Cr(VI) adsorption/desorption on untreated and mussel shell-treated soil materials: fractionation and effects of pH and chromium concentration

M. Otero[1], L. Cutillas-Barreiro[2], J.C. Nóvoa-Muñoz[2], M. Arias-Estévez[2], M.J. Fernández-Sanjurjo[1], E. Álvarez-Rodríguez[1] and A. Núñez-Delgado[1]

[1]{Department Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Engineering Polytechnic School. Campus Univ., 27002 Lugo. University Santiago de Compostela, Spain}

[2]{ Department Plant Biology and Soil Science, Faculty of Sciences. Campus Univ., 32004 Ourense. University Vigo, Spain }

Correspondence to: A. Núñez-Delgado (avelino.nunez@usc.es)

Abstract

We used batch-type experiments to study Cr(VI) adsorption/desorption on granitic material, forest soil, pyritic material, mussel shell, and on forest soil and granitic material amended with 12 t ha-1 shell, considering the effects of varying Cr(VI) concentration and pH. Sequential extractions were carried out to fractionate adsorbed Cr(VI) and to determine the stability of Cr(VI) retention. The pyritic material had the highest Cr(VI) retention capacity, whereas the granitic material showed the lowest retention potential. When high Cr concentrations were added, some saturation of the adsorbent surfaces became apparent, but Cr release remained low. The highest Cr retention was achieved at very acid pH value, with release progressively increasing as a function of increasing pH. The amendment with 12 t ha-1 mussel shell did not cause marked changes in Cr(VI) retention. Adsorption data were satisfactory adjusted to the Freundlich model. Regarding Cr(VI) fractionation, the soluble fraction (weakly bound) was the dominant in mussel shell and in the un-amended and amended granitic material, whereas more stable fractions dominated in the pyritic material (residual fraction) and in the forest soil (oxidizable fraction). In conclusion, the pyritic material presented the highest Cr(VI) retention capacity, while the retention was low and weak on the granitic material; mussel shell was characterized by not marked Cr(VI) retention

potential, and it did not cause remarkable increase in Cr(VI) retention when used to amend the granitic material or the forest soil.

1   Introduction

Mining, industrial and agricultural activities are the main sources of chromium pollution affecting the environment, notably the water and soil compartments. Cr(III) is the chemically most stable form of chromium, whereas Cr(VI) is highly toxic and more easily mobilized.

Different bio-adsorbent materials has been tried to remove Cr(VI) from polluted environments, as was the case for some microorganisms and other natural sorbents (Schiever and Volesky 1995). Schmuhl et al. (2001) found high Cr(VI) adsorption on chitosan, with best results at pH 5. Blázquez et al. (2009) obtained Cr(VI) adsorption >80% on olive waste when pH was <2, although adsorption clearly diminished when pH value increased. Good Cr(VI) adsorption results were achieved using algae and cyanobacteria (Park et al. 2006; Gupta and Rastogi 2008 a, b), as well as using waste from the coffee and tea industries (Fiol et al. 2008; Duran et al. 2011).

Do the authors really means "pertaining to the whole world" ?

Globally, it would be of relevance increasing the knowledge on Cr(VI) retention processes when this pollutant interacts with sorbent materials. In this way, Fernández-Pazos et al. (2013) studied quantitative and kinetic aspects regarding Cr(VI) adsorption/desorption on various solid media (fine and coarse mussel shell, un-amended and mussel shell-amended forest and vineyard soils, slate processing fines and pyritic material). In addition to the kinetic characterization, it would be interesting to elucidate complementary aspects, such as the effects on Cr(VI) retention caused by changing pH, or the fractions where the retained Cr(VI) was bound, which can aid to estimate the degree of stability of that retention.

In view of that, the main objectives of this work are: a) firstly to determine Cr(VI) adsorption/desorption when different Cr(VI) concentrations are added to a granitic material, a forest soil, a pyritic material, and fine mussel shell, as well as to the granitic material and the forest soil amended with 12 t ha-1 fine mussel shell; b) secondly, to elucidate the influence of varying pH as regards Cr(VI) adsorption on such materials; and c) finally to determine the fractions where Cr(VI) is retained in the various solid materials investigated, affect Cr(VI) release, as well as risks of water pollution and transfer to the food chain.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Materials

The materials used in this study were: a) a granitic material sampled in Santa Cristina (Ribadavia, Ourense Province, Spain) resulting from the evolution of a rocky substrate, similar to a C horizon, nowadays exposed to the atmosphere after the elimination of the upper horizons, then needing organic matter and nutrients to be restored, as happens with granitic mine spoils; b) an A horizon corresponding to a forest soil with dominance of Eucalyptus globulus as tree species, sampled in the vicinity of the aluminum industry Alcoa (San Cibrao, Lugo Province, Spain); c) pyritic material from a copper mine spoil (Touro, A Coruña Province, Spain); d) finely crushed (<1 mm) mussel shell from the factory Abonomar S.L (Illa de Arousa, Pontevedra Province, Spain); e) the following two mixtures: the granitic material + 12 t ha-1 mussel shell, and the forest soil + 12 t ha-1 mussel shell, shaking the mixtures for 48 h to achieve homogenization. The materials b), c) and d) were previously characterized by Fernández-Pazos et al. (2013) in a study focusing on kinetics of Cr(VI) retention, as well as in evaluating the effects of adding different concentrations of the pollutant to various sorbent materials.

Forest soil, pyritic material and granitic material were sampled in a zigzag manner (20 cm depth), taken 10 subsamples to perform each of the final samples. These samples were transported to the laboratory to be air dried and sieved through 2 mm. Finally, chemical determinations and trials were carried out on the <2 mm fraction.

