

# **Reduced partition function ratios of iron and oxygen in goethite**

Marc Blanchard, N. Dauphas, M.Y. Hu, M. Roskosz, E.E. Alp, D.C. Golden,

C.K. Sio, F.L.H. Tissot, J. Zhao, L. Gao, et al.

# **To cite this version:**

Marc Blanchard, N. Dauphas, M.Y. Hu, M. Roskosz, E.E. Alp, et al.. Reduced partition function ratios of iron and oxygen in goethite. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 2014, 151, pp.19-33.  $10.1016/j.gca.2014.12.006$ . hal-01096956

# **HAL Id: hal-01096956 <https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01096956v1>**

Submitted on 18 Dec 2014

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**Abstract** 

First-principles calculations based on the density functional theory (DFT) with or without the addition of a Hubbard *U* correction, are performed on goethite in order 32 to determine the iron and oxygen reduced partition function ratios ( $\beta$ -factors). The 33 calculated iron phonon density of states (pDOS), force constant and  $\beta$ -factor are 34 compared with reevaluated experimental  $\beta$ -factors obtained from Nuclear Resonant Inelastic X-ray Scattering (NRIXS) measurements. The reappraisal of old experimental data is motivated by the erroneous previous interpretation of the low-and high-energy ends of the NRIXS spectrum of goethite and jarosite samples (Dauphas et al. 2012). Here the NRIXS data are analyzed using the SciPhon software that corrects for non-constant baseline. New NRIXS measurements also demonstrate the reproducibility of the results. Unlike for hematite and pyrite, a significant discrepancy remains between DFT, NRIXS and the existing Mössbauer-derived data. Calculations suggest a slight overestimation of the NRIXS signal possibly related to the baseline definition. The intrinsic features of the samples studied by NRIXS and Mössbauer spectroscopy may also contribute to the discrepancy (*e.g*. internal structural and/or chemical defects, microstructure, surface contribution). As for 46 oxygen, DFT results indicate that goethite and hematite have similar  $\beta$ -factors, which suggests almost no fractionation between the two minerals at equilibrium.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

For decades now, the isotopic compositions of natural samples have been measured and found countless applications in all branches of geosciences (see for reviews, Valley and Cole, 2001; Johnson et al. 2004; Eiler et al. 2014). In the meantime, isotope exchange experiments were performed to improve our understanding of the processes responsible for stable isotope fractionation. More recently, new approaches have emerged and are contributing to this field of research. 56 First-principles calculations give reduced partition function ratios (also called  $\beta$ -factors) that can be combined for two phases in order to obtain the equilibrium isotope 58 fractionation factor ( $\alpha$ -factor), which is the quantity usually measured. These theoretical methods are also of great interest for investigating the mechanisms controlling the isotope fractionation at the molecular scale. For Mössbauer active 61 elements (like iron),  $\beta$ -factors can also be obtained using Mössbauer spectroscopy through the measurement of the temperature dependence of the isomer shift (Polyakov and Mineev, 2000) or using Nuclear Resonant Inelastic X-ray Scattering (NRIXS, Polyakov et al., 2005, 2007; Dauphas et al., 2012, 2014).

65 Dauphas et al. (2012) and Hu et al. (2013) reported NRIXS data for  ${}^{57}Fe$ -rich 66 goethite FeO(OH), hydronium-jarosite  $(H_3O)Fe_3(SO_4)_2(OH)_6$  and potassium jarosite 67 KFe<sub>3</sub>(SO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(OH)<sub>6</sub>. From such measurements, one can deduce iron  $\beta$ -factors as a function of temperature. Polyakov et al. (2007) had used projected partial phonon 69 density of states (pDOS) obtained using this technique to calculate  $\beta$ -factors for various phases. Dauphas et al. (2012) and Hu et al. (2013) used a different approach based on moment estimates of NRIXS scattering spectrum S(E), which simplifies evaluation of measurement uncertainties and potential systematic errors. The study of Dauphas et al. (2012) was the first of its kind in measuring NRIXS spectra

specifically for applications to isotope geochemistry. In doing so, they encountered a difficulty that had been unappreciated before concerning the baseline at low and high energies. Most previous studies in geosciences had focused on estimating the Debye sound velocity (Hu et al. 2003; Sturhahn and Jackson, 2007), from which compressional and shear wave velocities can be deduced if the bulk modulus and density of the phase are known. These estimates are derived from parts of the spectra 80 that are close to the elastic peak for the nuclear transition of  ${}^{57}$ Fe at 14.4125 keV. On 81 the other hand, the force constant, which controls  $\beta$ -factors, is heavily influenced by details of the spectrum at the low- and high-energy ends of the spectrum. As a result, little attention had been paid to the accuracy of force constant measurements by NRIXS. Dauphas et al. (2012) found that in some cases, significant counts were 85 present even at high energies. The projected partial phonon density of states,  $g(E)$ , and the scattering spectrum, S(E), never reached zero and as a result, the integrals that gave the force constants did not plateau for goethite and H-jarosite. These were interpreted to reflect the presence of multiple phonons at high energies. However, we were unable to replicate the measurements during another session of NRIXS measurements at the Advanced Photon Source synchrotron. This and other tests performed on other phases convinced us that the high counts in the tails are not from multiple phonons but rather reflect the presence of a non-constant baseline. To address this issue, Dauphas and collaborators have developed a software (SciPhon) that reliably corrects for non-constant baseline (Dauphas et al, 2014).

95 In the present study, the pDOS as well as the iron and oxygen  $\beta$ -factors of goethite are computed using first-principles calculations and compared to available experimental isotopic data. In parallel, the data published in Dauphas et al. (2012) have been re-evaluated using SciPhon and we present revised estimates for the force

constants of goethite and jarosite. To validate the approach and evaluate the long-term reproducibility of force constant measurements by NRIXS, we have analyzed the goethite sample two more times and the jarosite samples one more time. Those new results, together with a re-evaluation of previous data, are reported here.

- 
- 

## **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**2.1. NRIXS spectroscopy** 

Nuclear resonant inelastic X-ray scattering is a nuclear spectroscopic 107 technique that uses the nuclear transition of  ${}^{57}$ Fe at 14.4125 keV to probe the vibration properties of iron (Seto et al. 1995; Sturhahn et al. 1995). The method as implemented at sector 3-ID-B of the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory is briefly described hereafter. The incident beam is a pulsed X-ray beam of 70 ps duration and 153 ns interpulse duration. A monochromator restricts the energy spread of the incident beam to 1 meV. When the pulse hits the sample, X-rays are scattered by electrons and this electronic contribution is almost instantaneous. On the other 114 hand, the excited Fe nuclei have a finite lifetime of 141 ns and the electronic contribution can be eliminated from the signal by applying some time discrimination. The signal from NRIXS is measured using Avalanche Photodiodes (APD). The energy is scanned around the nominal resonant energy over a typical interval of -150 to +150 meV. When the photon energy is higher than the resonance energy, the excess energy can be lost to excitation of phonon modes in the lattice and the nuclear excitation can still occur (phonon creation). When the energy is lower than the nominal resonance energy, the energy deficit can be provided by lattice vibrations and the nuclear excitation can still occur (phonon annihilation).

