesized solid was washed but not dried prior to the dissolution experiments, there was no risk of converting studtite into metastudtite. The results of the dissolution experiments performed in aqueous
suspending the UO2(O2)2− complex was the dominating complex at [HCO3−] > 10−3 M while UO2(CO3)3−4− dominates at [HCO3−] ≥ 10−3 M. This could explain why the concentration dependence on the kinetics changes.

The rate of dissolution (in M s−1) at 10−3 M HCO3− appears to be higher in the present work in comparison to the work by Kim et al.12 This is most probably attributed to the significantly larger surface area to solution volume ratio used in the present work (assuming similar specific surface areas for the synthetic studtite).

In the present experiments, H2O2 appears to have reached a maximum concentration already within 7 h, whereas the U(VI) concentration keeps increasing throughout the experiment. The ratio between the concentrations of H2O2 and U(VI) upon dissolution of studtite should be 1:1. The fact that the U(VI) concentration is more than twice as high as compared to H2O2 implies that H2O2 is consumed in the system. The postulated consumption of H2O2 in the system would contribute to further dissolution of studtite from a strictly thermodynamical point of view. It should be noted that the formation of soluble uranyl-peroxo nanoclusters has only been observed in alkaline solutions (pH > 12) and in solutions containing very high concentrations of H2O2 at slightly lower pH (>10).35,36 Hence, it is very unlikely that cluster formation contributes to the dissolution of studtite under the conditions used in this work.

The Influence of H2O2 on Studtite Dissolution. Given that the dissolution equilibrium only accounts for the formation of uranyl-carbonate complexes, the presence of H2O2 would be expected to suppress the dissolution of studtite also in HCO3− containing solution. The results from dissolution experiments performed with an initial H2O2 concentration of 0.2 mM are presented in Figures 3a and 3b.

Figure 3a shows the dissolution kinetics of studtite in 0.2 mM H2O2 in the absence of added HCO3−. As can be seen, the concentration of U(VI) is close to the detection limit (1 μM) and does not increase with time. The H2O2 concentration remains constant at about 0.2 mM. This shows that the studtite surface is not an active catalyst for H2O2 decomposition. Numerous oxide surfaces, including UO2, have been shown to catalyze the decomposition of H2O2 to H2O and O2 with the intermediate formation of surface-bound hydroxyl radicals.38–40 The present results imply that covering the UO2 surface with studtite would reduce the surface reactivity toward H2O2.
independent of the H2O2 concentration, which is indeed H2O2 in 25 mL of 10 mM HCO3−. Hence, the solubility of studtite would appear to be H2O2 in 25 mL of 10 mM HCO3−. The third set of solutions, 0.1 mM NaNO3 and 0.1 mM H2O2 were reduced by 80% during the time of the experiment. It should be noted that no significant H2O2 consumption can be observed for samples not containing U(VI) (i.e., in the second and third sets of solutions, data not shown). Hence, H2O2 must be considered stable at the present pH and HCO3− concentration. What is really interesting here is the fact that the U(VI) concentration remains constant throughout the experiment, implying that the uranyl−carbonate complex acts as a catalyst for H2O2 decomposition. Further studies of this reaction are currently underway.

Kim et al. also studied the influence of H2O2 on the dissolution of studtite.12 They used aqueous solutions spiked with 10−3, 10−2, and 10−1 M H2O2. The results show increasing initial dissolution with increasing H2O2 concentration followed by a slower decrease in uranium concentration. Interestingly, the fastest initial dissolution and the highest concentration of dissolved uranium were observed at a very high H2O2 concentration. Under similar conditions, soluble uranyl−peroxide nanoclusters have been shown to form, provided that the pH is high enough.31

γ-Irradiation Experiments. The concentrations of U(VI) and H2O2 as a function of irradiation time for aqueous suspensions of studtite continuously purged with N2 are presented in Figure 5.

Figure 3b shows the dissolution kinetics of studtite in 10 mM HCO3− and an initial H2O2 concentration of 0.2 mM. Both the concentrations of H2O2 and U(VI) reach a maximum within 7 h, and the maximum concentration of dissolved U(VI) is almost the same as in the absence of initial H2O2. Hence, the solubility of studtite would appear to be independent of the H2O2 concentration, which is indeed unexpected if only the uranyl−carbonate complex is considered. From the known equilibrium constants we can calculate the solubility under the present conditions to be approximately 7 μM, which is almost one order of magnitude below the observed U(VI) concentration. However, if formation of uranyl−peroxo−carbonate complexes is also considered (primarily (UO2)(O2)(CO3)2− and (UO2)(O2)(CO3)4+),16 the experimentally observed concentrations are not unreasonable. Interestingly, both the concentrations of U(VI) and H2O2 decrease after reaching a maximum. The decrease in U(VI) concentration is moderate while the H2O2 concentration is reduced by 80% during the time of the experiment.