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Characterization of the solid materials used

The particle-size distribution of the materials was determined by using the Robinson pipette procedure. A pH-meter (model 2001, Crison, Spain) was used to measure pH in water and in KCl (solid:liquid ~~relationship~~ ratio 1:2.5). C and N were quantified by means of the elemental Tru Spec CHNS auto-analyzer (LECO, USA). Available P was determined according to Olsen and Sommers (1982). The exchangeable cations were displaced using NH_4Cl 1M solution, then quantifying Ca, Mg and Al by atomic absorption spectroscopy, and Na and K by atomic emission spectroscopy (AAnalyst 200, Perkin Elmer, USA); the effective cationic exchange capacity (eCEC) was calculated as the sum of all these cations (Kamprath 1970). Total

3

concentrations of Na, K, Ca, Mg, Al, Fe, Mn, as well as As, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Ni and Zn, were determined by means of ICP-mass (820-NS, Varian, USA), after nitric acid (65%) microwave assisted digestion. Different selective solutions were used to obtain the following Al and Fe fractions (Álvarez et al. 2013): total non-crystalline Al and Fe (Al_o, Fe_o), total Al and Fe bound to organic matter (Al_p, Fe_p), non-crystalline inorganic Al and Fe (Al_{op}, Fe_{op}), Al bound to organic matter in medium and low stability complexes (Al_{cu}), Al bound to organic matter in high stability complexes (Al_{pcu}), Al bound to organic matter in medium stability complexes (Al_{cula}), Al bound to organic matter in low stability complexes (Al_{la}).

2.2.2 Adsorption/desorption when different Cr(VI) concentrations are added

Cr(VI) adsorption and desorption as a function of the added concentration of the pollutant were studied as per Arnesen and Krogstrad (1998).

The adsorbents used were: granitic material, forest soil, mussel shell and pyritic material, as well as the forest soil and granitic material amended with 12 t ha-1 mussel shell. Fernández-Pazos et al. (2013) found that the amendment of pyritic material with mussel shell had not positive effect on Cr(VI) retention, so this combination was discarded in the present study.

As in Fernández-Pazos et al. (2013), 3 g of each solid sample were added with 30 mL $NaNO_3$ 0.01M dissolutions containing 0, 0.5, 5, 10, 25, 50 or 100 mg L^{-1} of Cr(VI), prepared from analytical grade $K_2Cr_2O_7$ (Panreac, Spain). The resulting suspensions were shaken for 24 h, centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 15 min, and finally filtered using acid-washed paper. In the equilibrium dissolutions, pH was measured using a glass electrode (Crison, Spain), dissolved organic carbon (DOC) was determined by means of UV-visible spectroscopy (UV-1201, Shimadzu, Japan), and Cr(VI) using ICP-mass (Varian 800-NS, USA). All trials were performed by triplicate.

Data were treated using the statistical package SPSS 19.0 (IBM, USA), fitting Cr(VI) adsorption data to the Freundlich model (Eq. 1). Fitting to the Langmuir model was not possible due to estimation errors being too high.

The formulation of the Freundlich equation is as follows:

$$q_e = K_f \cdot C_e^n \quad \text{(Eq. 1)}$$

where qe (mg kg-1) is the ion adsorption per unit of mass for the adsorbent, Ce (mg L-1) is

the equilibrium concentration of the dissolved Cr, Kf (Ln g-1 mg(1-n)) is a constant related to

the adsorption capacity, and n (dimensionless) is a constant related to the adsorption intensity.

After the ending of the adsorption trials, each sample was added with 30 mL of NaNO3

0.01M solution to desorb Cr(VI), then shaking during 24 h, centrifuging and filtering as in the

adsorption trials (Arnesen and Krogstad 1998). Desorbed Cr(VI), DOC and pH were

determined in all samples.

2.2.3 Cr(VI) adsorption/desorption as a function of pH

To study adsorption, triplicate samples (1 g each) of mussel shell, granitic material, forest soil

and pyritic material, as well as granitic material + 12 t ha-1 mussel shell and forest soil + 12 t

ha-1 mussel shell, were added with 10 mL of solutions containing 5 mg L-1 Cr(VI) and

different concentrations of HNO3 (0.0025 M, 0.0038 M, 0.005 M, 0.0075 M) or NaOH

(0.0025 M, 0.0038 M, 0.005 M, 0.0075 M), also including NaNO3 0.01M as background

electrolyte. Control samples were constituted by each of the solid materials added with 10 mL

of solutions containing NaNO3 0.01M and 5 mg L-1 Cr(VI), but without HNO3 or NaOH.

After shaking for 24 h, all samples were centrifuged for 15 min at 4000 rpm, and filtered

through acid-washed paper. The resulting liquid was analyzed for pH, DOC and Cr(VI).

Adsorbed Cr(VI) was calculated as the difference between added Cr(VI) concentration and

that remaining in the equilibrium solution.

Desorption was studied using triplicate samples (1 g each) of the same solid materials than in

the adsorption trials, that were added with 10 mL of solutions containing 100 mg L-1 Cr(VI),

also including NaNO3 0.01M as background electrolyte. After shaking for 24 h, all samples

were centrifuged for 15 min at 4000 rpm, and filtered through acid-washed paper, discarding

the liquid phase. The remaining solid phase was then subjected to a desorption procedure,

adding 30 mL of solutions containing NaNO3 0.01 M and diverse HNO3 or NaOH

concentrations aiming to provide a wide pH range, then being different for the various solid

samples. After shaking for 24 h, all samples were centrifuged for 15 min at 4000 rpm, and

filtered through acid-washed paper. The resulting liquid was analyzed for pH, DOC and

Cr(VI). Desorbed Cr(VI) was calculated as the difference between the amount retained in the

adsorption phase and that released to the equilibrium solution in the desorption phase, and it

was expressed as percentage of the total amount adsorbed.