123 From NRIXS spectra one can calculate  $\beta$ -factors by taking the moments of the 124 scattering spectrum S(E) (Dauphas et al. 2012; Hu et al. 2013) or the projected partial 125 phonon density of states g(E) (Polyakov et al. 2005, Dauphas et al. 2012). In the 126 present study, all samples were fine powders (isotropic) and the calculated pDOS 127 represents an average from contributions of all crystallographic orientations. The 128 pDOS is partial in the sense that NRIXS is only sensitive to  $57$  Fe. Using S(E), the 129 formula that gives  $\beta$ -factors is (Dauphas et al. 2012),

130 1000 ln 
$$
\beta \approx 1000 \left(\frac{M}{M^*} - 1\right) \frac{1}{E_R} \left[\frac{R_3^S}{8k^2T^2} - \frac{R_5^S - 10R_2^S R_3^S}{480k^4T^4} + \frac{R_7^S + 210 \left(R_2^S\right)^2 R_3^S - 35R_3^S R_4^S - 21R_2^S R_5^S}{20160k^6T^6}\right]
$$
  
131 , (Eq. 1)

132 where *M* and *M\** are the masses of the two isotopes considered (*e.g.*, 56 and 54), *ER* is 133 the free recoil energy (1.956 meV for  ${}^{57}Fe$ ), *k* is Boltzmann's constant, *T* is the temperature, 134 temperature, and  $R_i^S$  is the  $i^{th}$  centered moment of S given by  $R_i^S = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} S(E)(E - E_R)^i dE$ 135  $R_i^S = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} S(E)(E - E_R)^i dE$ . Equation (1) was derived by Dauphas et al. (2012) and 136 Hu et al. (2013) using two different mathematical approaches (expansions in powers 137 of temperature *vs*. thermalized moments).

138 The  $\beta$ -factors can also be calculated from  $g(E)$  using the formula that is valid for  $E/kT$ 139  $\leq 2\pi$  (Polyakov et al. 2005, Dauphas et al. 2012).

140 
$$
1000 \ln \beta \approx 1000 \left(\frac{M}{M^*} - 1\right) \left[\frac{m_2^g}{8k^2T^2} - \frac{m_4^g}{480k^4T^4} + \frac{m_6^g}{20160k^6T^6}\right],
$$
 (Eq. 2)

141 where  $m_i^g$  is the *i*<sup>th</sup> moment of *g* given by  $m_i^g = \int_0^{+\infty} g(E) E^i dE$ . Polyakov et al. (2005) 142 obtained this formula using perturbation theory and an expression of the kinetic 143 energy while Dauphas et al. (2012) obtained this formula using a Bernoulli expansion 144 of the reduced partition function ratio. In general,  $\beta$ -factors can be expressed as,

145 
$$
1000 \ln \beta = \frac{A_1}{T^2} + \frac{A_2}{T^4} + \frac{A_3}{T^6},
$$
 (Eq. 3)

where the coefficients *A1*, *A2*, and *A3* can be calculated from either Eq. 1 (S) or Eq. 2 (g). The pDOS *g* is calculated from *S* using a Fourier-Log decomposition (Johnson and Spence, 1974; Sturhahn et al. 1995; Sturhahn 2000; Kohn and Chumakov 2000) and Eqs. 1 and 2 are mathematically equivalent. In practice, Eq. 1 is easier to use as errors are not correlated between different energy channels and it is more straightforward to assess the effects of the data reduction procedure (*e.g.*, truncation 152 in energy, baseline subtraction) on the estimates of the  $\beta$ -factor coefficients. The above-mentioned equations can also be written as (Dauphas et al. 2012),

154 
$$
1000 \ln \beta = \frac{B_1 \langle F \rangle}{T^2} - \frac{B_2 \langle F \rangle^2}{T^4}, \qquad \text{(Eq. 4)}
$$

155 where  $B_1 = 2853$ ,  $B_2$  is a constant that depends on the shape of the pDOS and  $\langle F \rangle$  is 156 the mean force constant (in  $N/m$ ) of the bonds holding iron in position,

157 
$$
\langle F \rangle = \frac{M}{E_R \hbar^2} R_3^S = \frac{M}{\hbar^2} m_2^s.
$$
 (Eq. 5)

The same samples as those initially measured by Dauphas et al. (2012) were used in this study and details on the synthesis method can be found in Golden et al. (2008). 160 All samples were made starting with <sup>57</sup> Fe-rich metal (95 % *vs* 2.1 % natural abundance) as NRIXS is only sensitive to this Mössbauer isotope. The nature of the minerals analyzed was checked by X-ray powder diffraction (XRD). The Rietveld refinement (JADE software package, Materials Data Inc.) provided the following 164 unit-cell parameters for the goethite sample:  $a = 4.58$  Å,  $b = 9.94$  Å,  $c = 3.02$  Å (*Pbnm* space group). The particle sizes (equivalent sphere diameters of coherent domain sizes) were determined using the peak broadening of Rietveld-refined XRD, yielding 19.8 nm for goethite and 223.0 nm for K-Jarosite. Goethite particles are

usually acicular. In Dauphas et al 2012, the powdered samples were mounted in compressed pellets, which could impart preferential orientation of the samples, as rightly noticed by Frierdich et al. (2014). However, the latter measurements were done on the powdered samples mounted in vacuum grease at the tip of a kapton capillary, which should keep a random orientation of the particles. One or two APDs were mounted on the sides of the sample perpendicular to the incident beam, so as to capture the maximum solid angle of scattered X-rays. The forward signal was measured at the same time, providing an accurate estimate of the resolution function.

The data reduction was entirely done using a new software called SciPhon that is introduced briefly in Dauphas et al. (2014) and will be the scope of a forthcoming publication. The main difference with the data reduction protocol used by Dauphas et al. (2012) is the recognition that signal is present at the low and high energy ends of the spectrum at a level that is too high to be explained by the presence of multiple phonons. The approach used in SciPhon is to remove a linear baseline that is calculated by interpolating the data between the low and high-energy ends of the spectrum and truncating the data when the signal reaches a constant value. This is an effective method when a broad enough energy scan is acquired and one can clearly make the cut between what is signal and what is baseline. After truncation and baseline subtraction, the missing signal is reconstructed by calculating the contribution from the missing multiple phonons using a first estimate of *g* obtained from truncated *S*. When the baseline at the high-energy end is higher than at the low-189 energy end (most common situation), the correction for non-constant baseline brings 190 the force constant down. Conversely, when the baseline at the high-energy end is 191 lower than at the high-energy end, the correction brings the force constant up. The other features of SciPhon are deconvolution of the resolution function using a steepest

descent algorithm, removal of the elastic peak using a refined interpolation method, calculation of all parameters needed for application of NRIXS data to isotope geochemistry (Eqs. 1 and 2), and propagation of all uncertainties (not only counting statistics but also errors on baseline subtraction and energy scaling) on parameters derived from S. We applied the same algorithm to the new data reported here and to the raw data reported in Dauphas et al. (2012).