To explore the reason why the H2O2 released during studtite dissolution in HCO3− is slowly consumed, we prepared three different types of solutions and measured the concentrations of H2O2 as well as U(VI) (when applicable) over time. The first set of solutions contained 0.05 mM UO2(NO3)2 and 0.1 mM H2O2 in 25 mL of 10 mM HCO3−. The second set of solutions contained 0.1 mM H2O2 in 25 mL of 10 mM HCO3−. In the third set of solutions, 0.1 mM NaNO3 and 0.1 mM H2O2 were added to 25 mL of 10 mM HCO3−. The results for set number 1 can be seen in Figure 4.

As can be seen in Figure 4, H2O2 is almost completely consumed during the time frame of the experiment. It should be noted that no significant H2O2 consumption can be observed for samples not containing U(VI) (i.e., in the second and third sets of solutions, data not shown). Hence, H2O2 must be considered stable at the present pH and HCO3− concentration. What is really interesting here is the fact that the U(VI) concentration remains constant throughout the experiment, implying that the uranyl−carbonate complex acts as a catalyst for H2O2 decomposition. Further studies of this reaction are currently underway.

Kim et al. also studied the influence of H2O2 on the dissolution of studtite.12 They used aqueous solutions spiked with 10−3, 10−2, and 10−1 M H2O2. The results show increasing initial dissolution with increasing H2O2 concentration followed by a slower decrease in uranium concentration. Interestingly, the fastest initial dissolution and the highest concentration of dissolved uranium were observed at a very high H2O2 concentration. Under similar conditions, soluble uranyl−peroxide nanoclusters have been shown to form, provided that the pH is high enough.31

Figure 5. Concentrations of H2O2 (black dots) and U(VI) (red triangles) as a function of irradiation time for aqueous studtite powder suspensions (0 mM HCO3−) exposed to γ-radiation.

As can be seen, the concentrations of H2O2 and U(VI) do not increase after 8 h, indicating that the solubility of studtite is very low in pure water also when exposed to γ-radiation. The detection limit for H2O2 is around 5 μM, and for U(VI) it is around 1 μM. Hence, the concentrations in Figure 5 are, in general, below the detection limit, and the apparent changes in the H2O2 concentration with time are insignificant.

The results from the corresponding experiments using aqueous solutions containing 10 mM HCO3− are presented in Figures 6a and 6b, together with the corresponding data for the unirradiated suspensions.

The results are truly intriguing as it is quite clear that irradiation of the suspensions has a dramatic impact on the dissolution of studtite. After 8 h of irradiation, the U(VI)

Figure 4. H2O2 and U(VI) concentrations as a function of time in an aqueous solution originally containing 0.1 mM H2O2, 0.05 mM U(VI), and 10 mM HCO3−.
concentration (0.72 mM) is approximately 10 times higher than that in the absence of irradiation (0.07 mM). The concentration of H$_2$O$_2$ is also higher in the irradiated system as compared to the unirradiated system but only by a factor of 3. It is also quite clear that the concentration of U(VI) in the irradiated solution is about seven times higher than the concentration of H$_2$O$_2$ in the same solution. In the unirradiated solution the corresponding ratio is around two. The pH value of the solution before irradiation was 8.47, and the pH value after irradiation was 9.91. The relatively low H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations compared to U(VI) can partly be explained by H$_2$O$_2$ reacting with the aqueous radiolysis products. In fact, when performing a numerical simulation of the radiation chemistry of water assuming the release of H$_2$O$_2$ (in addition to radiolytically formed H$_2$O) to occur at the same rate as the release of uranium and using the dose rate of the experiment, the predicted evolution of the H$_2$O$_2$ concentration in solution is fairly close to the experimentally observed trend. However, the high concentrations of U(VI) in the irradiated system cannot be attributed to the solubility of studtite taking only the uranyl–carbonate complex into account.