2.2.4 Fractionation of the Cr(VI) adsorbed at three different incubation times

Samples corresponding ~~to granitic material, forest soil, mussel shell, pyritic material, as well as granitic material + 12 t ha-1 mussel shell, and forest soil + 12 t ha-1 mussel shell,~~ were added with a NaNO3 0.01 M solution containing 100 mg L-1 Cr(VI) (1:10 solid:solution ratio), then shaking for 24 h and filtering. The resulting liquid was analyzed for pH, DOC and Cr(VI). Finally, fractionation of the adsorbed Cr(VI) was carried out using the BCR procedure modified by Rauret et al. (1999). The fractionation was performed ~~for three different incubation times:~~ *after* 24 h, 1 week and 1 month. The resulting fractions were: acid soluble fraction, reducible fraction, oxidizable fraction, and residual fraction.

Repetition

acid-soluble

Do the residual fraction comprise the recovery error ? Or the not recoverable Cr was measured in the solid samples ?

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Characterization of the solid materials used

Table 1 shows data ~~referred to the basic~~ *of some basic* characteristics of the solid materials used in this study. ~~Additionally, particle size percentages (sand, silt and clay) were as follows: granitic material (60%, 17%, 23%); forest soil (65%, 20%, 15%); mussel shell (99.53%, 0.34%, 0.13%); pyritic material (67%, 14%, 19%).~~

Data already present in the table !!!!!!!!!

3.2 Adsorption/desorption when different Cr(VI) concentrations were added

3.2.1 Adsorption

Figure 1 shows that Cr(VI) adsorption increased ~~as a function of~~ *on* increasing *the* Cr(VI) concentration in the equilibrium solution, which was directly related to the increase in the Cr(VI) concentration added. The same behavior was observed by Fernández-Pazos et al. (2013) using mussel shell, pyritic material, forest soil and slate processing fines, by Rawajfih and Nsour (2008) using *Phragmites australis* biomass, and by Vinodhini and Nilanjana (2009) using various bio-adsorbent materials. In the present work, the maximum adsorption corresponded to the pyritic material (between 97.1 and 98.7%), significantly higher than that achieved by forest soil (between 22.1 and 86%), mussel shell (between 20.9 and 31.2%), and the granitic material (between 19.5 and 31.2%). The mussel shell amendment (12 t ha-1) caused a slight decrease in Cr(VI) adsorption on forest soil (reaching values between 21 and 86%), whereas it provoked a slight increase in Cr(VI) adsorption on granitic material

italic

Is not possible to verify this statement without data on variability of the points.

1   (achieving up to 50%). In a previous work, Fernández-Pazos et al. (2013) found slightly lower

2   Cr(VI) adsorption on pyritic material and mussel shell, whereas adsorption was very similar

3   on their forest soil samples.

Undefined sentence: "adsorption" refers to what ? To the sorbed amount ? to the sorbed/in solution ratio ?

4   Significant correlations were found between Cr(VI) adsorption and total Fe (r=0.995), Fe

o the Kf ? to the n ?

5   extracted with ammonium oxalate (r=0.993), non-crystalline inorganic Fe (r=0.992), and pH

6   in water (r= -0.900). Previously, Martin and Kempton (2000) observed that Cr(VI) adsorption

7   increased as a function of Fe oxides content, whereas Mesuere and Fish (1992) and

8   Weerasooriya and Tobschall (2000) indicated that Cr(VI) has slow to moderate affinity for Fe

9   and Al oxy-hydroxides. These facts are in relation with the high adsorption capacity of ~~our~~ the

10 pyritic material, characterized by having high Fe contents and very acid pH; furthermore, a

Which kind of step regression? Automatic? manual? forward or backward ?

11 step-wise regression test corroborated the importance of the total Fe content on Cr(VI)

How did the authors deal with the heavy collinearity present in the data set for Fe species (total, oxalete etc etc)??

12 adsorption, explicating 99% of the variance. In our study, the pyritic material was the one

13 with the highest Cr(VI) adsorption capacity, as well as the lowest pH (2.97), and high

14 concentration of amorphous minerals. It is remarkable that this pyritic material had high

15 specific surface and pH-dependent exchange capacity, developing positive charge at acid pH,

16 while chromium was in anionic form ($HCrO_4^-$, CrO_4^{2-} and $Cr_2O_7^{2-}$). The granitic material

17 showed the lowest Cr(VI) adsorption, which can be in relation with its low total and non-

18 crystalline Fe contents (Table 1). Correlations between adsorbed Cr(VI) and pH of the

19 solution were positive for un-amended (r = 0.701) and shell-amended granitic material (r =

20 0.770), and for un-amended (r = 0.672) and shell-amended forest soil (r = 0.819), whereas

21 correlations were negative for mussel shell by itself (r = -0.994) and for pyritic material (r = -

22 0.424). These differences could be due to different mechanisms acting when Cr(VI)

23 adsorption takes place on the various materials: electrostatic bindings, then including the

24 possibility of OH^- release and consequent pH increase when chromium anions adsorb

25 (Arnesen and Krogstad 1998; Bower and Hatcher 1967; Gago et al. 2012), or other

26 mechanisms not including OH^- release, such as Van der Waals and H bindings (Boddu et al.

What ?? Is the DOC a function of sorption ?? Complete nonsense !