## **2.2. Computational methods**

201 Goethite ( $\alpha$ -FeOOH) has an orthorhombic unit cell ( $a = 4.598$  Å,  $b = 9.951$  Å, c = 3.018 Å, *Pbnm* space group, Yang et al. 2006), containing four formula units. Calculations are done with the PWscf code (Giannozzi et al., 2009; http://www.quantum-espresso.org) using the density functional theory (DFT) and the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) to the exchange-correlation functional with the PBE parameterization (Perdew et al. 1996). The ionic cores are described by the ultrasoft pseudopotentials Fe.pbe-nd-rrkjus.UPF, O.pbe-rrkjus.UPF, H.pbe-rrkjus.UPF, as in Blanchard et al. (2009, 2010, 2014). The wave-functions and the charge density are expanded in plane-waves with 40 and 480 Ry cutoffs, respectively. Increasing these energy cutoffs to 60 and 720 Ry does not modify significantly the vibrational frequencies (< 1%). For the electronic integration, the Brillouin zone is sampled according to the Monkhorst-Pack scheme (Monkhorst and Pack 1976), using 213 shifted  $4 \times 2 \times 6$  *k*-point grids. Increasing the number of *k*-points does not modify the structural and vibrational properties. Calculations are spin-polarized and set up to the antiferromagnetic structure. The spins are oriented along the *c*-axis of goethite with up and down spins in alternate chains of octahedra (Cornell and Schwertmann, 2003). Magnetic moments are free to relax. Atomic positions are relaxed until the residual 218 forces on atoms are less than  $10^{-4}$  Ry/a.u..

Additional calculations were performed using the GGA+*U* method since it is known that the addition of a Hubbard *U* correction on the Fe atom improves the description of the electronic and elastic properties of goethite by taking into account the strong on-site Coulomb repulsion of Fe 3*d* electrons (*e.g*. Otte et al. 2009). The value of the Hubbard *U* is determined using a linear response approach in an internally consistent way following the procedure proposed by Cococcioni and de Gironcoli (2005) and Kulik et al. (2006). Details about the practical procedure can be found in Blanchard et al. (2008). The value of the Hubbard *U* is found equal to 3.34 eV, a value similar to the 3.30 eV found for hematite (Blanchard et al. 2008).

228 Following the method described in Blanchard et al. (2009), the  $\beta$ -factors were 229 calculated from the harmonic vibrational frequencies using

230 
$$
\beta(a,Y) = \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{3N_{at}} \prod_{\{q\}} \frac{v_{q,i}^*}{v_{q,i}} \frac{e^{-hv_{q,i}^*/(2kT)}}{1 - e^{-hv_{q,i}^*/(kT)}} \frac{1 - e^{-hv_{q,i}/(kT)}}{e^{-hv_{q,i}/(2kT)}} \right]^{1/(N_qN)} (\text{Eq. 6})
$$

231 where  $v_{a,i}$  are the frequencies of the phonon with wavevector *q* and branch index i = 232 1,3 $N_{at}$ .  $N_{at}$  is the number of atoms in the unit cell, while  $v_{q,i}$  and  $v_{q,i}^*$  are the vibrational 233 frequencies in two isotopologues. *N* is the number of sites for the *Y* atom in the unit 234 cell, *T* is the temperature, *h* is the Planck constant and *k* is the Boltzmann constant. 235 Phonon frequencies were calculated within the harmonic approximation using the 236 linear response theory (Baroni et al. 2001, Floris et al. 2011) as implemented in the 237 PHonon code (Giannozzi et al., 2009; http://www.quantum-espresso.org). Phonon 238 frequencies were computed on shifted  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  q-point grids, for which the 239 convergence of the  $\beta$ -factors is achieved.

240 The  $\beta$ -factors calculated from the pDOS (Eq. 2) are identical to the  $\beta$ -factors 241 calculated directly from the harmonic vibrational frequencies (Eq. 6) providing that 242 the highest energy of the pDOS is smaller than  $2\pi kT$ . When it is not the case (*i.e.*) when OH stretching modes are considered in the pDOS) the formula derived from perturbation theory (Eq. 1-4 in Polyakov et al. 2005) must be used instead.

#### **3. RESULTS**

# **3.1. Reappraisal of NRIXS data**

The two motivations for implementing a non-constant baseline subtraction procedure were that (1) replicate measurements of a given phase over several years yielded force constant values that were not reproducible and (2) the signal at the low and high energy ends of the spectrum often did not reach zero, so that the force constant integral did not converge. In Fig. 1, we show force constant determinations with or without baseline subtraction for goethite and jarosite. The values without baseline subtraction were processed in the same manner as in Dauphas et al. (2012), meaning that a constant background was subtracted, which is given by the average counts measured in a 10 meV window at the low-energy end of the spectrum (*e.g*., from -130 to -120 meV). The values without baseline subtraction differ slightly from those reported by Dauphas et al. (2012) and Hu et al. (2013) because we now only use the phonon-creation side to calculate the force constant (the phonon-annihilation side is calculated from the detailed balance and the temperature). The phonon annihilation side is still measured to define the low-energy end of the baseline but this side of the spectrum often suffers from low counting statistics, which is the reason why it is not used to calculate the mean force constant. When no baseline is subtracted, the force constant values show variations from one sample to another that far exceed individual 265 error bars (reduced  $\chi^2$  = 13.2). When the data are corrected for the presence of a non-constant baseline, the average force constant does not change but the sample-to-

267 sample scatter is very much reduced (reduced  $\chi^2 = 3.1$ ). The improvement in reproducibility (Fig. 1) and better consistency with force constant estimates from theory (see Sect. 3.2.1) justify our preference of the non-constant baseline data reduction algorithm (Dauphas et al., 2014). Below, we discuss the results for each phase individually.

## *3.1.1. Goethite*

Including the measurements published by Dauphas et al. (2012), goethite was analyzed by NRIXS three times. As explained in Dauphas et al. (2014) and the method section, the main difference in the data reduction approach used here versus that used by Dauphas et al. (2012) is the recognition that the non-zero signals at the low- and high-energy ends of the spectrum are not from multiple phonons but rather some non-constant baseline. Dauphas et al. (2012) used the counts at the low energy end as baseline and interpreted the non-zero counts at the high-energy end to reflect the presence of multiple phonons. Because the signal never reached zero for goethite, a correction for missing multiple phonons was even applied, which exacerbated the problem. The new approach removes a linear baseline interpolated between the low-and high-energy ends of the spectrum using the SciPhon software (Dauphas et al. 2014). Various quantities calculated from *S(E)* and *g(E)* are compiled in Table 1. The pDOS calculated for the three goethite samples are very reproducible and the average 287 pDOS is plotted in Fig. 2.

As shown in Table 1 and later in Table 5 for jarosite samples, *B2* (Eq. 4) is almost the same for the phases investigated (~59,000), so the force constant is the main controlling factor in iron isotopic fractionation even at low temperature and we will focus on the values of the force constants in comparing the results obtained by Dauphas et al. (2012) and Hu et al. (2013) with those presented here. The force constant values obtained from *g* are identical to those obtained from *S*, so we will only discuss the values obtained from *S* in the following.

295 For goethite, Dauphas et al. (2012) reported force constants of  $307\pm9$  N/m from *S* and 314±10 N/m from *S* after refinement. Hu et al. (2013) obtained similar values using the same data reduction approach. Significant signal remained at the high-energy end and as a result the force constant integral did not plateau (Fig. 6 of Dauphas et al., 2012), the new truncation-linear baseline subtraction protocol applied to the same data (using SciPhon) leads to a significant reduction of the force constant, *i.e*. 277±15 N/m. The larger error bar reflects the fact that additional sources of uncertainties associated with baseline subtraction and energy scaling are propagated in the calculation of the force constant (Hu et al. 2013, Dauphas et al. 2014). The two new goethite measurements yield force constants of 264±13 N/m and 267±13 N/m, averaging to 268±8 N/m for the three goethite measurements.

*3.1.2. Jarosite* 

Including the measurements published by Dauphas et al (2012), hydronium (H-) jarosite and potassium (K-) jarosite were analyzed twice each. Like for goethite, various quantities calculated from *S*(E) and *g*(E), using the new data reduction algorithm, are compiled in Table 2. The pDOS calculated for the two H-jarosite, and two K-jarosite samples are very reproducible and the average pDOS are plotted in Fig. 3.