To try to shed some light on the mechanism of the radiation-induced dissolution of studtite, we repeated the experiment purging with N$_2$O instead of N$_2$. In N$_2$O-saturated solutions, the hydrated electron is rapidly converted to a hydroxyl radical according to reactions 1 and 2.

\[ e^{-}_{eq} + N_2O \rightarrow N_2 + O^*^- \]  
\[ O^*^- + H_2O \rightarrow HO^* + HO^- \]  

(1)  
(2)

Hence, the yield of reducing radicals is drastically reduced while the yield of hydroxyl radicals is doubled. In a solution containing HCO$_3^-$, the hydroxyl radical is converted into carbonate radical anions (CO$_3^{2-}$). In other words, purging with N$_2$O will change the chemical conditions significantly. A possible reason for the radiation-induced dissolution of studtite could be a reaction between studtite and the hydrated electron reducing the peroxide moiety of studtite and thereby solubilizing the uranyl. If this process is indeed responsible for the observed dissolution, the experiment with N$_2$O purging will display slower dissolution. The results are presented in Figures 7a and 7b.

As can be seen in Figures 7a and 7b, there are no significant differences in either the H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations or the U(VI) concentrations between the N$_2$O- and the N$_2$-purged suspensions. This clearly shows that the hydrated electron is not involved in the dissolution process. It is difficult to imagine that a radiolytic oxidant would be responsible for the dissolution as studtite is already oxidized. Nevertheless, doubling the yield of oxidative radicals does not have an appreciable effect on the dissolution. Another plausible reason would be direct absorption of the radiation energy by the solid. To investigate this, three samples of 40 mg of studtite powder each were dried in air, and then two of the samples were irradiated for 8 h (corresponding to 3.2 kGy). One dried and irradiated sample was taken for powder XRD analysis. The XRD pattern shows that there was no detectable change in the studtite crystal structure or in its crystallinity. While for the other samples (one irradiated and one unirradiated), 25 mL of aqueous solution containing 10 mM HCO$_3^-$ was added, and the H$_2$O$_2$ and U(VI) concentrations were monitored over time. The results are presented in Figures 8a and 8b.

![Figure 8](image)

**Figure 8.** H$_2$O$_2$ (a) and U(VI) (b) concentrations as a function of time for dried (black dots) and dried and irradiated (red triangles) studtite powders immersed in aqueous solutions containing 10 mM HCO$_3^-$.  

As can be seen in Figures 8a and 8b, the differences in H$_2$O$_2$ and U(VI) concentrations between the irradiated and unirradiated samples are very small. This implies that the relatively extreme dissolution observed for studtite suspensions containing HCO$_3^-$ continuously exposed to $\gamma$-radiation cannot be attributed to permanent chemical changes due to direct absorption of the radiation by the solid. This is further evidenced by the fact that dry irradiation of studtite does not induce detectable changes in the XRD pattern. It is important to note that radiation enhanced dissolution of studtite is only observed for suspensions containing HCO$_3^-$. Since changing the gas atmosphere from N$_2$ to N$_2$O has an insignificant effect on the dissolution kinetics, we can rule out the active involvement of $e^{-}_{eq}$ as well as CO$_3^{2-}$ in this process.

Given the experimental observations presented above, the high U(VI) concentrations obtained upon irradiation of aqueous studtite suspensions containing HCO$_3^-$ can most probably be explained by the increase in pH which drastically increases the stability of some of the uranyl–peroxo–carbonate complexes (mainly (UO$_2$)(O$_2$)(CO$_3$)$_2^{2-}$) and thereby reduces the concentration of free H$_2$O$_2$ to very low levels. The direct consequence of this is that the solubility of studtite increases. Hence, the combination of radiolytic degradation of H$_2$O$_2$ and formation of uranyl–peroxo–carbonate complexes keeps the concentration of free H$_2$O$_2$ at a very low level and thereby drives the dissolution process.

These results clearly show that radiation driven dissolution of studtite would have a significant impact on the stability of studtite under deep repository conditions.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The present work shows that the solubility of studtite in the suspensions without added HCO$_3^-$ is very low. In suspensions containing 10 mM HCO$_3^-$, the observed solubility is...
considerably higher. This is attributed to the formation of uranyl-carbonate and uranyl-peroxo-carbonate complexes. In the presence of 0.2 mM H$_2$O$_2$ and 10 mM HCO$_3^-$ the solubility is higher than expected if only the carbonate complex is accounted for but reasonable if also the uranyl-peroxo-carbonate complexes are considered. Interestingly, the experiments show that H$_2$O$_2$ is catalytically decomposed in the presence of uranyl-carbonate.

The experiments also show that H$_2$O$_2$ does not display any appreciable reactivity toward studtite surfaces.

Upon exposure to $\gamma$-radiation, studtite in aqueous suspension containing 10 mM HCO$_3^-$ rapidly dissolves. The very rapid dissolution is attributed to a combination of radiolytic degradation of H$_2$O$_2$ and formation of uranyl-peroxo-carbonate complexes, keeping the concentration of free H$_2$O$_2$ at a very low level and thereby driving the dissolution process.
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