27 2003). Furthermore, in the present study DOC values increased as a function of adsorbed

28 Cr(VI), with significant correlations for granitic material by itself (r = 0.978) or mussel shell-

29 treated (r = 0.983), forest soil by itself (r = 0.905) or mussel shell-treated (r = 0.984), mussel

30 shell (r = 0.978), and pyritic material (r = 0.973), which can be in relation with release of

31 organic ions when Cr(VI) adsorption takes place. When added Cr(VI) concentrations

32 increased, both granitic material and forest soil showed decreasing adsorption percentages,

33 then suggesting progressive saturation of the adsorbent surfaces (Nameni et al. 2008).

1   Maximum adsorption was clearly higher for forest soil (86%) than for granitic material

2   (31%), which can be due to the higher organic matter, organo-aluminum complexes, and Alo

3   and Feo contents in the forest soil. At this respect, Kantar et al. (2008) indicate that some

4   ferric organic compounds facilitate the stabilization of Cr(VI) in acid to slightly alkaline soils

5   due to the catalytic reduction of Cr(VI) to Cr(III).

6   Adsorption data were satisfactory fitted to the Freundlich model (Table 2), as other authors

7   found for various bio-sorbents (Cetinkaya-Donmez, et al. 1999; Prakasham, et al. 1999)

8   meaning that adsorption maximum would not be easily predictable for these materials.

9   Significant correlations were found between the Freundlich constant K_F and FeT (r = 1), Feop

10 (r = 1), and Feo (r = 0.999), making evident the importance of amorphous minerals in Cr(VI)

11 adsorption.

12 **3.2.2 Desorption**

13 Table 3 shows that the lowest Cr(VI) desorption corresponded to the pyritic material (0.4-

14 0.8%), whereas mussel shell by itself released between 17 and 26% of the amounts previously

15 adsorbed. When 12 t ha-1 mussel shell were added to forest soil, Cr(VI) desorption increased

16 to between 8 and 44%, however desorption decreased to between 29 and 40% when the

17 granitic material was amended.

18 **3.3   Cr(VI) adsorption/desorption as a function of pH**

19 **3.3.1 Adsorption**

20 Figure 2 shows an overall increase in Cr(VI) adsorption as a function of decreasing pH values

21 in the equilibrium solutions. Similarly, different authors indicated that optimum pH values for

22 Cr(VI) adsorption are between 1 and 2.5 (Huang and Wu 1977; Boddu et al. 2003; Mohanty

23 et al. 2006; Rawajfih and Nsour 2008; Vinodhini and Nilanjana 2009; Wang et al. 2009), due

24 to a higher density of positive charges on the adsorbent surface, then facilitating the binding

25 to chromium anions that dominate at these very acid pH values ($HCrO_4^-$, CrO_4^{2-} y $Cr_2O_7^{2-}$)

26 (Boddu et al. 2003; Gupta et al. 2001; Ucun et al. 2002). Rawajfih and Nsour (2008), as well

27 as Wang et al. (2009), found that increasing pH values cause competition between chromium

28 oxyanions and OH^-, then decreasing Cr(VI) adsorption. In the present study, the pyritic

29 material was the one reaching the maximum Cr(VI) adsorption, concretely 50 mg kg-1

30 (equivalent to 99%) at pH 3.3 (Figure 2a), remaining high for the whole pH range. The

1 mussel shell retained around 50% of Cr(VI) when it was treated with acid and the solution pH

2 approached 7; however, the addition of base caused that adsorption diminished to 2.3 mg kg-1

3 (equivalent to 4.5%) when pH increased to 10-12 (Figure 2b). The granitic material showed

4 increased Cr(VI) retention at pH <3 (Figure 2c). The forest soil adsorbed 45.7 mg kg-1 Cr(VI)

5 (equivalent to 91%) at pH 2.97, but it decreased to 19.7 (39%) after being treated with base,

6 reaching pH 5.7 (Figure 2d). Although positive charges on variable charge surfaces can

7 explain maximum Cr(VI) adsorption when pH <3, the fact that the pyritic material showed

8 high adsorption even when pH value was increased can be in relation with its abundant oxy-

9 hydroxides content, some of them with elevated point of zero charge (Bradl 2004), as well as

10 in relation with Cr(VI) reduction to Cr(III) in presence of S2- and Fe2+, gave that Cr(III) may

11 be precipitated at pH values between 6 and 11 (Eary and Rai 1988; Sass and Rai 1987; Weng

12 et al. 1994). Mussel shell amendment did not cause great changes in the adsorbent behavior of

13 the amended materials, however it provoked an slight pH increase, and slight lowering in

14 Cr(VI) adsorption. But, in the case of the forest soil and the granitic material, this amendment

15 increased Cr(VI) adsorption if compared with samples having similar pH values, which can

16 be attributed to precipitation with carbonates, as signaled by Aziz et al. (2008) studying

17 chromium retention on limestone.

3.3.2 Desorption

19 Figure 3 shows chromium desorption percentage for the various materials after being added

20 with 100 mg L-1 Cr(VI). Desorption from the pyritic material was very low at pH <4 (Figure

21 3a), increasing with pH up to 478.8 mg kg-1 (51.7% of the amount previously adsorbed) at

22 pH 11, similarly to that found by Muthukrishnan and Guha (2008). Low crystallinity Fe and

23 Al oxy-hydroxides can be positively charged at pH <7 (Parfitt 1978; Richard and Bourg

24 1991), then retaining CrO42- (Rai et al. 1989). As pH decrease, HCrO4- concentration

25 increases, and this anion adsorbs strongly both to low crystallinity Fe and Al oxy-hydroxides

26 and to crystalline Fe and Al oxides (Zachara et al. 1989). Cr(VI) desorption from mussel shell

27 was very low at pH close to 5.5, clearly increasing at higher and (mainly) at lower pH values.