The force constant for H-jarosite reported by Dauphas et al. (2012) was 302±9 N/m from *S* and 310±9 from *S* after refinement. Data reduction using SciPhon yields a 316 force constant for this sample of  $273\pm15$  N/m. A second measurement of this sample during a different session gives 289±17 N/m. The average force constant for the two H-jarosite measurements is 280±11 N/m.

The force constant of K-jarosite reported by Dauphas et al. (2012) was 262±6 N/m from *S* and 264±6 from *S* after refinement. The revised estimate using SciPhon gives a force constant of 279±16 N/m. A second force constant measurement of this sample during another session gives a force constant of 305±18 N/m. The average of 323 these two values is  $290\pm12$  N/m.

In the case of H-jarosite, for which significant signal remained at the high-energy end and as a result the force constant integral did not converge (Fig. 6 of Dauphas et al., 2012), the new data-reduction leads to a significant reduction of the force constant. In the case of K-jarosite, the force constant integral plateaued and the estimated force constant does not change significantly with the new data reduction scheme used in SciPhon. Note that Dauphas et al. (2012) had no satisfactory explanation as to why the force constant of H-jarosite was significantly higher than K-jarosite, other than invoking the presence of high-energy modes arising from hydrogen vibrations. The results presented here show that the force constants of H-333 jarosite and K-jarosite are indistinguishable  $(280\pm11 \text{ N/m vs. } 290\pm12 \text{ N/m})$ .

# **3.2. First-principles determination of isotopic fractionation properties**

## *3.2.1. Iron β-factor of goethite*

In first-principles calculations, the goethite cell parameters were fixed to their experimental values (Yang et al., 2006) and atomic positions were relaxed using either GGA or GGA+*U* methods. GGA atomic positions are in excellent agreement with the experimental values (Table 3). Only the x atomic coordinate of H atoms shows a significant discrepancy revealing the difficulty of DFT to treat hydrogen bonds as well as the difficulty to determine experimentally the H positions. The GGA+*U* performs similarly as GGA for the description of interatomic distances (Table 4). This is also true for the vibrational properties. We observe a good correlation between experimental and theoretical frequencies for both GGA and GGA+*U* methods (Fig. 4). As already highlighted in Blanchard et al. (2014), the effect of the Hubbard U correction is mostly visible on the OH bending and stretching modes. The OH bending frequencies increase while the OH stretching frequencies decrease, consistently with lengthening of the O-H bond. The pDOS and in particular 350 the iron contribution is calculated using a  $8 \times 4 \times 12$  *q*-points grid obtained through a Fourier (trigonometric) interpolation of the force constants (see Méheut et al., 2007, for details). We observe a general good agreement between the calculated and measured iron pDOS (Fig. 2a). In detail, small differences can be noted between the average measured pDOS and the calculated ones. These differences are of the same order of magnitude as the differences between the pDOS computed with GGA and GGA+*U*, and are distributed all along the energy range, which suggests that they are not related to any specific vibrational modes. However, these small divergences lead to a significant difference in the calculated iron force constants that are equal to 233 N/m and 247 N/m using GGA and GGA+*U*, respectively. The force constant is calculated from the pDOS *g* by using equation (5). The integral in the second moment of *g* explains why the OH vibration modes with their high energies contribute a little to the iron force constant while the corresponding pDOS signal is almost negligible (Fig. 2). The difference between the DFT (233 N/m for GGA, 247 N/m for GGA+*U*) and NRIXS (268±8 N/m) force constants is already present before the OH vibration modes. Calculations show that the pDOS should be exactly zero over a certain energy range between the lattice modes and the OH bending modes (Fig. 2b), which is not the case for the NRIXS measurements and contributes to the overestimation of the iron force constant. This is likely due to the position of the baseline that should be 369 slightly higher. The variability of the calculated  ${}^{57}Fe^{54}Fe$   $\beta$ -factor is shown in Fig. 5, and the corresponding temperature dependences are reported in Tables 1 and 5. Its variations follow variations in the iron force constant (Eq. 4). GGA and GGA+*U* 372 results differ by  $\sim$ 8 % and it is not possible from the analysis of the vibrational properties to identify which computational method gives the best description of goethite. This difference should thus give an idea of the uncertainty intrinsic of DFT. 375 These theoretical values are lower than the NRIXS-derived  $\beta$ -factor but higher than 376 the  $\beta$ -factor determined by Polyakov and Mineev (2000) from the Mössbauer measurements done by de Grave and Vanderberghe (1986). Therefore with the new NRIXS data reduction, the discrepancy between the various analytical approaches is reduced but remains significant.

A general scaling factor reflecting the systematic underestimation of vibrational frequencies by the GGA functional is sometimes applied (*e.g.* Schauble 2011) or a mineral-dependent scaling factor is taken, assuming an accurate preliminary assignment of the vibrational modes (*e.g.* Blanchard et al. 2009). Here the theoretical  $\beta$ -factors were obtained by fixing the cell parameters to the experimental values and relaxing only the atomic positions. Following this procedure, we found that the interatomic bond lengths and therefore the vibrational frequencies are improved with respect to the fully optimized structure (*i.e*. relaxation of the cell parameters and atomic positions). No further frequency correction is needed. The iron  $\beta$ -factors of goethite calculated here are equal to 10.2 ‰ or 11.0 ‰ at 22°C, using either GGA or GGA+*U* methods. These values compare well with 10.5 ‰, which is the  $\beta$ -factor obtained from the fully relaxed structure and a frequency scale factor of 1.04 (quantified by taking the best linear-fit of the theoretical versus experimental frequencies). The same approach was applied to hematite, by keeping fixed the cell 394 parameters of the rhombohedral primitive cell to the experimental values ( $a = 5.427$ 395 Å,  $\alpha = 55.28^{\circ}$ ,  $R\overline{3}c$  space group, Finger and Hazen, 1980). Unlike goethite, the addition of the Hubbard *U* clearly improves the atomic positions, interatomic distances and vibrational frequencies of hematite. Therefore, only GGA+*U* results are 398 retained and it is found that the new  $GGA+U$  iron  $\beta$ -factor is undistinguishable from 399 the  $\beta$ -factor previously published in Blanchard et al. (2009) where a frequency scale 400 factor of 1.083 was used. In a similar way, we checked for pyrite that the iron  $\beta$ -factor obtained with the experimental cell parameters (Brostigen and Kjekshus, 1969), *i.e*. 13.1 ‰ at 22°C, is close, within the expected uncertainty, to the value calculated in Blanchard et al. (2009), *i.e*. 13.6 ‰. However we would like to emphasize that fixing the cell parameters to the experimental values do not dispense with checking that the calculated frequencies are in good agreement with the measured values.

## *3.2.2. Oxygen* !*-factor of goethite and hematite*

408 Beside iron  $\beta$ -factors, first-principles calculations provide the <sup>18</sup>O/<sup>16</sup>O  $\beta$ -factor of goethite as a function of temperature (Fig. 6 and Table 6). For goethite, GGA and GGA+*U* results differ by ~4%. In the ideal goethite structure, half of the oxygen atoms are hydroxylated and the others are not. Calculations show that these two oxygen populations can be distinguished isotopically. At thermodynamic equilibrium, heavier isotopes will concentrate preferentially in hydroxylated sites. The oxygen isotope fractionation of goethite corresponds then to the average of all oxygen atoms of the system. Similar calculations were also performed on hematite, using the same model as that previously used by Blanchard et al. (2009). As explained in section 417 3.2.1, only GGA+*U* results are considered. With ~62 ‰ at 25 °C, the oxygen  $\beta$ -factor 418 of hematite is found to be very close to the one of goethite, but with a slightly more 419 linear temperature dependence (Fig. 6).

- 420
- 

#### 421 **4. DISCUSSION**

# 422  $\,$  **4.1. Iron**  $\beta$ **-factor of goethite: intercomparison of the different methods**

423 In principle, DFT, NRIXS and Mössbauer spectroscopy should lead to 424 statistically undistinguishable iron  $\beta$ -factors. In the case of hematite, an excellent 425 agreement is found between DFT-derived  ${}^{57}Fe^{54}Fe$   $\beta$ -factor (*i.e.* 10.9 ‰ at 22 °C, 426 Blanchard et al. 2009) and NRIXS-derived <sup>57</sup>Fe/<sup>54</sup>Fe  $\beta$ -factor (*i.e.* 11.3  $\pm$  0.4 ‰ at 22 427 °C, Dauphas et al. 2012). In the case of pyrite, the apparent discrepancy between DFT 428 and Mössbauer results that was reported in Blanchard et al. (2009) and in Polyakov 429 and Soultanov (2011), could be resolved by using a better constrained temperature 430 dependence of the Mössbauer spectra (Blanchard et al. 2012). The first NRIXS-based 431 estimation has recently confirmed our pyrite iron  $\beta$ -factor (Polyakov et al. 2013). In 432 light of these previous studies, it is essential to investigate the origin of the scattering 433 of the goethite iron  $\beta$ -factors obtained from the three analytical techniques.

The first obvious difference between goethite and hematite is the presence of hydrogen atoms, and it is well known that the accurate description of hydrogen bonding using DFT remains a concern. However, it is important to note that the lengths of the Fe-O and Fe-OH bonds are well described (Table 4) and that all 438 vibrational frequencies below 700 cm<sup>-1</sup> (*i.e.* excluding OH bending and stretching modes) compare well with the experimental values (Fig. 4). These vibrational modes 440 are the main ones that contribute to the iron  $\beta$ -factor (Fig. 2c). The main difference between GGA, GGA+*U* and NRIXS comes from the high-energy end of the lattice

442 modes  $(65 - 90 \text{ meV or } 525 - 725 \text{ cm}^{-1})$  and the fact that the NRIXS pDOS does not 443 go down to zero between the lattice modes and OH bending modes (Fig. 2).

The nature and quality of the samples may also have an impact on iron isotope 445 composition. On one hand, a <sup>57</sup> Fe-rich sample with particle sizes of  $\sim$ 20 nm was synthesized for the NRIXS measurements, and on the other hand, Mössbauer spectroscopy was done on natural sample from the Harz mountains, well-crystallized 448 with particle size of  $\sim$ 1  $\mu$ m (de Grave and Vandenberghe, 1986). Some kind of internal disorder is however commonly observed in goethite, using *e.g*. differential thermal analysis, infrared or magnetic measurements (Cornell and Schwertmann, 2003). This internal disorder may correspond to crystal defects and/or iron vacant sites that are compensated for by extra, non-stoichiometric protons. All this amounts to introducing distortions with respect to the ideal crystal structure. In "real" goethite crystals, there will be a larger variation in the length of Fe-O bonds, which will lead to 455 a larger variation of the local iron  $\beta$ -factors (*i.e.*  $\beta$ -factors associated with each iron atom). In a similar but simpler way, the ideal goethite structure displays already two 457 oxygen populations with specific isotopic signatures and the bulk oxygen  $\beta$ -factor 458 corresponds to the average of these two local  $\beta$ -factors (Fig. 6). The prediction of the 459 iron  $\beta$ -factor of a goethite crystal containing a certain amount of defects would require the accurate characterization of the sample at the molecular scale, which is beyond the scope of the present paper. It is noteworthy that the presence of defective sites is not necessarily expressed in the overall isotopic composition because 463 compensation of local  $\beta$ -factors may occur. For instance, Blanchard et al. (2010) investigated the isotopic properties of hematite with iron vacant sites compensated by 465 protons. The local iron  $\beta$ -factors display variations over a significant range (1.1 ‰ at  $\degree$  0  $\degree$ C), but extreme values compensate each other, resulting for the model investigated,

in a negligible effect of these cationic vacancies on the iron isotope composition of 468 hematite. Similarly, we built a  $2 \times 1 \times 2$  supercell of goethite containing one iron 469 vacancy compensated by three protons. The overall  ${}^{57}Fe^{54}Fe$  *β*-factor is almost 470 unchanged (11.99 ‰ instead of 11.94 ‰ at 0 °C using GGA), even if the local  $\beta$ -471 factors display values ranging from 11.22 ‰ to 13.61 ‰ at 0 °C (the highest value, *i.e*. 13.61 ‰, corresponds to an iron atom surrounded by two vacancies because of the periodic repetition of the simulation cell).

474 Iron force constant and  $\beta$ -factor can also be affected by surface sites, the contribution of which should depend on the size of the crystals. Unlike for defects in bulk, the molecular relaxation in vicinity of the surfaces will more likely give rise to a specific isotopic signature that will affect the overall isotopic composition. Beard et al. (2010) and Frierdich et al. (2014) investigated the isotopic exchange between aqueous Fe(II) and goethite, using two sizes of goethite. Their results demonstrate that the equilibrium isotopic properties of nano-scale minerals may be distinct from micron-scale or larger minerals. They found that iron surface sites are enriched in heavy isotopes compared to bulk goethite. This fractionation is consistent with the 483 fact that the NRIXS-derived  $\beta$ -factor (for a nano-scale sample) is higher than the 484 Mössbauer-derived  $\beta$ -factor (for a micron-scale sample). However the difference 485 observed in  $\beta$ -factors (Fig. 5) is large compared to the difference in equilibrium fractionation measured by Frierdich et al. (2014) for various particle sizes. Rustad and Dixon (2009) examined iron isotope fractionation between hematite and aqueous iron, 488 and found almost no difference between bulk and surface  $\beta$ -factors. This conclusion applies to the (012) hematite surface with molecularly and dissociatively adsorbed water, using DFT calculations and the embedded cluster approach. Only few experimental and theoretical data exist on the topic. More studies are needed with other mineral surfaces and more structurally-complex surfaces.