28 Cr(VI) released from the granitic material hardly changed as a function of pH (Figure 3c), and

29 was always lower than 15% of the amount previously adsorbed. Cr(VI) was strongly retained

30 in forest soil at pH <7 (Figure 3d), increasing release with pH up to a maximum attained at

31 pH 10.8. Chrysochoou et al. (2010) indicate that the presence of organic matter (as in forest

32 soil) or sulfides (as in pyritic material) can facilitate Cr(VI) reduction to Cr(III), which can

precipitate at pH >5. Avundainayagam et al. (2001) signal that Ca2+ can favor Cr(VI) retention in calcareous soils, acting as cationic bridge on negatively charged surfaces, or by means of CaCrO4 formation (Perkins and Palmer 2000). The mussel shell amendment increased Cr(VI) desorption from the granitic material (Figure 3c), similarly to that found by Yolcubal et al. (2007) in a calcareous soil. However, the shell amendment had not effect on Cr(VI) release from our forest soil (Figure 3d).

3.4 Fractionation of the Cr(VI) adsorbed at three different incubation times

Figure 4 shows the results corresponding to the fractionation of the adsorbed Cr(VI), after 24 h (Figure 4a), 1 week (Figure 4b), and 1 month of incubation (Figure 4c). The soluble fraction (the most labile -Gleyzes et al. 2002-, constituted by exchangeable and carbonate-bound forms) was 95% of the adsorbed Cr in mussel shell, and 80% in granitic material, after 24 h of incubation. The mussel shell amendment caused that the soluble fraction in the granitic material increased to 95%, with parallel diminution of other more stable fractions, probably due to Cr binding to carbonates present in the shell. Mussel shell and the granitic material (un-amended or amended) did not show relevant modifications in the percentage of the soluble fraction for more extended periods of incubation (1 week and 1 month). At 24 h of incubation, the soluble fraction was 35% for forest soil, and 7% for the pyritic material. The value did not suffer relevant changes with time for the latter, but in the case of forest soil it decreased to 17% and to 11% when incubation time was 1 week and 1 month, respectively, due to the increase of a more stable fraction (the oxidizable one, related with organic matter). The mussel shell amendment did not cause remarkable changes in the content of the soluble fraction of forest soil. At 24 h of incubation, the reducible fraction (Cr bound to Fe and Al oxides and oxy-hydroxides) represented less than 12% in mussel shell, as well as in amended and un-amended forest soil and granitic material, but more than 35% in the pyritic material, which can be due to its FeT and amorphous Fe contents (Reddy et al. 1997; Nieto et al. 2008). In fact, in the present study significant correlations were found between Cr(VI) in the reducible fraction and Feop (r = 0.999), FeT (r = 0.998), Feo (r = 0.997), FeT+MnT (r = 0.997), and MnT (r = 0.964). When the incubation time increased to 1 week and 1 month, the reducible fraction decreased in the pyritic material, increasing in parallel the residual fraction (that corresponding to Cr incorporated to minerals). The mussel shell amendment did not cause relevant changes in the reducible fraction contents. At 24 h of incubation, the oxidizable fraction (Cr bound to organic matter) represented between 3 and 15% in mussel shell and the

10

pyritic and granitic materials, however it was 55% in forest soil, which had higher organic matter content. When incubation time increased, Cr(VI) in the oxidizable fraction also increased in the forest soil, reaching 80%, whereas that in the soluble fraction (the most labile one) decreased. At 24 h of incubation, the residual fraction was quantitatively the most important in the pyritic material, representing 40% of the adsorbed Cr(VI), and it increased to 50% when incubation lapsed 1 week.

4 Conclusions

The pyritic material showed the highest Cr(VI) retention capacity among the solid substrates studied, while the lowest corresponded to the granitic material. The forest soil presented high adsorption potential when pH was acid and the Cr(VI) concentration added was < 10 mg L-1. When the concentrations added were high (50-100 mg L-1), certain saturation of the adsorbent surfaces became apparent, although Cr(VI) release was low in the wide pH range studied. Cr(VI) retention was more pronounced at very acid pH, while increasing pH values favored its release. Mussel shell showed limited Cr(VI) retention capacity, and it did not cause marked changes in Cr(VI) adsorption when used as amendment on forest soil and granitic material. Adsorption curves fitted satisfactory to the Freundlich model. The soluble Cr(VI) fraction was the dominant in the mussel shell and in the un-amended and amended granitic material, whereas more stable fractions dominate in the pyritic material (residual fraction), and in the forest soil (oxidizable fraction). Globally, the pyritic material showed the highest and strongest Cr(VI) retention capacity, whereas the lowest and weakest corresponded to the granitic material.

Acknowledgements

References

Álvarez, E., Fernández-Sanjurjo M.J., Núñez, A., Seco, N. And Corti, G.: Aluminium fractionation and speciation in bulk and rhizosphere of a grass soil amended with mussel shells or lime, Geoderma, 173-174, 322–329, 2013.

Arnesen, A.K.M. and Krogstad, T.: Sorption and desorption of fluoride in soil polluted from the aluminium smelter at Ardal in Western Norway, Water Air Soil Poll., 103, 357-373, 1998.

Avundainayagam, S., Naidu, R., Kookana, R.S., Alston, A.M., McClure, S. and Smith, L.H.: Effects of electrolyte composition on chromium desorption in soils contaminated by tannery waste, Aust. J. Soil Res., 39, 1077–1089, 2001.