# 494  $\alpha$  **4.2.** Isotopic fractionations between minerals ( $\alpha$ -factors)

The experimental iron isotope fractionation factors between goethite, hematite and pyrite in condition of thermodynamic equilibrium can be determined by combining the measurements from Skulan et al. (2002), Welch et al. (2003), Syverson et al. (2013) and Frierdich et al. (2014) (Table 7). Keeping in mind that these mineral-mineral isotopic fractionations do not represent direct measurements and involve approximations like temperature extrapolations, we can compare them with the equilibrium fractionation factors estimated from NRIXS, Mössbauer or DFT (Fig. 7). 502 The range of iron  $\beta$ -factors obtained for goethite (Fig. 5) leads to a significant spread 503 of iron  $\alpha$ -factors for pyrite-goethite and hematite-goethite (Fig. 7). DFT  $\alpha$ -factor is in good agreement with the experimental pyrite-hematite value (0.62 ‰ compared to  $\Delta^{57}$ Fe = 0.44  $\pm$  1.0 ‰ at 350 °C). For pyrite-goethite, DFT  $\alpha$ -factors (GGA and GGA+*U*) are within the error bar of the experimental data. For hematite-goethite, DFT curves are 1-2 ‰ lower than the experimental points at 98 °C. The Mössbauer-508 derived  $\beta$ -factor of goethite (Polyakov and Mineev 2000) seems to be in better agreement with experimental points, while NRIXS data fall in the lowest part of the range (*i.e.*, little iron isotopic fractionation between goethite and hematite). The same conclusions could also be reached looking at the isotopic fractionation between aqueous Fe(II) and goethite ( Frierdich et al. 2014). However this would require to 513 combine the present mineral  $\beta$ -factors with a Fe(II)<sub>aq</sub>  $\beta$ -factor obtained from a different technique (for instance, the DFT values from Rustad et al., 2010, currently considered as the most reliable, and based on an aperiodic model, B3LYP exchangecorrelation functional and localized basis sets). This practice should be considered 517 with caution and the combination of  $\beta$ -factors determined by a single methodology is always preferable.

519 It often happens that the iron  $\beta$ -factors derived from Mössbauer are slightly different 520 and lower than the ones derived from NRIXS, but usually when the  $\alpha$ -factors are determined the agreement between these two methods and with the experimental data is satisfactory. This is shown, for instance, for the isotopic fractionation between molten silicate, FeS and metal (Dauphas et al., 2014).

For the oxygen isotopes, DFT results (GGA and GGA+*U*) indicate a small equilibrium fractionation between hematite and goethite (between -3.1 and +0.8 ‰ over the whole temperature range, Fig. 8). These theoretical estimations are consistent with the study of Yapp (1990), which suggests, from synthesis experiments conducted in the temperature range 25-120 °C, that goethite and hematite are isotopically indistinguishable at equilibrium. Several experimental studies also investigated oxygen isotope fractionation in hematite-water and goethite-water systems (*e.g*. Bao and Koch, 1999; Yapp, 2007). The hematite-goethite fractionation curve that can be derived from Bao and Koch (1999) shows a similar temperature-dependence as our GGA results but is slightly more positive (Fig. 8). In this study, experiments of goethite synthesis were performed at a pH higher than 14. However Yapp's results (2007) suggest that, in addition to temperature, pH can affect the measured oxygen isotope fractionation between goethite and water. He found for goethite synthesized at 537 low pH  $(-1 \text{ to } 2)$  a curve that differs significantly from the ones obtained at high pH (>14). Using this low-pH curve for goethite-water from Yapp (2007) and the hematite-water oxygen fractionation from Bao and Koch (1999), the hematite-goethite fractionation curve falls in the range predicted by DFT methods but with an stronger

temperature-dependence (Fig. 8). According to Yapp (2007), data measured for goethite crystallized at low pH may approach isotopic equilibrium values. These data are therefore the ones that must be compared preferentially with the DFT results. In conclusion, theoretical estimations for oxygen isotopes are consistent with experimental measurements, even if the exact temperature-dependence remains uncertain.

Our data display a significant discrepancy with the results of the semi-empirical approach of Zheng (1991, 1998), *i.e*. the modified increment method where the equilibrium oxygen isotope fractionation factors of oxides are assessed with respect to a reference mineral (quartz) by considering the bond-type in the crystal structure (*e.g*., bond strength, effect of mass on isotopic substitution). Blanchard et al. (2010) already reported a discrepancy for the oxygen isotope fractionation between hematite and corundum, suggesting that the modified increment method cannot be used to reliably predict isotopic fractionation factors.

- 
- 

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

L. Paulatto is acknowledged for his technical support to the computational work. This work was performed using HPC resources from GENCI-IDRIS (Grant 2014-i2014041519). This work has been supported by the French National Research Agency (ANR, projects 11-JS56-001 "CrIMin" and 2011JS56 004 01 "FrIHIDDA"), grants from NSF (EAR 1144429) and NASA (NNX12AH60G). Use of the Advanced Photon Source, an Office of Science User Facility operated for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science by Argonne National Laboratory, was supported by the U.S. DOE under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357.



and Floris A. (2014) Infrared spectroscopic properties of goethite: anharmonic

- broadening, long-range electrostatic effects and Al substitution. *Phys. Chem. Minerals*, **41**, 289-302.
- 592 Brostigen G. and Kjekshus A. (1969) Redetermined crystal structure of  $FeS<sub>2</sub>$  (pyrite). *Acta Chem. Scand*., **23**, 2186–2188.
- Cambier P. (1986) Infrared study of goethites of varying crystallinity and particle
- size: I. Interpretation of OH and lattice frequencies. *Clay Minerals* **21**, 191-200.
- Cococcioni M. and de Gironcoli S. (2005) Linear response approach to the calculation of the effective interaction parameters in the LDA+U method. *Phys. Rev. B* **71**,
- 035105.
- Cornell R. M. and Schwertmann U. (2003) The iron oxides: structure, properties, reactions, occurrences and uses. 2nd ed., Wiley-VCH, pp. 664
- Dauphas N., Roskosz M., Alp E. E., Golden D. C., Sio C. K., Tissot F. L. H., Hu M.
- Y., Zhao J., Gao L. and Morris R. V. (2012) A *general moment* NRIXS approach
- to the determination of equilibrium Fe isotopic fractionation factors: Application to goethite and jarosite. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **94**, 254-275
- Dauphas N., Roskosz M., Alp E. E., Neuville D., Hu M., Sio C. K., Tissot F. L. H.,
- Zhao J., Tissandier L., Medard E. and Cordier C. (2014) Magma redox and structural controls on iron isotope variations in Earth's mantle and crust. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett*., **398**, 127-140
- de Faria D. L. A. and Lopes F. N. (2007) Heated goethite and natural hematite: Can
- Raman spectroscopy be used to differentiate them? *Vibrational spectroscopy* **45,**  117-121.
- 612 de Grave E. and Vandenberghe R. E. (1986)<sup>57</sup> Fe Mössbauer effect study of well-613 crystalized goethite ( $\alpha$ -FeOOH). *Hyperfine Interactions* **28**, 643-646.
- Eiler J. M., Bergquist B., Bourg I., Cartigny P., Farquhar J., Gagnon A., Guo W.,
- Halevy I., Hofmann A., Larson T. E., Levin N., Schauble E. A. and Stolper D. (2014) Frontiers of stable isotope geoscience. *Chem. Geol*. **373**, 119-143.
- Finger L. W. and Hazen R. M. (1980) Crystal structure and isothermal compression of 618 Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, Cr<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, and V<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> to 50 kbars. *J. Appl. Phys.* **51**, 5362–5367.
- Floris A., de Gironcoli S., Gross E. K. U. and Cococcioni M. (2011) Vibrational properties of MnO and NiO from DFT+U-based Density Functional Perturbation Theory, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 161102(R).
- Frierdich A. J., Beard B. L., Reddy T. R., Scherer M. M. and Johnson C. M. (2014)
- Iron isotope fractionation between aqueous Fe(II) and goethite revisited: New insights based on a multi-direction approach to equilibrium and isotopic exchange rate modification. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta.* **139,** 383-398.
- Giannozzi P., Baroni S., Bonini N., Calandra M., Car R., Cavazzoni C., Ceresoli D.,
- Chiarotti G. L., Cococcioni M., Dabo I., Dal Corso A., de Gironcoli S., Fabris S.,
- Fratesi G., Gebauer R., Gerstmann U., Gougoussis C., Kokalj A., Lazzeri M.,
- Martin-Samos L., Marzari N., Mauri F., Mazzarello R., Paolini S., Pasquarello
- A., Paulatto L., Sbraccia C., Scandolo S., Sclauzero G., Seitsonen A. P.,
- Smogunov A., Umari P. and Wentzcovitch R. M. (2009) Quantum ESPRESSO: a
- modular and open-source software project for quantum simulations of materials.
- *J. Phys.: Conden.s Matter* **21**, 395502.
- 634 Golden D. C., Ming D. W., Morris R. V. and Graff T. G. (2008) Hydrothermal synthesis of hematite spherules and jarosite: Implications for diagenesis and hematite spherule formation in sulfate outcrops at Meridiani Planum, Mars. *Am. Mineral*. **93**, 1201–1214.
- Hu M., Sturhahn Y. W., Toellner T. S., Mannheim P. D., Brown D. E., Zhao J. and Alp E. E. (2003) Measuring velocity of sound with nuclear resonant inelastic x-
- ray scattering, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 094304.
- Hu M. Y., Toellner T. S., Dauphas N., Alp E. E. and Zhao J. (2013) Moments in nuclear resonant inelastic x-ray scattering and their applications. *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 064301
- Johnson C. M., Beard B. L. and Albarède F. (2004) Geochemistry of non-traditional isotopes. *Rev. Mineral. Geochem*., vol. **55**. Mineralogical Society of America, Geochemical Society. 454 p.
- Johnson D. W. and Spence J. C. H. (1974) Determination of the single-scattering probability distribution from plural-scattering data. *J. Phys. D: Applied Physics* **7**, 771-780.
- Kohn V. G. and Chumakov A. I. (2000) DOS: Evaluation of phonon density of states from nuclear resonant inelastic absorption. *Hyperfine Interactions* **125**, 205-221.
- Kulik H. J., Cococcioni M., Scherlis D. A. and Marzari N. (2006) Density functional theory in transition-metal chemistry: a self-consistent Hubbard *U* approach. *Phys.*
- *Rev. Lett*. **97** ,103001.
- Méheut M., Lazzeri M., Balan E. and Mauri F. (2007) Equilibrium isotopic fractionation in the kaolinite, quartz, water system: Prediction from first-principles density-functional theory. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **71**, 3170-3181.
- Monkhorst H. J. and Pack J. D. (1976) Special points for Brillouin-zone integrations. *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 5188-5192.
- Otte K., Pentcheva R., Schmahl W. W. and Rustad J. R. (2009) Pressure-induced structural and electronic transitions in FeOOH from first- principles. *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 205116.
- Perdew J. P., Burke K. and Ernzerhof M. (1996) Generalized gradient approximation made simple. *Phys. Rev. Lett*. **77**, 3865–3868.
- Polyakov V. B. and Mineev S. D. (2000) The use of Mössbauer spectroscopy in stable isotope geochemistry. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **64**, 849-865.
- Polyakov V. B., Mineev S. D., Clayton R. N., Hu G. and Mineev K. S. (2005) Determination of tin equilibrium isotope fractionation factors from synchroton radiation experiments. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **69**, 5531-5536.
- Polyakov V. B., Clayton R. N., Horita J. and Mineev S. D. (2007) Equilibrium iron
- isotope fractionation factors of minerals: Reevaluation from the data of nuclear inelastic resonant X-ray scattering and Mössbauer spectroscopy. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **71**, 3833-3846.
- Polyakov V. B. and Soultanov D. M. (2011) New data on equilibrium iron isotope fractionation among sulfides: Constraints on mechanisms of sulfide formation in hydrothermal and igneous systems. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **75**, 1957-1974.
- Polyakov V. B., Osadchii E. G., Chareev D. A., Chumakov A. I. and Sergeev I. A.
- 678 (2013) Fe  $\beta$ -factors for sulfides from NRIXS synchrotron experiments. *Mineral. Mag*., **77**, 1985.
- Rustad J.R. and Dixon D.A. (2009) Prediction of iron-isotope fractionation between 681 hematite ( $\alpha$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) and ferric and ferrous iron in aqueous solution from Density Functional Theory. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, **113***,* 12249-12255.
- Rustad J.R., Casey W.H., Yin Q-Z., Bylaska E.J., Felmy A.R., Bogatko S.A., Jackson
- 684 V.E. and Dixon D.A. (2010) Isotopic fractionation of  $Mg^{2+}$  (aq),  $Ca^{2+}$  (aq), and Fe2+ (aq) with carbonate minerals. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **74**, 6301-6323.
- 
- Schauble E. A. (2011) First-principles estimates of equilibrium magnesium isotope fractionation in silicate, oxide, carbonate and hexaaquamagnesium(2+) crystals. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **75**, 844-869.
- Seto M., Yoda Y., Kikuta S., Zhang X. W. and Ando M. (1995) Observation of
- nuclear resonant scattering accompanied by phonon excitation using synchrotron radiation. *Phys. Rev. Lett*. **74**, 3828-3831.
- Skulan J. L., Beard B. L. and Johnson C. M. (2002) Kinetic and equilibrium Fe isotope fractionation between aqueous Fe(III) and hematite. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **66**, 2995–3015.
- Sturhahn W., Toellner T. S., Alp E. E., Zhang X., Ando M., Yoda Y., Kikuta S., Seto
- M., Kimball C. W. and Dabrowski B. (1995) Phonon density of states measured

by inelastic nuclear resonant scattering. *Phys. Rev. Lett*. **74**, 3832-3835.

- Sturhahn W. (2000) CONUSS and PHOENIX: Evaluation of nuclear resonant scattering data. *Hyperfine Interactions* **125**, 149-172.
- Sturhahn W. and Jackson J. M. (2007) Geophysical applications of nuclear resonant scattering, in Ohtani, E., ed., *Advances in High-Pressure Mineralogy: GSA*
- *Special Paper* **421**, 157-174.
- Syverson D. D., Borrock D. M. and Seyfried Jr. W. E. (2013) Experimental determination of equilibrium Fe isotopic fractionation between pyrite and dissolved Fe under hydrothermal conditions. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **122**, 170-183.
- Valley J. W. and Cole D. R. (2001) Stable isotope geochemistry. *Rev. Mineral. Geochem*., vol. **43**. Mineralogical Society of America, Geochemical Society. 662 p.
- Welch S. A., Beard B. L., Johnson C. M. and Braterman P. S. (2003) Kinetic and equilibrium Fe isotope fractionation between aqueous Fe(II) and Fe(III). *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **67**, 4231–4250.
- 713 Yang H., Lu R., Downs R. T., Costin G. (2006) Goethite,  $\alpha$ -FeO(OH), from single-
- crystal data. *Acta Crystallographica* **E62**, i250-i252.
- 715 Yapp C. J. (1990) Oxygen isotopes in iron (III) oxides, 1. Mineral-water fractionation 716 factors. *Chem. Geol*. **85**, 329-335.
- 717 Yapp C. J. (2007) Oxygen isotopes in synthetic goethite and a model for the apparent
- pH dependence of goethite-water <sup>18</sup>O/<sup>16</sup> 718 O fractionation. *Geochim. Cosmochim.*  719 *Acta* **71**, 1115-1129.
- 720 Zheng Y. F. (1991) Calculation of oxygen isotope fractionation in metal oxides. 721 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **55**, 2299-2307.
- 722 Zheng Y. F. (1998) Oxygen isotope fractionation between hydroxide minerals and

723 water. *Phys. Chem. Minerals* **25**, 213-221.