Aziz, H.A., Adlan, M.N. and Ariffin, K.S.: Heavy metals (Cd, Pb, Zn, Ni, Cu and Cr (III)) removal from water in Malaysia: Post treatment by high quality limestone, Bioresource Technol., 99, 1578–1583, 2008.

Blázquez, G., Hernáinz, F., Calero, M., Martín-Lara, M.A. and Tenorio, G.: The effect of pH on the biosorption of Cr (III) and Cr (VI) with olive stone, Chem. Eng. J., 148, 473–479, 2009.

Boddu, V.M., Abburi, K., Talbott, J.L. and Smith, E.D.: Removal of hexavalent chromium from wastewater using a new composite chitosan biosorbent, Environ. Sci. Technol., 37(19), 4449-4456, 2003.

Bradl, H.B.: Adsorption of heavy metal ions on soils and soils constituents, J. Colloid Interf. Sci., 277(1), 1-18, 2004.

Cetinkaya-Donmez, G., Aksu, Z., Ozturk, A. and Kutsal, T.: A comparative study on heavy metal biosorption characteristics of some algae, Process Biochem., 34, 885-892, 1999.

Chrysochoou, M., Ferreira, D.R. and Johnston, C.P.: Calcium polysulfide treatment of Cr(VI)-contaminated soil, J. Hazard. Mat., 179, 650–657, 2010.

Duran, C., Ozdes, D., Gundogdu, A., Imamoglu, M. and Senturk, H.B.: Tea-industry waste activated carbon, as a novel adsorbent, for separation, preconcentration and speciation of chromium, Anal. Chim. Acta, 688(1), 75–83, 2011.

Eary, L.L. and Rai, D.: Chromate removal from aqueous wastes by reduction with ferrous iron, Environ. Sci. Technol., 22(8), 676–83, 1988.

Fernández-Pazos, M.T., Garrido-Rodriguez, B., Nóvoa-Muñoz, J.C., Arias-Estévez, M., Fernández-Sanjurjo, M.J., Núñez-Delgado, A. and Álvarez, E.: Cr(VI) Adsorption and Desorption on Soils and Biosorbents, Water Air Soil Poll., 224, 1366, 2013.

Fiol, N., Escudero, C. and Villaescusa, I.: Re-use of exhausted ground coffee waste for Cr(VI) sorption, Separation Sci. Technol., 43(3), 582-596, 2008.

Gago, C., Romar, A., Fernández-Marcos, M.L. and Álvarez, E.: Fluorine sorption by soils developed from various parent materials in Galicia (NW Spain), J. Colloid Interf. Sci., 374, 232-236, 2012.

Gleyzes, C., Sylvaine, T. and Astruc, M.: Fractionation studies of trace elements in contaminated soils and sediments: a review of sequential extraction procedures, Trends Anal. Chem., 21(6-7), 451-467, 2002.

Sorption and desorption studies of chromium(VI) from nonviable cyanobacterium Nostoc muscorum biomass, J. Hazard. Mat., 154, 347–354, 2008a.

Gupta, V.K. and Rastogi, A.: Equilibrium and kinetic modelling of cadmium(II) biosorption by nonliving algal biomass Oedogonium sp from aqueous phase, J. Hazard. Mat., 153, 759–766, 2008b.

Gupta, V.K., Shrivastava, A.K. and Jain, N.: Biosorption of Chromium (VI) from aqueous solutions by green algae Sirogyra species Water Res., 35(17), 4079-4085, 2001.

Huang, C.P. and Wu, M.H.: The removal chromium (VI) from dilute aqueous solution by activated carbon, Water Res., 11, 673-679, 1977.

Kamprath, E.J.: Exchangeable aluminium as a criterion for liming leached mineral soils, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. P., 34, 252-54, 1970.

Kantar, C., Cetin, Z. and Demiray, H.: In situ stabilization of chromium(VI) in polluted soils using organic ligands: The role of galacturonic, glucuronic and alginic acids, J. Hazard. Mat., 159(2–3), 287–293, 2008.

Mesuere, K. and Fish, W.: Chromate and oxalate adsorption on goethite 1 Calibration of surface complexation models, Environ. Sci. Technol., 26, 2357–2364, 1992.

Mohanty, K., Jha, M., Meikap, B.C. and Biswas, M.N.: Biosorption of Cr(VI) from aqueous solutions by Eichhornia crassipes, Chem. Eng. J., 117, 71-77, 2006.

Muthukrishnan, M. and Guha, B.K.: Effect of pH on rejection of hexavalent chromium by nanofiltration, Desalination, 219, 171–178, 2008.

Nameni, M., Alavi, M.R. and Arami, M.: Adsorption of hexavalent chromium from aqueous solutions by wheat bran, Int. J. Environ. Sci. Techol., 5(2), 161-168, 2008.

Nieto, A.M., Soriano, J.J. and García-Delgado, R.A.: Changes in chromium distribution during the electrodialytic remediation of a Cr (VI)-contaminated soil, Environ. Geochem. Health, 30, 153–157, 2008.

Olsen, S.R. and Sommers, L.E.: Phosphorus, in: Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 2, Chemical and Microbiological Properties, ASA, Madison, USA, 403-430, 1982.

Parfitt, R.L.: Anion adsorption by soils and soil materials, Adv. Agron., 30, 1–50, 1978.

Park, D., Yun, Y., Jo, J. and Park, J.: Biosorption Process for Treatment of Electroplating Wastewater Containing Cr(VI): Laboratory-Scale Feasibility Test, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 45, 5059-5065, 2006.