# 725 **TABLES**

726 **Table 1**. Goethite properties derived from NRIXS, based on the scattering spectrum, *S*(E), or the projected partial phonon density of states, *g*(E).





 $\sim$ 

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

737 **Table 2**. Hydronium-jarosite and potassium-jarosite properties derived from NRIXS, based on the scattering spectrum, S(E), or the projected

738 partial phonon density of states,  $g(E)$ .







**Table 3**. Theoretical and experimental atomic coordinates  $[\pm (x,y,3/4)]$ ,

740  $\pm (1/2+x,1/2+y,1/4)$ ] of goethite. Values in brackets give the differences with respect

	xFe	vFe	xН	vH	xО	V()	xOh	yOh
GGA	0.0503	0.8523	0.4041	0.0855	0.6978	0.2001	0.1989	0.0528
	(0.001)	$(-0.001)$	(0.026)	(0.004)	$(-0.008)$	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)
$GGA+U$	0.0603	0.8559	0.4011	0.0940	0.6798	0.1946	0.1959	0.0570
	(0.011)	(0.002)	(0.023)	(0.012)	$(-0.026)$	$(-0.005)$	$(-0.003)$	(0.004)
$Exp.*$	0.0489	0.8537	0.3781	0.0817	0.7057	0.1991	0.1987	0.0530

741 to the experimental values.

- 742 \*Yang et al. (2006)
- 743
- 744
- 745

746 **Table 4**. Theoretical and experimental interatomic distances (Å). Values in brackets

		Fe-O	Fe-Oh	$O-H$
	GGA	$1.8963(-0.037)$	2.1091(0.010)	0.9975(0.125)
		1.9725(0.017)	2.1167(0.011)	
	$GGA+U$	1.9484(0.015)	$2.0958(-0.004)$	1.0130(0.140)
		1.9889(0.033)	$2.1018(-0.004)$	
	$Exp.*$	1.9332	2.0994	0.8729
		1.9560	2.1059	
748	*Yang et al. $(2006)$			
749				

747 give the differences with respect to the experimental values.

- 749
- 750

751

- **Table 5**. Fits of the calculated  $10^3$  ln  $\beta$  based on the function  $ax + bx^2 + cx^3$ , with  $x =$
- 753  $10^6/T^2$  (*T* on K) for <sup>57</sup>Fe/<sup>54</sup>Fe isotope fractionation in goethite.



754

**Table 6**. Fits of the calculated  $10^3$  ln  $\beta$  based on the function  $ax + bx^2 + cx^3$ , with  $x =$ 

		a	h	c
Goethite O total	GGA	6.9558	$-1.9730 \times 10^{-1}$	$5.7833 \times 10^{-3}$
Goethite O total	$GGA+U$	7.1664	$-1.8753 \times 10^{-1}$	$5.2786 \times 10^{-3}$
Goethite O	GGA	5.2325	$-4.2571 \times 10^{-2}$	$4.3992 \times 10^{-4}$
Goethite O	$GGA+U$	5.5402	$-4.9704 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.8375 \times 10^{-4}$
Goethite Oh	GGA	8.6748	$-3.5227 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.1134 \times 10^{-2}$
Goethite Oh	$GGA+U$	8.7932	$-3.2570 \times 10^{-1}$	$9.9755 \times 10^{-3}$
Hematite O	$GGA+U$	6.0030	$-5.1020 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.1786 \times 10^{-4}$

757  $10^6/T^2$  (*T* on K) for <sup>18</sup>O/<sup>16</sup>O isotope fractionation in goethite and hematite.

759

760 **Table 7**. Mineral-mineral iron isotope fractionations determined from experimental 761 measurements. The extrapolation to higher temperature is made assuming a linear 762 dependence as a function of  $10^{6}/T^{2}$  and a fractionation equal to zero at infinite 763 temperature.  $\Delta^{56}$ Fe shown here are subsequently converted in  $\Delta^{57}$ Fe for comparison in 764 Fig. 6.



## **Figure Captions**

**Figure 1.** Comparison between iron mean force constant determinations by NRIXS with or without baseline subtraction. The baseline is a linear interpolation between signal measured at the low- and high-energy ends of the NRIXS spectrum, where no phonon contributions are expected. Baseline subtraction yields force constant values that display better long-term reproducibility compared to no baseline subtraction (the different replicates were measured at during several beamline sessions spanning three years).

**Figure 2.** (a) Average measured (NRIXS) and calculated (GGA, GGA+*U*) phonon density of states (pDOS) of iron atoms in goethite. (b) The iron pDOS and total pDOS calculated with GGA are plotted along with the calculated (circles) and experimental (triangles) infrared and Raman frequencies (Cambier, 1986; de Faria and Lopes, 2007). This highlights the energy gap existing between lattice modes and OH bending modes. (c, d) The force constant is calculated from the pDOS by using the formula ľ  $F\rangle = \frac{M}{\sqrt{2}}$  $\frac{M}{\hbar^2}\int_0^{\infty}g(E)E^2$   $\langle F \rangle = \frac{M}{\hbar^2} \int_0^{\lambda} g(E) E^2 dE$ , with the upper limit  $\lambda = \infty$  (Eq. 5). The term  $g(E)E^2$  is plotted in (c), while the force constant integral for different values of the integration upper-limit is plotted in (d).

**Figure 3.** Average phonon density of states of iron atoms in hydronium-jarosite and potassium-jarosite measured using NRIXS.

**Figure 4.** Calculated (GGA and GGA+*U*) versus experimental infrared and Raman frequencies of goethite (Cambier, 1986; de Faria and Lopes, 2007).

792 **Figure 5.** Temperature dependence of the iron  $\beta$ -factor of goethite.

794 **Figure 6.** Temperature dependence of the oxygen  $\beta$ -factor of goethite and hematite.

**Figure 7.** Temperature dependence of the iron  $\alpha$ -factor between pyrite and goethite, and between hematite and goethite. The experimental points have not been measured directly and are estimated instead from several experiments, which are compiled in Table 7 (Skulan et al., 2002; Welch et al., 2003; Syverson et al., 2013; Frierdich et al., 2014). For Mössbauer, pyrite, hematite and goethite data are taken from Blanchard et al. (2012), Polyakov et al. (2007) and Polyakov and Mineev (2000), respectively. For GGA and GGA+*U*, pyrite and hematite data are from Blanchard et al. (2009) while goethite data correspond to this study. For NRIXS, hematite data are from Dauphas et 804 al. (2012) and goethite data are from this study. No NRIXS iron  $\beta$ -factor is published yet for pyrite.

**Figure 8.** Temperature dependence of the oxygen  $\alpha$ -factor between hematite and goethite. For GGA and GGA+*U*, hematite data are from Blanchard et al. (2009) while goethite data are from this study. Results of the semi-empirical approach of Zheng (1991, 1998) are shown for comparison, as well as the following experimental data: Exp. 1 corresponds to data from Bao and Koch (1999) where goethite was synthesized at high pH (>14), and Exp. 2 combines the hematite-water isotopic fractionation factors from Bao and Koch (1999) with goethite-water data at low pH (~1 to 2) from Yapp (2007).





**Figure 1.**









826 **Figure 4.** 





**Figure 5.**







837

838







842

843 **Figure 8.**