Perkins, R.B. and Palmer, C.D.: Solubility of $Ca_6[Al(OH)_6]_2(CrO_4)_3 \cdot 26H_2O$, the chromate analog of ettringite, 5-75˚C, Appl. Geochem., 15, 1203-1218, 2000.

Prakasham, R.S., Merrie, J.S., Sheela, R., Saswathi, N. and Ramakrisha, S.V.: Biosorption of chromium(VI) by free and immobilized Rhizopus arrhizus, Environ. Pollut., 104, 421-427, 1999.

Rai, D., Eary, L.E. and Zachara, J.M.: Environmental chemistry of chromium, Sci. Total Environ., 86, 15–23, 1989.

Rauret, G., López-Sánchez, J.F., Sahuquillo, A., Rubio, R., Davidson, C.M., Ure, A.M. and Quevauviller, J.: Improvement of the BCR three step sequential extraction procedure prior to the certification of new sediment and soil reference materials, J. Environ. Monitor., 1, 57-61, 1999.

Rawajfih, Z. and Nsour, N.: Thermodynamic analysis of sorption isotherms of chromium (VI) anionic species on reed biomass, J. Chem. Thermodyn., 40, 846-851, 2008.

Reddy, K. and Chinthamreddy, S.: Electrokinetic remediation of heavy metal contaminated soils under reducing environments, Waste Manage., 55, 203–503, 1997.

1   Richard, F.C. and Bourg, A.C.M.: Aqueous geochemistry of chromium: a review Water Res.,

2   25(7), 807-816, 1991.

3   Sass, B.M. and Rai, D.: Solubility of amorphous chromium(III)-iron(III) hydroxide solid

4   solution, Inorg. Chem., 26(14), 2228–32, 1987.

5   Schiever, S. and Volesky, B.: Modelling of the proton-metal ion exchange in biosorption,

6   Environ. Sci. Technol., 29(12), 3049-3058, 1995.

7   Schmuhl, R., Krieg, H.M. and Keizer, K.: Adsorption of Cu(II) and Cr(VI) ions by chitosan:

8   Kinetics and equilibrium studies, Water SA, 24(1), 1-8, 2001.

9   Ucun, H., Bayhan, Y.K., Kaya, Y., Cakici, A., Algur, O.F.: Biosorption of chromium (VI)

10   from aqueous solution by cone biomass of Pinus sylvestris, Bioresource Technol., 85(2), 155-

11   158, 2002.

12   Vinodhini, V. and Nilanjana, D.: Biowaste materials as sorbents to remove chromium (VI)

13   from aqueous environment, a comparative study, J. Agr. Biol. Sci., 4, 19-23, 2009.

14   Wang, X.S., Li, Z.Z. and Tao, S.R.: Removal of chromium (VI) from aqueous solution using

15   walnut hull, J. Environ. Manage., 90, 721-729, 2009.

16   Weerasooriya, R. and Tobschall, H.J.: Mechanistic modeling of chromate adsorption onto

17   goethite, Colloid Surf. A: Physiochem. Eng. Aspects, 162, 167–175, 2000.

18   Weng, C.H., Huang, C.P., Allen, H.E., Cheng. A.H.-D. and Sanders, P.F.: Chromium

19   leaching behavior in soil derived from chromite ore processing waste, Sci. Total Environ.,

20   154(1), 71–86, 1994.

21   Yolcubal, I. and Nihat, H.A.: Retention and Transport of Hexavalent Chromium in

22   Calcareous Karst Soils, Turkish J. Earth Sci., 16, 363–379, 2007.

23   Zachara, J.M., Ainsworth, C.C., Cowan, C.E. and Resch, C.T.: Adsorption of chromate by

24   subsurface soil horizons, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 53, 418–28, 1989.

25

1   Table 1. General characteristics of the solid materials (average values for 3 replicates, with

2   coefficients of variation always <5%).

	Granitic material	Forest soil	Mussel shell	Pyritic material
Sand (%)	60	65	99.53	67
Silt (%)	17	20	0.34	14
Clay (%)	23	15	0.13	19
C (%)	0.11	4.22	11.43	0.26
N (%)	0.04	0.33	0.21	0.04
pH_{H2O}	5.72	5.65	9.39	2.97
pH_{KCl}	3.69	4.70	9.04	2.58
Ca_c (cmol kg^{-1})	0.18	4.37	24.75	0.36
Mg_c (cmol kg^{-1})	0.13	0.66	0.72	0.29
Na_c (cmol kg^{-1})	0.27	0.33	4.37	0.14
K_c (cmol kg^{-1})	0.31	0.60	0.38	0.24
Al_c (cmol kg^{-1})	1.63	1.92	0.03	2.86
e-CEC (cmol kg^{-1})	2.53	7.88	30.26	3.89
Al-saturation (%)	64.55	24.41	0.11	73.68
P_{Olsen} (mg kg^{-1})	2.56	28.80	54.17	8.80
Ca_T (mg kg^{-1})	<0.01	709	280168	603
Mg_T (mg kg^{-1})	355	831	981	8384
Na_T (mg kg^{-1})	102	515	5174	412
K_T (mg kg^{-1})	1434	1544	202	3186
Mn_T (mg kg^{-1})	24	93	34	296
Cu_T (mg kg^{-1})	7	16	7	773
Zn_T (mg kg^{-1})	18	37	8	58
Ni_T (mg kg^{-1})	1	11	8	5
Cd_T (mg kg^{-1})	<0.001	0.43	0.07	0.08
Cr_T (mg kg^{-1})	3	18	5	99
Co_T (mg kg^{-1})	0.4	1.4	1.0	3.1
As_T (mg kg^{-1})	3	4	1	7
Al_T (mg kg^{-1})	5981	19660	433	9624
Fe_T (mg kg^{-1})	3505	9486	3535	135157

3

Table 1 (continuation).

	Granitic material	Forest soil	Mussel shell	Pyritic material
Al$_o$ (mg kg^{-1})	1425	4275	178	563
Al$_p$ (mg kg^{-1})	463	4163	78.7	229
Al$_{op}$ (mg kg^{-1})	963	112	99.7	335
Al$_{cu}$ (mg kg^{-1})	150	868	22.9	186
Al$_{pcu}$ (mg kg^{-1})	312	3295	55.8	42.7
Al$_{la}$ (mg kg^{-1})	137	146	2.6	91.1
Al$_{cula}$ (mg kg^{-1})	12.8	722	20.3	134
Fe$_o$ (mg kg^{-1})	224	2333	171	41860
Fe$_p$ (mg kg^{-1})	54.3	2246	37.7	625
Fe$_{op}$ (mg kg^{-1})	170	86.9	133	41235

Element$_c$: Concentration in the exchange complex; Element$_T$: Total concentration; Al$_o$, Fe$_o$: extracted with ammonium oxalate; Al$_p$, Fe$_p$: extracted with sodium piro-phosphate; Al$_{cu}$: extracted with copper chloride; Al$_{la}$: extracted with lanthanum chloride; Al$_{op}$: Al$_o$-Al$_p$; Al$_{pcu}$: Al$_p$-Al$_{cu}$; Al$_{cula}$: Al$_{cu}$-Al$_{la}$; Fe$_{op}$: Fe$_o$-Fe$_p$

1   Table 2. Fitting of the various materials to the Freundlich model.

	Freundlich		
	K_F ($(L^n\ g^{-1}\ mg^{(1-n)})$	n (dimensionles	R^2
Granitic	7.5±2.5	0.75±0.08	0.980
Forest soil	28.1±2.0	0.38±0.02	0.995
Mussel shell	10.7±7.1	0.73±0.17	0.895
Pyritic	381.6±11.7	0.66±0.04	0.994
Granitic material + shell	8.3±5.2	0.63±0.19	0.891
Forest soil + shell	19.9±2.1	0.45±0.03	0.993

2

3

1 Table 3. Desorbed Cr (mg kg^{-1} and %) when 0, 0.5, 5, 10, 25, 50 or 100 mg L^{-1} Cr were

2 previously added to the various materials.

	Desorbed Cr	0	0.5	5	10	25	50	100
GM Granitic Material	mg kg^{-1}	0.003	0.943	10.249	16.893	37.799	68.150	128.289
	%	0	61	92	65.5	66	55	67
FS Forest Soil	mg kg^{-1}	0.000	0.634	0.905	1.314	4.773	17.711	45.115
	%	0	15	2.6	2.5	6	16	21
Pyritic material	mg kg^{-1}	0.018	0.040	0.213	0.401	1.335	4.015	4.722
	%	0	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.5
Fine shell	mg kg^{-1}	0.038	0.178	2.301	4.565	11.784	29.580	52.747
	%	0	17	23	26	22	20	23
GM+12t ha^{-1} shell	mg kg^{-1}	0.000	0.787	2.943	9.093	21.312	30.976	61.636
	%	0	31	41	35	33	40	29
FS+12t ha^{-1} shell	mg kg^{-1}	0.000	0.626	2.276	4.560	16.198	37.978	85.178
	%	0	15	8	10	24	36	44

3 GM: granitic material; FS: forest soil

4

1   a)

2   b)

3   c)

4   d)

5   Figure 1. Adsorption ~~curves~~ points corresponding to the pyritic material (a), granitic material, forest

6   soil and mussel shell (b), granitic material with or without mussel shell (c), and forest soil

7   with or without mussel shell (d).

1 a)

Fine shell or Mussel shell ??
Consistency required

2 b)

3 c)

4 d)

5 Figure 2. Relationship between pH and adsorbed Cr (mg kg^{-1}) for pyritic material (a), mussel

6 shell (b), amended and un-amended granitic material (c), and amended and un-amended forest

7 soil (d).   after an addition of 100 ppm of Cr(IV) ??

8

1   a)

2   b)

Fine or mussel ??


3   c)

Also here no variabilty
is shown.

In Granitic and Granitic + shell
could be possible to see that
the differences were not
significative, but no data are
reported to substantiate the
significativity of the
differences.
The authors say they have
the data (p.5. l. 9-14), so they
would be able to perform some
simple t-tests. Or at least,
less formally, add the points of
the replicates in the graphs.

4   d)

5   Figure 3. Cr(VI) desorbed (%), as a function of pH, for pyritic material (a), mussel shell (b),

6   amended and un-amended granitic material (c), and amended and un-amended forest soil (d).

7   , after an addition of 100 ppm of Cr(IV),

22

The figure can be simplifiyed
and improved by gathering together
the 3 columns (24h, 1w, 1,m)
into a single panel.

Also it looks like that all the initila Cr is
completely recovered and attributed to
a particular fraction without any loss
in the recovery.

It is not specified wheter the residual Cr
is measured directly on the solid or
rather assumed to be the
not recoverable/lot/unknowable amount

Plotting columns not closing at 100 %
would help the reader to see directly
which is the non recoverable/ residual Cr

Figure 4. Percentages of the various fractions of chromium adsorbed after 24 h (a), 1 week (b) and 1 month (c) of incubation. GM: granitic material; FS: forest soil; PM: pyritic material; Sh: mussel shell. (100 ppm of Cr(IV) added at t0)